

History A

Advanced GCE A2 H506

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H106

Examiners' Reports

June 2011

HX06/R/11

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 2011

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

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

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE History A (H506)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE History A (H106)

EXAMINERS' REPORTS

Content	Page
Chief Examiner Report	1
F961/02 AS Period Studies – General comments	3
F961/01 British History Period Studies – Medieval and Early Modern	6
F961/02 British History Period Studies	13
F962/01 European and World History Period Studies	19
F962/02 European and World History Period Studies – Modern	25
F963 and F964 AS History Enquiries	35
F965 Historical Interpretations and Investigations	44
F966 Historical Themes	49
F966/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1066-1715	51
F966/02 Modern 1789-1997	59

Chief Examiner Report

This Report should be read in conjunction with the Mark Schemes. Centres are encouraged to discuss the report in departmental meetings as well as with their candidates so that all those involved in the examination process are aware of the demands of the papers. Teachers are also urged to read sections on options/topics in the group of units they have not taught as much of the advice is of a general application. The reports are a useful resource for teachers and should help inform effective classroom preparation and practice.

By definition, much of this Report will concern itself primarily with dealing with weaknesses and offering guidance for improving performance. However, that does not mean that examiners saw a decline in the overall performance of candidates. Examiners commented on the good work that they read, and in many cases there were a number of excellent answers seen. It was pleasing to see that a significant number of candidates are able to display the key skills of analysis, judgement, evaluation and synthesis. However, it would also be fair to say that these skills do need to be sustained throughout answers if Centres want to improve their overall results.

The range of topics studied is satisfactory, although there have been some changing patterns. The 20th century Germany topics still dominate both the Modern Enquiries and Period Study Units, and, in the Early Modern, topics associated with Henry VIII account for a large number of candidates. The number of students taking Medieval options continues to grow, although there has been a decline in the candidature for the Early Modern European Period studies option. In the Enquiries option there has been a growth in the numbers studying England in a New Century and Churchill, whilst the Period Studies option has seen a growth in the Modern British topics, Mussolini and China. The Themes papers are still dominated by Tudor rebellions, Russia and Civil rights, whilst the coursework has seen responses to all topics.

Examiners are constantly reminded that no set answer is looked for in questions and that historiography is not a requirement of any paper (and, in many instances, is actually a hindrance). This is particularly the case when candidates simply describe the views of historians for either the Period studies or Themes paper, or refer to schools of historians for the coursework. History is a matter of judgement and we encourage examiners to reward this, provided the candidate has supported their argument with examples and it is not simply a bolt on assertion.

The guidance about techniques offered in this and previous reports is very important as this is usually the difference between a moderate and a good answer, rather than a lack of factual knowledge. The worst answers which contain little factual knowledge usually make other errors as well. The less successful analysis is often not well focused on the precise demands of the question and candidates would be well advised to give particular attention to key words and phrases in the question stem. One of the most common weaknesses on all papers is a failure to answer the actual question set, yet this is the first thing examiners ask – has the candidate answered the question set. Candidates would be well advised to spend time planning their answers so that their argument is structured in a logical fashion and convincing manner and so that they do not change their line of argument during their answer or realise that they have gone up a cul-de-sac. Principal Examiners have given specific guidance on how candidates can improve their performance in individual units, but in all units it is vital to give priority to analysis, and, for higher levels, judgement, which should be supported by relevant knowledge. Centres should be aware that AO1a marks are not simply for knowledge but for the use of knowledge; very often a few, well-chosen examples are better than an exhaustive list of all the facts about a topic as this often obscures the argument. There are, in any case, more marks available for AO1b or AO2 skills on all papers.

Centres should be reminded that this is a formal examination and they should dissuade their candidates from using any form of abbreviations, particularly when writing names. Points made in previous reports about paragraphs, punctuation and spelling are worth reiterating. It would also help examiners if Centres would remind candidates of the need to number their questions both at the start of the question and on the front cover and to leave sufficient space between answers for the examiner to write their summative comment. Candidates should be reminded of the need to write legibly as there were some scripts that had to be deciphered at mark review. Those candidates who use word processors should also be reminded of the need for space between lines and the use of a sensible sized font. Candidates are not penalised for these latter issues, but it does make the task of the examiner that much easier. There are now very few rubric infringements, although there were a number of candidates who answered Interpretation questions in the coursework element (F965) that are no longer valid. Centres should be aware that half of the topics see one of the Interpretation questions changed each year and they should check the web site to ensure that they are following the up-to-date list.

There were very few complaints received from centres about questions and this is an encouraging trend. When complaints are received or examiners perceive that there is a problem with a particular question serious consideration is given at Standardisation, during the marking process, and during the award. We welcome comments from Centres on how to improve the quality of support we provide and Centres can contact the Qualification manager or talk to the trainers at INSET if they have general issues they feel need to be addressed.

