

History A

Advanced GCE A2 H506

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H106

Report on the Units

January 2010

HX06/MS/R/10J

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, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2010

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: publication s@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE History (H506)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE History (H106)

REPORT ON THE UNITS

Unit/Content	Page
Chief Examiner Report	1
F961 British History Period studies	2
F961/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1035 – 1642	4
F961/02 Modern 1783 – 1994	8
F962 European and World History Period Studies	
F962/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1095 – 1609	12
F962/02 Modern 1795 – 2003	16
F963 and F964 (the Enquiry Units), January 2010	22
F963/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1066 – 1660	28
F963/02 Modern 1815 – 1945	38
F964/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1066 – 1660	44
F964/02 Modern 1774 – 1975	49
F965 Historical Interpretations and Investigations	55
F966 Historical Themes	63
F966/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1066-1715	64
F966/02 Modern 1789-1997	68
Grade Thresholds	72

Chief Examiner Report

The January session produced a number of outstanding performances at both AS and A2 levels and more than justified most Centres entering their candidates. At the other end of the scale a minority of candidates were under-prepared for the assessment and hopefully will not have suffered adversely from this experience. Deciding whether to enter candidates in January is not an exact science but some candidates, especially in the A2 units, scored very low marks. In every AS unit, however, the mean mark improved on the mark recorded in January 2009, and in four units there was an improvement in the mean achieved last June.

It is pleasing to note that the Principal Examiners in each of the AS units have reported a general improvement in candidates' work. Most notable is the attention that has been given to essay technique and to the quality of candidates' supporting evidence in the Period Studies, and to candidates' ability to balance their own knowledge with source evaluation in the Enquiries. Obviously, further improvements can be made. Weaker candidates still tend to write about the topic in question rather than the question itself, and some Centres need to spend more time practising source evaluation. The poor quality of written English also remains a weakness in many candidates' work. It may sound like a platitude but a candidate who reads widely is likely to explain and express his/her arguments clearly and with greater precision.

For the first time Centres entered candidates for Coursework and Historical Themes. It was really encouraging to read the excellent work produced by many candidates in their Interpretations and Investigations, and to see the professionalism with which most Centres went about their Coursework tasks. A sizeable number of candidates also entered the Themes paper and the quality of many essays, particularly those written on Medieval and Early Modern topics, was most impressive. This augurs well for the future.

F961 British History Period studies

General Comments

This was the third session of the new specification and is pleasing to report that a number of the issues that have been raised in previous reports appear to be receiving attention from centres. Most noticeably, there were very few purely descriptive essays and a significant number of candidates were able to offer at least some basic explanations or analysis, even if for weaker candidates it was little more than 'bolt on.' There were a significant number of answers that offered a balanced argument, creating an argument and counter-argument before going on to offer a reasonable conclusion that frequently contained evaluative features. It would certainly be fair to say that the quality of conclusions is getting better and that a large number of candidates are using it to reach reasoned judgements that are lifting essays from Level III to II in AO1b. However, there are also a significant number of candidates who are still unwilling to reach a judgement and are offering the 'list' response, without linkages or evaluative comment. This is somewhat surprising as this has been a key message of INSET over recent sessions and most Sixth Formers usually have an opinion on most issues! Although conclusions have improved and are helping a number of candidates to improve their performance, the same cannot be said of introductions. In many instances introductions are adding very little to the answer and although there is no requirement for candidates to write one, a well focused start would be beneficial. Candidates should avoid simply writing out the question again, but could offer their view about the question, suggest the line of argument they intend to pursue and set out the structure of their argument. This will work well provided they have thought their argument through and are able to sustain it throughout the essay.

It was noticeable that a number of candidates showed little understanding of some of the key concepts that form, or should form, the basis of the teaching of the key issues. This was specifically seen when handling issues such as 'liberalism', 'Balance of Power', 'Tory democracy' and 'Splendid isolation' and centres would be well advised to ensure that candidates have a good grasp of key concepts that pertain to their Study Topic. However, centres do appear to have responded to concerns expressed in the summer about supporting knowledge and it was pleasing to see that the quality of supporting knowledge had improved and that there were fewer chronological errors. As a result there seemed to be less noticeable difference between the levels achieved on AO1a and AO1b, although examiners were willing to award different levels for the two assessment objectives. However, at the lower end there were some very weak answers where candidates did not appear to have made progress from GCSE levels. Answers at this level relied on sweeping generalisations, or candidates wrote about material that was, at best, tangential to the question asked. If these weaker candidates could have a more secure factual base they would be able to move up the Levels and reach an AS pass. There was even a tendency for some to answer questions that had been set in 2009 or to devise their own questions! The question specific reports do draw attention to those questions where there were frequent failures to answer the actual question set and candidates must be encouraged to read the question carefully and focus on specific words if they want to do themselves justice. In a similar fashion, there is concern that some candidates have been given pre-prepared answers which they then try and adapt to the question set. Formulaic answers rarely help the best candidates and even the less able struggle when the question set is slightly different. It is more advantageous for candidates to think on their feet and frequently the originality and freshness from a 'new' essay brings reward.

Previous Principal Examiner reports have offered plentiful advice about Question types and the requirement to argue, assess and make links between factors, but Centres would benefit from revisiting these and ensuring that candidates are clearly aware of the requirements for each type of question. It would also be worth reminding candidates that where a factor is named in the question it is expected that they will write at least a good paragraph on it, even if they then go on to argue that it was not the most important factor. They cannot simply dismiss it as irrelevant; if

Report on the Units taken in January 2010

they do they will not go beyond Level IV on AO1b. In the same vein, if candidates write solely about the named factor the ceiling is Level III on AO1b.

It was noticeable, unlike last January, that most candidates were able to write two decent length essays, even if the second essay was sometimes less strong. There was no evidence that Centres had not taught all of the key issues within their chosen Study Topics, but despite this it is worth reminding Centres that the three questions can come from any of the six key issues and that they must not assume that if they have taught either the first or last four key issues candidates will be able to answer two questions. It is also worth stressing that there is not, nor will there be, a pattern to the questions that are set.

Examiners commented that the new mark scheme is working well and it is pleasing to see that candidates are awarded different levels on the Assessment Objectives. This new scheme allows candidates to be rewarded for the skills and knowledge they display and not to be put into 'best fit' Level, as had been the case on the legacy mark scheme. There were a significant number who received different levels and occasionally the difference was two levels.

The quality of written English still causes concern. Some candidates do not help their cause by poor sentence structure and punctuation and if their argument is not clear they cannot gain credit for it. The level of vocabulary used by some is disappointing and many do need to be encouraged to read more widely, not to develop their depth of content, but the quality of their written English. There are also some candidates who use abbreviations or note form and this must be discouraged. It is also important that Centres ensure that candidates are able to write legibly so that examiners can read scripts easily. In the last report candidates were encouraged to leave a reasonable amount of space between essays so that examiners can record their comments and marks; unfortunately this appears to have fallen on a significant number of deaf ears. On a similar note it would also be helpful if candidates would write the question numbers by the side of their answers and on the front sheet as it is not always immediately obvious to examiners which question is being answered!

F961/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1035 – 1642

From Anglo Saxon England to Norman England 1035-1087

- 1 This was quite a popular question, but many candidates did struggle with the named factor. Where they were able to write about Edward's personality they found it difficult to link it to the problems that he faced. Very few answers went beyond offering little more than a few platitudes about his personality or were able to offer little that went beyond the weaknesses. Candidates were much stronger when considering other factors, particularly his power base and the strength of the Godwins. There were some candidates who did establish links between these factors and his personality, but these were rare. The inability to deal with the named factor did have a depressing effect on AO1b as the balance of focus of the answers was only fair.
- 2 This was the most popular question in this section and as might be expected it attracted a wide range of answers. There were many candidates who were very knowledgeable about the actual events of the battle and this proved particularly useful for average and weaker candidates as it enabled them to produce a solid answer. There was strong differentiation between those who offered a closely argued analysis and those who merely described what happened, with a little evaluation bolted on at the end. It should also be noted that the phrase 'military factors' did cause some difficulties; it will stand a variety of interpretations, broad and narrow and therefore needed careful treatment in the candidate's mind and on paper for the purposes of the essay. Failure to do this often resulted in some sloppy writing about what constituted military factors. Most were able to consider a range of reasons, often considering issues such as luck, the mistakes made by Harold and religious factors. At the top level many were able to establish links between the factors, particularly William's military skill in exploiting the luck that seemed to favour him.
- 3 This was much the least popular of the three in this section and was often less well handled. Some candidates knew some details about William's work and his methods of government. However, there was less confidence when dealing with what he retained from Saxon government and administration. Candidates' ability to analyse developments was limited and many answers simply described the methods.

Lancastrians, Yorkists and Tudors 1450-1509

- 4 This was probably the least popular of the questions in this section and it did not attract many strong answers. Many candidates were unable to engage with the precise wording of the question. Instead of focusing on government, there were discussions of whether or not Richard was a 'bad king.' Others focused excessively on the short time span of his reign and therefore argued that his government could not have been successful. There was some knowledge of his dealing with the nobility, although some confused his reliance on northerners with a reliance on southerners. In many instances knowledge was limited to the disappearance of the Princes in the Tower or the Battle of Bosworth and this also encouraged a number to adopt a simplistic approach and suggest that his reign was a failure.
- 5 This was quite a popular question, but many of the answers focused on a very narrow range of issues, sometimes simply dealing with the Pretenders. A narrow approach did have a depressing impact on AO1b as candidates' focus was, at best, fair. There was occasional consideration of overmighty subjects, but very few were able to link the measures adopted by Henry to the concept of effective and there seemed little awareness that Henry was in considerable danger of alienating them and even provoking unrest by

the end of his reign. There were some who suggested that because Henry survived and handed the throne on to his son he must have been effective. Surprisingly, there was very little consideration given to financial issues.

- 6 This was a popular question and attracted a wide range of responses, although there were some candidates who were confused about the actual marriage arrangements that were made or virtually ignored the named factor and focused on issues such as trade. There were few who were unsure about what marriage agreements achieved and some simply saw it as automatically achieving an end to conflict. Many weaker answers focused on Arthur's marriage to Catherine and failed to deal with the Scottish match. There seemed little awareness of the short term peace it brought and the removal of the potential threat of Warbeck. There were some answers that focused excessively on the named factor and ignored other issues, for example the invasion of France was hardly considered. Issues that might have been considered included security, and this could have linked to marriage agreements, financial gain and the development and protection of trade.

Henry VIII to Mary I 1509-1558

- 7 This was a very popular question and, as might be expected, it attracted a wide range of responses. Better answers established criteria against which success might be judged in the introduction and throughout the essay related their arguments back to the criteria. Some argued that personal survival was his main concern and were able to link this to the need to keep Henry happy and were able to argue that until the failure of the Amicable Grant he was reasonably successful. It was surprising that some answers considered a very narrow range of issues and ignored issues such as finance or Wolsey's work on justice. It was also noticeable that very few were aware of his abandonment of his attack on enclosures in order to secure funds. Where candidates did discuss finances many argued that he was remarkably successful given the power and wealth of England, even he did not meet Henry's desires, particularly in the later period. Some were also able to link this effectively to foreign policy and argue that success in this area was particularly important as this was Henry's main concern. Discussion of legal reforms was generally less well handled and many comments were limited to the increase in business. In some answers there was excessive focus on his Church reforms and education at the expense of other issues.
- 8 This was quite a popular question and attracted some very good answers. It was particularly pleasing to see that most candidates had been able to move on from a basic description of the Elton debate and were able to avoid a description of his thesis and counter views. In many answers the depth and breadth of knowledge is to be applauded. A wide range of issues, ranging from the more obvious focus on the increasing role of parliament to the increase in Henry's control over liberties, the establishment of financial courts and the changes to the Council were often considered. Some candidates were able to assess the depth of change that these developments brought about and suggest that in many instances the changes were short term. It was also pleasing to see that most answers did not argue that parliament increased its power and were able to point out that its role was still dependent upon the pleasure of the king. The only confusion seemed to be over the development of various regional councils and many assumed that the Council of the North was new and not simply reformed after the Pilgrimage of Grace.
- 9 This was the least popular question in the section and it attracted a large number of very weak answers. There was a lot of description of unrest as well as irrelevant detail about Mary Tudor, which failed to address the demands of the question. It was surprising in many answers how little was known about the government response to unrest and candidates would certainly have benefited from more specific knowledge of the rebellions. There were very few answers that considered the military response in any depth. Candidates often ignored the circumstances of Mary's accession, which could have given

them a valuable area of discussion. The concept of 'effective' did cause most candidates difficulties and these sort of terms do need to have been discussed before candidates enter the examination room.

Church and State 1529-1589

- 10 There were few answers to this question and those that did tackle it were often unable to do more than describe the changes in religious policy during the 1530s. Knowledge of Cromwell's role, despite his specific mention in the Specification, was very limited and frequently confused. There was little evidence that candidates were aware of Cromwell's advanced religious beliefs or that he was more politically astute in promising to make Henry 'the richest man in Christendom.' Statutes and developments were ascribed to him before he had risen to power and an understanding of his role; even in the Dissolution of the Monasteries was weak. More surprisingly, most answers failed to weigh up the influence of Cromwell against other factors, particularly the role of Henry VIII. There was a wide range of factors that candidates might have considered including foreign developments and this could have been linked to the need for money, Henry's desire for increased power or his own religious beliefs.
- 11 There were few answers to this question and many found it difficult to focus on the dates in the question and drifted into surveys of the whole reign. There were also a number who spent too much time focused on developments under Mary, although the backward-looking approach was used well by some candidates. This was a question where historiography was used well by able candidates and was a hindrance for weaker ones. Many seemed unable to relate the difficulty Elizabeth had in passing the religious settlement to the question and got drawn into a description of what was actually passed.
- 12 This was the most popular question in this section. However, weaker answers frequently focused almost exclusively on the issue of Mary Queen of Scots or the Armada. It was clear that many candidates did not have any real understanding of the international situation, and remarks about the threats from France and Spain ignored the relationship between those countries completely. The strength and nature of the problem posed by seminary priests received very little attention, as did the rebellion of the Northern Earls. There were very few answers that were able to move on to real evaluation of Elizabeth's success and contented themselves with tactical comments about individual threats and events.

England under Elizabeth 1558-1603

- 13 It was pleasing to see that a topic which has in the past attracted some very weak answers, where knowledge about the Privy Council is, at best, generalised and more frequently confused, did produce some excellent answers this time. There was evidence of knowledge of both specific individuals and of their relationship with each other and as the Councillors with the Queen. Most answers showed an awareness of the regularity of the Council's sessions and the Council's ability to pressurise the Queen. Weaker answers often saw either party accepting the lead of the other as weakness, as if the relationship was entirely oppositional. There were still a few candidates who confused Council and Parliament. The issues of Elizabeth's marriage and the question of Mary Queen of Scots were the principal examples used to discuss and debate the relationship between Elizabeth and her Council.
- 14 Most candidates were able to discuss a range of financial problems, although the degree of detail and precise support varied considerably. There was usually a reasonable understanding of inflation, re-coinage was mentioned, but knowledge of earlier policies was thin and frequently inaccurate. Many answers argued that the cost of war was the

most serious financial problem and were usually able to support this view with reference to the cost of the Spanish conflict and how it contributed to the debt Elizabeth left. The question of the taxation system was often well explained and the problems this created was often supported by reference to Cecil's self-assessment for the subsidy. This was the ideal opportunity to link inflation and the problems of the tax system, but few seized the chance.

- 15 This was a popular question and, as might be expected, it attracted a range of responses. Most who attempted it were able to make reference to the problem of Mary Queen of Scots and the naming of a successor. However, there were few answers that really reached a judgement as to Elizabeth's success. It could have been argued that her policy was a success, marriage was not for Elizabeth and that given the pressures she handled the situation well. However, some did argue that Elizabeth was merely lucky, given her position as illegitimate in the eyes of many Catholics. There was often reference to the scare that her contraction of smallpox generated, but there was little on the fears of the Council and supporters and how precarious the sense of Tudor England was. The spell of Elizabeth's survival and therefore success attracted a significant number without really discussing the issues in detail.

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

- 16 This question produced a very wide range of responses. There were some excellent answers which focused on analysis and evaluation. These displayed a firm grasp of the problems caused by the antiquated revenue system inherited by James. At the top candidates were able to evaluate the impact of his extravagance rather than simply describe it, which was a common feature of lower levels. However, at the lower end knowledge was limited to generalisations about his spending and the loss of Crown lands. There was very little consideration given to the failure of the Great Contract, monopolies and impositions. Some answers saw it as an opportunity to 'assess' the problems that James faced and drifted off into considerations of foreign policy and religious developments which were not relevant.
- 17 This question was often poorly answered as most did not have sufficient knowledge of the period from 1625 to 1629 to be able to evaluate the proposition. Many answers were descriptive of some of the issues, particularly foreign policy or Charles' belief in Divine Right and suggested that these were the most important reasons. There were also a number who drifted into the 1630s and considered the nature of Personal Rule rather than the reasons for it. There was a great deal of confusion about the issue of tonnage and poundage. However, many were able to consider Charles' relationship with Buckingham, but more could have been made of his wish to avoid criticism and prevent parliament from linking supply to redress of grievance.
- 18 This was a popular question, but as with Question 16 it attracted a wide range of responses. At the lower end, candidates got bogged down in writing all they knew about Personal Rule, which was often very thin and general. They were certainly unable to link it to the outbreak of civil war and were even less aware that there could not have been a civil war in 1640. There were some who hinted at the link between the problems created by Personal Rule and the need to summon parliament to raise money to fight the Scots, but many answers ended in 1640. However, better answers offered a brisk evaluation of the importance of Personal Rule, stressing that war was impossible in 1640 because the king was isolated and without significant support. They then evaluated the key events – Root and Branch, the Grand Remonstrance, the Irish Rebellion and the Five Members - as causes of the war, assessing their significance in relation to the impact of the Personal Rule. At the top level it was impressive to see the grasp of complex material.

F961/02 Modern 1783 – 1994

From Pitt to Peel 1783-1846

- 1 There were many good answers to this question and most were able to weigh royal influence against other factors. Most candidates were able to support their argument with specific examples, often of the mince-pie ministry or of concerns during the Regency crisis. However, some candidates did not write enough about other factors or failed to take the opportunity to make links between factors. There were a significant number who wrote well beyond 1793 or became entangled in the 'terror years' or Pitt's 'repressive phase'. Better answers were able to link electoral and parliamentary factors, patronage and Pitt's skills. However, there were a number who wrote excessively about his financial measures without linking the material to his domination of politics. Factual knowledge was often impressive and wide-ranging and it was pleasing to see ideas being well-supported.
- 2 Despite the error in the title, candidates were not put off, but there were a significant number of answers that focused almost exclusively on one period. The question did require candidates to compare the later period with the earlier years in order to assess whether the Tory party was more liberal. There were a large number who wrote a great deal and very knowledgeably about the earlier period, going into great detail about the unrest and the repressive measures, but then confined their consideration to the later period to a paragraph. Many answers also lacked the depth of knowledge about the later period that one would have hoped to see, some were limited to writing about Peel's reforms at the Home Office and there were very few who were able to write about Parliamentary reform or Catholic Emancipation. It was also noticeable that many were unable to make enough of the economic-commercial dimensions of the liberal phase. The question was a good discriminator and better answers applied the tool of direct and close comparison between the two period. Better answers often mentioned the continuity of the personnel, but also the difference in approach and policy.
- 3 This was a popular question, but as in the past, there was a tendency to write more about Peel as PM rather than as party leader. There were even some who focused entirely on the 1841-6 ministry and its reforms. However, in better answers there was some good consideration of Peel's role in the recovery, reorganisation, the Tamworth Manifesto, appeal and electoral outcomes. Some candidates were even able to show that in appealing to a new electorate Peel's success was limited and showed a clear understanding of the outcome and nature of the 1841 election. The more successful answers usually assessed Peel as a party leader against his role as a national statesman and interpreted key policy areas delivered as PM in terms of party needs and issues. This question is a clear example of candidates needing to take careful note of the actual question wording and be more alert to the issue of 'leadership'.

Liberals and Conservatives 1846-1895

- 4 This was a popular question and there were a number of very good answers which displayed both a good range of precise knowledge and issues. Perhaps the greatest weakness was an inability to write in sufficient detail about the named factor and in some cases it appeared as if candidates had simply learnt a list of factors which they reproduced, rather than answering the question directly. However, better answers weighed up his contribution as Chancellor, the 'People's William' and links with the popular press against a good range of issues. Most were able to write about the importance of 1846, Palmerston, the Radicals and the Willis Room Meeting, frequently using the latter to argue that Gladstone's absence meant that he was less important than other factors in the emergence.

- 5 This was a popular question and attracted a wide range of responses. However, there were a significant number who wrote about the reforms of the ministry and their success and failures without linking the material to the demands of the question. It was surprising that very few candidates linked electoral comment of being borne down 'in a torrent of gin and beer' to the reform of Licensing Laws. There was also some confusion as to how many of the working class actually had the vote in 1874. However, there were many very good answers which weighed up Gladstone's alienation of a range of groups against the Conservative recovery. In adopting this approach there was also consideration of foreign issues and the Liberal record in Ireland as well as reference to Disraeli's comment about 'exhausted volcanoes.'
- 6 This was the least popular of questions in this section. However, although many candidates did struggle with the concept of Tory Democracy, there were others who had a very clear understanding and were able to weigh its importance up against other factors. There were a number of answers which simply included everything as part of Tory democracy; where this was done credit was not given, but candidates who were able to discriminate and argue that these elements, although not part of Tory democracy were more important and therefore the ministry did not follow the ideas, did gain credit. There were a significant number who got dragged into large descriptive accounts of foreign and imperial policy and his relationship with Queen Victoria which was often unlinked to the question.

Foreign and Imperial Policies 1856-1914

- 7 Although this was a popular question, most of the answers were of a disappointing quality. There were a significant number of candidates who struggled with the concept of 'balance of power' and got dragged into a narrative of foreign policy. However, this is a concept that is specifically mentioned in the specification and candidate should therefore have considered the idea before entering the examination room. Many were much happier writing about other factors, particularly the importance of Russia or the Empire and trade. There were many answers that were descriptive of events in the Balkans or of the Scramble for Africa and showed little attempt to relate material to the question set.
- 8 This was the least popular question in this section and many struggled with the idea of 'how far' and simply explained why support for imperialism declined or, in some cases, continued to grow until the Boer War. The wording of the question did allow candidates to argue that support remained largely intact and they did not need to suggest that support declined; the mark scheme makes it very clear that no set answer is looked for. Some answers spent a great deal of time narrating events and horrors of the Boer War to illustrate decline. There was very little consideration of Gladstone's imperial policy and the problems of the Sudan, which could have provided useful material. There was some evidence of awareness of popular imperialism through the music hall or popular literature and some candidates were able to use this knowledge well.
- 9 This was a popular question, but many adopted a descriptive approach or gave excessive attention to the problem of Germany and did not consider changing relations with France or Russia. Many argued that it was imperial problems that was largely responsible for changing relations with Russia and France and used the Boer War to highlight a loss of confidence at home and a fear of isolation. Better answers were able to link this to the German problem and argued that German support for the Boer's only added to a feeling of isolation and vulnerability. Knowledge of reasons for the deteriorating relations with Germany was usually sound and many were able to explain the declining industrial position of Britain and issues such as the naval race and the Moroccan crises.

