

History A

Advanced GCE A2 H506

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H106

Report on the Units

January 2009

H106/H506/MS/R/09J

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

It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses 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 syllabus 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 2009

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE History (H506)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE History (H106)

REPORTS ON THE UNITS

Unit/Content	Page
Chief Examiner's Report	1
F961 and F962	2
F963 01/02 and F964 01/02 (the Enquiry Units)	15
Grade Thresholds	28

Chief Examiner's Report

There is much to be learned from the first of the new specification assessments and Centres are strongly advised to pay close attention to the comments that follow. It is clear from the reports of both AS Principal Examiners that most Centres were ill-advised to enter their candidates after just one term's study. Unlike the legacy papers, the new AS specification has been designed as a one year course that requires a total of 180 guided learning hours i.e. 90 hours per AS unit. Although it is possible to sit assessments at the end of one term, candidates run a real risk of under-performing unless they have been properly prepared. This has been the key feature of the January assessment and is the underlining theme in both the Period Studies' and Enquiries' reports.

A lack of knowledge, understanding and maturity combined to produce largely disappointing results for the majority of candidates. In the case of the Period Studies units (F961 and F962), the candidates' knowledge was often insufficient to answer the question set and in fact many candidates could only answer one question. In most cases legacy topics have been extended in number and length and Centres who choose to study these need to address the amount of time they spend delivering the course in comparison with previous practices. The Enquiries units (F963 and 964) have been similarly extended and, where questions in the January assessment were set on later aspects of the topic, candidates frequently revealed their limited coverage and understanding.

Centres should also note that more emphasis has been placed in the allocation of marks in the new specification on the application of skills. In the Period Studies, due attention should be given to the analysis and assessment of factors before candidates reach a judgement on the question set. In the Enquiries, a good evaluation of the sources is imperative. Candidates therefore need to understand how best to integrate their own knowledge in their analysis rather than treat information, however relevant, as an appendage. All these skills require practice and maturity if candidates are to fulfil their potential.

On a more positive note, there was evidence of very good work in both units even if it was not spread evenly throughout the script. Many Centres seem to have focused effectively on the teaching of key skills and there were few really weak answers. What most candidates need is longer preparation time and a more complete coverage of the topic under study. Furthermore, the extra time allocated to both units in the assessment suggests that candidates should be able to reflect upon and plan their answers more carefully and be far less rushed than has often been the case in the legacy assessments. How candidates use their time is, of course, vital and additional time can tempt the unwary into writing as much as possible without considering its relevance and overall value.

Centres should also note that candidates are assessed on their ability to communicate clearly and coherently, and to write, spell and apply punctuation accurately, as part of AO1a. The quality of language after just one term's study can often be rudimentary and unrefined, and both Principal Examiners report that the overall level this session was only reasonable. Again, as candidates practise writing essays and expressing their ideas under timed conditions, so their standard should improve. This further underlines the wisdom of treating the January assessment as a 're-sit' session and teaching the AS units in the first instance as a one-year course.

F961 and F962

General comments

The overall standard of the answers was very disappointing, with very few candidates able to show a high level on both questions. Many candidates performed at Levels III or IV. There were a significant number of candidates who were able to produce one sound answer, but then either did not tackle a second question or wrote so superficially as to suggest that they had not covered the second topic. The paper is designed to be taught over the course of a full year and it was evident that many candidates had not covered all the topics, particularly when questions were set from the later key issues. At the same time many candidates appeared to lack the sophisticated analytical skills needed to reach the higher levels, suggesting a lack of maturity. Many did little more than list reasons or produce 'bolt on' evaluations, which failed to show a clear judgement about either the relative importance of factors or make clear their own view. The factual knowledge to support ideas was often superficial or generalised or not specifically relevant to the question set, focusing more on the topic than the demands of the actual question. A significant number of candidates would have benefited from time to reflect and practise timed essays.

The use of the new generic mark scheme, which requires two marks to be awarded, did see a large number of candidates achieving different bands on the two assessment objectives being tested, with the difference sometimes being as great as two levels. Candidates who made a clear attempt to grapple with the demands of the question were usually able to reach Level III on AO1b, but unless their ideas were well supported they frequently found themselves slipping into Level IV or V on AO1a. It is also worth noting that in the higher levels of AO1b candidates will need a good factual base in order to sustain their argument and allow a convincing judgement, rather than assertion, to be reached. As a consequence, a lack of good historical knowledge can have a significant impact, hitting both AO1a and AO1b. It would be advisable for centres to produce a student friendly version of the mark scheme and ensure that their candidates are familiar with its application. With two different highlighters students can be asked to identify relevant knowledge and areas of analysis, this can often bring home very clearly strengths and weaknesses, which can aid future planning. Although the mark grids may take longer to apply, they are beneficial for report writing as they will allow teachers to comment on specific skills and their relative strengths. Once again skills based exercises can then be devised to develop or improve weaker areas.

The types of question stems used are the same as those for the old specification and the skills being tested are also the same. Many candidates still seem unaware about the meaning of the term 'assess', despite regular discussion in the Principal Examiner's report and at INSET. It is therefore well worth repeating that candidates are expected to weigh up the relative importance of factors, explaining links between them and reaching a judgement as to their role. Many still simply list the factors and explain the role they played, making no attempt to evaluate their importance, or appear to believe that a sentence added at the end of a paragraph constitutes evaluation. This approach is often characterised by paragraphs that start with either 'another factor' or the 'second factor' etc. It might be suggested that teachers need to spend longer focusing on the skills being tested and ensuring that candidates can apply them.

Another common type of question requires candidates to consider 'how far' or 'to what extent' X was the most important factor. As with the old specification, candidates must write at least a good paragraph on the named factor, even if they conclude that it did not play a significant role before going on to evaluate the significance of other factors. At the top levels, as with the 'assess' style questions, examiners want to see candidates explain their view and reach a sustained judgement. This last term does play a significant role in the higher levels of AO1b and

teachers should spend time ensuring that their students have clear and supported views about the key issues and main topics.

It was disappointing to see a large number of answers lacking accurate supporting knowledge, with many answers showing a confused sense of chronology, using events from the wrong period or outside the dates in the question. It would be advisable for teachers to devise strategies that will address this issue, particularly with the students for whom the higher level analytical skills will always remain a challenge. At the lower level an improvement in the deployment of appropriate factual knowledge would probably see a significant improvement in the grade achieved.

The standard of written communication continues to be an issue and although most wrote in acceptable English, there were too many examples of candidates using 'would of' instead of 'would have' and similar lapses. A number of candidates used abbreviations which were not needed, such as HRE for Holy Roman Empire. A small number of candidates chose not to use the word **and** instead using + or &. Candidates are reminded on the front page of the need for 'clear and accurate writing, including ...grammar, punctuation and spelling.'

Candidates should also be reminded of the need to fill in the question numbers of the answers they have attempted; very few do this. There are occasions when it is difficult for examiners to be certain which question a candidate has attempted. There were also a number of rubric infringements with candidates answering three questions.

F961/1

Question 1

Answers to this question were usually focused and showed a reasonable level of analysis and understanding of the demands. The quality of the answer often depended upon a candidate's ability to set out the criteria against which they were going to discuss the issue of success. Much of the discussion frequently centred around his handling of the Godwin family and many answers concluded that Edward failed in the long term, despite short term success in having them exiled. Answers that focused on the positive aspect of his reign also tended to consider issues such as coinage, writs and the division of shires into hundreds. However, discussion of this issue was balanced by considering the problems Edward faced, particularly his lack of knowledge of England and that despite this he was able to bring a large amount of peace and stability to the country. It was disappointing that candidates did not use the issue of the succession to suggest that Edward ultimately failed by leaving a disputed succession that created the problems of 1066.

Question 2

There were a wide range of responses to this question and most candidates were able to put forward an argument, but the supporting detail was frequently superficial. However, there were a significant number of answers that were drawn into a narrative of events, particularly after Harald Hadrada's invasion, with little attempt to link the material to 'Harold's mistakes'. Candidates should also be aware that Harold was not present at Fulford Gate. Many candidates appeared to be more comfortable writing about the strengths and abilities of William, rather than Harold's mistakes. However, those who did write about mistakes usually focused on the march back from Stamford Bridge and his engagement with William before he had a full complement of troops, although some balanced this against the length of the battle and suggested that if it had not been for William's skilled use of the feigned retreat he may not have won. There were also a significant number of candidates who argued that William was a superior general to Harold in both experience and in his performance at Hastings, some even suggested that Harold had no military experience before Hastings, which makes it very difficult to explain his success against Harald Hadrada at Stamford Bridge. Some also claimed that he was a poor military leader because of his static position at the top of Senlac Hill. There were a number of candidates who

emphasised the role that luck played in the outcome, focusing particularly on the change in the direction of the wind coinciding with Harald's invasion.

Question 3

There were few answers to this question, but it was noticeable that many of those seen were unable to support their ideas with reference to a wide range of challenges. There was very little mention of Hereward the Wake and most answers focused on Exeter, the 'Harrying of the North' and the use made of castles.

Question 4

There were a reasonable number of answers to this question, but many candidates simply described Edward's policies towards the nobility without addressing the issue of 'how successful'. The range of examples used was also disappointing as many considered only Warwick and the Woodvilles, with some reference to Clarence. Where there was argument many suggested that he was more successful in his second reign than his first. There was very limited consideration of whether his creation of 'supernobles' was successful and many simply asserted that his policy towards livery and maintenance was a failure. Many answers concluded that Edward had been successful in dealing with the nobility because he died a non-violent death in his own bed rather than on the battlefield.

Question 5

This question produced a wide range of answers. The most common approach was to suggest that it was his loss of noble support that was the most important reason as this had serious implications at Bosworth and probably influenced the outcome of the battle. Many did argue that ultimately his reign was so short because of his death at Bosworth and some very good answers suggested that it was his death that was important; as if he had been beaten he may have been able to regroup. Candidates also considered the background to his seizure of the throne and argued that this created distrust. There was also consideration of his reliance on the northern nobility at the expense of the south and the lack of patronage that was available to him due to the nature of his seizure of the throne. There was a tendency for a number of candidates to simply list the reasons, rather than evaluate their relative importance.