F961/02 AS Period Studies – General comments

The responses of the candidates to this session's papers were on the whole very encouraging. There was no question on any of the four papers which failed to elicit some excellent responses and enough sound ones to demonstrate that it had been set at an appropriate level. There were very few rubric infringements. The vast majority of the candidates answered two questions and, in the majority of cases, the length of the responses and the marks earned were similar enough to demonstrate good timing and a fair sense of what was required. If the first mark was the higher, in the majority of cases, it was seldom by much.

It is also pleasing to see that candidates, and therefore centres, were on the whole clearly aware of what was expected in their responses. Examiners saw very few long descriptive essays, which is to be welcomed, as description, however detailed, can only earn Level 4 in AO1B. Most candidates were aware of the need to analyse. As a result Level 3 on AO1B rather than Level 4 is becoming the default mark, demonstrating a genuine improvement in response. Even relatively weak candidates knew they needed to focus on the question and typically responded with a list of relevant factors, each with at least some analytical comment. This tended to be supported by enough relevantly deployed knowledge to show at least some, and in some cases very competent, command of the topic. Most then attempted at least some degree of linkage or judgement. For most this came at the end in one extended concluding paragraph, and it is the mark of the strong answer that it is evaluative throughout. Coming to effective judgements is more difficult. Many candidates still found themselves unable to produce supported evaluation, and as a result attempted judgements were often asserted rather than effectively supported. Such judgements tend to take the form of the establishment either of linkages between factors or of a hierarchy of factors, depending on the question set. Either proved equally challenging. While even moderately strong candidates found that if they had knowledge they were able to deploy it to some effect, there remained a small minority with very little knowledge or understanding, whose efforts were limited to the production of a mixture of thin generalizations and assertions. Even these were usually broadly directed at the question. Completely irrelevant answers were very rare. However, there are individual topics where common misunderstandings lead to unhistorical arguments.

The quality of English in essays is on the whole good, though a minority of candidates use irritating abbreviations and slang. They should be reminded that in formal English these are not appropriate. Many candidates demonstrate admirable levels of knowledge, appropriate to the question and deployed effectively to support their analysis and evaluation. This demonstrated hard work and sound, well-focused teaching. It is also the best antidote to the sweeping generalization based on incomplete knowledge. A regular example of this was candidates who, writing about the Henrician Church, cited Wolsey, their only known example of a pluralist, as a typical offender. Moreover, while we welcome the virtual extinction of the narrative essay, dates still matter, as not knowing dates can lead to serious mistakes in either understanding, as for example those candidates who consider that hyperinflation in Germany peaked in 1929. It can seriously distort analysis too, as in the case of candidates writing on Mussolini, who considered the murder of Matteotti made the passing of the Acerbo law easier, not realizing that his death came after the law.

It has appeared in the past that modern Germany was perceived as an easier topic in these units. It is not, though it will be familiar to the majority of former GCSE candidates. In the past this has led to a higher proportion of poor candidates attempting it and some very poor performances. It was therefore very pleasing to see a higher proportion of stronger responses on this topic.

There are a few commonly occurring errors of approach. While an introduction setting out a view on the issue is very useful, a proportion of candidates over-extend this into a prolonged consideration of the background which is only of marginal value, before focussing sharply on the actual question. Some introductions, while more relevant, are a lengthy rehearsal of the argument in the main body of the essay, resulting in repetition. Some candidates attempt counterfactualism, which is usually unhelpful. Unless well-argued and very precise in its application this is in effect no more than speculation and can not support an argument. Use of historiography is explicitly stated not to be a requirement for these papers. There are some topics, such as religion in Tudor England, where there are well-known and strongly contrasting lines of debate. These lend themselves to a discussion of interpretations, but weaker candidates tend to get no further than description of the lines, which does not attain the high bands.

Candidates still need to be reminded of the importance of the accurate reading of questions. Too often essays fail to focus on the question because a word or phrase has been ignored. Examples include questions asking for consideration of an issue up to or after a certain date, or policy in relation to a specified country. A wider-ranging answer is bound to include a significant proportion of irrelevant material, and at worst may betray a failure to understand the required scope of the question. Sometimes focus is too narrow. For example some candidates writing about Nazi economic policies took their answers only to 1939 and not to 1945. Sometimes a key word is ignored or changed. A question on the extent to which religion was a factor in the success of the First Crusade was interpreted by some as the extent to which it motivated the crusaders. There is no necessary correlation between motivation and success!

An effort is made to present the questions in a predictable format so that the candidates are not caught out. Some candidates, and occasionally some centres, attempt to respond to this by pre-preparing answers. This is a mistake, as almost invariably the actual question asked requires a slightly different emphasis, and the analysis provided is not fully focused and relevant. However, it is worth considering the types of question for which candidates should be prepared, but regularly find confusing.