Domestic Issues 1918-1951

- 10** This was a popular question which attracted a wide range of answers. The better answers were aware of the distinction to be made over 'party' and 'government'. These answers were able to offer some good material on leadership, policy, electoral appeal and party organisation (recovery, creation of special departments like the successful Research Office). However, it would have been beneficial if candidates had written in greater depth on the outcomes of elections. At the lower end, candidates appeared to be hoping for a question on the Lloyd George administration and too much time was spent on his government and its fall, rather than the Tory recovery, confidence and desire to go it alone in 1922. There was also a tendency in weaker answers to dwell excessively on the General Strike. Many said very little about the formative and important government of 1924-9. This was a question where candidates did need to read the wording very carefully to ensure they focused on the key word – party – in the question.
- 11** Although this was a popular question the standard of answers was rather disappointing. There were a significant number who wrote too much or, in some cases, almost exclusively on the causes of the General Strike or examined the outcome up to 1929. There were some who were able to combine aspects of the background and causes to the actual question, but the number was limited. Those who did cover the reasons for failure were usually able to write quite knowledgeably about the role of Baldwin and government preparations, but were less confident when dealing with the TUC or mine workers factor. There was much that could have been said of the OMS, the role of Sir John Anderson, the extent of middle class volunteers and of the BBC and the British Gazette. Better answers often compared a government well-prepared for a strike with a TU movement very much the reverse.
- 12** This question produced some very encouraging answers. There was evidence of a good range of factual knowledge which was evaluated well. Many were able to set this material against the aims as outlined in Beveridge and the 1945 manifesto. The best answers were also able to make links between economic and social issues as well as make separate assessments. However, in many answers more could have been made of issues such as Nationalisation, the Sterling Crisis and Austerity. There were some answers that drifted too readily into a narration of foreign affairs. It would also be advisable to encourage candidates to cover the whole period. At the lower level, answers spent too long on the NHS and housing.

Foreign and Imperial Policies 1845-1990

- 13** This was the least popular question in this section. Many answers were unable to focus on the issue of 'change' and frequently finished up writing a narrative of foreign policy. There were also many answers that failed to cover the whole period, but there were also some that went beyond 1964. Some answers became over reliant on the early years of the Cold war, but even more noticeable were the significant number who wanted to write at length about the Empire.
- 14** This was a popular question and candidates were usually able to display reasonable knowledge and understanding about either the decline of the Empire or Britain's relations with Europe. Unfortunately, it was rare for candidates to be able to bring the two together and therefore failed to evaluate several factors. There was also a tendency for material that was used in question 13 to reappear vis a vis Empire and decline, with description of the ground nuts scheme featuring prominently! The issue of Suez also played a significant role in many answers and this was usually linked to the attitude of the USA towards Britain's empire. When dealing with Europe the focus tended to be on 1948-9, 1957 and 1963. However, there were a number who wrote intelligently about the changing economic fortunes of Britain and how this influenced her decisions.

- 15** Better answers usually started by outlining Thatcher's aims and then weighing up her policies against them before reaching a judgement about her success. Most candidates displayed some knowledge about her foreign policy, but the range of issues covered was disappointing, and at times very generalised. In some answers the Falklands War dominated, almost to the exclusion of everything else. Most had a reasonable knowledge of relations with Europe, but relations with USA and USSR varied considerably in their treatment. However, there were also a number of confused comments: the USA was accused of attacking Geneva and Thatcher had meetings with Khrushchev!

Post War Britain 1951-1994

- 16** This was a popular question and it attracted a significant number of good answers. Most were able to display a wide range of knowledge, although there were some who were much better when handling Conservative strengths rather than Labour weaknesses. However, the better answers did consider Labour divisions, the problem of leadership and uncertainty over policy areas. This was usually contrasted with issues such as Conservative organisation, appeal, leadership and policy, particularly issues such as the clever use of Stop-Go, Butskellism and reference to 'You Never Had It So Good.' However, there were some answers that drifted away from the focus of this question and wrote about Conservative failings, writing excessively on Suez and the economic problems of the Stop-Go policy.
- 17** This was another question where candidates would be well advised to read the question very carefully. There were very few answers that dealt with Heath as leader, most simply wrote about his time as PM. And did not cover the period before 1970. Consideration of this earlier period could have been very profitable and would have produced a more balanced answer and prevented the standard response that he was a failure. The knowledge used by candidates was variable, particularly on issues such as industrial relations and the trade unions and there was vagueness over economic and fiscal policies. There were a few candidates who compared Heath's electoral success, arguing that he won an unexpected victory in 1970 and failed twice in 1974 with his 'who governs Britain?'. There were some who then continued to write about Labour's failings up to 1979 and although they argued that this showed Heath's government was not as weak as has been suggested, they usually spent too long on this material.
- 18** There were very few answers to this question and most explained why there was an Irish problem and did not focus on the reasons why the government were unable to solve it. Many simply said that the problems were so deep-seated that they could not be solved and then explained the problems.

F962 European and World History Period Studies F962/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1095 – 1609

The relatively small number of candidates who were entered for this unit does mean that the question specific comments may be limited or be based on a very small candidature.

The Crusades and Crusader States

- 1 This was a very popular question and there were very few weak answers. Most candidates were able to construct an explanation or argument, although there were a significant number who did not focus precisely on the demands of the question. In these instances the most common problem was a focus on the reasons for the launching of the crusade rather than the motives of those who went on them. Most candidates were able to write about religious motives and it was pleasing to see the empathetic manner in which this was handled. There was significant focus on the concept of 'remission of sins', but at times other religious issues were less well developed or dealt with in a generalised manner, such as the reclaiming of Jerusalem or assistance for pilgrims to the east. There was discussion of Alexius' letter and the Battle of Manzikert, but candidates frequently failed to consider what knowledge would have been available to those undertaking the crusade. The question of social and economic issues was usually well-handled and many were able to support their arguments with reference to precise examples of the nobility. At the higher levels candidates were able to show that social and economic concerns did not preclude religious motivation.
- 2 This was the least popular of the questions in this section. A significant number who attempted this question simply did not know enough about the states and tried to discuss manpower purely in terms of the numbers who went on crusades and there was little knowledge of the numbers who remained behind and the implications of this for methods of defence or supplies. Where candidates did discuss the problem of manpower many were more concerned with explaining why there were so few, rather than evaluating its significance. Many candidates appeared to be more confident when writing about other factors and often dismissed the named factor in a few sentences. Issues that were discussed usually included the geo-political situation, particularly the development of Muslim unity, but also the problem of leadership within the Kingdom of Jerusalem, the divisions between the Crusader states and the poor relationship between the states and the Byzantine Empire. Candidates frequently wrote in very general terms and it should also be noted that those who want to access the highest levels must ensure that they cover the whole period.
- 3 This question presented candidates with a few difficulties. There were a significant number who were had problems with the term 'limited success', being uncertain whether to interpret it as success or failure. There were a number who saw the Crusade as a complete failure because the crusaders did not take Jerusalem. The other significant problem was the handling of 'personal rivalry'. There were a number who virtually ignored the issue and went on to discuss other issues, whilst there were many more who, although they knew a reasonable amount about the relationship between Richard and Philip were unable to relate it to the question. A sound understanding of the relationship between the two was lacking and thus its effects in leading to Philip's early departure and Richard's. In discussing personal rivalry many confined their answers to Richard's failure to marry Alys or his late arrival at Acre. There were a considerable number who were under the mistaken impression that Richard and Philip were either half brothers or sometimes brothers, but did not question the problems this might have presented for the projected marriage!

The Renaissance from c 1400-c1500

- 4 Although this question was quite popular there were very few very good answers. The greatest difficulty that appeared to face candidates was writing in any depth about the impact of the fall of Constantinople. Most answers argued that its significance was limited, but often did this by saying that the fall had no impact in this area. It is vital that candidates write at least a good paragraph on the named factor, even if they then conclude that its importance was limited, they cannot simply dismiss it as a factor if they want to access the higher levels. Those who did write about it often did so in very generalised terms and were unable to support their ideas with precise examples. Most were much happier writing about other factors, such as the political and economic situation in Italy or the classical legacy. In these areas the supporting knowledge was quite sound.
- 5 In the past questions such as this have often brought very generalised responses and so it was very pleasing to see that candidates were able to support their arguments with reference to precise examples from a wide range of artists and art forms. Most were able to produce a very balanced answer examining both the influences of classical art and architecture and other factors in the developments of the period. It was very encouraging to see the depth of knowledge displayed on Medieval art and techniques and this made many of the arguments put forward much more convincing.
- 6 It was pleasing to see that candidates had a much better understanding of the Renaissance in Northern Europe than had been the case in previous examination sessions and it is hoped that this development will be reflected in other Study Topics, such that all elements of the course are covered. Many answers were able to examine both sides of the question and provide evidence that the northern Renaissance was and was not influenced by developments in Italy. There were a number who were unable to take their answers further and reach a judgement, but in considering both sides they were usually able to access Level III on AO1b.

Exploration and Discovery

- 7 This was quite a popular question and produced some sound answers. The major difficulty encountered by candidates was simply a lack of precise knowledge, an issue that seems to have less of a concern in this session on many topics. Candidates achieved equal success whether they considered royal patronage to be the most important factor or whether they argued for another factor. Most were able to write with some degree of accuracy about Henry the Navigator, but became less confident when dealing with others. Candidates were able to consider a wide range of factors in their answers.
- 8 This was the least popular question in this section. Many had a good knowledge of the Portuguese Empire and most tended to agree with the assertion in the question. Some answers were able to produce a very wide range of knowledge of individual trading posts and settlements, which ensured that their ideas were more than sweeping generalisations. This was frequently balanced against issues such as military factors and religion. Although Brazil did appear in some answers, there was more focus on issues in the east.
- 9 Although this question attracted a number of answers, there was a rather disappointing pattern. The mixed motives of the conquistadors came through only in a small number of answers. Most saw the conquistadors in very simple terms and ignored the complexity of the issue. There were too many who drew on an artificial distinction between the religiously and non-religiously motivated. This sometimes led to a response that argued, in simple terms, Isabella's motives were religious and the conquistadors simply wanted gold. This did result in some imbalance and very superficial responses. This was one question where a greater depth of factual knowledge would have been a help.

Spain 1469-1556

- 10** This question attracted a significant number of responses and, as usual with this topic, a wide range of responses. There were a significant number of good answers that covered a wide range of issues and were able to make judgements about the various aspects of the religious policies followed by the two monarchs. On the other hand there were a number who wrote either very generally, simply described what Ferdinand and Isabella did or covered a few areas. In describing, often in great detail, what they did, many were unable to link their knowledge to the idea of 'success'. Better answers often set out their criteria for success in the introduction and then related their discussions back to it. There were many who were able to distinguish between the aims of the two monarchs and this frequently allowed a more sophisticated discussion of their policies. In some answers there was confusion as to the exact nature of the Inquisition in the two kingdoms and this resulted in some confused analysis, particularly over the economic effects. It was surprising that there were a number of answers that failed to consider the issue of Granada.
- 11** This was a popular question, but some candidates approached it as if they were expecting a slightly different question for which they had already prepared an answer. As a result they tended to focus on whether Charles was to blame for the problems he faced. However, most saw the need to balance his actions and foreign inexperience against other factors. Nearly all answers considered the legacy of Ferdinand and Isabella, but only the very strongest answers got far in their interpretation. The unrest of Charles' early years as a reaction against years of strong monarchs was only explored by a few. Candidates were much more confident when writing about Charles' own difficulties. There were a few answers that went too far into his reign, but most saw the need to confine their answers to the period before 1524.
- 12** This was the least popular of the questions in this section and it also attracted some weak answers. The question appeared to encourage weaker candidates into a narrative of what happened and there were very few who were able to focus on the date in the question and simply wrote about the whole reign. There were also few answers that were able to produce comparative lists of strengths and weaknesses or consider the strengths and weaknesses of an issue before reaching a balanced conclusion. However, the depth of knowledge available to most indicated that they had the material available to produce good answers, their problem was in knowing how to use the material.

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

- 13** This proved to be a demanding question which proved very tricky for the weaker candidates. Frederick of Saxony and the events of the early 1520's tended to dominate essays which then produced the final settlement of 1555 as somewhat of a surprise when there was little discussion of how the compromise had been reached. The complex relations between Charles and the Princes were little understood and other factors were often listed rather than assessed.
- 14** Weaker essays tended to do little more than describe battles and peace treaties and even some stronger candidates dealt with personal rivalry in a brief paragraph before moving on to dynastic claims and the strategic importance of Milan. Only a few mentioned Henry II as well as Francis I.
- 15** There were insufficient answers on this question to comment.

Philip II, Spain and the Netherlands, 1556-1609

- 16** This question attracted a wide range of answers. At the top levels candidates had a wide range of material available to support their ideas; for example they were able to discuss the number of bankruptcies or the scale of the debt. However, it was surprising that in many answers little consideration was given to the impact of bullion from the New World. There was certainly a clearer understanding of the financial issues than economic and in many answers there was little discrimination between the two. There were a significant number of answers that drifted into discussions of foreign policy without linking it to the problem in ruling Spain. Where candidates were able to do this, for example in linking the financial cost of warfare, particularly when dealing with the Dutch Revolt, they did gain credit. Most were able to discuss a range of issues and some answers showed a great deal of knowledge about government, religion and unrest.
- 17** This was a popular question and most did this fairly well, balancing the named factors. Although balance between the three countries was not a requirement, there were times when candidates did not give sufficient weight to one of the countries, but there was no pattern to this. Most were able to write about Lepanto, but some were sketchy about its significance and few were able to write in any depth about the Holy League. Perhaps the greatest weakness was the handling of relations with France, particularly the French Wars and Philip was seen as only wanting to be involved when Henry of Navarre became king. There were very few answers that suggested that the conversion of Henry might be seen as a success for Philip. In dealing with England there were a significant number of answers that did not go beyond 1588, dazzled by the success of the Armada, there were few who commented on Philip's success at keeping England out of the Americas.
- 18** This was the least popular of the questions in this section. The answers that were seen were often disappointing and there were few who knew enough about Maurice to write in sufficient depth about the named factor. As a result, most simply dismissed his contribution, or wrote very generally, and then proceeded to produce a pre-learnt list of reasons for Dutch success. Although this might be fairly successful, even when it was well supported in other areas, it did not constitute a balanced answer.

F962/02 Modern 1795 – 2003

Napoleon, France and Europe 1795-1815

- 1 The major problem for some was a lack of knowledge of the Directory – sometimes there were just a few generalised comments before candidates embarked on the more familiar story of Napoleon's rise. However, some provided detailed knowledge of France's economic problems, the Directory's foreign policy and the effects of the Revolution on the Directory's performance. The better answers explicitly linked the Directory's weaknesses to the success of Napoleon's early career (for example, his successes on the Italian campaigns). There were some impressive analyses of the relative role of the weak regime, Napoleon's own qualities and the individuals involved in the coup. The detailed knowledge of the events of Brumaire was impressive in some cases, but so was the ability to discuss different factors. Long accounts of Napoleon's early life were mercifully uncommon.
- 2 Although this question led some to a list approach, there were encouraging signs of discrimination and understanding that causes were often linked. There was a tendency to explain why the Russian campaign failed rather than discussing whether Napoleon's poor judgement or adverse circumstances were more to blame for an event pivotal to his fall. Some candidates saw events like the Spanish war and the Continental System as beyond Napoleon's control rather than the results of decisions taken by him. Where candidates dealt with Waterloo, knowledge was variable. Some answers focused exclusively on Napoleon's role which limited the level achieved on AO1b. Although the question is focused on this aspect of the topic, these answers had an unbalanced appearance because they omitted factors outside Napoleon's control, such as the role of the British (an under-developed point in general) and the Russian weather. Better answers were able to link these factors to the question by arguing that Napoleon provoked the British and that he should have taken more care over planning the Russian campaign. Weaker answers were made up of extensive description of the Russian campaign in particular. Some considered Napoleon's personal life and his changing character, but these answers contained too many vague assertions.
- 3 The general standard of answers to this question was disappointing. There was some awareness of the different nature of French rule in conquered areas. Better answers engaged with the ideas of the Revolution, less successful answers thought more in terms of general 'benefits and disadvantages' of Napoleon's rule. In general, knowledge of the Napoleonic Empire was quite generalised. The Netherlands was usually used as an example, but knowledge of it was not extensive. Many answers focused on Napoleon's reforms within France and then tried to apply them to conquered lands. But these answers tended to focus on the *Code Napoléon* and analysis was restricted to vague generalizations about it. Better answers adopted an approach which consisted of trying to identify *liberté*, *égalité* and *fraternité* in conquered lands; but these answers lacked detailed supporting knowledge and tended to focus on Napoleon's domestic reforms. Few candidates considered 'to what extent', but this was to be expected given the lack of knowledge in most answers.

Monarchy, Republic and Empire: France 1814-1870

- 4 This was the most popular question in this section and attracted a wide range of answers. Better answers were able to discriminate between a wide range of factors and weigh up whether Charles was to blame or whether factors, such as economic issues outside his control, were to blame. Some were able to make links between the two, arguing that Charles' poor response to the economic crisis did little to help his cause. However, there

were a number of answers that spent too long on the reign of Louis XVIII and displayed little knowledge of Charles' reign, confusing ministers and showing little awareness of crucial events such as the Ordinances of St. Cloud.

- 5 There was a wide range of answers to this question and, as might be expected, answers at the higher level showed a detailed knowledge of events throughout the period, whereas weaker answers focused on much narrower range of issues. Many were able to write in some detail about the family name and its appeal, particularly in light of the failings of Louis Philippe. Some were able to discuss issues such as his appeal to all classes and, in particular, his alliance with conservative forces. There was also some consideration of the failings of the Republic, particularly with reference to events in Paris.
- 6 This question caused difficulties for many candidates, not because the question was particularly challenging, but because they either answered why he pursued the policies or wrote about events of the 1850s or focused excessively on the Franco-Prussian War, rather than the build up to it. There was a great deal that candidates could consider, but knowledge was often limited to Mexico and the build up to the Franco-Prussian War. There were very few answers that considered the attempts to secure territory along the Rhine, French attitudes to the Polish Revolt and the Austro-Prussian War, instead a number got sucked in to writing about the Crimean War.

The USA in the 19th Century: Westward Expansion and Civil War 1803-c1890

There were very few candidates who answered on this section and therefore the comments are brief.

- 7 There was relatively little attempt to discriminate between factors – federal actions were one element among a list of factors. The knowledge of candidates tended to be quite general, though most did know the major acts like the Homestead Act. There were very few who attempted to evaluate the relative importance of the factors.
- 8 Answers to this question were very varied in terms of the material included. There was not enough focus on the actions of 1860-61 and too much general background. Some answers never reached the election of Lincoln so keen were they to talk about events between 1820 and the 1850s. Lists of reasons and descriptions of events were more frequent than in answers to some other questions.
- 9 Many candidates wanted to explain why the South lost and drifted away from the question set and this is another example where candidates need to be reminded to read the question carefully and not answer the one they had hoped to get. Many thought Lee was a great general, but were not quite sure why and sustained comparison was difficult for many. A common error was to put Grant at Gettysberg. Grant was often seen as a key figure, but again, some were not quite sure why. Centres do need to give attention to key military aspects of the war including leadership and candidates who attempt this type of question do need to have engaged with what happened in the campaigns.

Peace and War: International Relations c1890-1941

- 10 There was a considerable gap between some very strong and well-informed answers at the top end and weak and generalised responses which were unsure of which countries were in the alliances/ententes, what and where the Balkans were and what led to war. More encouragingly some answers showed a strong grasp of the material and an ability to evaluate a range of factors, for example arguing that the alliances in themselves did not bring war, being essentially defensive, but had led to the military planning that led to war. Some would have preferred a 'Was Germany to blame?' question, but few ignored the

question of the alliances and there were few pure narrative responses. However, few answers developed the importance of the Moroccan crises in the escalation of tension prior to 1914. The assassination of Franz Ferdinand was usually seen as the trigger for war or a short-term cause of the war, although some weaker answers omitted it entirely. Germany's metaphorical 'blank cheque', which enabled Austria to deal with Serbia after the assassination as they wished, was almost always linked to the Kaiser's policy of *Weltpolitik*. (Weaker answers thought that the 'blank cheque' was actually a document or treaty.) Better answers also developed the importance of the instability of the Balkan region to the outbreak of war and the effect of the competing imperialist foreign policies of Austria-Hungary and Russia on the region. Some went as far as considering the domestic situations in each country – for example, dissatisfaction with autocratic government in Russia – and their impact on policy decisions, but this was rare.

- 11** Better answers focused on the question, weaker responses outlined some aspects of the war. There was reasonable knowledge of the Schlieffen Plan but many drifted into a general account of various battles or engaged with the 'Was Haig to blame' debate. It is important that candidates try and engage with the question set rather than ones that they would like to have been set. Too many candidates misinterpreted the question by providing more generalised answers on why the war lasted so long. These answers frequently provided tangential or irrelevant evidence: the battles at Passchendaele and the Somme often appeared, as well as the Hindenburg line and even evidence from the Treaty of Versailles. Put simply, not enough answers contained detailed knowledge of the events leading up to Christmas 1914. The Battle of the Marne, for example, was not well-known. Some answers analysed German motivation before Christmas 1914 and discussed – sometimes at length – the policy of *Weltpolitik*. These discussions were rarely linked to the question. Weaker answers considered the importance of the war to each country involved. However, the contribution of trench warfare to the stalemate was usually explained. The inadequacies of technology at the beginning of the war were also handled reasonably well (but in some cases, technology was only referred to in the broadest terms). Most candidates described the defensive nature of early technology. Better answers were able to employ later evidence when discussing this point and link it to the question; as technology improved (tanks became increasingly important), more breakthroughs occurred. The role of the generals in the creation of the stalemate was treated inadequately. Candidates were unable to support this point with relevant evidence; most used later evidence without acknowledging that it fell outside the scope of the question. The similar size of the opposing armies was usually noted, but detailed discussion of this point was lacking.
- 12** Most candidates answered questions 10 and 11 for this topic. This question was done well in many cases with some good supporting material and a number of explanations considered, at the top end quite critically. There were very few who failed to cover most of the period, though the choices available to Japan by December 1941 were not always well understood. However, there were answers to this question which focused heavily on the impact of the Depression. Better answers were able to link this point to Japan's need for raw materials, a motive which lay behind the invasion of Manchuria. Knowledge of Japan's nationalist government was less detailed in some cases, but some candidates linked the rise of nationalism with the Depression. The League of Nations' ineffectiveness was reasonably well-known, but few candidates were able to link Japan's aggression with events in Europe. Some candidates mentioned Britain's policy of appeasement towards Nazi Germany, but they did not associate it with the League of Nations' attitude towards Japanese expansion.

From Autocracy to Communism: Russia 1894-1941

- 13** This was the most popular question and some candidates had been clearly prepared by having a list of factors about unrest. However, weaker candidates could not deal well with background information and assumed that little had changed between the 1850s and 1894. There were generalized accounts of the Russian peasantry or Russian 'backwardness' and the Tsar's personal weaknesses were often asserted with little explanation of how these caused unrest. Some were clearly trying to adapt a pre-prepared answer to the 'causes of 1905' question. Some drifted into a narrative account of events of 1905-06, whereas better answers tried to discriminate between different sorts of discontent and assess their relative importance.
- 14** Although most did try to address 'stable' many equated it with the power of the regime rather than balancing underlying instabilities with some evidence of greater stability. There were also a significant number who focused almost exclusively on economic developments and ignored the key word 'politically'. Stolypin's contribution was not generally well understood and there was variable knowledge of the Dumas. However, this question was answered in a more discriminating way than question 13.
- 15** A difficult question for many candidates because it invited description. Since the question begins with 'Assess', a lot of candidates did not appreciate the importance of evaluative judgements. Too many answers provided little more than a commentary of Lenin's career from 1917. However, the question discriminated well with better answers offering a balanced analysis and discussing whether making concessions meant strength or weakness and whether reliance on force was a sign of strength or weakness. In some cases, this commentary was structured; strengths would come before weaknesses. But in most, the discussion essentially consisted of a list of factors. The lack of critical judgement indicates that candidates found this question more difficult than the Napoleon questions (1 and 2), for example, which explicitly encouraged consideration of the relative importance of each factor either by beginning with 'To what extent' or highlighting the word 'main' in bold. Many also wrote irrelevantly about Lenin before he became leader. Insights were shown in better answers, but weaker ones offered limited material – not going much beyond 1919 and making generalized comments about Lenin.