Question 6

The more successful answers established a set of criteria against which to judge success, usually Henry's aims. Most considered that the securing of the dynasty was the most important and argued that Henry was largely successful, even if it did take a number of years. Some candidates tackled the question by considering his relationship with each nation and frequently argued that he was more successful in his dealings with Spain than France and Scotland. In particular they contrasted the marriage treaty with Spain with the failure to prevent Brittany being annexed and that Ayton was only a short term success. Candidates did give some attention to the issue of trade, but knowledge here was often very patchy. There were a number of answers that lacked clear knowledge of the various treaties which Henry concluded: Medina del Campo, Ayton or Etaples. There were also a large number of candidates who discussed Irish support for Simnel and Warbeck as an aspect of foreign policy, apparently unaware that Henry was Lord of Ireland by virtue of being King of England and that it is therefore not foreign policy.

Question 7

This was a wide-ranging question and attracted a number of approaches. Several candidates wrote mainly on the theme that Henry wanted to enjoy himself as king: this tended not to get them very far, since they usually omitted important aspects of the question in terms of foreign policy and matters of governmental style or dynastic considerations. The best answers showed an awareness of the situation in which Henry became king and took matters forward from that point in a thematic manner before reaching a conclusion about the extent of his success. Usually the king emerged quite well from this analysis, with any failures being blamed on Wolsey, although there were some convincing answers which held Henry responsible for an over-ambitious foreign policy and a petulant approach to the divorce question.

Question 8

The answers to this question varied in approach. Some tended to focus on the late 1520s, blaming Wolsey's fall on the failure to achieve the divorce from Catherine of Aragon, being outwitted by Francis I and Charles V in diplomatic terms and annoying Henry by the financial mess of the Amicable Grant. This was a perfectly valid approach and was done well by several candidates. Other answers took a longer look at Wolsey's career, many coming to the conclusion that his fall was more or less inevitable since the nobility would not countenance such an upstart having power over them. This approach runs the risk of becoming predominantly narrative, a list of Wolsey's actions which annoyed various magnates- the treatment of the minions or Wolsey's attitude to enclosure- with varied level of factual support. Although the question does need a discussion of more than the period after 1525, the word fall implies that it was sudden and so cannot be fully explained by his rise from humble origins through hard work and political cleverness.

Question 9

This question attracted some good answers which were able to engage with the question of how royal authority was exercised and by whom in the relevant period: there was knowledge of Henry's actions in respect of accusations against Catherine Howard, Thomas Cranmer and Catherine Parr, as well as awareness of the plan to have a Regency Council during the minority of Edward. How Seymour managed to undo the regency plan was mentioned to good analytical effect in a number of answers. Some good points were made about the king's ability to vary the religious establishment of England and this was linked to the issue of royal authority. Weaker answers tended to offer a narrative of Henry's last years, not always supported by abundant relevant knowledge.

F961/2

Question 1

This question was handled quite well, although some candidates needed to have a far greater chronological awareness of the radical challenges that faced Pitt and not write about events from Liverpool's ministry. Most argued that he was very successful, although there were some better answers that suggested his success was short term as his harsh measures served only to drive radicalism underground to resurface under Liverpool. Many answers suggested that it was not Pitt's policies that explain the success, but rather the weakness of the threat or its frequent association with the French Revolution which diminished its potential. Knowledge of Pitt's measures was usually satisfactory, although very few candidates were able to analyse the success of the policies and often finished up asserting that because the threat did not materialise he must have been successful.

Question 2

Although a number of candidates attempted the question there were very few that displayed satisfactory knowledge of the 1832 Act. Many answers did not go beyond setting the scene and others were little more than an introductory paragraph.

Question 4

Most answers were able to explain a range of factors, but very few were able to assess their relative importance and the answers finished up as a list of reasons, unable to get beyond Level III on AO1b, despite covering a good range and explaining each. Many answers focused on the issue of the departure of the Peelites from the Conservative party and the issue of Free Trade. Better answers linked the issue of Free Trade to Gladstone's budgets and this was also linked to the idea of sound finances. Many answers considered the issue of Italian Unification, but this was rarely developed and candidates found it easier to write about individuals such as Palmerston, but more could have been made of Gladstone as the 'People's William'. Very few answers were able to consider the issue of non-conformity and their concerns about religion and education. Many answers would have benefited from greater detail and it would have been

helpful if some candidates had a clearer understanding of the chronology of developments in the Liberal party.

Question 5

This was quite a popular question and attracted a wide range of responses as candidates put forward cases for both domestic and foreign and imperial policies. What was most disappointing was the lack of detailed knowledge, particularly about domestic reforms. Candidates made reference to Disraeli's reforms being permissive, but were unable to explain what this meant and the same was true when there was reference to One Nation Conservatism or Tory Democracy. Many reforms were mentioned, but detailed knowledge about their impact was frequently absent. When dealing with foreign and imperial policy, many answers focused almost entirely on the Eastern Question and the advantage of gaining Cyprus and the prevention of Russian expansion. There were some comments about the value of the Suez shares and Victoria's title as Empress, but these were often undeveloped. The same was true in dealing with imperial issues, although there were often undeveloped comments about 'men on the spot'. There was a great deal that candidates could consider and it was not expected that everything would be included, but greater depth was generally needed. Candidates do need to focus on the precise wording of the question and this was a clear example as many thought that 'success' was the same as 'popular'.

Question 6

This was the least popular of the questions on this topic area and attracted few high level responses. It was surprising that very few candidates were able to deal with the issue of Ireland in any depth and knowledge of parliamentary reform was rarely evident. Foreign policy was treated in a very cursory manner and detailed knowledge was again absent. It appeared that many candidates had not covered the third ministry as many of the examples were drawn from only the second ministry.

Question 7

Although this was a popular question, many candidates found the concept of 'principles' very challenging and this limited the level of their response. Many changed principles to aims and although this was often relevant it did mean that focus was not always directly on the question. The other major weakness of many answers was their narrow coverage of the period, with much information selected from the Eastern Question, particularly from Disraeli's second ministry. Some did try to discuss the issue of balance of power, but again the understanding of the concept was not always clear and most focused entirely on Russia and failed to see the emergence of Germany at the end of the period as an issue meriting consideration. There was virtually no consideration of British support for constitutional states and, more surprisingly for upholding the Empire.

Question 8

Answers to this question were usually sound, although some did struggle to develop the idea of trade routes as the most important reason. Many candidates found it easier to write about the need to keep Russia from the Mediterranean, usually for balance of power reasons, rather than the threat to trade. However, more could have been made of the need to uphold a declining Ottoman Empire in order to keep Russia out of the Balkans. The acquisition of shares in the Suez Canal could have provided some substance for the argument that trade was important. Most candidates were able to write in some detail about the importance of India and the desire to protect the 'jewel in the crown'. There were very few answers that were able to display knowledge and understanding from across the whole period.

Question 9

There were some answers to this question, but unfortunately there were very few answers that were able to focus on the precise wording of the question and deal with the issue of 'how popular' and simply assumed that it was popular and explained why. There was again some evidence that candidates who tackled this question had not really studied the key issue in any

depth and were struggling for a second question. Very few answers even mentioned the Khaki election and the subsequent reaction to the issues raised by the Second Boer War. There was also virtually no consideration of the death of General Gordon and the popular response or of the career of Joe Chamberlain and his ability to build a new career based on popular imperialism. Most answers were limited to some very sweeping statements about popular literature and Music Hall songs.

Question 10

There were a significant number of answers to this question, but the depth of relevant factual knowledge varied considerably. At the higher level candidates were able to write knowledgeably about the Sankey Commission, Red Friday and the return to the Gold Standard, but even here many did not evaluate the significance of the factors, or test them convincingly against each other. This resulted in many students, who had a good factual grasp, falling within Level III for AO1b because all they did was explain a range of factors. The discriminating factor was 'how far' and students did not show the confidence in their writing to make this jump. There were very few candidates who had a good knowledge of the chronology of events leading up to the strike and there was frequent confusion, which resulted in confused analysis. Many candidates also considered a very narrow range of causes for the strike, focusing usually on the general condition of mining and the role of the government. It was surprising that there was virtually no reference to the role of the miners and their intransigent attitude, epitomised by the slogan 'Not a penny off the pay, not an hour on the day'. Candidates were better at apportioning blame to the government and argued that Baldwin prepared for a strike and that there were many in the government who wanted a show down with the unions. However, in order to support this argument candidates frequently drew on information from during the strike. There was much confusion over the importance of Red and Black Friday, the issue of subsidies, the Gold Standard and the Sankey Commission. There were also a significant number of answers that went on to write about the actual strike itself and its consequences.

Question 11

Too many candidates appeared to have anticipated a different question and wrote a great amount of detail, but did not fully address the question set. There was a small minority who preferred to write about the political problems rather than the socio-economic, which was the focus of the question. As a result, many answers to this question were very disappointing and candidates displayed little knowledge of the measures the government took in order to deal with the problems. Knowledge was often little more than reference to a cut in interest rates and a weak reference to the Special Areas Act. There was confusion over the government's decision to leave the gold standard, with many arguing that the National Government took the country back onto the standard. There was virtually no consideration of the policy of Protection or of the various schemes to deal with social problems, with the Means Test largely ignored. Candidates were happier to write about other issues that brought about the recovery, but it would have been beneficial if this had been linked more closely to the question. Government preferred to create the conditions for recovery through private enterprise and although this was hinted at, it was not developed.

Question 12

This was quite a popular question, although the topic falls at the end of the Key Issues for this topic. In terms of detail and factual recall the responses were quite impressive. Many candidates were able to write convincingly on Conservative reorganisation, especially the work undertaken by Lord Woolton and the Maxwell-Fyfe Report. They also wrote well on the challenges facing the new Labour administration and growing divisions within the Labour hierarchy. However, most candidates were simply content to explain the issues rather than evaluate their significance or relative importance.

Question 13

This was a popular question and was answered reasonably well. The main weakness was that many candidates did not fully discuss the events and attitudes of the late 1960s and early 1970s. Much of the evidence and analysis focused on the 1950s and early 1960s. The role of Edward Heath needed far greater consideration in most answers.

Question 14

This was a reasonably popular question, but many candidates were unable to provide evidence from the whole period. The 1950s and 1960s tended to provide the focus of analysis at the expense of evidence from the 1980s.