“Assess”. Candidates asked to assess issues or factors, find it relatively easy to produce a list, and comment on each. What they find difficult is to link, compare, explain the relative importance, and so on of these factors, though they very often assert. It is common to read “The next most important ...is...” without any justification of this relative importance. Many are therefore limited to level 3 on AO1B.

“Effective”. Candidates asked about the effectiveness of a government or policy often assume that effective is the same as successful, which it is not. This approach was frequently seen in the Cold War topic and again limited the level candidates achieved.

Balance of the named factor against others: “ ‘X was the most important...’ To what extent do you agree?” Here it must be stressed that the candidate does not have to agree. X may be more important than Y and Z but the examiner needs to know why. On the other hand, Y and Z may be more important, but if so, the examiner needs to know why, and also how important, relatively, X is. Any question with a named factor to consider must be answered with reference to that factor against the others, even if the others were more important.

There is a common failure to answer effectively questions about the seriousness of problems, a type of question commonly asked. The first issue is of conflation of seriousness of a problem with whether it was successfully tackled. Candidates might meditate on the case of the Atlantic Campaign during the Second World War. Churchill later commented that it was the problem he had feared most in the whole war – massively serious and potentially fatal for the UK and the Allies as a whole. The loss of this campaign would have meant starvation for the UK and the possible loss of the war as a whole. Yet the battle was won and the U Boats took nearly 70% losses – complete defeat and the highest losses in a campaign (as opposed to a battle) in the history of warfare. Yet by the logic of many candidates this would have meant it was not a serious problem!

A second very common error is to drift from the discussion of problems to discussion of how those problems are addressed. This is at best tangential. Given the fact that this is a type of question which appears in most papers, candidates need to be better prepared to address them relevantly.

There are some presentational points which really help candidates communicate their answers to examiners, and make it easier to give credit to their work. Legibility of handwriting remains an issue for a minority. It is very hard to follow an argument, particularly one which is not perfectly organised, if at the same time the reader is struggling to read individual words. Where a candidate has been given permission to type, the font size should be 12 or larger and room needs to be left for marking. Double spacing helps and broad margins are essential. Questions should be numbered and that number recorded on the front page of the answer book as well as by the start of the question. If the question is not numbered and the answer is not very effectively identified in the introduction examiners can find it hard to tell which is being attempted, which emphasises the limits of the effectiveness of the answer. Whether essays are hand-written or word-processed, there are two essays. Examiners really appreciate a gap between them so that marks and comments on the first can be recorded. There has also been a minority of centres who have failed to ensure that loose sheets or second books are attached to the first answer book. As subsequent sheets and books are not always fully named, failure to attach incurs a real risk that the material will become separated and then not credited. Finally, centres are reminded that all work must be submitted in OCR answer books or on OCR answer paper. Failure to ensure this may leave an examiner unsure whether all the work presented was actually completed in the examination room, and can lead to a malpractice report.

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

1 How successfully did Edward the Confessor deal with the problems he faced?

Responses revealed a good spread of the possible material, and the candidates seemed to like the question, finding it easy to find the focus on Edward and his successes, and therefore to address the question. Responses tended to be differentiated by the quality of the candidates' knowledge rather than by any pattern of failure.

Most candidates were able at least to outline Edward's problems. A few narrated the events with a "bolt on" final paragraph of attempted assessment. Most decided that he was largely ineffectual in solving the problems but tried to explain that he did the best in the circumstances. Linking his exile and earlier period in Normandy to the question eluded some but better candidates investigated the issues resulting from this and how this meant that he had to strengthen his hold on power by bringing in Normans and using the existing nobility with the double-edged sword of the Godwin family. The threat of invasion was also considered as was his piety and the handing over of military tasks to different nobles and members of the Godwin family. The emerging problem of the succession was discussed and how this was handled in a seemingly contradictory manner.

Better answers kept the evaluation of success to the fore. Excellent answers were able to draw upon a wide range of specific evidence and use that to evaluate effectively. Some of these answers effectively evaluated problems from the start of the reign to the end and typically argued that the power of the Godwin family was the most significant.

2 "Harold's mistakes were the most important reason for Norman success at the Battle of Hastings." How far do you agree?

Many candidates found this question rather hard. There was good knowledge of wider factors leading to the outcome of Hastings, and details of the battle itself, but were sometimes confused about whether these in fact constituted luck. A pattern of failure therefore was to conflate Harold's mistakes with his bad luck. This question needed careful treatment and manipulation of material the average candidate knew pretty well. In terms of content candidates were spoilt for choice and responses could focus on the battle: comparisons of military tactics, the choice of location, the relative composition of the armies and so on were relevant. So too were the wider factors. The differing physical and mental states of the opposing armies was discussed by many, most deciding that Harold had had no choice but to defend the north. Many criticised his decision to force-march his army back down in a short space of time only to decide that again Harold had little choice, whilst some considered that William's marauding of the south might have undermined his position had that been allowed to continue. Harold's need to defend his kingdom from the invasion was contrasted by some with the "safe" state of Normandy. Most attempted some comparison of the strengths of William and Harold as military leaders. Most saw that luck was on William's side – the alleged arrow that killed Harold which decided the outcome tended to feature, even the changing of the wind. Yet for all this knowledge, well-expressed, it was only the stronger candidates who could comment truly effectively on whether a selection of these factors really equated to luck or a combination of other factors such as qualities of preparation, planning, leadership and skill.