Democracy and Dictatorship: Italy 1896-1943

- 16** As with Question 13 weaker answers offered generalized comments that might have been true for any time in the later nineteenth century. While regionalism was significant, candidates often overstated it as a problem by the early twentieth century and did not link comments about regional dialects or the impoverished south with unrest. Too often the question became a repository for information about Italy after 1861. Better answers focused on different sorts of unrest and concerns about the political system, but detailed knowledge of this was relatively uncommon.
- 17** There was more information about the key issue of socialism than has been the case in the past when this topic has been set. However, having considered the rise of socialism candidates then listed 'reasons for the rise of Mussolini', supported by variable knowledge. Better answers set fears of socialism against other factors such as the dynamism and appeal of fascism or the post-war problems of Italy. There was little detailed knowledge of developments in 1920-22 shown.
- 18** Though initially quite well focused, many answers were rather narrow in scope and drifted from the point. The existence of the church and monarchy as alternative power bases was often explained, but frequently in general terms and sometimes the answer then ran out of steam and candidates wrote generally about the success or failure of Mussolini's policies. Some did offer some definitions against which dictatorship could be judged and offered balanced judgements. A major omission in some answers was Mussolini's dismissal by the King in 1943.

The Rise of China 1911-1990

There were not enough answers on this topic to make any comments

Democracy and Dictatorship in Germany 1919-1963

- 22** The better answers isolated problems and made a balanced judgement as to how successful the Republic was in overcoming the problems it faced. There were, however many who wrote about events before the 1920s or others who jumped straight to 1923 and included only a narrow range of material. Some shifted to a more general 'successes and failures of Weimar' and rather neglected the idea of problems. However, there were others who simply described the problems and did not address how far the Republic was able to overcome them or did it in a single sentence bolted on to the end of each paragraph. Knowledge of candidates was very variable; once again, the role of Stresemann was not well grasped and there were a number who equated hyperinflation with the Depression. There was some confusion about the sequence of events in some answers and once again it is crucial that all centres, regardless of the topic being taught do their best to ensure their candidates have a sound chronological grasp of events.
- 23** Although there were some good answers where candidates did adopt an analytical approach, there were an even greater number who simply described the policies followed by the Nazi government, sometimes in very basic terms and at a level below that of GCSE and consequently produced very disappointing answers. Some attempted to evaluate the role of terror, but often at a basic level. Many answers did not go beyond a consideration of the Night of the Long Knives or Kristallnacht and then asserted that these events would have frightened many and resulted in obedience. There was consideration of a range of other factors by which the Nazis controlled the people, but often candidates simply embarked on descriptions of education policy and other elements of Nazi Germany, some of which had little relevance. There were a few who argued that Nazi success in creating jobs would have won them some support and therefore the regime was not simply based on fear or propaganda.
- 24** Though there was some knowledge of factors which kept West Germany stable, there was very little detailed knowledge of Adenauer. This is a major weakness which centres should address – generalized comments about economic prosperity, foreign aid, social harmony are not really enough for answers on a major political leader's hold on power. Where candidates did have a reasonable knowledge about events and developments they were frequently unable to link their knowledge to why Adenauer kept power for so long. The impression given is that few have any real idea of Adenauer's personality or major policies or the political context in which he worked. It is essential that the post 1945 period is studied by candidates in the same depth as the pre-1945 period.

The Cold War in Europe from 1945 to the 1990s

- 25** This was the most popular question in this section and the range of answers reflected the popularity. At the higher levels candidates did not simply list the factors, but adopted an evaluative approach and reached judgements about the relative importance of a range of factors. There was sound knowledge of the long term reasons for the tension, with many writing confidently about the legacy of the Russian Revolution and Communist ideology and its conflicts with Capitalism. Most were able to explain the tensions caused by the delay in opening up the Second Front. However, where candidates did struggle was with the events discussed at Yalta and Potsdam and some confused issues discussed there with Tehran. However, many were aware of the difficulties created by Roosevelt's replacement by Truman and the dropping of the atom bomb. The weakest areas were in discussing Poland the future of Eastern Europe.

Report on the Units taken in January 2010

- 26** Although a significant number of candidates attempted this question the standard of the answers was disappointing. Many could write reasonably accurately about events in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, but very few were able to use this knowledge to address how serious the problem was. There was very little knowledge displayed outside of these two events, although some did try and discuss the issue of de-Stalinisation. Surprisingly there was very little consideration of the refugee problem in Eastern Germany and the subsequent building of the Berlin wall.
- 27** If question 26 was disappointing, the answers to this question were even more worrying. Although there were very candidates who attempted it, those who did wrote in very general terms and seemed unable to give specific evidence to support their generalised comments. It appeared as if most were hoping for a question on the causes of the end of Communist rule rather than the consequences as that was the focus of a number of answers.

Crisis in the Middle East 1948-2003

There were not enough answers to this section to be able to comment.

F963 and F964 (the Enquiry Units), January 2010

General Comments

This series saw a mixture of candidates with many re-sitting in Year 13, but others entering for the first time. There was a greater spread of marks as a result. Some approached the sources with confidence, using historical terminology and knowledge with ease. At the lower end there was evidence that some candidates had made little progress since GCSE. Their failure to integrate content and evaluation was particularly noticeable. Centres are advised to consider carefully whether a **January entry for Year 12** is suitable for their candidates. The skills take time to mature, noticeably in the handling of concepts, evaluating sources, either individually or in groups and in integrating knowledge into this process.

As much of the purpose of this report is to help centres address ways in which to improve candidate performance, by necessity it focuses on aspects that can be improved. This should not detract from an impressive performance overall which contained much evidence of thoughtful well-targeted delivery by centres and engaged enthusiasm on the part of candidates.

Most candidates' scripts ranged between 39-70 marks, mainly achieving levels II, III, and IV. The 01 version (the earlier periods) saw some of the very high marks, especially on the German Reformation and the Mid Tudor Crises but overall the answers on F963/01 did less well than their more modern, 02, and European 01 equivalents. Candidates at most levels were trying to do the right thing, although it seemed that many, having grouped their sources, proceeded to discuss them sequentially, often in random order. 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 knew that they had to evaluate but preferred to do so in 'bolt-on' and discreet sections that did little or nothing to move the argument on in relation to the question.

It is worth considering the demands of the two questions in relation to the Assessment Targets. This is where candidates can underperform or lose marks unnecessarily.

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

The question asks the candidate to compare two sources '**as evidence**' which means assessing them in relation to each other. A *general* analysis is not what is required. There should be links to and focus on the key issue in the question. Candidates frequently ignore the key issue and would be well advised to highlight it on the paper as an aide memoire. The judgement reached should be about the Sources themselves as evidence, rather than the key issue itself in the question. This example, from Q2 on F963/01, is of a typical general conclusion: '*Therefore relations between monarchs and their advisers were more settled in Elizabeth's reign than in earlier reigns*'. This statement does not judge which of the two Sources provides the better evidence on the issue and explain why.

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

AO1a: Appropriate use and understanding of knowledge; clarity of expression:

- There are **no** marks for extraneous knowledge.
- The 6 marks available are for demonstrating a concise and clear understanding of the **context of an issue** (eg. issues involved in negotiations with Charles I; attitudes to improving the condition of factory workers; the effectiveness of the Nazi attack on the Churches) and of any **concepts** involved, for example in the latter an understanding that there were different Churches, Catholic and Protestant, involved.
- We are looking for a **light touch** here; say a sub clausal reference or at most one or two sentences.

A01b: Compare the contribution of two sources to the issue and arrive at a judgement on which may be the more useful.

- Many candidates simply focus on the topic, the Churches in Nazi Germany or Leipzig and Frederick the Wise, instead of the **specific issue**, the effectiveness of the Nazi attack on the Churches or Catholic reaction to Luther's teaching.
- They refer to the sources to extract information for a general answer to the topic, rather than **comparing them as evidence** for a key issue. The consequence is a sequenced approach, a level IV.
- Many candidates, at some point in their answer, resort to randomly juxtaposing dissimilar points. They do not **compare like with like** or point to the fact that one source may make a point which is absent from the other.
- Some lose the question when they limit themselves to **basic or undeveloped cross references**.
- **Judgement** should arise from an evaluation of the quality of the content, either throughout or in a developed concluding paragraph and should be on the evidence for the issue. Failure to consider this will confine a candidate to level III and below.
- It is vital that candidates **identify the relevant issues** arising in the two sources and use these as their comparative focus. Failure to do so leads to description, paraphrase or at worst copying out what is there, word for word.

AO2a: Analyse and evaluate the two sources as evidence.

- This has the **highest mark weighting** and candidates should focus on the sources as evidence.
- Some centres still use the list in Level 1A and 1B (and worse the more extensive one in the Legacy Level 1) as the basis for an answer. Such a **formulaic approach** diverts the candidate from both the issue in the question (and the appropriate content) and the need to compare provenance, integrating it into an explanation of similarity and difference and arriving at developed judgement. We cannot emphasise enough the **damage** this formulaic approach does. Candidates desperately seek qualities on their 'list' that are simply not there or are of minor or tangential significance. For example a paragraph might be added on 'completeness' which turns into a wish list of sources that were not used in the comparison.
- The key to an effective comparison of provenance is to **ask questions about the authors, their likely purpose, the different audiences and the respective tone**. For example, many candidates will devote whole sections of their answer here, and on Q(b), to reliability. This leads to discrete comment. For historians all evidence can be used. Issues such as reliability are factored in and only then are conclusions drawn from it and other factors. It is a part of considering purpose, tone and audience.
- Candidates frequently **sequence their comments on provenance**. Having compared content they are quite happy to comment discretely on authorship, tone or purpose. Without effective comparison on this they find an informed judgement difficult.

- Candidates will often take sources at **face value** eg. The Pope writing to Frederick the Wise congratulating him for never having supported Luther (?) or the claim by Austen Chamberlain that tariff reform was the key vote winning issue for the Tories in the 1910 elections.
- **Misinterpretation of the Sources** seemed to be on the increase. Candidates need to read the material very carefully.
- There is much **assertion**. Candidates need to provide explanation, development or example when they claim that something is useful or reliable, or biased.

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

This remains a challenge for most. Most know to attempt a grouping based on the assertion in the question but can lose credit if they proceed sequentially, often in two halves as it divorces the material from the question. For example, there is a discussion of each source, entirely discrete, and then a bolt –on section where the provenance of each is discussed, again discretely. This divorces the material from the question. Such an approach prevents candidates from integrating their points into the wider discussion of an interpretation and they fail to make the appropriate links. Candidates need to sustain their grouping by linking and cross referencing within it, establishing why two or three sources contribute to a particular interpretation or challenge it, and their relative merits as evidence. It is far better to integrate issues of provenance (authorship, purpose and audience) into this as it establishes the relative weight to be given to the evidence of a group of sources. It is, perhaps, instinctive for candidates to proceed source by source, even within an established grouping, but they need to bear in mind the need to compare within and across their grouping at key points. This needs to be done both in terms of the issues and content discussed and on issues of provenance which may affect the relative weighting given to their points.

Candidates would be well advised –

1. To read the sources with care in relation to the question.
2. Plan using grouping, cross referencing those sources that can support two or more views.
3. Then assess the value of their grouping (evaluation) building in any relevant knowledge at this point.
4. Thinking about their judgement and conclusion before starting to write and planning accordingly.

There were two key areas where candidates underperformed –

1. In using appropriate knowledge.
2. In applying the analytical and evaluative skills required to meet the requirements of the question effectively.

AO1a: Integrating knowledge selectively and appropriately to assess the interpretation of the Sources in a clear manner.

- It is worth remembering that there are **only 10 marks** for this.
- Some candidates simply wrote an **answer based on their knowledge** with the sources used for illustration or reference. Others knew that they needed to keep the focus on the sources, so dealt with this requirement by **bolting on their own knowledge**, either at the end, or scattered through the answer.
- In many cases candidates seemed to have little beyond a **general contextual underpinning**. They confined their comments to what was in front of them. This was particularly so on the Normans, the English Civil war, the People's Crusade, Churchill, the French Revolution, the Nazis and the Cold war in Asia. This was either because it was as

yet unconsolidated or because of some sizeable gaps. In some cases it was simply inappropriate and led the candidate away from the focus of the question. It is important to realise what the **role of knowledge is in this question**. It is there as a means of evaluating the sources, extending, confirming or questioning what they say. It is **particularly important in evaluation**. Selection and use of the most appropriate evidence in evaluating the Sources was the key to a high level mark for AO1a (and AO1b). For example, in assessing Henry VIII's execution of Cromwell, some candidates used the less relevant Pilgrimage of Grace. Most candidates chose to mention Cromwell's role in breaking with Rome and dissolving the monasteries. More appropriately given the date of the Source, better answers assessed the reliability of Henry's claim that he was tricked into dismissing Cromwell by lies. They used Henry's disgust at the Cleves marriage and acceptance of the religious arguments of the Catholic Howard faction together with the prospect of an attractive new wife. This opened an opportunity to evaluate whether Cromwell was pursuing his own policies against royal interests for Q(b). This was knowledge used appropriately for evaluation of the source.

- Many candidates missed key opportunities for **evaluating views within the Sources by use of knowledge**. This resulted in a lack of balance, where candidates rarely spotted the counter-arguments within the Sources. This was particularly noticeable in the English Civil War option, (the army's radicalisation and God's Providence as causes of the King being brought to trial) and in the German Reformation, where links to the effect of the printing press on popular support for Luther were rarely spotted in the sources and thus developed within the context of own knowledge. In the Mid-Tudor option, the comments on Cecil and Dudley were rarely evaluated using knowledge, and sometimes irrelevant evidence from a much later date of the Option. In the case of the English Civil War, many answers omitted any mention of the Second Civil War, instead focusing on the tangential and largely irrelevant period of the Personal Rule. On the Origins of the American Civil War candidates who skewed their answer towards 1860 rather than the 1820s and 1830s, produced extraneous knowledge, whilst on the French Revolution answers were general on the Terror rather than focused on the specifics of Robespierre's fall.

AO1b: Analysis and explanation of the question with substantiated judgement

- Candidates need to **explain, develop, use and cross reference** the points for or against a particular interpretation in the sources. In so doing they will analyse the material to answer the question and arrive at a well thought through and argued judgement. Many manage to do this only through a discrete discussion of the content of an individual source. Often effective points are made in isolation of the question and argument.
- Many answers **drifted out of focus on the key issue** in the question. The sharpness of focus was highly significant in marking out the best answers. For example on the 01 versions: the *effectiveness* of Peter the Hermit's leadership, *problems* arising from the *linking of England with Normandy*, *Catholic reactions* to Luther's *teachings*, *servicing royal interests*, *reasons* for bringing the King to *trial*, (Many answers on the English Civil War talked about the *execution* of the king). On the 02 versions: the issue of whether Gladstone's reforms were *designed to satisfy Liberal interest groups*, an explanation of the *main reason for fluctuating working class support* of the Conservatives, *serious misjudgement* on Churchill's part over Indian policy or *willing collaboration* by the Churches with the Nazis.
- **The structure of the argument** is important. Many answers were of two halves - the first, attempting to analyse and use the Sources, but the second merely a resort to an essay style answer, with little or no further reference to the Sources. Candidates need to drive the answer, using Sources throughout.
- **Judgements and conclusions must be linked to the sources**. Candidates often attempted a reasonable focus on the sources but they must remember that they are **assessing them as evidence** in their judgements. Instead they resorted to knowledge points **on the issue in general**. The answer would become topic based rather than what the sources have to say about a particular issue.

AO2a: Analysis and evaluation of the Sources

- **Most marks** are given for this.
- As identified above this was the other key reason for underperformance. Candidates confine their discussions on provenance to Q(a). If they do so on Q(b) they do so **discretely**, failing to link their discussions to the grouping and the key issue in the question. Having fallen down on analytical skills in AO1b they compound this by **failing to evaluate the source's relative contribution to the debate**. This confines them to Level III and below. To access Levels I and II the source must be given relative 'value' in its contribution to the question.
- By tackling the sources **sequentially and discretely** they inevitably move into Levels IV and below. It prevents them making the necessary links within and between sources and with the question.
- Weaker candidates will often simply **describe the introductions and attributions**, as if this constitutes evaluation. It does not.
- At **Level V and below** there were those answers which blatantly copied out Source content sequentially with merely an uninformative, often repetitive, assertion.
- Many low level answers expressed **general comments about the topic** rather than focusing on the question itself or analysing the detail of the Sources. Again many Sources were taken at face value e.g. Elizabeth *instructing* Cecil to be loyal on her accession therefore, it was asserted, he could be trusted to serve royal interests - this was not developed or challenged by knowledge of his actions.
- At the highest levels, there were a few perceptive answers with impressive awareness of detail and the use of well chosen evidence in evaluation of provenance as well as content. Some able candidates lost marks for using Sources at face value and not considering their provenance, reliability or use.
- A number of candidates from some Centres attempted to use modern historians' views as a means of evaluating primary Sources - for example, on the English Civil War paper, it was stated that 'Charles I was indeed untrustworthy, as this is a view accepted by modern historians.' Candidates on the 01 versions of the paper were more prone to this than their 02 counterparts. **Historians' debate is not the focus of this Unit**, but may be a part of the Investigations and Interpretations Unit at A2. The **Enquiries Unit needs historical evidence used for evaluation of linked Sources**.
- **Evaluation** is best achieved as part of the grouping, either within it, in terms of establishing relative importance, or as part of the grouping (eg all Protestant or Nazi views; all pre or post war). It should always be related to establishing its value in relation to the question.

AO2b: Synthesis of grouped Sources and integrated knowledge in evaluation of the interpretation.

- This too has a relatively high mark allocation and is about **bringing together, in a successful synthesis, all the above skills**. In particular this is where we reward not so much the knowledge used per se but its integration and relative balance (unevenness and then imbalance).
- Candidates need to group Sources for analysis according to their view to create an argument of two or more sides for the 'assess how far' element. Many seemed to think that, as the question began with 'use your own knowledge' they should begin 'essay style' instead of using the Sources to drive their answers to Q(b). Thus they can underachieve on AO2b by failing to achieve sufficient synthesis.
- There are still some candidates who persist in **adding a bolt on** - 'and from my own knowledge, I know that . . .' This undermines synthesis and evidence is not linked or active in assessing 'how far *the Sources* support . . .'
- A surprising number of answers **failed to find more than one view** in the Sources. There were obvious internal clues which might have been used as a springboard for argument.

Report on the Units taken in January 2010

The most successful answers made impressive use of all these clues and saw that some Sources might be used for more than one side to an argument.

- **Knowledge** needs to be selected for its relevance and pertinent use in integration into the argument and there were some excellent answers which did achieve this with clarity and control. Those in the middle range of the Mark Scheme were able to analyse the interpretation in the question, but less likely to balance it with an alternative view in judgement.
- Often some better answers **lost sight of the Sources in the final page or so**, meaning that the conclusion and judgement were limited, undermining synthesis.

F963/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1066 – 1660

Comments on Individual Questions

The majority answered on the Civil War but the Mid Tudor Crises were also well represented. Very few answered on the Normans and may well have been re-taking from the summer session. Candidates exhibited all the problems cited above but in addition seemed short on conceptual understanding, in particular in relation to the 2nd Civil War, its existence and the politics that then ensued. There were some high end scripts seen, mainly on the Mid Tudor Crises. Many candidates were let down by an inability to keep the sources central to their responses and to evaluate them to answer the question set. No letters of complaints were received about the questions.

1. The Normans in England 1066-1100

On balance this was the least well handled option on this paper.

a). 'As evidence for military campaigns' led many into sequential description at the lower levels. Where candidates did attempt to compare, they mentioned involvement of French kings, peace treaties, castles and problems caused by Robert, from whence they drifted into Q(b). The comment on money in Source C was unlinked (bribery as part of a campaign). Many did not notice the change of reign, referring to 'William' only. Many did not attempt to make anything of provenance, let alone compare, but those who did generally used the book titles in the attributions and made general comments about Anglo-Norman lineage for Source C. This is one who tried to assess utility:

'...both sources are useful and quite reliable as evidence for these military campaigns but Source C is more useful as although it focuses just on events in Normandy, it gives a more even view on the shifting loyalties and use of non-military tactics, such as bribes and peace treaties.'

We expected comment on the English perspective of both sources with comment on Henry of Huntingdon's 'English' awareness of the threat from Scotland, something that few picked up on and is certainly not in William of Malmesbury, whose perspective and comments pertain to Normandy only. This could have been used as the basis of judgment, Henry providing a broader perspective.

b). The main flaw in answers to this question was that the key issue of 'problems arising from the linking of Normandy and England' was not the focus. Most candidates merely explained the events concerning William I's family, using the Sources for reference and adding some knowledge of William's legacy to his sons, which they then evaluated as unfair and Rufus as unpopular. Where there was an attempt to create an argument about problems, of more than one view, the alternatives that candidates found to family were generally the Scots, the French kings and the nobles - rarely the Bretons. Few were able to develop the problem of dual loyalty created by linking England and Normandy. Most mentioned Odo discretely as an alternative view, failing to count him as William's family, and many did not link these comments to Source B, Orderic Vitalis, who was rarely used effectively to establish a view that the rapacity of the new Norman nobility was a key problem in England. There were stock comments about the provenance of Source D, but few made any other comments on provenance. However it should be possible for candidates to understand that modern historians use these chronicles for their basic information and thus the following cannot be counted as perceptive comments on Source D:

'... this source may not be completely reliable because it's from a modern historian who obviously wasn't there at the time so how does she know what William said.'

Report on the Units taken in January 2010

'The provenance of Sources C and D is very different, which allows us to infer that the sources are thus more reliable because they are still very similar. Source C was written between 1135 and 1143 by an Anglo-Norman chronicler whereas Source D was written in 2005 by a modern historian. Their similarities can be seen as strength to both sources' reliability.'

These comments might be seen as the starting point for some thought, not the completed judgment. Some candidates had difficulty in distinguishing between fact and opinion in Source D. Much of it is an indirect speech report of what William II is thought to have said. So how valid is this comment?

'Source D on the other hand also shows bias but this time only against Robert. This is unsurprising as the book the source comes from is called "King Rufus" and thus we can infer it is written in his favour.'

Some candidates did try to work out their own ideas in discussing provenance but failed to link it to the question of whether the problems were down mainly to William I's own family:

'The provenance of the Sources [A and C] cannot really come into question as they both appear factual with no affinity expressed, so any differences that are expressed are mainly due to the time which the Sources are written about. However, it could be said that Source C does display a negative image of Robert, with "lacked courage" and "begged", which implies he was weak. This may be because as this Source was written later, the writer may be able to judge him on following actions, such as his failure to move on England in 1088, which could point towards weakness, so will immediately assume his actions are down to weakness.'

This answer is more successful in linking to the question:

'Source B also agrees with Sources A and C but in a slightly different manner suggesting William's problems in linking his lands came from his English based family (his cousin and half-brother). The source suggests that the regents, who were family members, were brutal and did not listen to the English however reasonable their claims. The line "the English were groaning under the Norman yoke" shows this, as does the phrase "swollen with pride". However the author of the source, Orderic Vitalis, is well known for his tendency to emphasize events and exaggerate them with literary flourishes. This is one reason why this source may not represent the whole story of William's experiences with regents. For example, Lanfranc was regent during the 1075 revolt of the Norman earls and stifled the attempted rebellion with much skill, keeping the kingdom well balanced.'

Those who tried to introduce own knowledge usually bolted it on, and occasionally there were 'stand-alone' comments on legal reforms in England. The judgement, whether supported or not, was generally that family were the main cause of the problems.