Question 15

This was a popular question, but was answered with varying degrees of success. The main criticism was that few candidates provided a wide range of issues to analyse. Some answers limited their analysis to just the Falklands War and this put a ceiling on the level they could achieve. Candidates should also be encouraged to focus on specific words in the question, in this instance more could have been made of 'achievement'.

F962/1

Question 1

This was the most popular question on this topic and attracted a wide range of answers. Most candidates were able to consider a range of factors for the success of the First Crusade, but fewer candidates were able to write in great depth about the 'weakness of its enemies' and explain how this helped the Crusaders. There was often description of the divisions within the Muslim world, but this did need to be linked to the question. Many candidates were unable to name Sunni and Shi'ite or give details of events where disunity had actually led to loss of battles/sieges. On other aspects of weaknesses, focus was equally lacking. On the whole answers were generalised, with candidates lacking detailed and specific information. There were some popular factual misconceptions:- that divisions amongst the Sunni Seljuks occurred through the disagreements of the sons of Alp Arslan rather than Malik-Shah. Alp Arslan was also wrongly, but widely believed to be the father of Kilij Arslan. Answers often tended to focus on rather general issues such as luck, the effects of women and particularly cannibalism, which was sometimes elevated to the status of a regularly employed crusader tactic. Such answers were often at the expense of more central and more easily substantiated issues. Where better knowledge existed it tended to be descriptive, lacking evidence to link it to the question. As a result, there was little real evaluation, but rather a series of assertions.

There was little detailed knowledge displayed about either leadership or tactics employed by the crusaders. Most answers wrote in some depth about religious zeal, but again needed to link this to the success of the Crusades. There were some that did use the example of the Holy Lance at Antioch to show how religious enthusiasm could inspire, but this was not seen in many answers.

Question 2

The question was often misinterpreted – with rulers taken to mean those of European countries, so that there was much irrelevant discussion of both the second and third crusades. Similarly, Jerusalem was taken to mean Outremer in general, again leading to discussion of issues outside the parameters of the question. Again, there was a lack of specific and detailed knowledge, there were references to the importance of castles, but candidates often failed to name one. Poor knowledge led to generalised assertions as opposed to any real evaluation of issues. When candidates did show some knowledge about the rulers of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, they were frequently unable to link this to the state's survival. Candidates were more able to consider other factors, often focusing on the disunity among its enemies, at least in the earlier period and the support received from The Empire, others coming on Crusades and the supplies from Italy. There was little consideration of the tactics employed, particularly the avoidance of pitched battles, the use of castles and the role of the military orders. It did appear that many candidates struggled to have sufficient knowledge to tackle this question.

Question 3

This was the most disappointing of the questions on this topic as very few were able to focus on the exact demands of the question and wrote instead about Saladin's success against the Third Crusade. This also led some candidates to change the question into a discussion of whether Saladin actually was successful. Many answers were limited to sweeping generalisations, although some did write with some accuracy about the greater unity within the Muslim world. There were many generalisations about Saladin's leadership and military skills, which were little more than unsupported assertions. Where better knowledge existed, it tended to be descriptive, so that in both cases there was a distinct lack of any real evaluation.

Question 4

This was the most popular question in this section. Candidates had some good knowledge of art works, but did not always use it relevantly. There was little or no reference to the political structure of the city state and its effects on the development of the Renaissance, with most candidates simply confining themselves to wealth and competition, with sometimes a passing nod to classical background. Evaluation was poor, with only a single concluding paragraph, often little more than assertion.

Question 5

Candidates were often able to list different types of patrons and the art or architecture they produced, but without explaining the nature of the influence they had. There was little discussion of factors other than the different types of patronage. Evaluation was often again confined to a final paragraph, and was little more than assertion.

Question 7

This was a popular question and candidates were usually able to write about a range of factors, although not always linking them to success. The weakest area was usually consideration of the role of the Spanish monarchs, where many answers wrote generally about the importance of Ferdinand and Isabella to the success of Columbus and to Charles' lack of involvement in later voyages. There were very few who were able to discuss the limited importance of Ferdinand and Isabella's patronage of Columbus and were more confident writing about their religious zeal and desire to see the Crusading spirit continue. Many wrote quite well about other factors, often stressing the importance of the role of individuals in the success, as they had to overcome great difficulties, also suggesting that royal involvement was bound to be weak given the distances involved. There were some answers that argued that royal support was vital in the early stages, but less important under Charles. This was a valid approach, but candidates did need to sustain their argument if they were to reach the higher levels.

Question 8

Although candidates frequently knew a great deal about what the individuals did, they were often unable to assess their significance. As a consequence there were a significant number of answers that were largely descriptive of the voyages or which limited any analytical comment to a bolt on at the end of the paragraph, seriously limiting the band that could be achieved. There were also a large number of answers that did not weigh up the role of individuals against other factors, necessary if candidates are to assess the relative importance of a factor. It was the lack of detailed analysis, rather than factual knowledge that prevented many candidates from reaching the higher levels.

Question 9

This was a popular question and once again candidates were able to consider a range of factors, although most did conclude that gold and silver were the most important reason. This argument was usually supported by relevant examples from the voyages of Columbus, Pizarro and Cortes, with descriptions of how gold and silver were obtained. In some answers this was broadened to consider other economic factors. There was also consideration of issues such as religion and whether it was used as a cloak for expansion. Some answers also considered domestic factors, such as increased political stability or the need to develop a poor home

economy, whilst others linked it to the idea of challenging Portugal. Many answers were able to explain the role of each factor, but there were a large number who were unable to evaluate the relative importance of factors and this limited the Level that could be achieved.

Question 16

There was considerable irrelevancy in many answers, because candidates strayed away from the beginning of the reign which was the focus of the question. There was some confusion between finance and the economy. Answers were very generalised with little specific knowledge, making it difficult for candidates to make any real evaluation of issues, other than a general assertion that weaknesses outweighed strengths.

Question 17

Many answers tended to be very unbalanced with little focus on France. Where there was some consideration of these policies, they were very generalised – no mention of Spain's involvement in the religious wars and sometimes inaccurate – many being under the misapprehension that Henri IV's conversion to Catholicism was as a result of Philip's influence. Only very generalised knowledge of issues relating to England – although almost everybody mentioned the Armada. There was no recognition of either country being involved in events in the Netherlands.

Question 18

There was very little knowledge of foreign help to the Netherlands, France often being omitted altogether. Candidates therefore tended to ignore the issue and instead focus on other issues. Even here however, there was little specific knowledge, or it was undeveloped: many candidates for instance were able to suggest that geographical factors were an issue with the south being unable to cross rivers such as the Waal and the Maas, but were unable to show how this factor was exploited by deliberate flooding by northern leaders such as William of Orange and Maurice of Nassau so that answers were very generalised making any real evaluation virtually impossible.

F962/2

Question 1

The better answers did assess and prioritise with links, whereas the weaker responses usually provided a list of reasons. However, some candidates included irrelevant material from before 1795 as if they felt they really had to use it. In most instances not enough was said about the interaction of military and political skills and luck in Napoleon's rise to power and some answers said little or nothing about the Coup of 1799. Better answers did consider the role of individuals, as well as Napoleon's opportunism and the effects of underestimating him. References to the need of the French for a strong leader were acceptable if they were backed by links to Napoleon's propaganda claims.

Question 2

Some answers were thin on content or else made too many claims for Napoleon, for example many of the changes of 1789-93 were attributed to him. The better answers did make links to equality, liberty, property and fraternity and related such to actual acts and policy areas. Some were able to see both the pros and cons such as freedom versus control, free press versus censorship, policing, moves to the Emperorship, educational chances, merit, local-regional government, economic opportunism and a sense of rights. How far he was an heir of the French Revolution and betrayed key ideals was an issue that was addressed by some.

Question 3

This question was less popular, but was still answered effectively. The keys were the range of examples, the sense of benefits (gains v losses), economic and fiscal, control, the nature of rule and attitudes towards nationalist goals, for example Italy and Spain featured in some answers. Better responses ranged into the German lands and the Low Countries.

Question 4

This question was answered generally well or very well. In many instances a chronological frame worked with analysis and evaluation. Many were able to write in detail about politics, electoral policies, Chamber politics, the different political factions, legalism, the interaction of social and political arenas, minorities, deaths, unrest and factional strife with a proper sense of the King's position and problems. There could have been a sharper focus on change in places. The best answers were able to offer contrasts around 1820 and the hopes of 1814-16 with events after 1820.

Question 5

This question also produced many sound answers, with much knowledge and a good sense of the long/short term issues. Some answers did say too much about Louis XVIII's reign and some did not assess the triggers of 1829-30. The best picked up on factional groupings, tensions, the socio-economic context and the weakness of Charles X's position in terms of support.

Question 6

This question also saw a large number of chronological approaches and occasionally they were driven a little too much by description or narrative. The best answers embraced evaluative comments and related the outcomes to the aims, contrasting the 1860s and 1850s, and seeing Napoleon III's errors- secret diplomacy, extravagant moves, failure to build alliances, under-estimation of Bismarck and Prussia. More could have been made of the effects his diplomacy had on erstwhile friends or friendly powers- hence the isolation endured by 1868-70.

Question 7

This was a fairly popular question, but the quality of responses varied. There were very few high level responses as most candidates were unable to weigh up cattle-farming against other factors. Most answers were simply lists of the reasons why the west was opened up, supported by varying degrees of detail. Many candidates did need to display a greater degree of supporting detail in their answers, particularly on the issue of cattle-farming. They did appear more able to write about communications and transport as factors, and at the higher levels some were able to make a link between the development of railways and cattle farming, with reference to the growth of towns, such as Abilene. The issue of mining also brought some knowledge of the gold rush and the establishment of frontier towns. There were a number of answers that spent far too long on issues such as trapping and the fur trade.

Question 8

Answers to this question varied considerably. Although there were a number who were able to consider a range of factors, there were very few who attempted to assess their relative importance and there were many who were unable to develop their points fully. Most argued that the main reason was the cultural differences between the two groups. However, the examples used were not detailed. There was some consideration of broken government promises and the treatment of Native Americans, which was often reasonably well supported. Many answers lacked the period range and knowledge, with examples often being drawn only up to and into Jackson's Presidency, or more rarely, taken from the later Indian Wars. More could also have been made of the roles of the Government, particularly with reference to broken treaties and attendant socio-economic issues.