3 How far did William I change the government of England?

This question also proved rather difficult for most candidates, though for very different reasons. It was the least popular and the differentiator seemed to be knowledge, with the occasional candidate producing a very well supported answer but others struggling. The majority of candidates had a fairly good idea of what William did, though with differing degrees of specific factual support. Knowledge of the Saxon system tended to be significantly weaker, so that it was hard for them to say how much he was in fact changing. The weakest responses struggled to find specific examples to support an argument. Some described in detail the establishment of the feudal system without a clear link to the question. Slightly stronger but still weak were responses in which Domesday featured largely, linked to heavier taxation and changes in land ownership and the different relationship of the tenants with the Crown and the replacement of personnel. Fewer displayed significant knowledge of either the church or local government. There were some excellent answers. These were typically those able to focus on the word "government" in the question.

4 Assess the reasons why Henry VI lost his throne.

This proved tricky for some. There is of course an ambiguity in the question. Which time, or both? One pattern of failure was to spend the entire essay on what was in fact background: to discuss Henry's weakness as king and the reasons for the Wars of the Roses. A whole centre's candidates saw this as an essay about the pretensions of the Duke of York, and stopped before his death, leaving the impression it was he who deposed Henry. Very few proved knowledgeable about Warwick or Edward IV, though more had plenty to say about Margaret. Overall this proved a hard question. On top of this was the limitation in ability to assess. That said, it was a very popular question with candidates, and produced some of the best as well as some of the weakest responses to this section. Some latitude in approach was expected and allowed. A few referred to 1471 but the bulk attempted to focus on 1461.

There were some mechanical approaches that decided on three main reasons which differed a little but in the main were Henry VI's weaknesses of character and health; his reliance on favourites; and social and economic change. Many concluded that the latter was the most important but too often the relative importance was effectively only asserted. Attempts to link this to the question and / or compare with other factors were weak. Some did link it to William de la Pole's rise to Duke of Suffolk because of his wealth through the wool trade but overlooking his way of advising the king and the close relationship that was at the heart of his rise to power. Attempts to link the power of Warwick to these causes were implausible as his wealth was acquired from a series of inherited legacies and a profitable marriage.

A significant number of candidates started in 1422 and barely got beyond 1450.

Knowledge of the events of 1450-1461 was minimal for many. Certainly a discussion of 1460-61 would have raised the generalised answers especially as many were blaming the loss of the throne on York. The fact that he had died in the previous year was largely ignored and many lacked any reference to Edward IV. Some referred to the power of the Nevilles in a general way without reference to 1460-61. A number had Suffolk continuing to influence Henry's weak decisions post 1450 and Somerset beyond 1455. Not many discussed the role of Margaret after 1456. Relatively few candidates used knowledge of, for example, the battle of Towton, to explain the loss of the throne.

5 Assess the reasons why Richard III was able to secure the throne in 1483.

There were two main patterns of answer to this question, both understandable. Those who find evaluation hard could get to a list of factors, some quite impressive and well supported, but could not compare or assess them. Others found it hard to focus on 1483, taking a broad approach to Richard's strengths. Few made the mistake of not looking beyond Bosworth, which was pleasing

There were a number of weak answers which did show knowledge of the details of 1483 and consequently dismissed them in a paragraph before discussing why he did not secure his throne by 1485. Few mentioned the Woodvilles. Most referred to the minority rule issue and Edward's untimely death. The support of the Council and later parliament was referred to but few referred to the support of Henry Percy or even Buckingham. References to Buckingham were about the 1483 rebellion and his execution considering that he was a traitor with a claim to the throne were valid as part of securing the throne in 1483. Some were aware of the executions of Anthony Woodville, Richard Grey and then Hastings.

Too many responses asserted that Richard killed his nephews; better responses showed awareness of the controversy surrounding this claim.

6 How effectively did Henry VII handle the nobility?

Most responses tended to conclude that Henry was fairly successful in this regard. Few tended to see that this was in part because Henry was able to win cooperation from the nobles rather than crush them.