2 Mid-Tudor Crises 1536-1569

This was the question that produced the most successful answers, although the range of response was considerable. Most answers were developed with an attempt to focus on the questions.

a). Most candidates focused on '*relations*' between monarchs and advisers, but some preferred to use the word 'control', a narrower focus. Most saw the negative tone in Source A and compared it with the more positive tone of E. Many picked up the comments on faction in A but missed links with faction in E, whilst many picked up Dudley in E but failed to notice the more positive comment on Cromwell in A. Some misinterpreted E and suggested that Elizabeth and Henry were equally negative about their advisers.

Report on the Units taken in January 2010

The provenance of the Sources was mentioned by most, using the comment on timing in the introduction to A, though links to the provenance of E were less common. There was confusion about audience in A, the word Constable being the source of this. Many mentioned the tone of the Sources effectively. Even weaker answers commented that Henry VIII was ill at this time, so his views might have been untypically gloomy.

Not many pointed out that A is largely reported speech (Henry VIII) with some comment, while E has some reported speech (Elizabeth) but also considerable judgement. Thus there is little point in resorting to 'A says....Source E says...' unless it is made clear whether it is monarch or writer who is saying it. The two aspects of E need commenting on separately as the second can make use of the writer's mature experience in government. What follows are some examples of attempted valuation:

'There are limitations to Source E's reliability as it is written in a period when faith in the monarchy had been damaged by the less than successful reign of James I. The source is written as a nostalgic piece, harking back to the perceived "golden age of Gloriana".

Although both sources have clear limitations, Source A is the more useful as it describes a genuine time of uncertainty after Cromwell's fall and is written by a witness with a purpose of reporting the facts to his king.... whereas Source E is nostalgic in its portrayal of the relationship between Elizabeth and her advisers.'

'Source E is written 60 years after the time period of the 1560s and is therefore likely to have been influenced by much Elizabethan propaganda, but by the author's title "Sir Robert Naunton" and, the title of the work, "Fragmenta Regalia" being in Latin we understand that the author is educated and of high social class. It is written by "an experienced secretary", but from the next reign and the author was only a young child in the 1560s.... It is therefore likely that Elizabeth's court was not, as he says, "ruled by one mistress", but much more like Henry's court in Source A, with advisors struggling for power and influence.'

The better answers set their judgements in context such as what part of the monarch's reign was being described and whom some of the advisors might have been

'...while Source A represents only the King in 1541, most specifically in the time of "his illness", Source E gives a more synoptic view of Elizabeth's reign, written some time after.'

'Elizabeth, as Source E would put it, despite the patriarchal society she reigned in, managed to have greater control over how much influence her ministers thought they had. Naunton included the incident when Robert Dudley, who was thought to be Elizabeth's lover, was very quickly reprimanded when he tried to exceed his station and this shows how even emotional influences did not change Elizabeth's political opinions and convictions.'

Many weaker answers asserted the unreliability of Marillac because he was French, rather than focusing on his role at court as an ambassador, sending home reliable reports. Candidates sometimes made less than thoughtful judgments about the evidence provided by ambassadors' despatches. They would not have been expected to know that Marillac was a very experienced career diplomat but it is probably safer to assume that he was rather than that he could not understand English very well and that he had very little access to information at court, which many candidates said. A general view was that he was playing up the weakness of Henry VIII because that is what his government wanted to hear. Does this seem a sensible estimate? How long would an ambassador last in post who misled his government into making ill-judged decisions? Had they made relevant use of Cromwell's Protestant German alliance in the Cleves marriage this might have been acceptable, but this evidence was more effective when used to evaluate Henry's comments on Cromwell's execution, to assess whether the King was shifting responsibility from himself (advisors used to deflect criticism). Many evaluated the comment on Cromwell as Henry's 'most faithful servant' by using evidence of the Break with Rome and

Report on the Units taken in January 2010

dissolution of the monasteries, but others diverted by referring to the Pilgrimage of Grace and irrelevantly comparing him with Wolsey.

Most candidates who focused on comparison did judge which of these Sources was the better evidence, usually plumping for E. Some took the opportunity to talk about Elizabeth's love affair with Dudley in 'evaluation' of Source E which tended to diversion. The best answers compared the provenance of A with the context and purpose of Naunton's reminiscences, contrasting Elizabeth with Stuart relations with favourites and factions. Although not expected it was rewarded.

There were some inventive and speculative 'evaluations':

'As the author of A was French, his country was at war with England a lot of the time. Therefore, by describing Henry's Council as weak and scheming, he is making the country seem weak and vulnerable. This means the French king would be encouraged to invade perhaps, which is what a patriotic Frenchman would do.'

Others were rather 'stock':

'In Source E the writer writes in 1641, so has had time to collect a variety of sources to inform his own writing thus giving him a better overview'.

and the imaginative:

'As Elizabeth's no longer around, it means there will be no immediate repercussions for Naunton, as she could not have thrown him in jail for insulting her, had he done so. Naunton therefore had no fear to write the truth, leading to Source E to be the more objective and therefore more useful of the two in this sense.'

Concluding with some hoop-jumping 'limitations':

'As the Sources are written about different monarchs and their writers have different backgrounds, it is impossible to truly compare the two without bringing in a third source to corroborate or disprove the evidence of these two.'

and 'judgement':

'Together we cannot discover any real truth either about Henry's relationships with his ministers or Elizabeth's with hers, nor about the biases of an ambassador nor those of a later commentator. Therefore they are not massively useful.'

There was some confusion about Naunton's age - a child prodigy who wrote at the time, or a child throughout Elizabeth's reign or that hindsight distorted the event. Candidates needed to pick up on 'published in 1641'.

2b). This question did produce answers with two sides of argument across the whole ability range. At the lowest level, these were undeveloped text-based answers, rising in the middle levels to analysis with bolt on knowledge, often turning into essays half way through, while at the top there were some very sophisticated evaluations with good synthesis of both views and clear judgement. The usual grouping of the Sources was A with B and C for the negative view; D with E for the positive view but seeing that A and B might be used for both sides of the argument. One weakness was a failure to distinguish between fairly well-intentioned but misguided policies and venality and power-seeking in advisors. Some went into great detail about Somerset's policy towards Scotland or his debasement of the coinage as though he had something to gain from them.

Two Sources, A and B, contained two levels of information; each was about a particular named adviser, Cromwell and Somerset, and also about other advisers who were their enemies. Only the best answers seemed to unravel this. At the lower levels, Source B was poorly understood,

Report on the Units taken in January 2010

its context inaccurately asserted and Somerset himself seen as the author, rather than the Privy Council who had just ousted him. An example of poor comparative evaluation stated:

'Whereas in Source A we can see Henry libelling his staff and get an image of a thoroughly insecure king, Source B, in its essence, makes us come to believe what a lucky ruler Edward VI was to be assisted by such a man. He sings Edward's praises, saying ' . . . ' .'

Assertions followed:

'This Source, I believe, is certainly reliable, though maybe somewhat biased, as it was made by the Privy Council at the time of Somerset's supposed transgression.'

With 'stock' comments on provenance:

'The obvious difference between Sources A and B is that one is a letter meant for a certain someone, whilst B is a legal document meant to be viewed by a plethora of people. Source B certainly shows us that advisers could be trusted to serve royal interests.'

In this ability range, Source A was seen as wholly negative, and in Source C the factions were assumed by their very existence to be acting against royal interests. Few mentioned the Spanish marriage or knew anything about Renard. In contrast this example shows how to evaluate at the highest level:

'Source C, like A, also implies that ministers did not serve royal interests under Mary but instead spent their time 'split', 'divided' and refusing to attend the Council 'because of their hatred for the Chancellor'. However, care must be taken when using this Source. It is by Renard, the Imperial Ambassador and a close advisor of Mary. Whilst it might be expected that his inside knowledge of the Court would be useful, he often tried to raise his own importance in his reports to Charles V. For example, in C he complains of 'the excessive numbers of councillors' but in reality though many of the Council did not attend meetings, business was carried out effectively by a core of experienced men.'

Most took Somerset's comment in B about '*defending Edward*' at face value and saw him as a good servant, but some then diverted unnecessarily into knowledge about the Dry Stamp and the Vagrancy Act, rather than developing content and provenance - Somerset's relations with the Privy Council, or the events mentioned in the text - Warwick's suppression of Kett's Rebellion and the fall of Somerset after he had taken the King to Windsor. Here is one example of a reasonably successful attempt to use and evaluate B in relation to the question:

'While Somerset did act against the interests of the King, causing the rebellions through his religious and foreign policies, it was not intentional as Source B depicts. He never "encouraged" the people to revolt, this was in fact, the opposite of what he wanted, rebellions deflected his attention and resources from Scotland. Consequently it could be argued that Source B is against the proposition; to ensure Somerset cannot return and affect their own influence they exaggerate his crimes for their own purposes.'

Many assumed that Source D was evidence that Cecil served royal interests, despite its attribution of 'the third day of her reign', a point picked up by better candidates who then used knowledge of varying relevance in evaluation of Cecil's role. It helped to point out that Elizabeth's 'Instructions' could at best be pious hopes about what royal counsel should be, not necessarily what followed in practice. Another approach to D was to use contextual knowledge to assert trust:

'Source D would suggest that advisers could be trusted, depicting Elizabeth's absolute trust in William Cecil, as she declares he "will be faithful to the state". This is supported by the fact that Elizabeth had known Cecil for years before this, so Elizabeth was familiar with him and well qualified to give a judgement. Furthermore, Source D quotes directly from Elizabeth herself,

Report on the Units taken in January 2010

enhancing its credibility. Moreover, while the sources do not mention it, Cecil did prove to be a most able and loyal councillor

Cecil's part in securing the Church Settlement and the Northern Rising of 1569 were sometimes used well, but some made inaccurate or irrelevant comments about these. Though later, the execution of Mary Queen of Scots was also used, usually ineffectively.

This very good example integrates an evaluation of provenance for A02a:

'Similarly, E reflects the aims of the author, Naunton, writing in 1641, and appears to be more concerned with furthering the glorious reputation of Elizabeth, firmly established by the 1640s, than the actual events. He was not in a position to know the actual dynamics of Elizabeth's court.

and uses well chosen knowledge in evaluating the interpretation for A02b:

Though he states that Elizabeth 'created, upheld and weakened factions', over most issues Cecil and Dudley often worked closely together, especially to safeguard the growth of Protestantism. D are the Queen's words to Cecil on appointing him to the Council, asking him to 'give the advice you think best'. At times he went against the Queen's wishes, especially when Cecil threatened to resign in 1559/60 if Elizabeth didn't send troops to help the Protestant rebels in Scotland. However, this was still, arguably, in the royal interest. A Protestant Scotland, free from French troops, would be a safer neighbour and so Cecil pushed for it. Cecil mainly clashed with the Queen over her own marriage in the light of the threat of Mary Queen of Scots. However, this was still serving the royal interest as he saw it.

The best answers developed the content of Source E using knowledge of Elizabeth's methods of controlling faction and linked to Sources A and C for contrast, although much depended on how these were evaluated. Her impact on Dudley 'behaving more humbly thereafter' was sometimes evaluated well using his involvement with the Northern Earls in 1569. Supported judgement differentiated between the reigns of the forceful rulers, seeing Henry's gloom as untypical of the rest of his reign and questioned the extent to which Mary's Council broke down. Surprisingly few mentioned the gender or age of the monarchs concerned and that some of the issues were thus different when the monarch was a minor or a woman from those facing an adult male in trusting his advisors. Here is one who did:

'During the period 1540 - 1569 the monarchs relied on trusted advisers to help them govern England, as their interests were to maintain stability, both with nobles and commoners and to keep a politically stable England at all times. This was especially important in Edward's reign as he had to rely on his advisers more so than his late father had done, being a minor.'

This is not particularly well expressed but tries to bring out the same issue:

'Source C and Source E also concur. They both show elements of distrust or reasons why they weren't really serving the monarch's interests. Source E shows Elizabeth's advisor seeming to act like he ruledand neither did Mary's Council. This perhaps could be to do with the fact they were the first female monarchs with an independent regency. As female monarchs brought their own problems, such as husbands and this was a problem that created the severe Wyatt rebellion in Mary's reign.'

3 The English Civil War and Interregnum 1637-60

This question was often not well done. Candidates did not seem to find it very accessible, largely because their knowledge of the period 1647-49 appeared weak and some seemed unaware of the 2nd Civil War. Most of the knowledge used dated, largely irrelevantly, from the 1628-42 period. Many had an inaccurate grasp of the chronology of events. The other marked feature was, with some exceptions, clear subjectivity in the discussion of reasons why the King was brought to trial. Many candidates accept only positive interpretations of Cromwell and the parliamentary side. Most accepted the total responsibility and untrustworthiness of the King himself, and failed to even consider alternative views such as a clash of ideologies or the ambitions of army radicals, though there was plenty of internal evidence in the Sources to support such views.

a). The key to a successful answer to this question was an understanding of the changing context as a backdrop to issues such as restoration of the King's power, religious and financial incentives, military support and the people's liberties. Instead of looking at what Charles was prepared to offer in return for armed support and comparing it with what he thought he could offer after this armed support had failed, they got bogged down in generalized and repetitious statements about his duplicitous nature. His trustworthiness was the focus of question b); for this question the focus was on arrangements for religion, constitutional power, provision of troops, rewards and so on. The dates of the two sets of negotiations were important, so that those candidates who started by commenting on C put themselves at a disadvantage straight away. Too many seemed to be unaware of the Second Civil War.

In the lower levels, answers were not focused upon the issues involved in negotiations. Some candidates did not use the introductions and seemed at a loss to understand the parties in negotiation. Most grasped some of the religious comparison, though the extent of detail and development of this point varied.

This is one of the better examples, showing evaluation of reliability using context:

Both Sources highlight the importance of religion in reaching a settlement with the King, stating in A that he would 'confirm a Presbyterian system' and in C stating that he 'would not give up the bishops'. The King is being somewhat contradictory here as a Presbyterian system would in itself give up bishops - however it seems likely that he would only have agreed to that due to immense pressures upon him and the need for Scottish support. Therefore, due to the time of writing in A, that the king had only just escaped army custody, it may not be as trustworthy for showing the real issues involved in negotiations as he is just agreeing to what the Scots wanted to get their support.'

This was followed by a less developed point:

'Both sources touch on the issue of returning the King to power. In Source C 'Colonel Hutchinson argued that restoring the King's power would be inconsistent with the liberty of the people'. C also suggests that this was a divisive and controversial issue as 'Both houses disputed for most of the night.' Source A supports that this was a key issue in that it is mentioned in the Engagement.'

This missed an opportunity to consolidate the point using knowledge of Charles playing off his divided opponents against each other to explain how the splits themselves were an issue in changing negotiations.

Fewer answers clearly linked the issue of the restoration of the King's authority, but the best elaborated upon his prerogative and the lack of trust of Charles evident in Source C. Though many mentioned the King's request not to have the 'blood spilt in the late war' held against him, few then explained relevant context or linked to 'his defeat and capture'. A lack of attention to the

detail of texts seems to be a major problem for some candidates, who write very generally about the Sources rather than analysing, comparing and contrasting them.

The provenance of Source A was generally stated as 'an official, legal document which is therefore reliable'. Tangential early knowledge was often used in evaluation, taken from the Bishops' War and Solemn League and Covenant. The provenance of Source C was usually dismissed very quickly as familiar, written with hindsight by the wife of an army officer - in fact, saying little more than the introduction. Candidates who want to label some sources as 'primary' need to take care. Lucy Hutchinson is not a primary source for the terms of the negotiation. Most candidates found Source C difficult to disentangle. It consisted of the Parliamentary Commissioners' report on their negotiations with the king, as described by Lucy Hutchinson, with Lucy's comments on this, based presumably on her own views and her husband's and others' reports to her, plus her report of her husband's view expressed in the Parliamentary debate. It needed an understanding of this and the fact that there was division among the 'Parliamentarians' by this time for comments on the provenance to be entirely satisfactory.

This example elaborates a little more than many, but authorship and date are missed:

Source C is a memoir which, while offering a good personal insight into the situation at the time, is often open to personal or political bias and is not necessarily typical. However, the source was written 20 years after the event which can allow for a more distant and therefore balanced view. Colonel Hutchinson was also of high rank and would have held a reasonable degree of influence in Parliament which would suggest that others shared his views and that he would have a good knowledge of the issues at the time of negotiations with the king. '

The judgement here has some support and is at least comparative:

'Overall I feel C is better evidence as it is a view from Parliament where issues regarding the king were debated whereas Source A is part of one treaty when the king was in a vulnerable position.'

The date of C was rarely mentioned, and then mostly with 'stock' comments on hindsight rather than the context and purpose of publication. Few developed the divisions within Charles's opponents evident within the Source - the Commissioners representing Parliament in negotiations against the wishes of army officers, in light of the Vote of No Addresses refusing further negotiations with a duplicitous King. Many did see that the King was playing his enemies off against each other, but did not explain.

b). Some candidates found it difficult to focus on the meaning of this question. It did not ask whether they thought Charles I could no longer be trusted but whether the people who brought him to trial believed this, and if so what gave them this belief, or whether there were other motives (the judgement of God, that he had become a man of blood deserving of punishment or the political motives of the Army and the Rump in wanting a Republic). This means they should not doubt the reliability of Sources B and D as being 'biased' in some way but credit them with showing reasons for the Army and the Rump's actions. Their belief that they were acting out the Lord's will backs this up; it is not an opposing point, as many thought.

Most candidates used the Sources descriptively or analytically to create a case for the King's untrustworthiness, but only more able candidates linked this case to the reasons for his trial or balanced it with alternative views. Many began by cross-referencing B with D, evaluating the claim that Charles was 'that man of blood', assuming this to be the same as untrustworthiness. At the lower end, this led into a general and irrelevant narrative of Charles's activities before 1642 and the outbreak of the First Civil War which was then asserted to have caused him to be brought to trial. This approach ignored the title of the paper 'The Second Civil war and the Trial of King Charles I' and the date in the question which specified 'after 1647 could no longer be trusted'.

Report on the Units taken in January 2010

This candidate had awareness of the date in the question:

Sources B, C and D argue the interpretation that Charles was brought to trial to account for his actions which caused death in the Civil Wars. B describes Charles as 'that man of blood' which was a common description of him at that time. C supports this and goes one step further in that it claims that he King 'acknowledged himself guilty of the blood spilt in the late war'. However, it is limited to the 'late' war rather than the First Civil War.'

This is followed by evaluation of the typicality of this view using content and context:

C also shows that this view was by no means shared by all as 'Both houses disputed for most of the night' which shows that Charles had a good deal of support. I think this may mainly be due to, with the exception of the army, the general belief in the divine right of kings and that nonetheless Charles was the legitimate ruler.

There was plenty of relevant material within the Sources to act as a prompt for further analysis. In the higher levels, answers developed the theme of the invitation to the Scots in A, the radicalisation of the army evident in B, parts of C and the introduction to D - and 'the power of the sword' in E. Such links, when evaluated in the light of provenance and reliability, were the foundation for a focused argument. Some discussed the aims of the Levellers in the light of the King's religious aims stated in A and C, and the army's view of God's Providence in the defeat of the King justifying their view in B that he should be brought to trial. Pride's Purge was often known but less often effectively used for evaluation of D and of the interpretation of royal untrustworthiness alone leading to his trial because this was the view of a powerful group within the army. The legality of the court established in D was discussed in some higher level answers.

This example touches on this point and develops a clear sense of debate and balanced evaluation:

Source D suggests the King's ambition for 'unlimited' and 'tyrannical power', which refers to the measures employed by Charles during the personal rule, which was one of the reasons why the king was brought to trial. However, Source D is only the Rump Parliament, so is in effect only consisting of those who opposed the King making its evidence less than typical. However, this is again exaggerated as there was no law at the time or necessity for the monarch to call parliament and the methods of taxation were all within the law, although they had admittedly been neglected by his wealthier predecessors. Though the Rump's view was less than typical, it is solid evidence of their reasoning. However, factors such as Cromwell's personal ambition would be neglected.'

Such comments were rare, as there seems to be an unwillingness to see Cromwell in a less than positive light.

Source E was generally the only one used for an attempt to balance the argument and put the King in a more positive light, yet it could have been linked to A. Some able candidates quickly dismissed the contents of E, stating that this was the King cynically wriggling out of his guilt, thus proving his untrustworthiness. Only a handful of answers made a supported attempt to use the King's comments on 'the power of the sword' to evaluate whether his opponents were equally guilty of attacking the liberties of the people.

This example shows how knowledge might be integrated into balanced evaluation and use of E:

However, in Source E Charles defends himself claiming that 'A subject and a sovereign are totally different things' meaning that people have no right to make judgement upon him and that he merely defended himself against the 'power of the sword'. This justifies things like the Army Plot, in that they had no right to imprison Strafford as people 'have no right to share in government'. However, this is written from the scaffold, when his situation was desperate.

Report on the Units taken in January 2010

Charles would have sought to vindicate his actions as much as possible and therefore what he says may not necessarily be true.'

Some also used their knowledge of Divine Right theory to develop the points within the Sources concerning the difference between the subject and the sovereign in the light of democratic ideas within the army. The propaganda use of Source E, set in context, was sometimes effectively grasped, though Charles's 'corruptible' worldly crown giving way to an immortal crown was sometimes misunderstood to mean that he agreed he had been politically corrupt. This example focuses clearly, evaluates the quantity and quality of evidence and balances the conclusion with a synthesis of views:

Overall I feel that the interpretation that the king's lack of trustworthiness was the main reason why he was brought to trial. Despite the quantity of evidence being on the side that it was due to Charles being a 'man of blood', I think that the quality of evidence points rather to his inability to be trusted any longer. This is because the Sources arguing the alternative arguments are written with a need to condemn the King so as to remove him. I therefore think the key issue is why the King needed to be removed and this is because he couldn't be trusted to rule once more due to the Army Plot and the terms of the Engagement in Source A. Therefore the undertones in Sources B and D, that he was 'trusted' and abused his position are the most compelling argument as they explain the need for the construction of other arguments when faced, as C suggests, with what to do with the King in 1648.'

F963/02 Modern 1815 – 1945

A reasonable number of candidates answered on Q1 (The Condition of England), fewer on Qs 2 and 4 (Gladstone and Disraeli and Churchill). The most popular by far was Q3 (England in a New Century). Candidates responded reasonably to Qs 1, 2 and 4 and were focused in their approach. A feature of those answering Q3 was that many did find the specific question difficult to focus on, so that fewer reached the higher levels. Generally, if this was the case, it was through a lack of evaluation and an inability to grasp the more subtle aspects of the sources provided. No complaints were received about the questions sets.

1 The Condition of England 1815-53

(a). Most answers here made a reasonable attempt at comparison, although many were tempted into sequence. Only better candidates were able to stand back and see the agreement on the need for improvement and the shared optimism on improving conditions. Whilst many spotted their shared emphasis on some sort of education most missed the more important similarity on work as the way forward for workers, thus missing an obvious provenance point – they were both mill owners. The key mistake for many was to misunderstand the provenance and context of Bright in E. They seemed misled by the reference to him being a radical MP in the introduction, assuming him to be a proponent of factory reform and thus restrictions on hours and age. Many seemed to think that he was attacking the inadequacies of previous factory acts. They seemed unaware of his middle class Free Trade radicalism that ensured he was a key opponent of restriction. This misunderstanding ensured that they missed the key difference between the sources. For Bright workers were held back by tariffs and restrictions on work; for Owen it was poor working and living conditions. There was also some confusion over context and dates, many assuming that Owen (and, for the weaker, Bright as well) was responding to the Factory Acts when he was an early campaigner, writing before the key Act of 1833, who used New Lanark as a social laboratory for his ideas. Clearly a minority had never encountered Owen and thus made heavy weather of Source A, where much could be compared on provenance – the unusual nature of New Lanark, its typicality and possibly the restrictive moral side of the experiment. Few developed his purpose in writing ‘A New View’ (to argue his vision) and thus to question his selection of benevolent examples. To work there one had to buy in to Owen’s vision. Similarly few challenged Bright’s rather partial and rhetorical advocacy in Parliament of the factory owner’s case. Not many seemed to know about the truck system, cooperation or, in Bright’s case, the free market. Again, perhaps rather obviously, not many made use of the date difference, one an early pre factory act experiment, the other a spirited attempt to oppose the 3rd major instalment of factory reform in 1844.