Question 9

Although this was quite popular, the standard of the responses was disappointing. The best answers were able to offer effective and reasonably close comparisons, but they often lacked sustained illustrative support. They sometimes considered issues such as political/military leadership, morale, Cabinets, states and rights, Congresses and how they used resources. However, many candidates were unable to establish criteria against which they could make judgements. Answers often relied on sweeping generalisations about their role in government and their appointment of generals, although on the latter point there was some knowledge, it did not focus directly on the question and dealt more with the ability of the commanders. It was

particularly noticeable that precise knowledge about Davis was lacking. There was also often frequent imbalance or sequential treatment which lacked any end comparative judgement.

Question 10

This was generally a sound and effective question, although some answers did dwell too much on the reasons for the Stalemate. Also, some only seemed to know of the later 1918 allied breakthrough. There were a number who wrote very little about Haig and the British army and some forgot the role of the French. The Americans did feature quite well, although their leadership and overall role could have been adduced more sharply. Solid answers made reference to such factors as: technological shifts, better tactics, use made of firepower, the concept and execution of movement, use of tanks, lessons learnt, the re-training of armies, the German Spring Offensive and the reasons for it and the Allied fight back.

Question 11

There was a major difficulty with this question as many did not understand the concept of self determination; all too often countries or leaders were 'self determined'. Very few answers ranged beyond the Versailles Treaty and even then very little was done in respect of the question arena. Much was made of other motives and factors such as revenge, re-drawing Germany's boundaries and exacting financial penalties. As a result answers were limited in scope and therefore reward levels. There were a few answers which did assess self-determination against other factors and used evidence from the full range of treaties.

Question 12

This question produced a range of answers. Some candidates wrote about the War in Europe and some fell short of 1938-41. However, the better answers had a good awareness of Japanese ambitions, aggressive intent and acts, of China and the events and of the USA responses, although events of 1940-1 were often absent in the analyses.

Question 13

This was a popular question and saw a fairly wide range of answers. The most common problem was the inability of candidates to link the factors they discussed to the actual question. Very often candidates explained the problems facing the peasantry, but failed to explain how it contributed to 1905, other than to say they were discontented. This was also noticeable when dealing with the Russo-Japanese War, which candidates stated resulted in defeat, but did not explain how it contributed to 1905, unless they stated it was an humiliation. There were a significant number of answers that completely ignored Bloody Sunday and very few had any knowledge about the development of events outside St. Petersburg.

Question 14

The main feature of answers to this question was the lack of detailed supporting material, particularly on White weakness. There were very few answers that explained the composition of the White armies and even fewer that could talk about the problems of command and war aims. Candidates were better at explaining Red strengths, but again knowledge tended to be generalised; there was little precise evidence about the contribution of Trotsky to the organisation and discipline of the Red Army. More could have been made about the geography and therefore control of the main industrial areas and rail network by the Bolsheviks. Comments made about the treatment of the peasantry by the Reds were often contradictory and reasons for peasant support following seizure of grain, war communism and terror were not very convincing.

Question 15

There was frequently a good depth of knowledge displayed in answering this question, but candidates needed to be more explicit in linking the material to the question. Many knew a great deal about the positions controlled by Stalin, but were unable to explain how his position as General Secretary helped him rise to power, there was frequent mention of his promotion of supporters, but no answers were able to support this by reference to men like Radek or Voroshilov. There was much discussion of the struggle between the Left and Right within the

party and Stalin's use of this, but there needed to be much more analysis and explanation of how this aided Stalin. Most answers were also able to consider the mistakes made by Trotsky, although this did need to be developed and more could have been made of the fear that many had of him, given his control of the Red Army.

Question 16

Most answers dwelt on events of 1918-20, few really engaged from 1915. Some answers spent far too much time on pre-1914 features and issues. Many responses were detailed on 1918-20, considering politics, economics, the price of peace, nationalism, socialism, but did not always illustrate enough or make links between factors. Some candidates simply saw the question as an opportunity to write about the rise of Mussolini.

Question 17

There were similar problems with this question. Many wrote about Mussolini pre 1922. A few answers ignored the direction to the 1920s. Better answers considered Mussolini's skills, propaganda, the role of the elites and compromises, the fears of socialism, violence, electoral changes, the Aventine Secession, in some instances links were made, but not necessarily evaluative. More could have been made of the relative importance and how far Mussolini was lucky, an opportunist, a leader wanted by key groups, the beneficiary of errors made by his opponents.

Question 18

This question was answered reasonably well, although there were some generalisations. Candidates were usually able to consider social areas. Better answers did understand and assessed; some links were made between factors, but there was also a lack of supporting detail. Not enough was made of the different phases; for example comparing 1920s and 1930s and the whole idea of the Corporate State was often absent or underdone in scope. Answers tended to explain patchily and needed more of the reasons for contrasting fortunes and the faltering economic situation by the mid 1930s.

Question 22

This was a popular question, but too many answers focused on the events of the early years of Weimar and therefore did not explain fully why Weimar survived. Many answers therefore gave the impression that this was not the question they were expecting. Some even started with the point that Weimar was doomed from the start. There was much uncertainty about how to tackle the question and this was shown by phrases such as 'another reason might be'. However, some answers were able to explain how the Spartacists and Kapp were defeated, but often did not go beyond 1923. Issues such as economic recovery or the improvement in living conditions were frequently ignored, although some mention was made of the foreign policy successes of Stresemann. There were few answers that considered the weakness of the opposition or the success of government policies, such as the new currency. However, fewer answers suggested that even though it survived, the basis of its support was very narrow and that many of the issues it had to deal with remained unresolved.

Question 23

Although this question was tackled by a significant number of candidates, their understanding of the term Gleichschaltung was very mixed and in some instances it was linked to Volksgemeinschaft, with many obviously hoping that it was the same thing. Much depended on their understanding of the term and the areas they then covered. There were virtually no answers that considered the creation of a one-party state and the destruction and replacement of trade unions. Most answers considered the problem of women and youth, with some reference to the question of the Church, but here knowledge was very superficial. The Nazification of state and local government warranted no mention. Some wrote a little too readily of controls and methods and often related this to a past question without using such material to assist the analysis of the concept and execution of 'co-ordination'.

Question 24

Although some candidates displayed reasonable knowledge of the events from 1945 to 1949, very few were able to explain reasons for the development of two German states. The currency question dominated most answers, although there was some mention of the different political ideologies. Some candidates did place the development into the wider context of the Cold War, but this was often poorly explained, whilst others went beyond the dates in the question. Where candidates were able to explain a range of reasons there was still little evidence of evaluation of the importance of the factors.

Question 25

There was some broad understanding of the issues and also an awareness of the views of different historians, though this was often not linked to events, but was used by some to explain as a further set of reasons. More could have been made of Stalin's place, role, suspicions, acts and also of Truman and his role. The A bomb and the absence of a common enemy were adduced as the two key reasons.

Question 26

Answers tended to be better on 1968 than 1956 and tended to avoid comparisons. Most treated the events sequentially, sometimes setting out causes, then consequences, one after the other. The above meant a lack of focus on similarities and differences in scope of issues.

Question 27

There were some reasonable answers, but most were generalised as to their content range. More was said of Russia than Eastern Europe, though a few references were seen. There was some tendency to focus more on the cause of the chaos and collapse than the consequences.

F963 01/02 and F964 01/02 (the Enquiry Units)

General Comments

The total entry for the Enquiry Units was 998 with a breakdown on the British History Units of 128 on the earlier period (F963 01) and 161 on the later (F963 02), and on the European and World History Units of 184 on the earlier period (F964 01) and 525 on the later (F964 02).

Obviously none were resit candidates; all were taking the paper for the first time and the evidence suggests that for the vast majority this was not appropriate. The marks were disappointingly low. In the legacy specification we advised against taking this Unit after only one teaching term as candidates had not had time to reflect with appropriate maturity on sources and their use. This is even more the case now that there are more key issues to cover. **It was clear to all examiners that candidates were not ready.** They lacked knowledge and understanding of their periods and were basic in the way they handled sources, finding evaluation especially difficult. Where questions focused on issues and material towards the end of a unit (The Home Rule crisis on Gladstone and Disraeli; the Crusader States; Lutheran Popularity post 1540 on the German Reformation) there was much uncertainty and, at worst, evidence that the later periods had yet to be taught. **The January paper should be used in future as a resit paper only.**

Most candidates ranged between 30-65 marks, mainly achieving levels III, IV and V. Some were in the 60s but many found it difficult to get into the 70s. It was very rare to see a mark in the 80s and only a couple managed the 90s. The 01 version (the earlier periods) saw some of these very high marks but overall they did less well than their more modern, 02, equivalents. On a more positive note, candidates at most levels were trying to do the right thing, especially at the bottom end in the 30s and 40s. They simply didn't know how to make the sources work within the framework they knew they needed to work towards. More disappointing were those in the middle and top ends who preferred to argue their points by source reference and well used stand-alone own knowledge. They were convinced by their command of the topic, failing to realise that they needed to go further and question the sources, using their own knowledge to do this. **Own knowledge must be subservient to the Sources on this paper.**

This was the first time that the **new mark scheme** was used and it has enabled examiners and teachers (hopefully) to pinpoint candidate skills more accurately, pointing to particular deficiencies and strengths. Teachers are strongly advised to adopt this in their own marking. It is a useful means of assessing candidate progress during a course. The weighting of marks is a clue to the relative importance of skills. The focus should be on AO2 a and b. AO1 a and b have less marks attached, hence the relative underachievement of some candidates. It is worth considering how we reward candidates:-

Qb – Assessing an Interpretation (all assessment targets)

- AO1a - relevant knowledge that is used to extend, confirm or qualify the contribution of the Sources to the interpretation or view. It should largely be used to assess content and provenance. The mark allocation is low (10/70).
- AO1b – explaining, analysing and judging the sources in relation to the question. The key is developed explanation and analysis incorporating knowledge. This is also where we reward substantiated judgement. By LIV there is description of the sources with little if any judgement. Again the weighting is low (12/70).
- AO2a – an evaluation of the sources as a set, a group or individually in relation to the question. How much weight is given to a source or group of sources? Evaluation is rewarded in L1A, L1B 9 (all sources) and LII (most). If the sources are merely

referred to illustratively then LIII and below is appropriate. Most marks are awarded here (28/70)

AO2b – This is about synthesis – bringing together all the other skills to provide an effective answer to the question. It is also where we reward a balanced discussion as between sources and evaluative knowledge. It too has a high weighting (20/70).