What was needed by a large number of candidates was knowledge of actual nobles. Most had a fair list of measures Henry took to gain and keep control, but more examples would have helped. Pleasingly, even modest candidates seemed to see and attempt to address the word 'effectively' successfully, and very few merely described policies. A modicum of knowledge therefore took candidates to the middle grades. A fair number, however, twisted the question into "how effectively did Henry VII rule?" spending several sides on examining his financial policies and administration but without reference to specific nobles or even a generalised comment. There were too many sweeping statements such as that in 1485 (rather than by 1509) there were no overmighty subjects, ignoring Henry Percy, Oxford and William Stanley and / or that Henry totally ignored the nobles and appointed new men and that this was revolutionary, indicating a weak grasp of the system and lack of knowledge of Edward's reforms and earlier practices. The search for concealed feudal rights and Acts of Attainder were often badly misunderstood.

7 "The most important reason for Wolsey's fall from power was his failure to obtain a divorce for Henry VIII." How far do you agree?

The Wolsey question was on the whole rather well handled. All candidates saw the need to say something about the divorce and balance it against other factors. There was a significant minority who lost credit by dismissing the divorce as the main reason – perfectly acceptably – but not saying enough about it, the named factor. A good proportion found it possible to achieve judgement by keeping before them the link between his failure in the divorce question and previous factors potentially weakening his position and the King's trust of him. There was some good knowledge of the theological debate (significance of Leviticus, Deuteronomy). Factual knowledge of Wolsey's policies, the growing list of his enemies, the role of the Boleyn faction, in short of factors within England, was often good. What was often significantly poorer was knowledge of continental factors. A number of responses confused who Charles V was in terms of the sack of Rome and his relationship with both the Pope and Mary.

8 To what extent did Thomas Cromwell's reforms change the government and administration of England?

Some knew a great deal about Cromwell, indeed the question tended to be well addressed. Some showed awareness of the historiography, but very few were able to benefit from this, merely describing the points of view. Historiography is never required for this unit, and the responses to this question demonstrated that it does not advantage candidates. While there are well-known debates, knowledge of them has to be integrated effectively into the answer to benefit the candidate. Some excellent responses evaluated the debate effectively; weaker ones described the debate. Most candidates described a range of Cromwell's policies, and tried for each one to address the question, but few achieved a convincing synthesis to a high level conclusion. Candidates in some centres showed the dangers of attempting to pre-prepare answers, producing either a list of historiographical points or learned and imperfectly understood facts about Cromwell's work without linking them effectively to the question. This approach was not very successful.

9 "The most serious problems facing the governments of Somerset and Northumberland were social and economic." How far do you agree?

Weaker responses tended to describe what Somerset and Northumberland did. Some spent considerable time narrating the Jane Grey story without much, if any, link to the question. Those who did try to address the question had several problems in doing so. The first was the classic: too many candidates conflated the success of dealing with the problems with the seriousness of that problem, fundamentally confusing their arguments. The second was to drift from problem to policy: what they did to address their problems. This again is a very common error. It should be noted that questions on this paper regularly ask candidates to consider problems, and that this must not be confused with the measures taken to address them. More specific to this question was a failure to appreciate what constituted social and economic, and also an unconvincing definition of law and order. The Lady Jane Grey affair may have led to a potential for armed conflict, but it was a clash over control, not a breakdown of the rule of law and order among the governed. There were a good number of very solid answers which demonstrated that it was within the potential of candidates to handle successfully.

10 Assess the condition of the Church of England in 1529.

Some good responses demonstrated that this was a question the candidates were expecting. All were able to identify criteria for assessment, and most were aware of the debate on the subject (though the use of historiography did not add substantially to the level of overall argument). Some excellent answers debated the strength of anticlericalism and the typicality of Fish, Colet, the Hunne case and clerical abuses with balanced debate referring to evidence from wills and bequests and the popularity of church festivals and rituals. The weaker candidates tended to describe opposition, a legitimate approach only if this was accompanied with an evaluation of its nature and extent. The best answers assessed directly the seriousness of opposition from individuals, from parliament and from the Pilgrimage of Grace by examining its impact and extent. A pattern of failure, however, was to write exclusively about Henry's reasons for attacking the church. Some weaker candidates treated this as a question about the background to the "divorce", even in a few cases showing a lack of knowledge of dates by describing the changes to the church in the 1530s as a result of Henry's annulment. Wolsey, too, tended to feature as the known example of church abuses without a demonstrated appreciation of his unique position.

11 How successful was Mary I in restoring Catholicism to England by 1558?

This led to a variety of responses. Some were over-sanguine, but of course the position was legally one of success in 1558. More on the weaknesses which allowed Elizabeth to reverse the position by 1559 was in order. But at least this question showed that there was a lack of determinism in the candidates' approach. None said that 1559 proved the restoration of Catholicism was doomed. A majority were shrewd about the issue of monastic lands, showing how the legal transfer of that land by purchase after the seizures made it impossible for Mary to return them and therefore greatly weakened the Church's position.

Even good answers usually missed the London Synod 1555 and the impact on training of the Bishops and failure to restore monasticism to any extent with its impact on training of priests at the other end of the church structure. Otherwise there was good awareness of the survival of Catholicism, the repeal of the Henrician and Edwardian legislation, the return of the Papal Supremacy and Cardinal Pole, the mixed success of the burnings especially the aged Cranmer whose work became sanctified by his martyrdom. Some were aware of the religious overtones in Wyatt's rebellion and that support for Mary at the start was at least as much because she was the rightful heir as because of her religion.