(b). This question saw some reasonable evaluation of the key issue, perhaps because candidates had views on whether workers were exploited across the board. Rather less picked up on whether this was the case with ‘all’, ie. adult men, women and children (variously defined in this period). A few weak candidates did not know what exploitation meant. Some just asserted points using some very vague knowledge:

‘I know there was exploitation because they worked long hours for low pay’.

Horner in Source D was an obvious clue here as it specifically commented on women, whilst Owen in A and McCulloch in C were clearly largely concerned with children. Some, using the dates of the Sources developed an interpretation based on change over time, integrating some sound contextual knowledge on the various campaigns and factory acts of the period. There were some intelligent points made on provenance and a real attempt at some evaluation of the sources contribution to the issue. Candidates seemed aware of at least some of the limitations of some highly contentious views. Nonetheless each source seemed to throw up difficulties for some. Owen in A caused some confusion, some dismissing the Scottish link along with a failure

to identify New Lanark as untypical if used alongside C for a grouping that challenged the interpretation of exploitation for all. Source B was usually taken at face value, despite the doubt thrown on its views by McCulloch in C ('gross exaggeration'). Only a minority picked up on its propaganda purpose, using references to slavery ('no white slavery'). Some misinterpreted C's reference to factory's as the 'best schools', thinking them to have schools attached instead of simply an environment which stressed disciplined hard work for an naturally indolent group. Candidates found Source C (McCulloch) difficult to assess and were uncertain about the views of early 19th century economists. Source D was less problematical although some took unhistorical issue with Horner's apparent sexism and were reluctant to develop his point about how female labour undermined the social well being of the working class. Not many spotted that he didn't think that the conditions and hours of men should or could be changed. Few were able to run with the introduction, having little idea what was meant by a reform 'Whig Journal'. As in Q(a) Bright was generally misunderstood to be a factory reformer and few challenged his optimistic rhetoric on 'recreation and enjoyment', or could link it to Source C (both were abstract and theoretical justifications for the factory). Knowledge was often well integrated, although few commented on the factory as a possible improvement over rural and agricultural hardship or picked up on C's reference to the alternatives – beggary in the streets and crime.

2 The Age of Gladstone and Disraeli 1865-86

(a). Some candidates made heavy weather out of the two sources on Forster's Education Act. Contextual knowledge and an understanding of it were necessary to make sense of the attitudes displayed by Bright and Barry. For example the reference in Barry to the 'conscience clause' was to 'Cowper-Temple' but few realised it or were able to explain why Barry thought it harmful to religious education and thus contrary to Bright's claims. Weaker candidates failed to spot that both were attacking the act, but from diametrically opposed perspectives, one an outraged nonconformist, the other an engaged and perceptive Anglican. Barry was challenging some of Bright's conclusions. Few spotted that he was a head teacher and might therefore speak with some authority on the issue whereas Bright spoke for nonconformity as a political interest. Little was made of the dates, 3 to 4 years into the Act, which enabled both to speak from some first hand experience. We did not expect candidates to know about Barry. All the information needed to evaluate his provenance was included in the introduction and attribution but we did expect candidates to know a little about Bright. For many however he seemed an unknown quantity. Perhaps more important was the need to understand terms like 'nonconformist', 'denominational' and 'voluntary'. Some thought nonconformists to be secular, perhaps because Bright was arguing for Board Schools on the grounds that they would encourage religious schools to come under their aegis. We did not gloss 'nonconformist' or 'voluntary' but we did 'denominational'. Despite this many candidates struggled to understand it. A careful reading of what Bright and Barry had to say should have enabled candidates to compare both their attitudes and evidence. A surprising number failed to pick up on the fact that Barry was responding to the phrase that Bright uses in B about the Bill 'encouraging denominational education'. This should have provided an obvious way in to comparison as Barry challenges his view of its impact and purpose. They also struggled with his point that the Anglican schools may be preferred on grounds of snobbery. Many struggled with judgement and asserted that either one or the other was of more value. Only a few noted Barry's educational expertise and experience in conjunction with his more perceptive views on the impact of the Act. Bright had resigned in from the government in 1873 and was acting as the spokesman of outraged nonconformity towards the end of Gladstone's first Liberal ministry.

(b). Here too candidates were mixed in their response. Many seemed not to understand what Liberal interest groups might refer to. For a successful response candidates needed to understand that the Liberals consisted of aristocratic and landed Whigs, nonconformists anxious to curb the privileges of Anglicanism, radicals and trade unionists and many ordinary urban middle-class taxpayers. These were the Liberal 'interest groups' and the question asked whether that best explains the nature of the reforms, as Sources A, and in part B and E suggest , or

whether other factors were at work. Sources C, D, and in part B and E, suggest they were designed to attack traditional privilege and indeed alienated key liberal groups like the Whigs, nonconformists and trade unionists. Candidates should have spotted that each source could be linked to both a reform and an interest group. Thus Source A dealt with Irish Disestablishment and claimed that it was purely about pandering to the nonconformists. Sources B and D dealt with education and provided mixed evidence on what Forster's Act was designed to achieve. Source C covered drink and the Licensing Act, again raising the question of nonconformity's influence and Source E looked at radicals and trade unionists, providing mixed evidence on the question. Many candidates struggled both with what the sources had to say and the nature of their evidence. Disestablishment was unknown to many in any detail, understanding of education was often flawed and knowledge of the Trade Union reforms was very mixed. Few seemed to understand the nuanced points Matthews was making and few picked up on his balanced views, instead merely asserting stock points on hindsight. Even more surprising was a lack of knowledge on drink and the political and religious issues surrounding it. Evaluation of the evidence in this question was attempted only by a few. All except E were varieties of Liberal thinking. If, like C, they commented that a powerful interest was damaged surely it is worth pointing out that a Liberal source commenting in this manner was more likely to convince than a critic like Arnold in Source A. Alternatively, knowledge of the Temperance campaign might affect how the evidence in C is used. 'Beer' as a traditional liberal interest might be sacrificed to the power of the nonconformist interest. Indeed there was little recognition that Gladstone might often have to choose between opposing interest groups within the Liberal party and that his reforms bore the scars of this.

3 England and a New Century 1900-24

This proved the most popular question on the paper. This is a topic where the use of timelines in revision and class could pay dividends as dating and chronology in both questions were confused.

(a). Very surprisingly there seemed much confusion over the issue of tariff reform, (frequently mis-spelt) . Some got confused by the mention of cheap food, assuming that this was something different to tariff reform. Others identified it with the Conservative party as a whole and seemed unaware that they were split on the issue. Some assumed it was already in place and not a key divisive issue within the party. Without understanding this they were unlikely to make much sense of the two Conservative sources. A few confused Joe Chamberlain with his son Austen. Dating was frequently ignored, even by better informed candidates, who persisted in talking about the events of 1906 rather than those in 1910-12. Perhaps they were misled by the reference to 1906 in Source D, an example of where candidates need to read carefully. As a result they were unable to pick up on the key difference – Austen Chamberlain was anxious to claim that Tariff reform should be credited for winning seats in the 1st election of 1910 whilst Lord Derby disputes this, seeing only disaster and party splits if the issue continued to be an open one. Context and provenance would suggest that the election was fought over the people's Budget rather than tariff reform, a crucial point when evaluating the evidence of C in comparison to D on attitudes to tariffs. Some seemed to think that the Conservatives won the January election! From Derby's viewpoint the narrow failure to defeat the Liberals in January 1910 and again in December 1910 could be attributed to an unpopular Tariff policy, whereas for Austen Chamberlain it had brought them to within an inch of victory. It followed that only a few were able to see the comparative issue of employment lurking within tariff reform, C claiming that where this was stressed they were able to overcome the Liberal allegation of Tory food taxes whilst D saw it as a threat to employment in cotton based Lancashire. Although most made some attempt at evaluating Austen Chamberlain in C many struggled with Lord Derby in D. They were misled by the information that he was a leading Lancashire landowner, thinking him unsympathetic to Cotton and industry. They mistakenly thought the link between farming and landowning meant that that was the reason why he opposed 'food taxes', instead of seeing him as the spokesman of Lancashire cotton, traditionally supporters of Free Trade and cheap untaxed food. If this was grasped, most assumed that Lancashire was typical of the rest of the country. Either way it led many to dismiss his evidence as unsound and partial, an example of old fashioned Tory England

rather than traditional Conservative Liberalism. Another contextual failure was the inability to spot the difference in dates and thus the change in Conservative leadership from Balfour (the recipient of the letter in C and a leader who had promised a party referendum on tariff reform) to Bonar Law, referred to by Derby in D as someone who appeared to be withdrawing the offer. Some candidates knew that Bonar Law was a Tariff reformer, which partly explains Derby's concern to bring Lancashire's pressure to bear on him, a pressure which proved successful. Given the problems and the partial nature of both sources few candidates were prepared to make a judgement as to which was the better evidence.

(b). Candidates also encountered problems here, in particular a looseness with chronology and a lack of understanding that 'fluctuation' could imply recovery after decline. As so often in the past tariff reform is not fully understood. The link between tariffs, food taxes (cheap food) and employment levels was not well explained. Most lacked precision in their comments, serious when the sources could lead them to conclude that working class support was lost because of tariff reform in the 1903 -10 period but was attracted back by other issues between 1911-14. It was frequently unclear what period they were talking about or indeed what election (1906 or the two 1910 elections, the results of the latter much confused). There was also confusion over tariff reform and the Conservatives. Many assumed it was Conservative policy, thus making nonsense of sources C and D and almost all assumed it was a working class vote loser, despite the evidence of source C and the pointed reference in E that protection and a strong line on defence might be welcomed in some industrial quarters (dockyards and armaments). Nonetheless most could at least attempt a grouping based around sources C and D pointing to cheap food (some did spot that C admitted losses) as the reason for fluctuating support, with A, B and E suggesting other factors were more important for the working class. However this was often established sequentially by reference rather than evaluatively. In particular few candidates were able to evaluate their grouping. B, C and D provided important insights into high level 'insider' Conservative thinking, in contrast to the outsider/historical views in A and E. This was one reason why few picked up that B and D is the same person, Stanley (Sir Edward Stanley becoming Lord Derby - despite the introduction drawing their attention to this). If they did, it seemed merely to confuse. This was an important evaluative point. Clearly Stanley appears to have changed his mind between 1906 and 1912. In 1906 he blames the new Labour party for his defeat; in 1912 he thinks tariff reform is the great working class vote loser. Given that he has an axe to grind and a specific purpose in D, candidates might give more weight to his views in 1906, thus suggesting that cheap food, at least in Lancashire, was not the key issue for the working class. Few countered this by recognising that Stanley's experience in 1906 related only to one constituency and to generalise based on this was unwise. Few then linked with the views of A, which considers other grievances, alongside tariffs, that made for Conservative unpopularity (Chinese Slavery, Taff Vale, education and a perception they were the party of the rich). Many also failed to see that Derby's meeting was not a working class one but a party one and that cotton industry attitudes might be those of employers as well as workers. Knowledge was often conspicuous by its absence. Most candidates were entirely dependent on the sources and it was particularly evident that not all understood the source references they were using or could make the necessary links between sources (A and B on Labour and the working class; A and E on imperial issues). This also affected how the sources were evaluated as some knowledge of the changing leadership of the Conservatives (B, C and D - Balfour to Bonar Law), and the vacillating nature of party policy on tariffs, assisted in this. As in (a) it would have helped if candidates evaluated the evidence on tariffs in C and D in the light of the main issues of the 1910 elections, the Budget, the Constitution and the House of Lords.

4 Churchill 1920-45

This was the third most popular question but overall candidate response was reported as less impressive than in 2009. Perhaps India and the Empire were less understood. Certainly the conceptual background was weaker, more generalised and with less supportive and integrated knowledge.

(a). Many candidates did not get much further than 'Source A supports self-government and Source B does not', to be expected from a Secretary of State for India (A) and Churchill (B). Contextual knowledge was weak, especially about self- government. Most assumed that dominion status and full self government was on offer. It was not and, before 1945, was never to be on the same basis as the white dominions. The context for 1931, the date of both sources, was the Round Table Conferences, a consequence of the commitment to review Indian arrangements contained in the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms of 1919. As Source A states it was an opportunity for 'all parties' to 'cooperate to bring a new constitution'. They were thus for *discussion* between interested parties and *review* only. A new Act, the Government of India Act, was not to emerge until 1935 and was very moderate in its proposals. It certainly failed to grant anything like dominion status. An understanding of this would have enabled candidates to modify the position they took on William Wedgwood Benn in A. He claimed the policy of discussion was received favourably, a rather different thing to accepting full self- government (Dominion status). Nonetheless Churchill in B opposed even the existence of such contacts and discussions, fearing a sell-out. Only more able candidates were able to select the key issues for comparison raised in both sources – views on a new constitution, political liberties, religious or sectarian issues affecting minorities, attitudes to the Muslim and Hindu leadership, law and order and trade. There was much difference here. Instead most candidates became sequential in their approach, missing the opportunity to compare by issue rather than by simple assertion. Provenance was also weak with only some picking up on audience and purpose (a mass meeting of the opponents of change in B, the House of Commons in A, where Benn was seeking to be conciliatory, build agreement and to put a favourable gloss on government policy. Hardly any candidate mentioned that he was a Labour Secretary of State in a MacDonald government and Churchill a Conservative opponent who had broken with his own party hierarchy over the issue. Few questioned the alleged minority status of Churchill's views, accepting Benn's assertions ('except in some quarters'). They underestimated the strength of support for Churchill on the backbenches and amongst the Conservative rank and file. However most managed something on the differences in tone and most judged Benn (by taking him at face value) to be the more useful source for establishing the majority view.

(b). Although the sources were fairly well understood many answers were let down by some very sketchy, stand alone, own knowledge. There was a tendency to assert misjudgement on Churchill's part without much serious consideration of his case, despite the prompts in Source E. Few ran with the qualifying 'serious' misjudgement in the question. Nonetheless most managed to group the sources into those that considered his Indian judgements flawed, Sources A, C and D, and those who considered his points valid, Churchill himself in B and Weidhorn in E. Those that grouped A, C and D often made little attempt at evaluation, few considering that A may be doing Churchill's views less than justice (they are marginalised with a vague reference to some 'quarters'), underestimating the support he had, and that Gucharan Das in C, at least before the Famine in 1942, was less than engaged in the issue of Indian participation in administration and government. Indeed many took him as typical of Indian opinion. Few knew anything of Churchill's policy over the Famine or of Amery, his Colonial Secretary, and Wavell, the Viceroy's, despair over his attitudes which would have confirmed the points in D. Although Wrench in C is an authoritative source his acceptance of Ghandi's view in 1941 that Dominion status in 1931 would have satisfied the nationalists is mere speculation. In 1941 the war with Japan had somewhat changed views. Here too knowledge was lacking over Source C's comment on the offer of Dominion status with the right of withdrawal from the Commonwealth and the divergence between Churchill and Stafford Cripps over what he should commit Britain too. Arguably Churchill was simply buying time given the exigencies of war and pressure from the Americans

over the Atlantic Charter. The same lack of evaluation was evident in B and E. Churchill obviously stressed religious bickering, the injustice of the untouchables and the likely effects on British trade at the height of the great depression for a domestic audience, but all were important reservations, albeit perhaps used as diversions from the necessity, as Churchill saw it, of the need to preserve the Empire and ensure Britain's continued great power status, as E confirms. Own knowledge about Congress administrations in the 1930s would suggest that Churchill's fears about discrimination against Muslims was correct. Most assumed Weidhorn in E fully agreed with Churchill's attitudes, on the strength of his acknowledgement that some of the prophecies were correct (on great power status, sectarian strife and Hindu domination). They failed to spot the qualifier at the beginning of the source – that not *all* his prophecies were erratic. Although Weidhorn didn't specify which it did mean he thought some less than wise or consistent. Surprisingly few picked up on the provenance here – a collection of Churchill's speeches on India, the extract coming from a generally favourable 'forward'. As evidence it judged from hindsight and would not consider whether, for example, the sectarian strife could have been avoided by more judicious and gradual concession pre war, something Churchill opposed and helped delay. They were, after all, as one candidate noted in a slip of the pen, his 'wildness years'.

F964/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1066 – 1660

They proved to be a reasonable cohort with some impressive answers. However it was felt that Centres do need to take note of the points made in the General Comments about sequencing, describing and referencing which were all too prevalent. In addition they do need to take note of the purpose and focus of the questions – popular response and ineffective leader in Q1 and Catholic reactions and the reasons for the failure to suppress Luther's heresy in Q2. About a third of the candidates answered Q1 on the First Crusade and the Crusader States, the rest tackled Q2 on the German Reformation. No letters of complaints were received about the questions set.

1 The First Crusade and the Crusader States 1073-1130

(a). There were some basic and costly mistakes which should be reported. A handful of candidates tried to compare all five Sources and one or two others compared the wrong ones. Some candidates did not notice the title of the paper and wrote generally about the First Crusade, rather than the People's Crusade. 'The preaching' of the Crusade was sometimes taken to mean Urban II's preaching at Clermont, and the 'popular response' was not understood as intended by those who referred purely to the princes' response.

This example is not only unclear in expression and focus on the People's Crusade but integrates Source quotations illustratively in a narrative manner rather than analysing them:

We are able to say that whilst 'the princes, with their need of financial resources and large supporters' were rather more measured in their approach due to their positions, this only served to emphasise many different approaches to venturing on Crusade and thus everyone was able to journey to Jerusalem: 'no-one ever having been held in such honour' arguably depicting the way in which people could adhere to preachers of different backgrounds.'

Weaknesses might reflect a lack of knowledge about this aspect of the topic, as there was usually little sense of context and most answers were heavily based on Source content. Most answers said nothing of provenance and those which did often asserted B to be reliable. Only the best discussed its date and its author's purpose to glorify her father's reputation, whose advice here proved to be sound. Some, misled by the date of A (1140), thought that Anna Comnena was not an eyewitness. The provenance of A was sometimes used in the light of its title and linked to its religious tone. Even when provenance was evaluated for reliability or use it was not always linked to content or to the question. Both were written after the First crusade, one to demonstrate the wide appeal of Crusade, the other handling a difficult issue for the Byzantines, yet both are from a Christian perspective and clearly confirm each other in providing evidence of popular response. Yet only the very best answers compared provenance effectively. Here is an example:

'Source A is written in hindsight and the fact that the People's Crusade was not utterly slaughtered by Qilij Aslan and his forces may contribute to the Christian author's favourable view of the response raised by Peter the Hermit. The author sees the People's Crusade as a brave attempt by ordinary people to fight off an infidel threat, and in the process of doing this, become martyrs for the Christian cause. The fact that Guibert's book would have been circulated widely in Europe also may help to explain his point of view - he recognised that his readership would appreciate a good story.'

The comparison with Source B links provenance to content:

'Source B is also written in hindsight, and Anna Comnena consistently takes her father's (Emperor Alexius) side when writing her account of his life. Therefore, we are told that Alexius 'advised Peter to wait for the counts and their forces to arrive, but Peter was over-confident and

went ahead without support.' Although this may be written off as a biased view, we know it is true that Alexius believed that the People's Crusade could potentially jeopardise the First Crusade, making it more convincing. There was much evidence to suggest this was so, not least the behaviour of the people's crusade before reaching Constantinople and outside its walls.'

The answer continues its argument making inferences using Source content:

'Source A makes the point that they were 'poor in possession' and Source B that there were 'a large number of unarmed men' so they must have known they were underequipped and inexperienced, but the fact that they went ahead with it anyway tells us a lot about their determination'.

And reaches a focused judgement:

'Both Sources provide good evidence for the popular response raised by Peter's preaching, that it was enthusiastic and zealous despite lack of weapons and experience. However, Source A tends to glorify Peter's part in events so is more subjective because of the religious purpose of its author. Therefore Source B is the better evidence.'

More typically comments on this question were not well linked and were overly descriptive. Many candidates established effective criteria for comparing 'the response' such as numbers, location, enthusiasm, attitude, aims. The higher level answers reached a considered judgement on the Sources, and usually chose B as the better evidence, despite describing rather different parts of the people's crusade, A the preaching and response in Europe, B their arrival, type and attitude.

(b). The main discriminator here was the inclusion of knowledge, which was absent at the lower levels and scanty even towards the top. There were many internal clues, useful as springboards for analysis and evaluation, but only the top answers developed the 'unruly' aspects with evidence of events as the Crusade passed through Germany or developed the references to Constantinople and the Emperor which many answers did not spot, taking the comments about Peter's absence at face value as poor leadership. Most answers were text-based and agreed with the interpretation without balancing the argument - some even criticising Peter for not training his troops. Only a few evaluated his ineffective military leadership as expected by commenting that Peter was, after all, a hermit! The best answers created a three-sided Source-based argument: religiously inspiring support for the cause (A, B and E); poor military leadership (B, C, D and parts of E); but justification in that lack of supplies, a doubtful Byzantine Emperor (here few picked up on the Gesta's comment in C) or an unruly mob (B and C) were more to blame than Peter himself.

The provenance of the Sources was rarely used effectively, while at the lower levels candidates wrote stock comments about Source E only, the content of which was mostly listed and rarely integrated or used. This was a pity as E contained prompts for assessing leadership during the Crusade. Some candidates with knowledge of the topic took the opportunity afforded by the dates of Sources B and D to impart irrelevant knowledge later than the focus of the question. However, here is one example of a candidate who did use own knowledge effectively to extend a thoughtful evaluation of the authorship of Source C, tied in to the terms of the question in the last sentence:

'Source C was written by a Frank in the retinue of Bohemond, one of the princes whose crusade was successful. Being of the nobility, Bohemond would have looked down on any leader who was not of his class, as not to do so would be to undermine his own power. The author of the source, being in the employ of Bohemond, would not have taken any standpoint other than that held by his employer. Therefore he would be biased towards a negative view of Peter the Hermit as an effective leader.'

Similarly, the following example provides a good example of how to make a comparative evaluation of provenance:

Report on the Units taken in January 2010

'While it is not easy to discount the words of Anna Comnena in overplaying the role of the Byzantines and understating the role of the Franks, it is clear in this source, as Source A verifies, that there was a lack of military experience on the people's crusade. In this way, although Source B may overplay the role of the Emperor, it is reliable in that Source A verifies the claims made by Anna.'

This example of a focused conclusion shows synthesis:

'Therefore all the Sources are similar in that none of them claim that Peter was an effective wartime leader, but they also all give indications that his army was incredibly poorly organised, untrained and unequipped. There are differences amongst them - Sources A and B portray him as being very inspiring, whereas C and D point out that he wasn't even with his army when they were defeated, so wasn't really able to lead them. However, the Sources as a set together with outside evidence suggest that Peter the Hermit was extremely inspiring and that, given all he got when he wanted an army was an unruly mob, it is overly harsh to call him ineffective and more realistic to say that the People's Crusade failed due to the shortcomings of his followers who constituted his army.'

2. The German Reformation 1517-1555

As the choice of most, this question produced a range of responses and approaches. However many candidates seemed not to have looked at the date range in the title of the paper (Reactions to Luther and his ideas 1519-21) and went far beyond 1519-21, some even reaching 1555.