We would also like to draw teachers attention to the document on the OCR website (**Thinking about the Enquiry Assessment Targets in F963 and F964**) which was used as the basis for training our examiners and which discusses the above points in further detail. It provides the framework for a useful skills audit for teaching and delivery in the classroom. There is also a **compilation of previous reports** highlighting common errors and suggesting advice for tackling this in the classroom.

The **extra time** (1.5 hours instead of 1) has enabled candidates to reflect, plan and think about the sources more effectively and may well be the reason that more attempted to demonstrate the skills listed above. There were fewer cases of sources being omitted, although it did mean a few attempted to compare all 5 sources in Qa. **Spelling and punctuation** was reasonable, if often very basic. Colloquialisms abounded. Candidates need to think conceptually and use the terms appropriate to their period of study. This will enable them, for example, to achieve AO1a. Nonetheless the standard of English was reasonable, especially given only one term of the AS course had been completed. What follows are the **faults** common to the two questions this January.

Sub Question (a) – The Comparison

This was less effectively answered than on the legacy papers, perhaps because the extra time allowed candidates to incorporate irrelevant knowledge and description of the sources. We would like to draw the following to the attention of teachers.

- **Sequencing** was very prevalent and a sign of the weakness of the responses. It ensured that many did not manage more than a LIV. A source, even if evaluated effectively, was done in isolation. The comparison, if any, was confined to a brief final paragraph. Even if content was compared, provenance was rarely handled in the same way. Candidates much prefer to assert provenance discretely and rarely compare it. They need to realise that it is the key to an effective judgement – which may be the better source for a particular issue.
- **Provenance** was thus treated in isolation and was the least effective aspect of the question. It must be related to the question. We often see signs of a tick list approach to provenance using the AO2a LIA qualities in isolation. They are not used in relation to the issue in the question. It needs to be remembered that the key provenance point will vary from question to question. If a candidate tries to apply a whole list of qualities then they will be trying, in some instances, to discuss what is not there. The emphasis will vary. Sometimes it will be the dates and a changing context. At others it may be tone, the nature of the source, its audience or purpose. These need to be directly engaged and not discussed in the abstract.
- **The use of own knowledge**, as made clear above, is frequently misunderstood by teachers and candidates. AO1a is, respectively, only 6/30 and 10/70. There was a considerable increase in long winded introductions and unnecessary background, combined with considerable digression. AO1a is about demonstrating understanding and in providing brief and effective context. Candidates achieve it by the assured handling of key terms in their comparative exposition. It will be obvious whether they know the context of Charles V on the eve of his war against the Lutheran Princes and again in the Peace of Augsburg, or on the 1938 Munich Conference. Such knowledge can easily be put into the sub clause of a sentence.

- **A Judgement is required** and is frequently why, in AO1b, a candidate is capped at a LIII or below. Judgement arises mainly out of provenance and needs to be linked to the comparative issue in the question. Candidates need to ask themselves which source might be the better evidence for understanding or illustrating the issue and its problems. Whilst many candidates do provide a final judgement this tends to come at the end, as an afterthought, is asserted and rarely earned or justified in the comments on provenance.

Sub Question (b) – Assessing an Interpretation

More time delivered more focused answers but the approach tended to be sequential (each source considered on the pattern A, B, C, D and E, or a mix – we are not fooled!) and referenced (used illustratively and, at worst, merely described). Provenance existed but was often tacked onto the end, listed and not related to establishing the relative worth of a source. Good practice is to sustain a grouping according to interpretation or view, arguing a case that leads to a sustained judgement. Many candidates started to do this by an appropriate grouping but then lapsed into sequencing or they sustained the grouping but lost sight of the question. If they had integrated provenance then they would have provided a commentary on the relative value of the sources. Their efforts are often piecemeal. Candidates would be well advised to read all the sources before starting, not least because sources often relate to each other. On the German Reformation, Source E contained much useful context for the question. Sequential candidates arrived at E too late to use it effectively. Teachers should especially note the following.

- **Sequencing** was almost universally prevalent. It impedes evaluation and cross reference and tends to encourage description. Content is used in isolation.
- **Referencing** (the source says) leads to description and it is rare for there to be any evaluation of the issue in question. This cannot be rewarded above a LIII. The onus is on the candidate to work through an argument and the contribution of the sources to it, not on the examiner.
- **Stock evaluation** is very common amongst both weaker and middling answers. It leads to assertion – that Source B is biased/primary/secondary etc. and therefore is of no use. That may be so, but left at that it is mere assertion and not infrequently betrays simplistic assumptions. It needs to be unpacked in relation to the question. What is the nature of its reliability or unreliability? It must be integrated into the argument.
- This is particularly so where **modern historians** are the source. The key here is to look at their view or interpretation. Is it one sided or balanced? Are they judging from a political/economic/religious or social perspective? Do they exemplify or just assert? Do the other sources illustrate, support or counter these views?
- **Introductions and attributions** were often underused as an effective means of evaluation. They can easily be linked to tone or reliability whilst the date, usually spotted for the comparison question, is often ignored here. We frequently see the introductions merely written out, as though this was enough to ensure evaluation.
- **Knowledge** remains a problem for most. They fail to get the balance right or to understand how to use it on the Enquiries paper (AO1a). Some candidates ignore any specific reference completely and can be rewarded only insofar as they demonstrate conceptual understanding. This January most were dependent almost entirely on the sources. A minority marginalised these and proceeded as though this was a period studies paper with the sources occasionally mentioned in a passing sub clause. The function of knowledge on this paper is to extend or challenge a source's view and to provide contextual information to enable a source to be analysed for the reliability of its contribution to the debate. It is part of the evaluative process. For example, on F964/02 Q4 on Dictatorship and Democracy in Germany, Maria Kraus in Source D may be an untypical nosey neighbour but knowledge would suggest both that there were other factors in how the German population were controlled (propaganda, which could be briefly discussed, is very evident in her comments on her neighbour's behaviour and appearance) and that she corroborates Source E's view that it was less the Nazis themselves that were 'all seeing' than the army of unpaid informers who did their work for them. Knowledge could extend this (the role of teachers in enquiring about parental attitudes). Source C (the Gestapo report) only makes

- **Misreading the question** is all too frequent. Candidates discuss a general issue and could usefully highlight the interpretation they have been asked to discuss. Weaker responses sometimes try to maintain relevance by a lengthy and repetitive rendition of the question wording, usually a sign that they do not really understand what it is getting at.

Comments on Individual Questions

F963 01

There were only 128 candidates taking this paper. The vast majority answered on the Civil War with some tackling the Normans but only a few the Mid Tudor Crises. The standard was disappointing, answers exhibiting all the problems cited above, but there were some high end scripts seen and most acquitted themselves reasonably in terms of basic period knowledge and understanding. They were let down by their inability to keep the sources central to their responses and to evaluate them to answer the question set. No complaints were received.

1 The Normans in England 1066-1100

(a) Most could access the key difference between A and B, fair versus unfair treatment of the native English, but could not develop this or spot inconsistencies, particularly the contradictions in the evidence of William of Poitiers. On the one hand he appears to say that many English receive far more than before but then immediately refers to extensive grants to the Normans. Few spotted the key qualification – that no Frenchman was given anything *unjustly* taken. As conquerors they would regard most land as potentially theirs. Provenance was weak, based around a simple Norman chronicler versus an English born one. This needed linking with the text as William of Poitiers is a notoriously pro Norman source. Few spotted the crucial dates and context. He is writing in 1071 about the immediate conquest, before the rebellions of 1069-71 and possibly refers to William's initial policy of conciliation. This was replaced by a much harsher policy of confiscation of which there are hints in A. Orderic Vitalis in B clearly has a later overview and can refer to the wider impact on the native English. His may be the better evidence, a judgement which few attempted.

(b) Most produced a very one sided answer here, sequencing the sources to produce an interpretation that agreed with the proposition that changes in land holding post 1066 were because of military need. Candidates were unduly dependent on the sources for information and as a result failed to evaluate them via their own knowledge. For example sources B, C and D are all monastic sources and may view land linked to military need with a dim view when it came to Church possessions. They are likely to dwell on this aspect. Nonetheless the Abingdon Chronicle in D accepts the need and points to the key reason for this – the insecurity following the conquest, the need to protect the Thames valley corridor and the extent of rebellion ('new conflicts and conspiracies' almost every day). The other key weakness in answers to this question was to pick up on other views about the reasons for change, particularly evident in source E. This was the need to reward followers ('spoils'), patronage and an endowment of the Church as thanks to God and a fulfilment of the promise to reform a decadent English Church (one way of dealing with sources C and D). Sources A, B and E stress colonisation, settlement and patronage and much could be made of William of Poitiers in A who hints at a different policy toward land in the first couple of years after the conquest. No candidate was able to see that the reasons for change are linked. Military needs were linked to confiscation, military need and patronage.

2 Mid-Tudor Crises 1536-1569

(a) Weaker answers simply compared the two rebellions in general but most used the question's focus on the ways in which support was won to very good effect, pointing to a stress on loyalty to the person of the monarch, dislike of advisers (with the stress on a new and heretical protestant nobility in E), fear of foreigners (either already in England in D, a possible exaggeration, or threatening invasion in E) and the link to wealth and lands. Not all picked up on marriage, explicit in D and implicit in E (a Courtenay marriage), or on the differences between north and south, the former implying a semi feudal command for tenants to 'arm and join us quickly' the latter more an appeal to 'friends and neighbours' to assemble to protect liberty and commonwealth. Little was made of Gentry versus Nobility in the two sources, an important provenance point. Judgement here would be that both were of equal value.

(b) This was reasonably handled by all and in a few cases produced answers that were a pleasure to read. Most candidates were able to pick out Catholic aims in A, B and E, some indeed aware of different types of Catholicism, and Protestant ones in C and, implicitly and contextually, in D (Wyatt). For some their answers stopped at that point, the argument tending to stress the importance of religious factors in rebellion. Some agreed with the assertion, others stressed Protestantism, but this limited their response to the Pilgrimage, Western and Northern Risings as opposed to Kett's and Wyatt's Rebellion. Better answers looked at other issues as well. Most spotted economic factors, especially in C. Only the better responses could see that they also figured in B, D and E. Class or social factors were spotted only by the able few. Much could have been made of this, especially when considering the provenance and context of sources like Aske in A and the Earls in E (Gentry and traditional noble families versus new Court Nobles – Cromwell and Rich, named in A, Cecil and Dudley, by implication, in E). The Western rebels in B have a social agenda as does Kett in C. Similarly few linked this to politics and court faction, despite the north v south regional agenda in A and E, and the articles in A designed to restore the political status quo ante. In terms of evaluation much could be made of the more hidden agendas in Aske, Wyatt and the Northern Earls. Were they using religion and foreign fears to mask more political or regional agendas? Only a few better responses referred to this.