Evidence from Elizabeth's reign could have been used more effectively to show the extent of support for Catholicism.

12 How effectively did Elizabeth and her bishops deal with the Puritan challenge from 1558 to 1559?

Most candidates understood the needs of the question, and there was no obvious pattern of failure. Some of the best answers began by distinguishing between moderate and radical puritans and then discussing the nature and extent of support for each group. The majority of candidates, however, were unable to move beyond dealing with a series of the central factors: the Elizabethan Settlement, the Puritan Choir, Archbishop Grindal and the Propheysings. Weak description of the Puritan choir and simplistic attacks on Neale characterised some of the weaker answers. Some when looking at the early Puritan challenge were unaware that most exiles did not return until at least 1562. Only strong candidates tended to be aware of the position in 1559. It was the quality of the analysis and depth of knowledge rather than choice of material which tended to be the principal discriminator.

13 How serious were the problems faced by Elizabeth in 1558?

Weak candidates sometimes exhibited a classic pattern of error in attempting to address this question. They wrote about what Elizabeth did and not what the problems were. Many, better focused, described the problems rather than assessing seriousness. Finding criteria to assess seriousness was particularly challenging. Some candidates failed to focus on 1558. Some drifted to the end of 1559, by which time the Religious settlement was in place, and the international position had changed greatly with the Treaty of Cateau Cambresis. These changes could be used to highlight the situation in 1558, but sometimes just showed a vagueness of knowledge. More seriously still, some candidates went through the reign, to Elizabeth's generally.

The best answers covered disputes at court, in Council and Parliament as well as within the political nation in the counties. Valid explanations of the foreign situation were at a premium as most considered that Spain posed a serious threat in 1558-9 because of Elizabeth I's Religious Settlement, unaware of the threat Mary, Queen of Scots as queen would have posed to Philip's Empire and borders and of his support for Elizabeth in Rome delaying the Bull of Excommunication. Too often candidates attempting this sort of question are hampered by an absence of knowledge of the situation in Europe. Good candidates had no such problems.

Coverage was broad ranging from political, dynastic / gender issues, foreign and socio economic after the 1550 cloth trade collapse, the need to reform the coinage, the inherited debt and the famine and disease of the 1550s.

14 How effectively did Elizabeth I handle the issue of succession during her reign?

This question attracted a good number of answers, but a proportion of candidates found it hard to focus, and pulled in issues of marriage and control without explicitly linking them to the succession. There was a wide diversity of opinion over whether her policy of procrastination and refusal to name an heir was effective or not. Answers tended to be rather descriptive or assertive, when a discussion of the wisdom of these choices would have been much more effective.

Some answers were pleasingly broad-ranging, indeed a minority became too vague, and some interpreted this as a general question on the effectiveness of Elizabeth's government. One common pattern was descriptive answers of suitors with some analysis of the clashes with MPs and ministers wanting assurance of their careers. Better answers placed these issues in the context of other states and female rulers. There was discussion of the threats posed by Mary, Queen of Scots and the need to execute her, and Elizabeth's procrastination. Many were unaware of the 1586 Treaty of Berwick that unofficially was interpreted as recognising James I as her successor but most were aware that he succeeded without a challenge.

15 "The popularity of Elizabeth and her government declined seriously in the period after 1558." How far do you agree?

This was relatively well handled, without any striking patterns of failure or success, with the possible exception of the issue of Essex. His dissatisfaction and rebellion tended by some to be seen as symptomatic of general unpopularity which in the case of his rebellion seems illogical, given the lack of support. That apart, various factors were addressed, with success according to candidates' ability.

Candidates tended not to have a full understanding of the Crown's finances, the difference between Ordinary and Extraordinary Revenues and the fiscal and administrative weaknesses of the antiquated revenue system. This tended to weaken responses. Most were aware of the deaths of key ministers, the socio-economic crisis and possible mini ice age of the 1590s, The Irish and Essex rebellions and the issues of an ageing queen. Answers tended to be descriptive as assessing seriousness proved challenging, again limiting the quality of the responses.

16 How serious were the religious divisions in England during the reign of James I?

The pattern of error associated with questions about problems seemed particularly damaging here. A significant proportion of essays in fact described James' religious policies, with results which could score only relatively low marks. Some candidates seemed to know the various "events" to mention in terms of religion in James' reign (Hampton Court Conference, Book of Sports, Bancroft Canons etc) but were not able to show how these could be relevant to the specific question at hand. A more specific problem was a failure of a proportion of candidates to take into account the changing situation through the reign, especially the heightening of international religious tension after 1618. Too many saw the tensions as a constant. Worse, some focussed almost exclusively on the start of the reign, considering only the Millenary Petition, Hampton Court Conference and Gunpowder Plot.