(a). This question was generally answered comparatively within a range of levels. A few candidates wrongly compared Sources A and B (instead of C), and a couple of others misread the introduction to A, asserting that Erasmus was a German Archbishop. Some answers compared generally without focus on Catholic reactions. Only the best answers differentiated Erasmus's own view from that of the churchmen he criticised, seeing the dual reactions within the content of the Source. At lower levels, some candidates seemed to suggest that Erasmus himself rather than the Catholic authorities would prefer Luther dead, and that it was he who criticised Luther with 'crazed howling' and 'venomous lies'. Many candidates failed to note that Erasmus was dissociating himself from Luther, perhaps because of his acerbic comments on Churchmen. A common but understandable error was to interpret the Augustine reference as meaning Luther's order. Less understandable was the few who thought it a town. On Source C many took it at face value, failing to pick up its false note of papal persuasion of the key German prince.

Comments on tone were sometimes unclear, such as:

'Erasmus had very strong beliefs when it came to justice for Luther and openly attacked the men of the Church as 'vicious'. His ability to use vile language against the Catholic Church showed that Erasmus had also possessed the standing in the Church and enabled Luther to continue on in spreading his Lutheran ideas.'

Another attempt to use provenance was speculative and unconvincing:

'In Source A Erasmus, a famed humanist scholar, supports Luther theologically, saying that 'his ideas are in St. Augustine'. However, since this is a private letter, it might be at odds with Erasmus's published opinions.'

Two good examples of how not to evaluate were:

'Source A was written by Erasmus, so it is likely to be a balanced objective account, making it more reliable'

Report on the Units taken in January 2010

'Both are private letters which makes the two sources reliable in the fact that they are not for public viewing, and Erasmus' and Pope Leo's thoughts and feelings can be expressed'.

An example of how to do it was:

'Thus Erasmus had both the connections with the Church and also the detachment from it to write a fair and unbiased account of a humanist scholarly catholic reaction, whilst Pope Leo had the strength of papal monarchy to seek to embarrass an awkward protégé into alignment with traditional thinking on Luther as a heretic. Both provide effective evidence of the breadth of catholic reaction.'

Only a handful set the Sources in the context of the Leipzig Disputation (Source A) and the publication of 'Exsurge Domine' (Source C). There was some inaccurate chronology used, such as a Golden Rose accompanying the letter to persuade Frederick the Wise to vote for/stand as Emperor when the election had taken place the previous year. Luther's 1520 pamphlets were also stated as context for Source C when they were not yet published (the first in August, a month after Source C was written). Others who realised the Pope's duplicity in Source C used inaccurate and un-chronological knowledge in their attempt to evaluate - for example *'Frederick had captured Luther and taken him to Wittenberg castle for safety.'* Only a few candidates rightly pointed out that Frederick had prevented Luther's summons to Rome in 1518 and secured a meeting with Cajetan on German soil, showing his support for Wittenberg University and Luther as its star theologian and teacher.

There were, some impressive answers to this question, which made full links between the Sources on 'Luther's teachings', using excellent relevant knowledge of Erasmus's doctrinal standpoint, rather than, as many lower answers, using later knowledge of their quarrel in 1524. They also realised the ambivalent purpose of Source A: to persuade Albert of Mainz to prevent Luther being condemned to save Erasmus's own reputation and to distance himself from association with Luther's writings. There were some good evaluative comments on this, and some well supported, balanced judgements on the Sources as evidence for Catholic reactions. 'A' was the Source most often judged to be better, for its balance and use, although it was not necessarily typical of catholic and traditional reaction.

(b). Some candidates, with a range of degrees of success, took this question as an opportunity to write a pre-planned general essay with or without 'nods' to the Sources. Even some who began well, with the grouped Sources driving their answer, proceeded to 'balance' their argument with bolted-on knowledge of other factors, when there were clearly other reasons in the Sources.

This is a good example of argument based on use of Source content:

'Source D, a Papal Bull, decreed that anyone who supported Luther would be considered a heretic 'however lofty and dazzling their dignity might be'. This suggests that influential supporters were the main reason for the inability of the authorities to suppress Luther's heresy, as there could be no other reason to decree such a thing otherwise. Source E corroborates this as it is the Emperor's decision to outlaw and ban all teachings of Luther - 'no-one shall dare buy, sell, read, print' his books. It states 'all beloved and faithful subjects' should not engage with Luther, extending persecution wider than those of 'lofty and dazzling dignity' to include the ordinary people. This suggests widespread knowledge of Luther's teaching via the prevalence of the printing press.'

In contrast the following example shows stand-alone knowledge, some of it tangential or irrelevant, driving an answer where focus on the Sources has drifted. The Sources are referred to very briefly for illustration of the argument (Level III for AO1b; Level IV for AO1a - knowledge for its own sake rather than used; limited integration or synthesis in evaluating the interpretation for AO2b):

Report on the Units taken in January 2010

The situation in the German states at that time also did not make it easy for the authorities to suppress Luther's ideas. There was at that time a large number of towns and a disproportionately high literacy rate. The invention of the printing press made the transmission of ideas fast and easy, as reflected in Charles V's concern in Source E, that Luther's ideas are 'violently spread throughout Germany. The printing press, combined with the Renaissance reigniting interest in the original form of the Bible (which reflected Luther's view of 'sola scriptura') as well as the prevalent university culture and many trade routes through German cities, meant that it was difficult for the authorities to suppress the spread and popularity of Luther's ideas.

The best answers sustained their Source-driven approach which argued firstly, that influential supporters, some princes and universities, prevented the Catholic authorities suppressing Luther's heresy; secondly, the most influential authorities in the Empire, Charles V and the Pope, opposed Luther, but the context of the Empire hindered them; thirdly Luther's stubbornness prevented compromise and kept him in the forefront of debate and finally that German popular and nationalist support stirred by the printing press played the major role. Often, it was one of the last two views which were judged as the most convincing.

At the lower levels, there was little use of content and no mention of provenance. Source B was rarely understood clearly or used effectively. Few commented that this showed the support of intellectuals who were 'few in number'. Even fewer were those who linked this to Source A to query how much practical value they had in protecting Luther. Most saw B as supporting the assertion and a sizeable number quoted A and B as supporting the idea of 'influential supporters, missing their a typicality. Some managed a cogent argument to this effect but most did not. Source E was often merely linked to D with little attempt to develop either for argument. Indeed E was generally taken as a peg on which to hang own knowledge about the kidnapping and all that subsequently followed. A handful perceptively noted that D and E show that Luther had failed to gain the support of the two most influential leaders in Christendom. Not exactly an obscure point.

This is an example of good general judgement without fully accurate inferences. It integrates some quotations from the Sources into a general conclusion, but lacks synthesis of the set of Sources with selected knowledge to give an accurately supported evaluation of the interpretation in the question:

'Luther's stubborn character, determination and prolific writings were all important, but not as important as the influential support he held. Support from influential scholars such as Erasmus, who praises Luther's 'brilliant sparks of gospel learning' might have helped Luther to gain the support which contributed to the authorities' failure to suppress Luther. But most crucial was the support of his own Elector Frederick the Wise. If Frederick had 'taken him captive' as Leo urges in Source C, Luther would not have been able to continue the dissemination of his 'heretical' ideas however much determination he had.'

F964/02 Modern 1774 – 1975

Q1 on the French Revolution and Q2 on Italian Unification were reasonably popular, although Italy was reported to have been handled better in the main than France. Q3 on the Origins of the American Civil War attracted a substantial number of mixed ability candidates, whilst Q4 remained the favourite. Q5 on the USA and the Cold War in Asia saw only a few entries. There were two complaints about Q3 on the Nullification crisis, and also two on Q2, Piedmontese Liberalism, and one on the Churches in Nazi Germany. All were on the basis that these questions focused on relatively minor, and in the case of Q3, under resourced, parts of the specification. Nonetheless they are there and can therefore be examined. Certainly Centres should be reassured that candidates took them in their stride. Although few candidates managed to obtain Levels 1, most in the levels below tried to apply what they knew in an appropriate way, which was heartening, although evaluation only occasionally occurred in most answers.

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

A reasonably popular topic but candidates made less than they should have done from the questions because of their failure to develop alternative views in Q(b) and some lack of evaluative source skills on Q(a).

(a). Many candidates found themselves dealing with the two sources sequentially. The successful managed to focus on a range of issues, Robespierre's oratory (admired in A; seen as pride in D), character, attitude to religion, approach to justice and punishment and his ambitions. Armed with these criteria abler candidates could make meaningful comparisons about opinion on Robespierre. Weaker candidates thought that both were anti Robespierre, failing to spot the clues in A about personal friendship and the hope that he would listen and the comments about his apparent popularity in D amongst the crowd. Indeed Vilate in D is careful to distinguish between various strands of opinion on Robespierre – the more positive views of the crowd, in contrast to the more negative views of a sans-culotte, members of the Convention and his colleagues on the Committee of Public Safety. Candidates needed to read this source in particular with great care if they were not to generalise. For example Desmoulins in A, from a friendly perspective sees Robespierre as bloodthirsty and severe whereas Vilate in D does not mention this, perhaps because he too was associated with it and does not want to draw attention to it post Thermidor. On provenance there was some similar carelessness. Few made much of Camille Desmoulins's revolutionary credentials or the date and context (Robespierre at the height of his power). It took some courage to publicly address Robespierre in this way (none seemed to know that it cost him his life) whereas Vilate in D is writing after Robespierre's fall and execution. This enabled him to comment with less fear of the consequences, although negativity to Robespierre was common post Thermidor and most wanted to distance themselves from him. Better on tone, many neglected a judgement. Some tried to compare Sources A and B, instead of A and D. A disturbing minority thought Desmoulins to be a woman.

(b). Middling and weaker answers struggled to escape the assertion in the question and thus found it difficult to establish alternative interpretations. They used all the sources as exemplars of Terror and argued that Robespierre's fall was thus inevitable. They failed to spot the evidence of eccentric and pseudo religion in Sources B and D (the Cult of the Supreme Being and much else) and thus whether it was these policies that led to the fall of Robespierre. Most were able to see that Sources A, C and E focused on the methods of the Terror as ultimately counter productive (only the abler spotted the credit that C gave to its original justification – the defence of the fatherland and the raising of armies). Many struggled to use Source B appropriately. It was intended to give a sense of the extent to which the Republic was prepared to mould and control morality and everyday life and we hoped that candidates would see in it the seeds of Robespierre's downfall, especially the unrealistic nature of such policies and the extent to which

Robespierre became identified with them. As their empty rhetoric failed so too did their main proponent. Better candidates linked it to Source D and Robespierre's growing sense of self importance. The use of the word 'article' in the attribution confused some, who concluded that it must come from a newspaper and would thus be unreliable. Source D, in many respects the crucial source, was also problematic for many. Superficially it demonstrates popular support for Robespierre's revolutionary policies. However Vilate goes on to provide telling evidence of Robespierre's loss of support amongst the revolutionary elites, both in the Convention and in the Committee of Public Safety. Candidates' knowledge of Robespierre's precise fall was rarely seen, yet it would have been able to confirm the hints in D that his downfall lay in the alienation of his increasingly worried colleagues. With many missing this it was even more surprising that few picked up on the line in D that cited a sans-culotte as commenting on his dictatorial tendencies. Most preferred to use Source C for this, failing to link the two. Source E produced much 'stock' comment. Better was to comment on its relative lack of balance and judgemental nature, yet the corroboration of its points in A, B and C. Knowledge was, in general, weak and rarely much in evidence. Very few candidates had a firm grasp of the December 1793-July 1794 context. Even examples of the Terror and its political impact were missing from most. Some wanted to write about the effect of war, which appeared en-passant only in C, and/or economic factors. Whilst relevant to an essay question it did little to contextualise sources whose focus was moral, legal and political. Nonetheless some impressive answers were seen, the most frequent argument being that Robespierre went beyond the tipping point by executing Danton and Desmoulins.

2 The Unification of Italy 1815-70

(a). Weaker candidates found it difficult to spot the comparative issues here, missing the ambassador's comment in D that Cavour's position was 'seriously weakened' in 1857, in contrast to B in 1852 who felt him to be in 'complete charge'. The role of the parliamentary right was also a key comparative issue, less important in 1852, more successful electorally in 1857, as was the alliance with Ratazzi and the Centre Left or moderate radicals, clearly crucial in 1852, but under threat in 1857. The role of the King is referred to in 1857 and his influence with the French but is conspicuous by its absence in 1852. Rhetoric and its reporting in the press were also used by abler candidates as a key comparative point. Many resorted to sequenced explanation faced with the nature of Cavour's political influence in Piedmont. However more knew of the context of B, the Connubio and its continuing importance for Cavour, and had some appreciation of Cavour's stance on the press as a key weapon to use in the popularity stakes. When evaluating the provenance of both candidates seemed happier with Source D than Source B. Both tended to be taken at face value with little examination of the motives of the author. The ambassador in D, in particular, offered opportunities for evaluation. Was he putting an overly positive gloss on events? Was Cavour immune to French pressure? Who was playing whom off against the other? Most candidates thought D provided evidence that Cavour was weak on the grounds that he couldn't control the press, a misreading of the text. He may have been weaker because of the election results but clearly was feigning inability to influence a press that he claimed had little power, hardly a convincing position and obviously simply special pleading. Galvagno too is not necessarily reliable, although he was a member of the cabinet. Candidates were free to see him as either supportive or critical. His evidence can be read either way.

(b). Answers to this coped well and the evidence suggests that a focus on Liberalism and Piedmont's internal development was dealt with successfully. It was reassuring to find that most understood Liberalism and knew that free trade, a free press, anti clericalism and parliamentarianism were the key components of the notion. Most showed some supporting knowledge and were able to discuss trade treaties with France and other states, the Siccardi laws (less well known) and the Statuto. Some were even aware that Cavour had been a journalist and owner of *Il Risorgimento* when discussing the press in D. Those who were unable to see that anti-clericalism was liberal had problems with Source C. Only a minority were caught off guard by a prepared set of ideas on Cavour and were unable to adapt their information to a set of sources focusing on how liberal the Piedmontese state was in the 1850s, or how

authoritarian behind a facade of liberal sentiment (did Cavour undermine Cabinet government as suggested in B?). Sources A, B and D were generally handled well, particularly A on Free Trade, although if they didn't know that a Liberal society was characterised by a free press they handled the latter (D) poorly. Sources C and E were more problematic. Some didn't understand the connection between religious policies and anti-clericalism. Acton's perspective in E, as both a catholic and a liberal could, and did, lead to some perceptive analysis, but many latched on to one or the other and drew one-sided conclusions. Source C proved the most testing to use. Candidates were unsure of what policies were being referred to. Where did Victor Emmanuel's sympathies lie? Was the government acting liberally or not and was the King more or less liberal than the policies of his government? Most concluded that it demonstrated that Liberalism was a facade, the King being reluctant to move on press freedom and Church reform. Much could be made in the evaluation of this letter to the Pope. Its tone is relatively fawning.

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

(a). Most understood the constitutional issues here but a significant minority were defeated by the technicalities of the arguments in the two sources. They could clearly see the evident disagreements over the legality of nullification in the case of South Carolina but struggled to delineate the differences over how each side justified its position (the people v. The States; State law v. Federal law; whether the Federal government could intervene v the right of a State to resist, what constituted liberty etc.). Contextually the issue of free trade and its links to slavery were not always appreciated ('obnoxious' v. 'Beneficent' tariff). In terms of provenance most felt happy to evaluate on secure North v. South grounds and did not delve into Calhoun's sensitive position as the new Vice President, obliged to uphold the integrity of the Union yet potentially at odds with President Jackson, (the 'Exposition' was secret). Many immediately labelled Calhoun a 'Fire eater'. Not many commented on the difference in date. Calhoun in A was writing before positions became entrenched. Webster, coming from a state (Massachusetts) that had consistently argued against States rights and was the centre of northern manufacturers eager for protection, was speaking in the Senate, traditionally conservative on the Constitution. Thus much evaluation was rather trite:

'the sources are from important people'

'A and B come from opposite ends of the political spectrum and therefore cannot be used as evidence for the moderate truth or views of the everyday man'

It clearly failed to recognise that politicians reflect as well as create opinion. Some Centres seemed to have been taught to comment:

'it is only an extract, the writers might say something different in other parts of the article or speech'

thereby devaluing the source in a formulaic way. Unless candidates can give chapter and verse on the unfortunate omission on the part of the examiners it is a diversionary and meaningless comment. It is not what we mean by evaluation and is to be discouraged.

(b). In some answers there were some decidedly spurious groupings and not much integrated knowledge used. Many resorted to projecting forward to what happened later. Occasionally this could be made relevant but more often not. The 1850s and 1860 thus figured but unless it was rigorously compared to 1832-33 with a stress on what was similar/dissimilar and then linked via evaluative to the sources it could gain little credit. Many candidates and indeed centres proceeded sequentially which lost the chance of evaluative links and this despite establishing an effective grouping of B, C and D suggesting the Union was threatened, with A and E suggesting it was not. If pursued comparatively within the group there were plenty of opportunities to evaluate but most went on to examine the sources discretely. Evaluation of the sources was weak, few picking up on the position of Calhoun as Vice President or Clay as a conciliator. Much could have been made of whether a fiscal disagreement with decidedly constitutional overtones was enough to provoke secession and whether this could have been contained. Effective

reference to economic disparities and the Force Bill and their relative importance would have assisted evaluation. Sources C and D were crucial here but few candidates were prepared to evaluate the content. Was this just rhetoric and posturing as the tone and language suggests or were the pronouncements genuine statements of intent? Source C was an ultimatum with a deadline. Could Jackson have maintained any other line? Yet he was a slave-owning southerner and a general yet he claims that South Carolina is intent on secession. He could be sincere and South Carolina was raising an army, if only in self defence.. A comparison between A, where Calhoun is expanding on a view before the crisis erupts, with Clay in 1833 (E) suggests posturing. Clay thinks nullification lacked public support and that South Carolina was trying it on. Yet he was attempting to win support for a compromise tariff and may thus be glossing over the seriousness of the situation. A good number seemed to think that Clay was a Northern Senator and Kentucky a Northern state.

4 Dictatorship and Democracy in Germany 1933-63

This was reasonably well done by a large candidature, but the subtleties eluded many. The terms church and churches were used with often very little sense of there being different denominations. Effective integrated knowledge was lacking in many cases.

(a). Whilst reasonably done by most some lost focus on the key issue – evidence for the effectiveness of the Nazi attack on the Churches. There was much sequential comment but abler candidates seized on the Protestant/Catholic differences and appreciated the issue of typicality with Bavaria in D, in contrast to the more general comment in E. Some missed the agreement over youth – that in both peace and war this was the group where, for whatever reason, the Nazis were being more effective. Most also saw the importance of the dates and were able to contextualise, the Nazis at their peak in peacetime Germany in D, far more on the defensive in E (literally at Stalingrad), although surprisingly few essayed a reason for this (that spiritual values amidst spiralling casualties and fear could be expected). We saw many cases of a formulaic response here, with lists of ‘qualities’ trotted out. For example, the Gauleiter reports in E were often subjected to such a response and were considered untypical and unreliable. In fact we have little reason to doubt the veracity of their evidence. Whilst most saw them as equally reliable some, in formulaic mode, asserted that the writers might have been exaggerating ‘*in order to get their bosses to take action*’ with no evidence or suggestions as to how this could be proven or exemplified. The stress placed on this by some was such that the content of the sources was barely touched.

(b). This too was reasonably well done, although many of the more nuanced points in the sources were ignored. For some it proved more difficult than it looked, mainly because of their lack of appreciation of the Churches and Volksgemeinschaft and of the Protestant/Catholic/Reich Church dimension. At various points most identified A, B, C and D as all being representative of the Church as a whole. Source A was often mistakenly attributed to the Catholic Church instead of a Catholic Schoolteachers Association. It could not be taken as an official response of the Church as a whole. This is another example of where careful reading is necessary. More surprisingly the political context of collaboration was sidelined or ignored by some – the Roman Catholic Centre Party and its vital role in early 1933, specifically commented upon by Bachem in Source B. Again the Youth dimension was missing, hinted at in the sources and a key area of struggle between rival organisations. Few picked up on ‘*willing*’ collaborators. Those few who did used this as an effective analytical tool, concluding that although there may have been collaboration it was rarely willing, except perhaps at the beginning and then only amongst the laity (Catholic schoolteachers). A minority didn’t understand the meaning of the word ‘collaborator’. Yet it was refreshing to see a wide variety of interpretations emerging, ranging from willing collaboration through resignation that this was the price of survival (very evident in B and D), passive resistance to formal opposition. Some interpreted this as a matter of change – collaboration being replaced by opposition- others continuity. For most however knowledge did not extend much beyond the Concordat (variously attributed to all Churches, Protestants or correctly to the Catholic Church), although some mention was made of individuals, notably Bonhoeffer, and Cardinal Galen on the issue of euthanasia. Weaker

candidates were anxious to offload extraneous material on Anti-Semitism, T4, Hitler and the SA and anything else Nazi. After the Concordat some candidates were in the hands of the sources knowledge wise and few seemed aware of Nazi efforts to establish their own Church or faith. Some were confused over references to Marxism and Bolshevism, failing to see it as the key issue over which collaboration could occur. Others didn't develop the educational points, very important to both protestant and catholic Churches. Evaluative opportunities were often neglected. The reports in D and E could have been seen as reliable and effective evidence of the situation whilst the letters in A and C were more conscious of the sensitive politics, image and cooperative areas to stress, to be expected given their earlier dates and public context. Much could have been made of the speech in B and was by abler candidates. In terms of context it was public and controversial. Given its content it gives a shrewd and probably honest view of resigned collaboration from the political wing of a still powerful Catholic Church. The links with C are obvious – more evidence of Nazi intent to destroy Catholic organisations.

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

This question failed to attract a large candidature.

(a). Most seemed confused by the dates here, 1950 coming at the end of the 1945-50 period. The sources provided an overview of US strategies during a period that saw a consolidation of the Cold war in the immediate post war period. Inevitably Japan and the Philippines were the core of that strategy but the context of E was the invasion of South Korea and both sources commented on what to do about conflict on the mainland. They agree that this was up to the indigenous population, backed by the UN. The sources allowed candidates to integrate their knowledge effectively but most took time to see how to use C in this respect and often failed to locate its context – the failure to stop Communism in China and the domestic pressure of the McCarthyites. Certainly few picked up that such a speech to the National Press Club was singularly ill advised and may indeed have encouraged North Korea to seize the initiative and attack the South. Lack of focus saw some candidates thinking they should discuss containment to rollback, others the loss of China and yet others 'Europe first'. There was much sequencing and description. Surprisingly few realised that the key difference between C and E was the hardening of US policy after the invasion of South Korea. The most effective answers realised that the omission of Korea from Acheson's defensive perimeter in C led to Truman's more hard-line approach in E. Evaluation was often quite casual, consisting of little more than C being typical of Acheson's views with no more development of purpose, audience and context. There was much 'stock' evaluation in that as politicians, or in speaking to newspapers, they were bound to lie/exaggerate/not explain everything, even on E where events could verify what Truman was saying. Several saw the main difference being that Acheson was stating the theory behind policy and Truman the practice, sound as long as the key difference in dates was noted and used in evaluation. For many there was a reluctance to state the obvious – that Truman was President and was here announcing to Congress the commitment of forces to aid South Korea. Abler candidates noted the both the limitation, and the similarity with C, in that the US was still clinging to the idea of local Asian resistance aided by US air and sea power. There was as yet no commitment of US ground troops.