3 The English Civil War and Interregnum 1637-60

(a) There were a lot of weak answers seen to this question, with much general comment rather than a focus on opposition to the First Civil War. Such comment missed crucial differences such as the Gentry focus in A, the wider response in D. General referencing was particularly evident with little attempt to link either to the question or the sources. Most candidates resorted to this, eg. *'the key theme highlighted in the two sources is the growth of neutrality during the First Civil War'*, or *'the sources show that it was the civilian population who were opposed to the war'*. Some tried to create an argument based on whether there was substantial support for war which only served to draw them away from the question. A frequent technique was to juxtapose two sentences of content, thus assuming a comparison has been made eg. *'Source A is the county of Cheshire declaring neutrality and Source d is a parliamentary supporter warning of the growth of neutralism'*. This technique is not comparative and avoids the key issue of opposition. Knowledge was often used inappropriately as unnecessary background rather than as a contextual aid to comparison. A frequent response was a detailed and focused answer which, through sequencing, produced only implied comparison. Weaker responses failed to spot that Myddleton in D thinks that Neutralism can be won over with the imposition of stricter military discipline. His authorship caused much confusion; some claiming, inaccurately, that he was an opponent of the war others merely mentioning the examples of opposition from the source and missing the provenance completely. Most could not see his purpose as the key to his comments and failed to analyse the detail of his comments *about* the opposition, and how they could be won over. In A the key weakness was to miss the point that this is the Cheshire Gentry, concerned to minimise conflict between themselves and to maintain the integrity of their property ('possessions and arms to be returned to their owners').

(b) The most frequent mistake here was to change the question to the reasons for Parliament's victory in the Civil War, instead of why it took them so long. Source C provided the trip wire as, whilst analysing the impact of the New Model Army, candidates discussed it as a reason for

victory. From then on they proceeded to organise their material to fit this. The focus in C should have been to discuss the state of the army before the New Model and to assess whether Lucy Hutchinson's points are reliable and useful given her partiality to it. Source E was also interpreted in the light of a 'reasons for victory' answer. Instead of using it to stress initial royal strengths, linking it to B and C's comments about conservatism and innate deference to the King's position by Parliament's commanders (Manchester and Essex), candidates pounced on royal weaknesses to bolster their new 'reasons for victory' response. Little was made of the neutralism that held back victory for either side, so evident in A and D. Most answers were heavily sequenced, often just a series of general assertions based on implicit source content. Some only came alive when thinking inventively and irrelevantly of other types of sources the examiners could have set, thinking they were commenting meaningfully on source limitation. Judgements often ignored source content and provenance. There was much 'stock' provenance but the following was a good example of comparative provenance linked to the question.

'Source D describes the 'misery imposed by the military' and as it is a supporter of Parliament, writing to the House of Commons, also Parliament, it is probably reliable, as the writer would not like to speak this truth if he did not have to, and would not need to exaggerate as they were both on the same side. It was also written a month before the New Model Army was emerging, suggesting that changes could have been made to prevent this bad behaviour. On the other hand, Source B may be less reliable as it is the view of a Royalist who would have wanted Parliament to be seen in a bad light. It shows Manchester going against the advice given to him by Cromwell. The disagreements are likely to have damaged unity between them so prolonging their ultimate victory.'

Thus the link is made to the question of reasons why the First Civil War was not quickly won.

F963 02

There were slightly more candidates sitting this paper, 161, but obviously the candidature was also very small. A small number of candidates answered on Qs 2 and 4 (Gladstone and Disraeli and Churchill) rather more on Q3 (England in a New Century). Candidates responded reasonably and were focused in their approach but very few reached the higher levels, usually through a lack of evaluation and an inability to grasp the more subtle aspects of the sources provided. There were many rather weak responses. No complaints were received.

1 The Condition of England 1815-53

Too few scripts to be able to comment.

2 The Age of Gladstone and Disraeli 1865-86

(a) Most candidates picked up on the differences between Gladstone and Bright in regard to the Irish and their problems but failed to see the similarities and develop the provenance. Gladstone's views are also reported in D and Bright has some sympathy with the Irish over land and religious issues. Both see current Irish nationalist MPs as a nuisance. These aspects were frequently missed but most were able to point to the differences, particularly the lack of trust shown by Bright in D. Very few picked up on Gladstone's purpose in consulting with Derby - sounding out the likely opposition to Home Rule and thus stressing the need for it (excessive Irish obstructionism in parliament, which was better organised and growing) and with Bright, a close mentor with whom he might be more honest. As a result little attempt was made to arrive at a judgement on which may be the better evidence for Liberal views, a judgement that needed to be grounded in an understanding that Gladstone was in a potential minority and Bright spoke for many in the party on this.

(b) Most candidates considered Gladstone to have mishandled the issue of Home Rule in 1885/6 but found it difficult to group the sources, failing to realise that most could be interpreted either way. On balance C, D and E could be used to suggest he mishandled it, whilst A and B, before his conversion became public knowledge, suggests a more careful approach. Few considered other factors, Chamberlain (in E), Ulster (also in E), Tory opposition (in B) or even

the Whigs in the Liberal party (dealt with in detail in A, B and C). Quite a few candidates were confused by the fact that Sources A, C and D were reporting Gladstone's views. They thought they were the views of, variously, Derby, Granville and Bright. A careful reading of content and provenance should have made this quite clear. In some cases it was obvious that candidates were inadequately prepared for this later topic and they tried to use Irish information on the 1870s to substitute for a vague or non-existent understanding of 1885/6. This usually took the form of confusion between the Land Acts and Home Rule. Better candidates failed to use the references and hints in B and E that Gladstone was hoping to 'use' the Tories to pass Home Rule and take the flak, surely a recognition on his part that he would have problems and was at least preparing the ground, unlikely though it would be that Salisbury would play ball. Most candidates sequenced the sources and tagged knowledge onto the end. The opportunities for evaluation were missed, especially on Gladstone's relationship with the Whigs and party grandees in A, B and C. None asked themselves how far Gladstone was telling the truth or misleading and obfuscating in these reported conversations, as Derby admitted in C.

3 England and a New Century 1900-24

(a) This was very poorly done. At one level candidates appreciated the key difference that B considers the Lords to have a secondary role to the elected House and should certainly not be the proxy for the opposition Tories, whilst D argues on national issues they should make an elected government think again and possibly resubmit to the people via a general election. There was much woolly thinking and careless use of concepts in the answers here. There was little attempt to consider the secondary differences in the sources or bring contextual knowledge to bear to develop and explain them. Thus in B Campbell-Bannerman refers to Liberal policies like education being affected whilst in D it is precisely this type of legislation, aimed to please sectional interests in the Liberal party (in B's case the Nonconformists outraged by Balfour's earlier Education Act of 1902), that Balfour had in mind when he refers to 'hasty and vindictive' proposals seeking 'electoral advantage'. His notion of a 'tyrannical state', an elective dictatorship, was not understood. Provenance was poorly developed. The purposes, outlined above for B, were not used nor, in many cases, were the contexts (the electoral victory in 1906 for B, and the People's Budget of 1909 for D). Some picked up on audience (the Commons in B and a populist gathering in Manchester in D) but few developed it in relation to constitutional issues and the need for Balfour to find a populist argument for the role of the Lords. Hardly any essayed a judgement despite both, in a nutshell, providing the key opinions admitted to in public.

(b) For many this merely continued their points in (a), an extended and sequential discussion of the role of the two parties in clashing over the House of Lords. Some better candidates initially grouped the sources into A, D and E assigning responsibility to the Liberals, with B and C agreeing with the assertion that it was the Conservatives who were at fault, a rather superficial approach. Having done this they proceeded in a sequential manner (A, B, C, D, and E with very occasional snippets of knowledge). Judgement appeared at the end and had rarely been earned by what preceded it. None seemed to realise the importance of evaluating Source A. As a private letter, laying out Conservative strategy by Balfour to Lansdowne, his counterpart in the Lords, it was excellent evidence that the conservatives were mainly to responsible for the ensuing clashes. Sources D and E are simply corroborative evidence of the development of that strategy up to 1909. Perhaps none could see this as they failed to understand how that development occurred, ie. the Conservative argument that the 1909 Budget was not just fiscal but 'political and social' in that it was redistributive and challenged contemporary economic and fiscal norms with an eye to electoral advantage, an appeal to the working class. Whilst most could see that the Liberals could be contentious in their policies, either in a traditional Gladstonian way (Nonconformity, Ireland etc.) or in a New Liberal way, very few were able to see that Lloyd George in C might bear most responsibility. There was much misunderstanding of his position. He may have deliberately set out to ensnare the Conservatives into rejecting a new liberal measure aimed at both insuring the elderly and re-equipping the navy. Here an evaluation would have helped, particularly of its exaggerated tone and contentious imagery within a popular and public context (a speech in Newcastle). He says similar things to Campbell-Bannerman but in a very controversial way, but then he is speaking three years later on an even more important

set of issues (national efficiency in both defence and care). Weaker responses seemed unaware of the jump in time between 1906 and 1909 and thus the contextual changes. Candidates also failed properly to take the hint in B about 'a way will be found' to develop the 'resources of the constitution'. Linked to the tone of Lloyd George it could be interpreted as Liberal responsibility for the clash, at least after the initial rejection by the Lords of Liberal bills in 1906.