The best answers were able to assess the degree of change over time. There was some interesting debate about the significance of the Gunpowder Plot. They could place the dispute provoked by the Palatinate Crisis within a context of controversy over James's preference for friendly relations with Spain and his plan for a Spanish Marriage Alliance. The worst dwelt in generalities without specific reference to the 1621 and 1624 parliaments and the Journey to Madrid. Excellent answers were able to use relevant evidence from Elizabeth's reign, notably the plots, to substantiate judgments

17 Assess the reasons why Charles I embarked on personal rule in 1629.

Assess the reasons – weaker candidates could only identify and list them with individual comments, limiting the credit that could be given to their response. Relative importance was often asserted. Only stronger candidates achieved any developed comparison. However, most managed a good number of factors and had a fair attempt at a question they were clearly not surprised by. Very few struggled for range of material, though one discriminator was the level and accuracy of supporting knowledge.

Some weaker answers tended to give a narrative of the reign up to 1629 with explanation not central. In contrast, better answers pursued a clear argument evaluating reasons. For example, it was argued effectively by some candidates that the belief in Divine Right was the central problem. Some excellent answers were able to identify problems surrounding the constitutional place of parliament.

18 “The events of 1629-1640 were more important in causing the Civil War than those of 1640-1642.” How far do you agree?

This was a question that a lot of candidates were apparently expecting, and was on the whole competently handled. Opinion was divided, but most managed to develop both sides. Only a very few took the old view of the war being increasingly inevitable as the Personal Rule progressed, or even from the start of it. Most were aware that a crucial factor was the re-growth of a royalist party as a result of the intransigence and assertion of the Parliamentary leadership. Some stated this and felt that it was sufficient to discount the earlier period, spending the entire essay on 1640-42. Successful essays showed an appreciation of the role of both periods.

In some centres no answer focused sharply on the outbreak of civil war. The majority discussed the long-term causes of the war, inevitably finding themselves explaining Charles's responsibility for the political crisis of 1640 rather than the outbreak of war and being left with insufficient time to analyze the key issues of 1640-42. The best answers were able to see that for Civil War to start, there needed to be sufficient support for two sides. Some candidates were able to use an excellent range of knowledge. Some responses described the debate, often simplistically (eg revisionist historians reject that long term causes were important).

F961/02 British History Period Studies

1 'The reform of finance and administration was the most important reason for Pitt's domination of politics from 1789 to 1793.' How far do you agree?

Candidates understood that they needed to compare the named factor against other possible sources of dominance, such as the King's support, and reach an evaluative conclusion. Most candidates were able to rehearse an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of Pitt's financial and administrative policies but very few were able to show how his policies strengthened his political position by linking it to vital support bases such as Independent members of the Commons. Some candidates spent too long evaluating the success of Pitt's reforms, but the vast majority produced an argument and answers were generally well supported with very good levels of knowledge. However, there was a tendency amongst some candidates to discuss the financial and administrative policies in detail but fail to link them to political dominance, which they then went on to do more effectively with their other factors. A significant number of candidates wrote well about Royal support as an alternative explanation of his success but not many had a clear perspective on the weaknesses of the Whig Party or the mutual dislike between the King and Fox. Coverage of the effects of the French Revolution on political alignments was generally overlooked. There were a few answers which went beyond the dates in the question and candidates need to be reminded to read the question carefully.

2 How effectively did Lord Liverpool's government handle the radical challenge in the period from 1812 to 1822?

This question was less effectively tackled than Question 1. The main problem for candidates was that they focused more upon the radical challenge than Liverpool's response, often simply describing examples of unrest and then adding on some comments about how Liverpool dealt with it. The better candidates considered the argument that the challenge was not as great as first seemed and that this had to be considered alongside Liverpool's problems in order to evaluate its overall effectiveness. However, some candidates rose to the challenge of trying to engage with the idea of 'effectively', though often the issue of successful became the focus of the answer. However, there were a significant number of answers that were very descriptive of radical activities with little analysis. There were a significant number who chose the line that repression caused radical challenges – a valid argument but if pressed too far their answers became too indiscriminate. Good candidates referred to the economy as a factor in the argument and some candidates mentioned the Queen Caroline affair, but the emphasis was often on the reasons for the divorce rather than on the opportunity it offered for anti-government protesters to gather in London and show up the ineffectiveness of the government. However, the best responses assessed radicalism as a force against government measures and representations of radical activities and put them into a wider political and social context.