(b). Here too the preference was for sequenced description and it appeared that for many the earlier period of 1950-45 was sketchy to say the least. Candidates were either thrown back on the information in the sources or were determined to write about Vietnam in comparison with Korea and the 1945-50 period. Thus the failure of US policies in Vietnam would, in some desperation, be traced back to this period. Chronology was also rather shaky, for example on when China was 'lost' or when the French were in Vietnam. There was an awful lot about domino theory and 'salami approaches', often of little relevance to whether US policy was weak. The view that it was is predominantly in B, and to an extent in C, D and E. The alternative, that it was more robust, is in A, D and to an extent in E. Source A, Senator Edwin Johnson, proved problematic for many. A small number saw him as evidence for weakness as the policy he described never happened and Mao in B showed the bomb for what it was, a 'paper tiger'.

Others placed it before Hiroshima and thus interpreted it as demonstrating strength, vindicated by a willingness to use the bomb. Few seemed to pick up the idea of a confident post-war US, secure in its sole possession of the A bomb or used the introduction, which suggested that Johnson was against military involvement. They failed to evaluate it in the light of a reluctance to commit and that this was superpower status on the cheap, possibly unrealistic in its underestimation of the strength of Asian nationalism, as China was to prove. Some candidates adopted a very anti-American stance, interpreting all they did in the 1945-50 period in terms of later events (Vietnam again). This unbalanced much of what they had to say and certainly detracted from a focus on alleged weakness. Evaluation could also be rather simplistic. Thus comments such as:

'A, C and E are by senior Americans and so are biased.'

did not get an answer very far. The inclusion of two communist sources in B and D also confused some candidates who either dismissed their comments as 'biased' communist ranting or took their points too literally. Mao in D was there to point to the weakness of reliance on the A bomb in that any US President would be reluctant ever to use it again or be able to justify its use. However few looked at the context and date of B, which would suggest that Mao, involved in a struggle to overthrow nationalist China and with a view to an international and American audience, would need to stress the power of the people. In contrast Zhou Enlai, albeit in a propaganda speech post the fall of China, suggests a tentacle like strength, ever ready to interfere in Asian affairs. There was much that could be said about these two rather contradictory sources and judgement on their value as evidence enriched the few who did comment on them in this way.

F965 Historical Interpretations and Investigations

This was the first time that this unit has been assessed. The marks ranged widely and included all mark bands from IA to VII.

Many centres have attended OCR inset on marking and most centre markers related their comments to the mark schemes. It was clear that in the majority of work sampled, a great deal of care had been given to marking, with helpful marginal comments and clear final summaries which explained the marks given for the assessment objectives. Some centres omitted to give levels (as well as marks) at the end. It is better to indicate levels as the comments should match the level descriptors in the mark scheme. It is a useful final check for centres that the marks and comments are congruent, particularly when internal moderation has taken place. Although this is time-consuming, it does help to ensure consistency of marking and is appreciated by the moderators.

In terms of administration, there were some instances of centres failing to enclose the Candidate Assessment forms. These do not need to be sent in advance, but it is a requirement that they should be sent with the samples. There should be a careful check by centres to ensure that the marks on the script match those on the mark sheets. In one case, there were four instances where the marks were different. This delayed the moderation process. Also, it is important that the centre number and candidate number are on every piece of work. As this is one unit and assessed as such, it is important that both pieces of work by a candidate are submitted together, rather than all the Investigations and all the Interpretations in separate folders. In general, plastic folders are unhelpful and it is better to use a paper clip or staple to fasten the two pieces.

There were no instances of candidates submitting prohibited combinations, but centres do need to remind candidates of the word limit. It is the candidates' responsibility to ensure that each piece of work is no longer than 2000 words.

Given that this was the first time that centres used the mark scheme and had responsibility for assessing their own candidates, the moderators were very encouraged by the accuracy and realism of most of the judgements by centres and would like to express their thanks. There was a considerable measure of agreement between centres and moderators on standards and the comments which follow about these must be set in that context.

A minority of scripts were inadequately annotated and there was one example of disagreement about the rank order of candidates' work. Most marks were within nationally accepted standards and could be accepted by the moderators. This is a tribute to the professionalism and integrity of those teaching and marking this unit. There were few examples of excessively stereotyped work and there was a real sense that candidates had engaged with the tasks in an independent manner.

This report will look at strengths and weaknesses of candidates' work in both Interpretations and Investigations and then identify some areas where there was some disagreement about marking.

Interpretations

Better answers focused on the interpretations and did not use them merely to illustrate an essay on the question set. It was often helpful when candidates offered an overview of the passages, identifying those which took a similar approach to the debate. Many answers did this succinctly and some offered their own view on the issue in the question, while others showed an understanding of why it was possible for historians to differ. Both approaches are useful and

Report on the Units taken in January 2010

there is no 'formula' ; the mark depends on how well the interpretations are explained in relation to the issue in the question and how well they are evaluated using contextual knowledge and considering the evidence offered by the other passages. Stronger responses offered supported judgements throughout and ensured that their overall conclusion was consistent with these; they were characterised by a sharp focus on the issue and a flexible and appropriate deployment of contextual knowledge. Good answers used all four passages.

In this answer to 14A the candidate uses the passage, offers both contextual knowledge and reference to another passage. The focus on the relative importance of Bismarck is sustained.

Craig in passage B claims 'had the Prussian army not been as good as Bismarck believed it to be, he would have been a dead man before the day of the battle was over...but he had not been mistaken in his initial judgement'. Indeed, Bismarck's confidence in his strong Prussian army was justified and many leading politicians would not have taken the risk. Bismarck had fought for an increased military budget against liberal opposition in the Landtag and his victory had surely helped. The result of this was the development of an army capable of defeating Austria in 1866. His political bravery had prevailed and contributed hugely to the result of 1866. To a degree Interpretation C agrees with this as Breuille admits that the military balance of power had shifted very sharply from Austria to Prussia. This view is supported when one considers that Prussian War Minister Von Roon implemented reforms like increasing army size, making conscription compulsory, for three years at least and ensuring that the Prussian army had a better standing of training and discipline compared with the Austrians.....The argument of B is therefore acceptable, but he fails to recognize any external factors influencing Bismarck's success, such as the Zollverein or the favourable international circumstances present at the time.....It can safely be said that Bismarck can claim no role in the initial setting of economic stability. He was lucky to have inherited such a favourable situation, but as B states, it was partly Bismarck's doing in maintaining the anti-Austrian policy which had been so successful before that led to Austria's defeat.

In 19(c) this candidate focused on the issue and brought contextual knowledge to bear. The interim judgements are by and large consistent with the final view.

According to Interpretation A, 'Vietnam also left the US relatively weaker vis-a- vis the Soviets', this being the antithesis of the Korean War. The Vietnam War did cause America to ignore other foreign policy issues which escalated tensions with other countries. However, Interpretation C argues with this point by reminding us that the United States emerged stronger than many people expected. Economically, the USA was indeed still the richest and most powerful nation, but their reputation had been crippled by their actions in the Vietnam War. America began to question how vital it was that all countries followed their democratic regime. According to 'Rise to Globalism' by Stephen Ambrose, Congress passed a 'blank cheque' enabling the President to expand the war without consulting Congress. This would not have happened under previous circumstances and proves how fixated with foreign affairs they had become. It was clear to future leaders that this was not in America's best interest. Some of the information in C and D supports my opinion that the war in Vietnam caused a more lasting impact to the US rather than their people of South East Asia further as they acknowledge the reaction war veterans received on their return and how this affected US civilians....Nearly 700,000 most of these poor, non-educated or black, found it extremely difficult to get a job.

The conclusion is

Interpretation C leads to a conclusion of fundamental importance. It highlights how completely destroyed was the American trust and attitude towards its government and how this bond is vital to run 'a perfect society'. It led to 'a persistent distrust of the public institutions'. In the late 1960s thousands of Americans protested against the war by radical methods such as burning draft cards. In 'Vietnam' by High Higgins it shows that in 1967 tens of thousands participated in a mass demonstration outside Washington. The physical impact of the war caused considerable

Report on the Units taken in January 2010

damage to the economy to the people of South East Asia, resulting in tremendous psychological and economical difficulties. Nevertheless I believe that the interpretations are more in favour towards my opinion, agreeing that the war did cause thousands of Americans to lose faith in their system, which is highly significant and why I believe that America encountered a more lasting impact.

Candidates should try to ensure that arguments are clear and consistent

This candidate offered a clear view in the introduction

This essay will argue for the opinion that Alfred's purpose for the Renaissance had deeper connotations than merely an altruistic desire to improve the levels of literacy

This passage was considered critically

Lapidge emphasizes that Alfred realised the revival of religion and learning as the cure to the Viking invasion, an interpretation supported by Wormed in "The Ninth Century". Following Alfred precisely, Lapidge argues that Alfred understood the Viking invasion to be a form of divine punishment for the English people's failure to maintain the ability to read the word of God. This belief would have been typical of the time, a letter from Alcuin to Aethelred written in 788 similarly suggesting that the wave of Viking invading during this period were due to divine punishment for the 'manifold sins of the English' also states this. Alfred would have been aware of Alcuin's work, the doctrine of divine punishment being a literary tradition dating back to Gildas in the 6th century. This would have been taken into consideration by Alfred and his advisers and thus the interpretation that Alfred viewed the literacy of his officials as paramount....seems strong. The introduction of John the Old Saxon and Grimbold of Flanders similarly suggests that by replicating the actions of Charlemagne, increasing the number of men that could read and understand the word of God, he could formulate similar successes. This is evidenced further by another extract from Alfred's preface to 'Pastoral Care', where he states that when the Kings of England obeyed God and his messengers succeeding both in wisdom and warfare' they would be able to 'extend their territory outside. This passage comes directly from the hand of Alfred and suggests that victory would only come from obeying the word of God, an action only possible for the literate. Thus such a source seems infallible evidence for the argument that Alfred's intentions for the Renaissance were to crush the Viking invasion through studying the word of God

The conclusion, here quoted in part, was consistent with the analysis and interim judgement

Alfred may have had a genuine desire for his people to learn and appreciate literature, his personal love of the written word being evident when he memorised an entire book of psalms in his childhood. I believe that Alfred's intentions may be much deeper than this.....cultural developments in Alfred's reign were aimed at cementing his political stance in the eyes of the English population whilst subsequently forcing out the Vikings from English territory

To summarise, better answers will engage consistently with the key issue in the question, will keep the passages as the focus of their answers; will use knowledge selectively and pertinently to evaluate the passages; will make critical use of other interpretations; will offer a reasoned conclusion which follows on from the judgements made in the course of the essay.

Candidates should score less well

- If they refer to interpretations in passing, or do not offer much more than a general short summary of the interpretation, failing to consider its reasoning or evidence.
- If they do not refer to all the passages
- For merely explaining what the passage says.

Report on the Units taken in January 2010

- By merely comparing passages is not the same as using different interpretations to corroborate or challenge the view in a passage.
- For evaluative assertions about passages not supported by evidence
- For conclusions which offer little or no judgement but just a summary of the passages

Though the response below does refer to a passage, it does not attempt to link it to the question – which concerns whether Stalin was most to blame for wartime disagreements. Note the use of “As Interpretation A shows..” The passages should be the focus of the answer, not used illustratively.

By the time the big three had met at the Yalta conference in February 1945, relations were at an all time low. Even between Churchill and Roosevelt, as they disagreed on how to handle Stalin and what to do with Europe. Roosevelt even made fun of Churchill in order to try and bond with Stalin. However, this was nothing in comparison to the relations with the Soviets. As Interpretation B notes “by the Yalta conference the military experience of the Grand Alliance had done nothing to mitigate the political differences”. This interpretation believes that it was due chiefly to the treatment of Russia by the Allies in regard to the Second Front and that Russia now felt that it had no particular obligation to the Allies, which were after all countries who had done very little for it and in some cases openly opposed it prior to 1941. At Yalta, Poland and Germany were the main subjects. Stalin was eager to tear Germany apart and destroy its infrastructure but while Churchill was opposed to this he was unwilling to start any arguments about it. Roosevelt claimed to agree with Stalin but in reality, and as the US later found out, this was impractical and did not suit their best interests as they needed Germany for trade.

The following is focused on the issue and sets two sources together, but the evaluative element is limited

Interpretation C also discusses the seminary priests in England; however it contradicts interpretation D in that it suggests the seminary priests were definitely unsuccessful. The weakness of the seminary priest’s (sic) influence C suggests is that they were concentrated mainly in the southeast where there were little catholic prospects. The other reason being that the priests focused their efforts on the gentry and not the majority of the people, this weakened overall catholic support. However both C and D agree that the intention of the priests did pose a threat. As C states their task was to sustain and strengthen existing catholic beliefs. It is correct that this is a threat as, if successful could have led to a higher demand for further catholic elements in the church, creating a serious threat to Elizabeth and her church. Interpretation C, like interpretation D, indicates some threat as it explains support for the seminary priests among the gentry as they would successfully back any future restoration of the old religion. The favoured argument in C indicates that the arrival of the seminary priests didn’t cause a catholic threat, despite having the support of the powerful gentry.

The assessment by centres of Interpretations

In general, centres were looking for relevance, for evaluation, for sustained argument and judgements and annotated appropriately. Where there were disagreements they mainly over these issues

1. Over-rewarding simple comparison of passages with little sense of evaluation
2. Rewarding the presence of own knowledge too highly when it was not being used
3. At the Level II/III boundary and also the Level II/I boundary in A02 there was some generosity to any attempt to deploy knowledge to assess interpretations. The judgement at Level III and above is the extent and depth of supported evaluation.
4. Sometimes it was not noted when candidates failed to use all four passages or when the focus of the argument shifted from the key issue, but there were still attempts to evaluate.

Of these elements, the most recurrent was the failure to see a distinction between merely comparing passages and using them to evaluate. Though evaluation may be implicit, it is helpful to look for key evaluative vocabulary as an indication that the candidate is engaging with the interpretation and not merely understanding its gist and comparing it with other passages. Marking should note where the candidate has not really gone beyond the brief summary of the passage offered. When evaluation is used as an annotation, this should indicate a judgement not merely a link with the key issue in the question.

Investigations

Most candidates offered investigations linked to the Interpretations. There were some candidates who chose questions that, while linked as required to the Interpretation, were based more on research of a topic of the candidate's choice. There was not sufficient evidence to suggest whether one approach was more or less successful. Candidates are less likely, however, to offer successful answers to questions which require excessively broad surveys or where there are limited chances for debate.

The focus of this element of the unit is the critical evaluation of a range of sources in the context of a historical enquiry. The majority of candidates attempted to consider a reasonable number of sources most of which were appropriate. The differentiation in marks came from whether sources were merely applied to the question or were used with a sense of discrimination and tested against contextual knowledge, other interpretations or their nature (in the case of primary material) as evidence.

When assessing this work, the main focus has to be on the way that the candidate has approached the evidence. The key assessment questions are whether the sources are relevant to the enquiry and whether they have been used in an argument or simply to illustrate a description. If they have been used, but in an uncritical way then marks will be lower than if they have been used both with some critical sense and solid evidence of evaluation.

This part of the unit demands the selection of sources by candidates, understanding of debates and an ability to integrate the evaluation of evidence into a sustained investigation of an issue. The range of marks was wider than for the Investigations part of the unit, where the interpretations are provided. Centre marking by centres was not as accurate as for Interpretations and there were generally more disagreements here between centre marking and moderation. However, this was by no means always the case. There was much very clear assessment linked to the mark scheme which recognized the strengths and limitations of candidates' use of evidence. Centres are to be congratulated on some very careful and well-focused assessment.

Better investigations kept a very close eye on the issue in the question and were able to integrate source evaluation and argument successfully, ensuring that the essay was driven by the evidence.

In the following example, there is a real attempt to use different pieces of evidence to consider a view. There is some unevenness, but the approach is generally critically and shows some discrimination between the types of evidence.

Question: *To what extent was the Marshall Plan merely a policy of American self-interest?*

Nicholas Thompson, writing with the benefit of hindsight states "The Marshall Plan turned into one of America's greatest foreign policy triumphs. It helped save Europe both from starvation and from communism" Reports from aid agencies at the time corroborate that Europe was starving and French opinion polls taken in 1946 state "food ...was the public's number one preoccupation" Statistics from the OECD back up that Europe was no longer starving by 1955:

GDP levels in France and Italy almost doubled from 1946 to 1955. Additionally election results in Italy show that the Communists did not gain the 20 seats necessary to form a parliamentary group. Statistical evidence, which is reliable and objective...corroborates that Europe was starving and then no longer starving and that communism had declined. Thompson implies that these benefits were consequences of the US policy but this does not prove that these were necessarily US objectives. All policies can have unforeseen negative and positive consequences. However when the evidence is taken together : the reality of the situation in Europe the fact that Marshall Aid specifically targeted "hunger and poverty" in Marshall's speech and that the Plan delivered \$13 billion in aid to Europe 1948-52 strengthens Thompson's views and furthers the argument that the Marshall Plan was not merely in the interests of the USA. There is also corroborating evidence that stopping Communism was also the objective. Gaddis writes of the need to counteract "the risk that hunger, poverty and despair might cause Europeans to vote communist". Gaddis' evidence is strengthened by Tony Judt's agreement that "at the time Communists were able to mobilize popular anger and capitalize on the failures of their won governments" Further strengthening the evidence are the statistics of the local communist parties in France by 1947 with 901,100 members, in Italy 2.25 million..... (Footnotes omitted)

Knowledge and another source are here used to establish a view which the candidate later went on to assess.

Question: *Assess the view that Bismarck intended a war against France from 1866*

After the Austro-Prussian war, Prussia was left in a favourable position. The leniency shown in the Treaty of Prague shows that Bismarck was eager for peace and wanted an unscathed relationship with Austria. Taylor argues Bismarck had no clear aims after the victory of 1866, he asked only to be left alone. The validity of this view is heightened when one considers that Bismarck was increasingly aware of the recent growth of French military power due to reforms after their intervention in Mexico in 1862. Moreover France was attempting to cement international alliances with both Austria and Italy and the high fatality rate of the Austro Prussian War, reaching nearly 40,000 also casts doubt about any future risks that Bismarck would take. Bismarck was wary of the cultural divisions could bring to Germany. Williamson claims "he considered the catholic south as an essentially alien society which would not integrate easily with the protestant north" (footnotes omitted)

Both these examples are aware of the debate and focus on the question.

In terms of using evidence, most candidates offered a range of sources and few merely narrated a sequence of events. However, some found it difficult to know what to do with the evidence that had gathered. The examples below reveal some weaknesses in actually using evidence.

The following example refers to many sources, but it is not clear what case is being established or criticised in relation to the question and there is limited critical sense. The issue is not whether Elizabeth fashioned her own image but how successfully it was promoted. Without a clear grasp of the question, evaluation and deployment of evidence may have little value.

Question: *How successfully was Elizabeth's Image promoted through art and literature?*

John Calvin, for example, states that "The government of women...was a deviation from the original and proper order of nature" in a letter to Cecil. This view was widely interpreted as being a reference to Elizabeth's female monarch predecessors, however, and not a threat to her throne. It does serve to prove what other historians have highlighted; however, that there were serious points of conflict that arose from the gender and religious nature of Elizabeth's propaganda. In early representation Elizabeth is a summer queen or nature goddess whose effect on the natural world paralleled that of the sun. The sun was accorded prominence in

several state portraits such as the Ditchley portrait and the Rainbow portrait and was a central motive in John Davies' Hymns of Astrae, a series of acrostic poems dedicated 'to that cleere majesty/which like another Sunne in glory rise'. Works of literature like this were prompted by the many specific types of image that were developed: protestant, female, masculine mind with female appearance, and so on. Although there have been cases of Elizabeth's initial popularity being thanks to "spirit of the age in happy conjunction with the unique character and achievement of the queen" (E C Wilson England's Astrea) and praise such as 'she inspired patriotism, heroism, poetry" (JB Black The Reign of Elizabeth 1558-1603) comments like these alone can hardly explain the success of the national cult, however. This naive view has been rebutted by various revisionist historians who argue that her queenly role was certainly not fashioned by herself.

The piling up of authorities is not really a substitute for evaluating and using different view to corroborate/challenge evidence. The problem in the following example is that there is no real indication why these historians take these views and the extracts do not always clearly state their point of view. A range of sources is deployed, but there is little sense of any discrimination between them and little real critical evaluation.

Question: Assess the view that Bismarck intended a war with France after 1866

Williamson argues that 'Leopold accepted..after considerable pressure from Bismarck" and Stiles echoes the view that Bismarck was pushing for the candidacy by sending 'bribes to push Leopold's candidacy' to the Spanish government. Wilhelm was hesitant of the candidacy and Stiles believes 'left to himself he would have refused consent'. Clearly this supports the view of Bismarck as a master planner and Whitfield further emphasizes this by pointing out that Bismarck was well aware that this would provoke a hostile reaction from France' . Craig takes the view that Bismarck believed that 'in the event of war with France a Hohenzollern on the Spanish throne would compel the French to divert one or two armies to protect their southern frontier, suggesting that...he was almost certainly preparing for war .In contrast, Feuchtwanger suggests that Bismarck did not intend to provoke a war with France and encouraged it discreetly so as not to antagonise France. Taylor believes he encouraged the candidature as 'a precaution against the projected Austro-French alliance'..... Boehme echoes this view and believed the fact that the Spanish candidature provoked a war with France 'may be considered an irony of history'.

Using seven historians in a passage like means that it is too difficult for their views and evidence to be considered and evaluated meaningfully.

The following example shows an attempt to use sources – but the referencing is not very clear; the interpretations are not brought well into focus and there is little critical evaluation

Question: To what extent was Containment based on the desire to defend freedom?

The Allies motives for containment were not just based on a desire to defend freedom: America's desire for trading partners and economic clout, Britain's failed attempt to shore up her crumbling empire, and Europe's desire to rebuild itself after the ravages of World War II were all key motives for Containment policy, which had very little to do with political freedom¹ However, it is unlikely that the attempted fulfilment of these desires would have resulted in war as there 'is no evidence that Soviet intentions ran towards sudden military attack'² However, if we follow Leffler's argument that the Cold War and therefore Containment actually represents not the pursuit of freedom versus the pursuit of a communist utopia but two military superpowers

¹ See Leffler and DS Painter Origins of the Cold War, National Security and Foreign Policy

² John Lewis Gaddis

seeking hegemony at whatever the political cost³ then we are returned to the central justificatory importance of freedom by the allies (and also to the soviets) in pursuing this agenda.

As 28/40 marks are for the use of sources, this aspect has been stressed. The main reasons for differences between centre and moderator marks in this part of the coursework are as follows.

1. The failure of centre marks to note and take account of a failure to answer the question directly and to pursue a relevant argument.
2. The over-rewarding of reference to different sources without sustained evaluation or much sense of discrimination
3. Insufficient account taken of the failure to deploy knowledge to evaluate sources in a sustained or relevant way.
4. Over –rewarding of limited judgements in answers which merely summarise different positions and arguments.
5. Under-rewarding, in some cases, the deployment of relevant sources. Centres should consider carefully before awarding band VI or Band VII marks when an attempt has been made to select and include relevant evidence, even if there is little critical evaluation.

Centre markers are advised to focus their attention on how sources are being used first of all, but this will involve considering whether they are being deployed to investigate the issue in the question. When a decision has been taken on this aspect, markers should consider whether the A01 objectives have been met at the same level.

There were few answers which did not use sources. Though some candidates are still drawn to schools of history, these did not predominate and there was generally a focus on precise and particular sources not ‘the Soviet school’ or ‘revisionists’. There was relatively little ‘ad hominem’ evaluation –“he is a Germany and so will be biased”; “he is writing before the archives opened and therefore will take an orthodox view”. This was encouraging and it is hoped that this will not appear in subsequent examination sessions.