4 Churchill 1920-45

(a) Most candidates picked up on the basic difference between B and C but did so very generally, relating it to the Sudeten Crisis as a whole instead of focusing their answers on Conservative opinion over Chamberlain's role at Munich. Some seemed unaware that Churchill was a conservative but most saw him as an 'enfant terrible'. Most struggled with the content, failing to see the obvious difference between Churchill and Chips Channon, that the former talks in specific terms about Chamberlain's handling of the crisis (diplomatic failure in that the Little Entente was swept away to the detriment of both France and Czechoslovakia, and strategic in that the Czechs and the Danube 'road' were open to the Germans) whilst the latter just talks emotionally of Chamberlain's 'excellent case'. Channon does not mention a specific refutation of Churchill's points (some like the Danube valley highly dubious) but he does agree with Churchill that Conservative opinion backed Chamberlain. Not many spotted the similarity that even Churchill is careful to acknowledge Chamberlain as a sincere 'struggler for peace'. Channon is obviously ecstatic and concerned to portray Churchill and the Conservative opposition as a mere thorn in the side of the government, something that Churchill corroborates (that 'everyone' does not want to hear what he has to say). Candidates were on firmer ground over tone, contrasting the sombre nature of Churchill's rhetoric with Channon's gushing and none too complimentary attitude. Effective points were also made on the speech/ diary difference, although few stated specifically the precise similarity of date, with one commenting on the speech of the other. Effective judgement was rare and required both evaluation of what they had to say and especially its impact on party opinion. Here it was important to distinguish between the immediate impact of the crisis and the morning after, as it were, where Churchill may have made more of an impact on the party.

(b) Candidates were let down here by a sequential approach and by too much use of hindsight which saw Churchill as entirely justified in what he said. Some tried to group, usually using Churchill himself in B and Ismay in D to argue the case for the validity of his criticisms and George VI in A, Channon in C and Reynolds in E for the case against (that they were unjustified). This was fine provided they stuck to it but most could not resist the source by source account that lost the tight focus on the question. Many relegated the sources to an illustrative role and proceeded to dump their not inconsiderable knowledge of the topic. Often introductions gave us a rolling account of Hitler's policies and the earlier spineless actions of British statesmen that were of little relevance. There was much that knowledge could do to extend and qualify the points in the sources, on imperial attitudes alluded to in D for example, but none used knowledge in this evaluative way. Few realised that the key to an effective answer was to examine critically and evaluatively Churchill's own case in Source B, disentangling the rhetoric from he was actually claiming. Ismay in D is the only other source that looks at Churchill's case on its merits, albeit from hindsight and a wartime association at the highest of levels. His is a balanced account, in part accepting Churchill's case (militarily the Germans were not ready and we lost Czech defences and armaments) but also questioning it by stressing domestic and imperial disunity should war have been pursued as policy in 1938. The King in A and Channon in C reinforce this. Reynolds in E develops this latter point contextually by stressing Churchill as an outsider who took no account of issues such as cost, the Asian theatre and his own role in undermining both this and his own standing. He reminds us how much anything that Churchill says in his memoirs is selective in relation to his case, a point that none picked up on. Nonetheless candidate response to this new topic was an engaged one. The enthusiasm of most for the subject was clear and to be commended.

F964 01

184 candidates sat this paper, slightly more than the two versions of F963, but again a small candidature that it is difficult to generalise about. They too were rather weak and for the same reasons, although some answers impressed. It was felt that Centres here did need to take note of the points made in the General Comments about sequencing, describing and referencing. They were especially prevalent here. Rather more answered Q1 on the First Crusade and the Crusader States but about a third tackled Q2 on the German Reformation. No complaints were received.

1 The First Crusade and the Crusader States 1073-1130

(a) There was less obvious sequencing here than in some other questions as most understood the need to compare each source against the other but many struggled to compare 'like with like' within the framework of problems facing the Crusader States. Comparisons lacked development and the weakest were not infrequently incoherent. Fulcher in A was often described, yet he provides a clear account, from a Christian on-the-spot perspective, of the problems faced – encirclement (corroborated by the Muslim Chronicler in C), lack of people and cities (indirectly referred to in C through the reference to a need to act before they could establish themselves), living amongst a conquered enemy and lack of animals (horses and therefore cavalry). The last two are not mentioned in C, the thrust of which is to focus on the threat from neighbouring Muslim states and particularly from a Byzantine emperor, Alexius I, who wished to galvanise them into action against the new crusader states. Clearly Alexius has moved from wary ally to the crusaders to active enemy of the new states and is also impeding new Frankish crusaders by war and by denying them access across Byzantium. This sort of clear focus eluded most. On provenance the tendency was not to tie the provenance into an explanation of difference and similarity but to produce separate paragraphs just describing the origins of the writers in very simple terms. Few commented on the different dates, an ideal way of explaining the different emphasis on different problems, or spotted that Ibn al-Qalini, based in Damascus, might not be well qualified to comment on negotiations in Baghdad. He certainly has a very anti Byzantine tone although his comments on Alexius' motives may well be valid. Fulcher in contrast, whilst also indulging in pride at Crusader skill and savagery, does openly discuss the problems faced.

(b) Most found this question accessible but tended to use the sources for both illustration and information. For some their grasp of the 1100-30 period was weak and they tried to use irrelevant material from the first crusade to answer the question. The siege of Antioch and Jerusalem were thus frequent and unwelcome visitors to their answers. Better candidates grouped their sources, using parts of all five to illustrate Muslim disunity, and A, D and E to point to other factors such as ruthlessness, Baldwin's skill, Castles, the Knights Templar, geography (coastal supply) and Christian enthusiasm. Answers were weak on evaluation. For example candidates could have mentioned that both Muslim and Christian sources refer to Muslim disunity thus suggesting its relative importance. Sources D and E were poorly handled. Source D especially was often ignored, its military points that both sides were reluctant to commit to a major and possibly decisive battle being a reason for the survival of the States. Fulcher, as an eastern resident, would be sympathetic to such mutual caution. This could have been linked to the military points in A and E, especially the feudal nature of the new states and their ability to cow their local Muslim population. Source E however tended to be used for its final and balanced comment on Muslim disunity rather than for its more subtle points on crusader adaptability. There was also some evidence of over prepared responses to this question. They lacked the ability to adapt flexibly to the given sources and the evaluative problems raised by these. Centres should be aware of the dangers of this approach, which tends to a period study, yet 'list' like answer. Sources are dealt with formulaically with provenance de-linked from the question. The tendency is to assert rather than demonstrate and analyse.

2 The German Reformation 1517-1555

(a) The grasp of events beyond 1531 was limited in many answers. The significance of 1555 was unclear to many candidates. Most grasped the basic point concerning the acceptance of Lutheranism by Charles and Ferdinand but the detail of the content of the Source was rarely

addressed. Likewise, few had ideas on the relative part played by Charles and Ferdinand at each point, though some were able to mention provenance and the context of Source B, but not D because of their limited later knowledge. There were candidates who stated that the Schmalkaldic War was a total defeat for the princes, who then became confused by the terms of Source D. As expected, some candidates imparted knowledge of events, rather than using context to inform the comparative analysis, e.g. *'The Lutheran princes all united in the Schmalkaldic League for mutual defence and this was organised by Philip of Hesse. The League caused problems for Charles V as he already had a lot of problems with the Ottoman Turks.'* Weaker answers then branched off into tangential and irrelevant comments about the threat of the Turks. Context was also used inaccurately, e.g. *'By 1546, CV had time to tackle the religious problem. The Schmalkaldic War happened when the Schmalkaldic League was up against Charles and the Catholics. Therefore this is why Charles took that attitude in Source `B',* putting the cart before the horse and assuming the war had already started, missing the point that it was Charles who was declaring the war. Almost all answers attempted provenance (Charles's position in 1546 and the frankness of a letter written to his half sister with a public treaty that may well reflect a reluctance on Charles' part if not Ferdinand's), with varying success, but few were strong on the comparison of content. Weaker answers lost the focus on attitudes to the German Princes but a few really excellent responses included long and thorough comparative analyses.

(b) Sequencing and description were less common here. Most candidates were able to make some links. It was answered extremely well by the best candidates, who used the detail in the Sources to pursue a range of relevant angles in answering the question. Most were happy to agree with the assertion that the princes were the main reason for Lutheran survival, but did not neglect to integrate other factors into their argument, particularly sincere belief and the role of the urban reformation. However, there was a distinct lack of knowledge of events after 1531. The death of Luther 1546 was known to only a small number of candidates. There was confusion concerning the 'Elector of Saxony', Maurice, as stated in Source E. Many candidates thought this was Frederick the Wise, thus allowing themselves to discuss some familiar early evidence, which was, of course, irrelevant. There seemed to be several candidates who had not noticed the date range in the question (1545-1555) so spent a lot of time on the 1520s, or perhaps conveniently ignored it as they had no knowledge of the period asked for. In many cases, an unfocused sequential answer became more relevant when Source E was reached, as it helped explain the earlier events. By then it was often too late to rescue the answer. Candidates might be wise to read all the Sources before they start question b)! Source C was the one least well grasped, mostly because of a lack of contextual knowledge. However, some of the best answers recognised that Source C suggested the urban reformation was a major reason for the survival of Lutheranism. Some felt it showed the indifference of the German princes to Lutherans losing their freedom, but more often it was interpreted as similar to Source A, in showing the religious reasons for the survival of Lutheranism. Those who could see that an implied failure to change minds rather than win military battles like Muhlberg would not advance the cause of Catholicism hit the right note here, although it could be argued that a Lutheran in 1548, facing persecution, might well take this view. Better answers grouped the five sources for argument but saw the different views within Sources A and E, so were flexible in the route of argument they pursued, and did not stick to a rigid grouping of Sources. Melanchthon in Source A was frequently misunderstood with many assuming that Princes were insincere and thus could not be a factor in Lutheran survival. They failed to read the text closely, which in fact suggests that it was the nobility at the courts of princes who were more likely to be fair weather Lutherans. Nonetheless Melanchthon may take an unduly strict view here, reflecting a scholarly disdain for the Courts of Princes. Mühlberg was often not known, and some wrongly thought the princes won the battle, showing a lack of attention to the detail of Source E. Some failed to use E at all, and thought Charles won the war. C, D and E were most often not grasped by weaker answers, probably because they had no background knowledge. Some candidates seem to think that long quotes with little comment 'develop' the views in the Sources, whereas this gains them little, if any, credit. Attempting meaningful comments are a much better idea.

F964 02

This attracted the largest candidature, as was to be expected, with 525 candidates. A few answered Q1 on the French Revolution, rather more Q2 on Italian Unification. Q3 on the Origins of the American Civil War attracted a substantial number whilst Q4 remained, even in its new version, the perennial favourite, although less substantially so than in the past. No candidate sat Q5 on the USA and the Cold War in Asia and no complaints were received. Although few candidates managed to obtain Levels 1 and II most in the levels below tried to apply what they knew in an appropriate, if limited way.

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

(a) Most candidates managed a reasonable comparison of content. Both sources cited the destruction of chateaux but then differences emerge, B stressing the element of banditry and plunder, C the element of frustrated protest at the barbarous remains of feudal law. They were much weaker in spotting the provenance which explains this. Although most saw that there was a difference between the Estates of Dauphine and the Duke d'Aiguillon they were confused by the latter's noble status and his understanding attitude to the unrest. They forgot to develop the purpose of both. Source B, the Estates, do not call for reform but effective police action to repress what they see as criminality rather than the revolutionary fervour detected by the Duke in Source A. His purpose is to encourage the Assembly to give up feudal obligations. Not many could see the context here – that the Duke was detached from the reality of the Grand Peur (little recognised as the context) and was part of the liberal enthusiasm sweeping Paris. This also prevented them attempting a judgement based on which propertied group may be considered the better evidence for unrest. Both may be of value, provided one realises that there were probably elements of both revolutionary enthusiasm and criminality in the provinces.

(b) Again most candidates were able to group the sources into those that stressed political and constitutional motives (A, D and in part C which has a liberal and modernising agenda) and those that asserted the primacy of economic issues (B, C and E, although B sees banditry as jumping on the bandwagon of government paralysis). They were less assured on evaluation, failing to see that A, C and D are all Liberal nobles (Aiguillon), Clergy (Sieyes) or intelligentsia (St. Etienne) who would see matters in political terms. B and E are well balanced in that one is on the spot, (horrified propertied observer), whilst E is a modern historian able to assess the impact of economic issues on the poorer members of Parisian society. None made the point that both are valid and that revolutionary activity was bound to reflect the interests and outlook of different social orders. Some candidates based their answer on this knowledge, sidelining the sources and their chance of hitting the top three levels.

2 The Unification of Italy 1815-70

(a) Some candidates with weaker answers were confused by the references to Charles Albert, whom they felt they had heard of and to Charles Felix whom they had not. Further confusion was wrought by who replaced whom, what a regency was and their respective views on reform. This meant that they didn't really understand the point made by Santarosa in A about Charles Albert's responsibility for inaction and then flight when the going got tough. Nor did they spot that Mazzini in Source B doesn't mention Charles Albert but does corroborate Santarosa on Charles Felix' betrayal by asking for Austrian force. They were better on seeing the conflicting views on Santarosa's own role, with Mazzini stressing a betrayal by the rebel leaders themselves. There was much stock evaluation of Mazzini – that as a youth he could not have appreciated what was going on and even one candidate who considered his mother negligent for taking him for a walk in the midst of a revolution. Clearly the event made an impression on him and his views here on the nobility of some of the Genoese populace explain much of his later thinking on the unification process. This escaped most. Only the better answers could see that Santarosa was seeking to justify and assert his own role. The dates were, surprisingly rarely commented upon and even when remarked upon most did not know what to make of them, forsaking context for stock comment on Mazzini's memory.

(b) Some candidates also found this to be a challenging question, not knowing what to make of the interpretation that the early revolutions left the nationalist cause without hope. They could not see how the sources developed this theme. It eluded them that Santarosa in A remained rhetorically hopeful and that Mazzini in B saw the need to continue the struggle for liberty. Capitani in C was better understood but not many realised that he initially commented that some nationalists ('a few fools') remained 'strong in their fantasy' despite his later evidence that none wanted nationalism. Mazzini in D was often misinterpreted. Candidates knew him as the great Italian nationalist and couldn't quite believe his bitter denunciation of the early leadership, a theme he developed here from the youthful comments made in Source B. They thus had difficulty in placing him in the 'cause without hope' corner, although an evaluative point could have been the title of his work in D which suggests that hope remained. D'Azeglio was unknown to most. None knew that he was PM of Piedmont 1849-52 and one wondered whether the later period was very well known. Here too candidates with weaker answers found it difficult to understand the views of a moderate, particularly his point that the revolutions were counter productive. Candidates often failed to evaluate the sources, thus Capitani's employment by the Austrians was not remarked on by many, or the context of the various revolutions and the popular reaction to them as a possible means of setting the sources into the period of the question.

3 The Origins of the American Civil War 1820-61.

(a) Answers here were limited by a frequent failure to understand the function and purpose of the Colonisation Society. Most mistakenly thought it to be pro slavery and thus based their comparison on a misapprehension. The Editorial might be patronising about white 'intellectual superiors' but it recognised the impact of white prejudice and sought a policy of repatriation. In contrast Garrison, who appeared not to be well known, challenged this point directly by asserting that American liberty applied to all. Candidates with better answers spotted the date, 4th July, American Independence day, and the significance of his appeal on that particular day. More surprisingly many failed to spot his audience, the very Colonisation Society beloved of Source E. None were able to use context to suggest that in 1829 there was common ground between the Society and other abolitionists, Quakers supporting both, but that some southern slave owners were Colonisationists on the grounds that it would draw out the eventual demise of slavery (some candidates pointed out that slave birth-rates easily outnumbered those settled in Liberia). The provenance of E was compared, if at all, in a stock manner with some thinking Pennsylvania to be a southern slave state.

(b) Many candidates, despite the early pre 1850 focus, wanted desperately to discuss post 1850 material (Dred Scott, John Brown, Lincoln, Fugitive Slave Acts etc) and frequently did so to little effect. The focus was on the extent of popular support, North and South, for the abolition campaign, before 1850. However most did find plenty to say using the sources, although this was frequently done by referencing and sequencing. Knowledge seemed to be very skeletal on this topic. Most argued that Garrison in A, Robinson in B and the editor in E demonstrated failure in some form or another, whilst Calhoun in C and Grady in D suggests some limited and growing success. Better answers realised the importance of Sources C and D in this. Calhoun in C is a committed Southern anti abolitionist. On the one hand he is trying to prevent Congress from considering abolitionist petitions (something he was successful in doing, although none used their knowledge to provide such information) but in doing so he recognises the growing threat they face and the increasing volume of petitions that enflame southern fears. He paints a fanciful version of the future. Grady in D is more balanced. He recognises the more typical 'scorn and anger' and the racism in both North and South that underpins slavery's continuance (something further confirmed in E), but he also comments on the commitment of the abolitionists and the strength of their 'friendship. Books like his autobiography in 1843 will have an effect. If candidates had had more knowledge they could have pointed to the experience of other escaped slaves such as Frederick Douglass to corroborate Source D. Good responses also used the evidence in Robinson's letter, the provenance of which is sound, to point to committed women and the 'good number of decent and intelligent people' in his meeting. The Abolitionists recognise that they have a long struggle 'with many a heartless being'. Too many relied too

heavily on the content and took it at face value rather than the propaganda it was intended to be, on both sides. Provenance, as in B, was necessary, to find a way through these sources. Very few commented on the South, perhaps assuming the question did not apply there, but points could usefully be made about the abolition campaign there (and their extensive mail shots to the South), something many southerners blamed for uprisings like the Nat Turner rebellion in Virginia in 1831.

4 Dictatorship and Democracy in Germany 1933-63

(a) Candidates compared the content reasonable effectively, although many missed the more subtle aspects. Few commented that A is socialist (Sopade was seen by a few as a Nazi organisation) whilst B refers to both Communist (factory based) and Socialist (both factory and leisure based). The key to an effective answer was to spot that they were referring to different areas of opposition, the Home in A, where the Blockleiter frustrated SPD activity, and the factory and worker clubs in B, where Gestapo agents are given the run around by a shifting population, word of mouth, solidarity and effective SPD training. Answers were less effective on provenance, especially the joint frustration felt by the two opposing sides in the face of each others tactics. Both were private reports, truthful in their rather restricted fields, and both were from 1937. Judgement was rare, the better attempts stressing that both complement each other or that B was better given its wider frame of reference.

(b) Answers here were marred by candidates jumping to the comment that the Gestapo were 'all seeing and all knowing' and focusing simply on this. The sources were trawled illustratively for examples of it, and those with knowledge dumped vast amounts on anything from Hitler's rise to power to information on women, education and the Hitler youth, much of only tangential relevance. They missed the focus of the question which was on the factors explaining security service control of the population. The 'all seeing and all knowing' (effectively spying) was only one factor to set against several – the role of fear, imprisonment, inducements, propaganda and the media etc. Seen in this light, fear and imprisonment is evident in A and D, propaganda in C. As for spying the sources provide a mixed picture. Candidates were more comfortable with this, seeing that B, C and E all suggest limitations to an 'all seeing and knowing' security service, whilst A and D suggest an element of truth in the suggestion. Better answers spotted the connection between A, D and E. Gellately in E suggests that the services were thinly spread and that comprehensiveness was achieved through an army of nosey parkers, a point corroborated in A (staircase informers) and D (neighbourly suspicions of Jewishness and pro French attitudes, although one could question the typicality of this incident). Weaker answers merely accepted Gellately's point that they were too stretched to be effective, missing the crucial opening sentence. An important source was the SD Report in C. Many misread it thinking that it provided evidence of an 'all seeing and knowing' society when in fact it is the opposite – the opportunities listed are 'all too often neglected'. This was also in the context of wartime when the Security services would have the added problem of enemy spies yet the advantage of German patriotism, as Maria Kraus demonstrates in Source D. Careful reading and a knowledge of context would have rescued many from some wrong headed comments here.

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

Too few scripts to be able to comment.

Qa – The Comparison

- AO1a – demonstrating an accurate understanding of concepts and context (there are only 6/30 marks here). Knowledge for its own sake is not rewarded.
- AO1b – comparing content and by analysis arriving at a substantiated judgement (8/30). No judgement is LIII or below and sequencing is LIV or below.
- AO2a – an evaluation of the two sources by linking their provenance, comparatively, to content. If this is uneven then LIII or below is appropriate. A sequenced approach or 'stock' evaluation is LIV, or below. Most of the marks are awarded here (16/30).

Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE History H106 H506
January 2009 Examination Series

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
F961	Raw	100	75	65	55	46	37	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F962	Raw	100	75	65	55	46	37	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F963	Raw	100	74	65	56	47	39	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F964	Raw	100	74	65	56	47	39	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:
http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums_results.html

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

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 2009