Summary

The outcomes both in terms of the quality and obvious independence of candidates’ work and the professionalism with which centres approached the assessment were highly encouraging. Marking was more problematic in the Investigations than in the Interpretations, but this was not altogether unexpected given the nature of the exercise and the fact that OCR advice about queries made to its consultancy service have been largely focused on Interpretations. Issues have been raised here and advice offered. This can be developed if centres wish to use the consultancy service,

³ Leffler again

F966 Historical Themes

General Comments

This was the first session of the Historical Themes units and the outcome was very encouraging. The entry for both F966/01 and F966/02 was around 10 per cent of the total cohort of candidates which was an increase on previous January sessions. 25 Centres entered 312 candidates for the Medieval and Early Modern paper and 47 Centres entered 827 candidates for the Modern paper. There were no letters of complaint from Centres. As one would expect from a synoptic assessment, taken in most cases after one term's teaching, the quality of scripts was very varied. At the top end there were several outstanding performances from high quality candidates, who not only demonstrated excellent historical skills but also were clearly well prepared for the assessment. At the bottom end, many candidates appear to have underestimated the intellectual demands of the unit and the importance of thorough revision as the basis for achieving good marks.

Candidates seem to have benefited from having more time to answer two questions; very few essays were unfinished and most reflected careful organisation and a depth of knowledge not generally found in the legacy assessments. However there was a danger of candidates putting in anything and everything that might seem relevant and so losing control of the material. Centres might find it helpful if they were to spend more time doing question analysis. This would enable candidates to identify the key issues in a question and enable them to focus more easily on the question set. Generally candidates were well-informed but essays tended to have structural faults rather than those of content or detail. For instance, candidates sometimes mistook the aim of a question, failing to make an appropriate comparison, perhaps omitting to come to a conclusion or explaining a judgement rather than evaluating it. These could be eradicated at the planning stage. The 'plans' which preface many answers often contain little more than slabs of information which the candidate dutifully transcribes in yet more detail in the body of the essay. Better plans indicate the key words of the question and the direction in which the answer is to go. Weaker responses lacked focus on the exact demands of the questions set. In particular the command stem of questions was frequently ignored presumably due either to a lack of understanding or a determination to answer a question that had been revised and practised in advance. This was especially true of responses to the questions on Tudor Rebellions and Russia and its Rulers.

The absence of a Timeline Insert also appears to have had a beneficial outcome. Some candidates made basic factual errors, which is to be expected, but there was no indication that candidates failed to cover the whole period in their essays or that their arguments lacked appropriate supporting evidence. Most candidates produced two essays of almost equal length although some did spend too long on the first answer. Some were clearly under-prepared and wrote very little or else dealt in big generalisations.

Essays are assessed according to two Assessment Objectives and Centres should impress upon their candidates the importance of demonstrating synthesis and analysis in their answers. These skills carry twice the number of marks accorded to factual knowledge, relevance and the quality of communication. The latter elements are important but in this synoptic paper, synthesis and analysis receive a greater weighting. Many candidates will see an improvement in their performance if they give more attention to identifying links and connections between developments, making cross references and, where appropriate, demonstrating continuity and change over time. Those who write synoptically tend to include references to large chronological sections of the period in each paragraph, thus drawing their conclusions from across the period. In particular, questions that have a 'turning point' focus generally require a better technique, which sets the event or individual in context and assesses its historical significance. Candidates still regard these questions as opportunities to write about every new event, each of which is classified as a 'turning point'. A more discreet selection and judgement would be beneficial.

F966/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1066-1715

Individual Questions

English Government and the Church 1066-1216

- 1 A disappointing question that was largely answered by means of a chronological narrative. Some candidates explained why rebellions broke out rather than assessed the degree to which the reasons for the rebellions remained the same. Better essays grouped rebellions thematically but even these were often drawn to explaining why the rebellions occurred. There was a general tendency to see the rebellions as mono-causal eg the Anglo- Saxons rebelled against William I because he wanted to give away their lands to his Norman friends.
- 2 A focus on 'never fully in control' might have guided the answers along the right lines but the precise words of the quotation to be evaluated were frequently ignored. Similarly, an attempt to define 'control of the Church' would certainly have given the essays more structure than many of them had. A few candidates unloaded everything they knew on the Canterbury/York dispute yet omitted to show how this was relevant. Others took pains to explain why the archbishops were never fully in control.
- 3 This was the least popular question in this section and the least well done. Many answers which failed to reach Level III did so because candidates did not read the question carefully enough and so wrote in general terms. Many candidates did not consider what the papal reform movement was nor what impact it made on England. As a result, they were unable to deal with 'more by change than continuity'.

Rebellion and Disorder under the Tudors 1485-1603

- 4 This question produced some interesting and at times very good answers. It was the most popular in the set on rebellions and proved an excellent discriminator. The essence of a good essay lay in recognising that 'local grievances' needed to be assessed and illustrated as a cause of rebellion. The weavers and craftsmen of Lavenham and Bury St Edmunds, for instance, already suffering from the effects of an economic depression, felt they could not pay the exorbitant Amicable Grant tax in 1525. The people of Louth, fearing that their parish church goods were about to be seized in 1536 as diocesan, monastic and subsidy commissioners travelled the county, marched in protest to Lincoln. Tenants on the Clifford estates in Westmorland joined the pilgrims in 1536 in objecting to rack renting. Villagers in Norfolk, angry at Flowerdew's unwarranted enclosures in 1549, called upon Kett to lead their protest. Cornish parishioners in Bodmin in 1549, dissatisfied with the new English Prayer Book, followed their vicar and marched to Exeter in rebellion. Some of these examples were given in high quality essays but many candidates were unable to cite any 'local' grievances and instead talked about general complaints. They therefore viewed 'local' to mean unique to an area, without recognising that most rebellions had a local origin. Thus the Yorkshire, Cornish and Oxfordshire rebellions were assessed as local because protests were confined to one county. Indeed some candidates turned the question into one about 'regionalism'. Some, having said that the Northern rebellion was local, continued to write that it was a factional rebellion and therefore not local at all. Most essays regarded dynastic and political rebellions such as Simnel, Warbeck and Essex as exceptions to the premise. Weaker responses tried to group rebellions into categories, such as religious and economic, but found that this approach sat uncomfortably with the question. Some candidates went through the reigns chronologically rather than drew

relevant conclusions about similar causation from the whole period thus resulting in very little synopsis or synthesis. A fair number resorted to their causes of rebellions essay and took little account of the wording of the question while some who did ignored the adverbial content of the question. Several candidates brought in Irish rebellions and supplied local circumstances to explain their causation.

- 5 This was the least popular of these questions and not well answered. A comparative evaluation of English and Irish rebellions was required but most candidates seemed unable to construct an appropriate framework to achieve this. Essays frequently became explanations or accounts of why almost all rebellions failed. A standard answer listed the rebellions in England, noted successes and failures, did the same for Ireland and then finished with a conclusion which did not touch 'far more successful'. Weaker answers argued that if a rebellion lasted a while (as in Ireland) or required an army to put it down (as in England), then the rebellion was a success because grievances had been aired and the government had been forced to take notice. Better responses linked the aims of a rebellion to the outcome and identified any circumstances common to both English and Irish rebellions. For example, each of the rebellions in England in 1489, 1497 and 1525 had their principal tax revoked because the government feared popular protests could get out of hand. Several candidates pointed out these 'successful' rebellions but overlooked positive gains for the gentry and legal groups resulting from the Pilgrimage of Grace, a cessation of enclosures following Kett's and the Oxfordshire rebellions, and the success enjoyed by Tyrone having negotiated a deal with Mountjoy in 1603. Generally assessments of failed rebellions in England and Ireland were better handled.
- 6 'Maintaining stability' was the focus of this question. Good candidates kept it at the centre of their argument, whether they were dealing with the nobility, clergy, gentry or monarchy; weaker responses wrote about the topic in question ie the nobility, before moving on to other related themes. The weakest essays devoted inadequate attention to the nobility or regarded all men in authority as 'nobles' and wrote generally about their role in the long century. Assessing the role of propaganda had a place in this question but only if it was tied to the issue of 'maintaining stability'. All too often it was not. There were, however, some very good essays that illustrated the nobility as law enforcers, peace makers and societal leaders. Of course, some candidates regarded the nobility as potential destabilisers which, though true, gave some essays a skewed balance concerning their negative role. The best responses were able to show how the nobility upheld order in times of domestic stability, when there were no rebellions to suppress, by managing their tenants and estates effectively, overseeing county administration as lords-lieutenant, and working alongside the gentry and JPs. Several linked these developments to the halcyon Elizabethan era after 1570.

England's Changing Relations with Foreign Powers 1485-1603

- 7 A large number of candidates attempted this question and produced some very good answers. The best essays examined foreign policy thematically, sometimes treating aims and methods together but usually separately. They considered how particular aims were implemented and most argued that there was much continuity in both areas and, where differences occurred, they were often due to the personalities involved. Many candidates wrote general accounts of foreign policy punctuated by noting that Spain became an enemy during the reign of Elizabeth. Weaker candidates produced a chronological survey of events, made no distinction between aims and methods, and generally felt that foreign policy was characterised more by change. Few candidates looked at how far religious issues affected foreign policy aims particularly during Elizabeth's reign when confessional politics assumed a more prominent position.

- 8 This was a popular question and well answered if candidates adopted a direct comparison. Scotland and France were interpreted as having each threatened England's security at various times, but France was the more enduring problem. Knowledge of Scotland was variable, particularly under James VI, and weaker candidates focused too much on the threat presented by Mary Stuart after she arrived in England. Better candidates noted the preoccupation of France with Italy and Spain and her handicap during the wars of religion. The best essays explained the interrelationship between the two countries in the Auld Alliance and identified the 1510s and 1540s as the most perilous decades for England. Some candidates questioned whether there really was a serious threat and how far England was responsible for precipitating political and military crises.
- 9 Neither popular nor well handled, this question produced few good answers. Too many essays presented a chronological narrative with supplementary comments on Anglo-Spanish relations and failed to produce a thematic or synoptic assessment. Some candidates considered some of the political, religious and economic consequences; most essays were drawn towards the Elizabethan military and naval conflict but offered little in the way of analysis of English domestic events.

The Catholic Reformation 1492-1610

- 10 Whether candidates agreed or disagreed with the premise, most wanted to get on quickly to assess other factors that contributed to the success of the Catholic Reformation. Isabella and Ferdinand, Henry VIII and Philip II figured prominently as examples of secular rulers but surprisingly little was said about Francis I, Charles V and later Holy Roman Emperors, or German princes in general. A good evaluation of secular rulers was needed for high level marks. Most candidates focused on the role of the Papacy, citing popes who assisted the Catholic Reformation and those who did not. Sixtus IV was often included and Centres should note that his pontificate falls outside the period of study. Several candidates pointed out how Catholic reforms, such as those contained in the Tridentine Decrees, depended for their enforcement on secular as well as ecclesiastical authorities, and that the secular rulers who were keen to reform churches in their own country often relied on the Jesuits, Inquisition and Tridentine Decrees, and so did not act alone.
- 11 This question produced some outstanding answers. The best responses focused on change and continuity and examined different aspects of the Catholic Reformation accordingly. They recognised that none of the 16th century developments was totally novel, and links with earlier periods and institutions proved useful areas of analysis. In particular, the Inquisition, 'new' orders, general council and doctrinal statements issued at Trent were cited as examples of continuity. Most candidates felt more at ease looking at examples of change. Some spent too long writing contrasting biographies of Renaissance and Reformation popes; others assumed that 'new' orders had no precedents. It was pleasing to see, however, that almost all candidates recognised elements of both continuity and change in the Catholic Reformation though, on balance, they came down on the side of conservatism rather than innovation.
- 12 This was not a popular question and produced few really good answers. Most candidates believed neither the Inquisition nor the Index fulfilled positive roles but few were able to give sufficient evidence in support of their argument. Indeed there was much ignorance about both institutions and almost all candidates confined their discussion to the Roman Inquisition and Index. Some clearly believed that there was no inquisition before 1542 and that the Spanish and Portuguese inquisitions were irrelevant in the question, even though essays went on to assess the work of Ximenes in Spain. Too many candidates sidelined the Inquisition and Index as unimportant or irrelevant and devoted most of their answer to assessing the Papacy, religious orders and Council of Trent. These features certainly had a place in this question but only if used comparatively in the context of the Inquisition and Index.

The Development of the Nation State: France 1498-1610

There were no candidates

The Ascendancy of France 1610-1715

- 16 A good start might have been a definition of absolute monarchy, with possibly a reference to Bossuet. What passed for definition, though, in all essays was the vacuous statement that 'absolutism revolved around the principal (sic) of a strong king having legitimacy and sovereignty'. Nevertheless, most essays were comparative, although some essays contained almost everything anyone might want to know about the two kings.
- 17 A handful of candidates attempted this question. Most candidates seemed to find it easier to formulate a comparative thrust, typically concentrating on the economy, relations with other powers, diplomacy and propaganda. Unfortunately many relied on characterisation as a substitute for argument, in which references to 'the visionary Richelieu' abounded. Knowledge of Colbert was generally sound but details of Mazarin were at a premium.
- 18 Only three candidates attempted this question. None displayed sufficient knowledge or understanding to get very far, relying heavily on descriptions of the changes affecting various social groups and concluding with generalised assertions.

F966/02 Modern 1789-1997

Individual questions

The Challenge of German Nationalism 1789-1919

- 1 This was the least popular question in the set on Germany but generally very well answered. Most aspects of the question were competently covered with a good discussion of geographical, political, religious, social and economic issues. If there was one area of weakness, it was that some candidates failed to discuss the nature of the German Empire in 1871. The best candidates set the question of unity in the context of the whole period and focused on 1815, 1848, 1871, 1890 and 1914 as useful moments to assess the premise; weaker responses often had little knowledge of the first 25 years of the period and were less assured about the last 30 years.
- 2 A popular question, and quite well answered. Most candidates managed an assessment of the key economic factors, such as trade, industry and communications, and linked these developments to German nationalism. They focused on the role of Prussia and Bismarck's handling of the economy, as well as discussing issues like war, liberalism and the role of other leaders. Weaker essays comprised narrative and descriptive accounts of the growth of nationalism and offered little knowledge of economic developments beyond the Zollverein.
- 3 Several candidates adopted a formulaic approach to this question, and indeed organised their material in exactly the same way replete with the same examples. Unfortunately unless candidates focused on the aims of the respective leaders, and many did not, they found it hard to make a judgement on their relative success. As a result, while candidates were generally quite sound in describing how the rulers manipulated nationalism, how they dealt with crises and finally the legacy that they left, only the best candidates assessed and compared the effectiveness of each man.

The Changing Nature of Warfare 1792-1945

- 4 This question produced some good essays that focused on conscription as a major or minor factor in successful wars, and then explained with examples why other factors at times may have been more significant. Foremost amongst these were the effective use of technology, the competence of generals, strategy and tactics, training and discipline, and a country's natural resources. Most knew a fair bit about the start and end of the period with respect to conscription but said little about what happened in between. Weaker candidates often lost sight of the key element in the question – 'to succeed in war' – and failed to analyse how far the reasons for success depended on conscription. Others largely ignored the issue of conscription and focused instead on other factors which enabled armies to be successful in war. Some candidates drifted into an essay about the size of armies without recognising that some wars, such as colonial conflicts, were won with smaller armies and, in the case of Britain, with mainly volunteers.
- 5 This question was the least popular of the three. It was generally approached through a chronological framework which made it difficult for candidates to offer a comparative analysis and evaluation. Most candidates treated 'command and control' as a single entity, and went on to assess the role of generals in warfare. This was an acceptable approach but some candidates substituted these key words with 'tactics and strategy'. Better responses confined their argument to 'battles' in warfare, and discussed the connection between the quality of command and the outcome. Examples were given of competent

generals winning battles (Napoleon), competent generals losing battles (Rommel), incompetent generals winning battles (Raglan) and incompetent generals losing battles (Joffre). Most candidates understood that the outcome of battles depended on a combination of factors, sometimes working in tandem, and that 'command and control' was just one element that became increasingly less significant as the period progressed.

- 6 This question was not well answered though it was quite popular. Several essays revealed a paucity of knowledge concerning the First World War and technological developments. As a consequence they could not compare it with other turning points such as World War Two. Some saw 'industrialisation' as an all-inclusive term that included communications and propaganda but seldom the infrastructure required for countries to gain an upper hand in modern warfare. Thus, the narrow focus tended to result in responses reaching Level III at best. The most common error was to describe technological changes of the nineteenth century in isolation without applying them to warfare.

Britain and Ireland 1798-1921

- 7 This was a popular question and produced a range of answers most of which were sound. The best essays focused on 'consistently failed' and questioned the premise particularly in relation to the later period and Sinn Fein. Weaker candidates compared revolutionary nationalism with constitutional nationalism and several lost sight of the question. Some also struggled with the words 'consistently' and 'mass support'. Some able candidates showed how the line between different types of nationalism could be deemed to have been hazy at times. Candidates who deftly made links (eg the failings of constitutional forms and appeal leading on to greater support for revolutionary nationalism) and did not write excessively about constitutional areas were safe enough but many wrote a standard comparison essay. Those who wrote mainly or exclusively about the actual question did much better but some followed a chronological-descriptive route which impeded delivering an effective synthesis.
- 8 Candidates generally challenged the premise, some because they could offer a more convincing turning point and some because they knew little about Gladstone's first ministry. The better essays assessed the religious, economic and political consequences of this period for Britain and Ireland and set 1868-74 in its context. Some argued convincingly that it was a turning point; others begged to differ. Only the best really addressed the key element, namely 'Britain's relationship with Ireland'; those that did had a focus on the Protestant Ascendancy, shifting political allegiances, Westminster, electoral factors, as well as personalities and agendas. The skill required to address a 'turning point' is often misunderstood by candidates who regard every new event as 'a major turning point'. Several weaker responses thus described a catalogue of isolated events without any reference to Gladstone's government and with very little synthesis. The preferred alternatives to 1868-74 were the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829, the Famine, the Third Home Rule Bill and the Easter Rising. Some essays did not reach 1921.
- 9 This was the least favoured of this set of questions. Some candidates knew a lot about land and were sound on Land Acts but tenant-landlord relations, tithes, political, religious and economic problems associated with land and the British governments' attempts to address them lay at the heart of the question and many candidates lacked sufficient knowledge to deal with these issues. Often too much was said about the Famine or else description predominated and any relevant legislation tended to be listed rather than explained and analysed. Some wanted to write about a range of issues other than land, and interpreted the question to be one about British governments' responses to the problems of Ireland.

Russia and its Rulers 1855-1964

- 10** It has become a regular feature of questions that deal with Russian governments for candidates to focus too much on anything that occurred and to dismiss the development of government as incidental. Unfortunately, this session was no different. Candidates must realise that economic reforms such as emancipation of the peasantry, collectivisation and five-year plans only become relevant when they are linked to political, administrative and ideological methods and changes in government. Some wanted to include foreign policy and wars or else failed to show how a concern for the welfare of the people was linked to government; the same applied to sections on social policies. Several candidates assessed each Russian ruler between 1855 and 1964 (though many stopped in 1956) but without drawing any comparisons with Stalin or making him the reference point of a synthesis. Those candidates who did discuss repression, the fate of opposition, ideology, political parties, the absence of democracy, one party state, the 1936 Constitution, and compared developments under Stalin with changes under other rulers, scored well. 1861, 1881, 1905 and 1917 were seen as alternative pivotal moments.
- 11** This question generally worked well. Some candidates made hard work of the question by ignoring 'similar aims' and ran through a narrative of everything that happened. Many wrote about motives, so rehearsing recent past questions on this theme; and some described policy areas and outcomes. But most candidates could focus on a range of aims, though often comparisons were limited in scope. A significant number talked about foreign policy as linked with involvement in wars. This might have been all right if the argument had been linked to domestic issues but, sadly, this was seldom the case. The better ones picked up on the desire to modernise and to remain in power but more could have been made of repression and the handling of opposition. Here economic goals – surprisingly – got less coverage than in many answers to Q. 10.
- 12** This was a very popular question which produced a range of responses. All focused on peasants (or peasants and pheasants!). Good candidates used a thematic framework (land issues, finance, repression, working and living conditions) and were able to distinguish between different types of peasants and so recognise that their lives varied from era to era; there was no uniform development. Some saw significant improvements under the soviets but only better essays referred to the educational, health and social progress made after 1945. Some believed that major changes for the better occurred under Alexander II, Lenin and Khrushchev but the rule of Alexander III, Nicholas II and Stalin were times of regression. Themes that were addressed included opportunities, land ownership, freedoms (or the reverse), religious and social welfare – less was said about the attitudes of the state, exploitation, taxation, grain seizures. Few discussed the First World War and Provisional Government, and there were some alarming gaps of knowledge concerning Stolypin and the NEP. Descriptive and chronological approaches characterised weaker answers which often had some novel things to say about Emancipation.

Civil Rights in the USA 1865-1992

- 13** A popular question but too many candidates wrote a very standard African American essay response (roles of Federal government, Supreme Court, African American leaders etc). Many followed a chronological route, describing methods and roles rather than comparing the aims of leaders and campaigners. Weaker responses often focused on success/failure of the Civil Rights movement and there were some who discussed obstacles to the campaign. Quite a few failed to discriminate between the different aims of campaigners or they adopted a very narrow perspective (eg the aim was always to improve civil rights and/or to achieve equality). Some did see beyond individuals but very few got beyond 1968. As ever, Martin Luther King and Malcolm X figured prominently, though Booker T

Washington and Du Bois as well as Garvey got good coverage, even if not really directed at the question set. A few candidates, however, focused on issues such as housing, health, education and geographical location, and used them to supplement an evaluation of aims.

- 14** There were some very good, knowledgeable answers which usually started with internal divisions and then went on to make a comparison with other factors that influenced the progress of labour rights. Many answers were unbalanced or generalised, often describing features but without evidential support, and many tailed off in the 1950s or 1960s before jumping to the Air Traffic controllers strike under Reagan. Contextual factors were usually cited and other factors included the attitudes of Federal/State governments and Big Business but too often not enough illustration was advanced. Generally not enough was made of the New Deal era and the 1960s often received curt treatment. Many answers tended to become a list of factors and would have been much better if a cross-evaluation of factors had been attempted. Some Centres displayed an alarming lack of knowledge concerning internal divisions in both the trade union and labour movement.
- 15** It was pleasing to see many good answers but, as often in the past, quite a number were very generalised or else excessively descriptive. Most candidates knew something about the Indian Reorganisation Act and the context of the New Deal, though not many had any criticisms. Some candidates had impressive knowledge of the 1960s through to the 1980s, but this was often at the expense of earlier periods. A common approach was to claim that the IRA was something of a foundation for what was to follow but it was the growth of the Red Power movement in the 1960s that constituted the most important turning point. This was fine and made for some interesting answers except that in a number of cases the period before 1934 was largely neglected. An awareness of issues over employment, education, housing, economic and political rights nevertheless did emerge at times. Again, the concept of a turning point and how to examine it proved troublesome for many candidates, who tended to simply state a turning point and go on to list such alternatives. Unfortunately some candidates turned the question into one about how government agencies and presidents had proved obstructive to Native American civil rights.

The Development of Democracy in Britain 1868-1997

There were no candidates.

Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE History (H506)
 Advanced Subsidiary GCE History (H106)
 January 2010 Examination Series

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
F961/01	Raw	100	73	64	56	48	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F961/02	Raw	100	73	64	56	48	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F962/01	Raw	100	73	65	57	50	43	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F962/02	Raw	100	73	65	57	50	43	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F963/01	Raw	100	68	60	53	46	39	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F963/02	Raw	100	68	60	53	46	39	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F964/01	Raw	100	67	60	53	46	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F964/02	Raw	100	67	60	53	46	40	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F965	Raw	80	64	56	48	40	32	0
	UMS	80	64	56	48	40	32	0
F966/01	Raw	120	85	76	68	60	52	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
F966/02	Raw	120	85	76	68	60	52	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0

Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (ie after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
H106	200	160	140	120	100	80	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
H106	18.56	46.74	75.61	92.42	99.02	100.00	1371

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:
<http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums/index.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 2010