3 How far did the terms of the Great Reform Act satisfy the supporters of parliamentary reform in 1832?

The main problem for many was the failure to define "supporters of parliamentary reform". There needed to be a focus on the Whig Government itself and the aim of averting revolution, the middle class should have been differentiated from the working class, and the Ultra Tories who also supported reform because they thought it would lead to the repeal of Catholic Emancipation. The vast majority of candidates did not discuss these separate interests. However, there were some who were able to link the disappointment of the working class to the emergence of Chartism and this was a valid line to take, whilst others suggested that the act satisfied the important interests in society and achieved the aim of uniting the upper and middle

class. Answers often tended to be assertive or generalised, often not using enough knowledge to support the arguments or were descriptive, often in great detail, of the terms of the act without linking this knowledge to the demands of the question. There were a significant number of answers that drifted from the demands of the question and answered on why the act was passed or even wrote at length about the Whig reforms of the 1830s, neither of which approaches could score highly.

4 How important was Palmerston in the emergence of the Liberal party by 1868?

This question attracted a wide range of responses, ranging from a wide ranging list of factors to a description of Palmerston's policies. There was often an attempt to weigh up the relative importance of factors, but in weaker answers this often took the form of assertion. Some struggled to appreciate the importance of the parliamentary disposition of parties. Good candidates often focused on the importance of the Peelite split and free trade, whilst weaker answers tended to stress the role of personalities, particularly Palmerston and Gladstone. However, there were some candidates who struggled to write in sufficient relevant depth about Palmerston and as a result often argued that he was not important at all. Better answers assessed his political skill levels, cultivation of the press and its impact on voters, representation of Liberal strands, setting such issues against other strands that made up emergent Liberalism. Candidates did need to pay attention to the date in the question and go beyond the death of Palmerston.

5 To what extent did Disraeli's foreign and imperial policies achieve their aims?

This question produced a significant number of competent essays, which defined his aims and then discussed his policies in the light of the definition. Some candidates considered whether he had concrete, clear, consistent aims or whether he was opportunistic. Many considered the issue of the Balkans and real British interests there, such as naval, commercial, Cyprus, and Gladstone's return to the political arena, irritating Disraeli, Berlin in 1878, the interest in imperial affairs and the reliance on 'men on the spot'. Good candidates emphasised not only buying shares in the Suez canal and the failure to control the 'man on the spot' in Afghanistan and South Africa but also on the Eastern question. However weaker candidates often dealt separately with the Eastern Question and the Congress of Berlin as if they were unconnected. A number tried to argue that a foreign or imperial policy aim was to win working class support as part of 'one nation' conservatism and 'Tory Democracy', which got them drifting away from the thrust of the question at times. A few linked aims and outcomes to electoral defeat in 1880. However, some candidates did confuse imperial with domestic and others included a discussion of Ireland in their response. As with many responses, weaker candidates tended to describe the policy rather than evaluate it.

6 How successful were Gladstone's Irish policies?

There is a lot of potential material here and some candidates fell into the trap of a narrative of Gladstone's attempts to pacify Ireland. Only the better candidates were able to dip into this material to illustrate their analysis. Not many were able to view his policies from a wide perspective – the Irish Catholic and Protestant communities, the House of Commons, the English electorate, Gladstone himself. The aspect that caused confusion was the Irish Universities Bill. Candidates knew it failed but ascribed its failure solely to differences of opinion in Parliament and did not mention the opposition of the Irish Catholic bishops. As in question 4, the wording of the question enabled most candidates to produce an argument and make judgements. Some were able to give detail of many of the Acts however some were weak there. Land featured prominently in many answers and religion and the disestablishment of the Irish Church were usually present but Home Rule rather less so. More could have been made of the

political and social context and of the mix of conciliation and coercion; education and its social context could have featured that much more, given its contemporary importance. Parnell and the IPP received variable treatment, ignored completely by some. There were some good responses about the sense and implications of Gladstone's personal mission and a few did pick up where he was at odds with his Party and Cabinet. A number took a chronological approach, going through administrations. The better answers were more thematic in their approach.

7 'The role of individuals was the most important reason for Britain obtaining possessions in Africa.' How far do you agree?

This was the most effectively answered of the three questions in this section. Candidates were able to identify a range of possible factors for analysis. The best candidates regularly indicated how the different factors inter-linked and those at the top end of the mark scheme did this very proficiently especially with regards to the motivations of the individuals that they studied. One centre took 'individuals' to mean PMs and their policies with regards to Africa, which was a different, but valid approach to the question. There was often good attention to an impressive range of individuals and links to such areas as exploration, discovery, humanitarian and missionary activities. Other factors cited were strategic and military, economic and commercial, rivalry with other countries and the Scramble for Africa. Some answers had a paragraph on individuals with varying levels of competence, followed by several other factors, many of which were discussed well. Others covered the topic geographically and wove into their answers analysis of individuals and other factors region by region; either approach produced good responses.

8 How much support was there for imperialism from 1880 to 1902?

A number of candidates found this a difficult question. Defining how to measure "support" was a serious problem for many and answers often focused on why there was support and why there was opposition. As a result many essays were little more than descriptions of pro-imperial literature and propaganda with little direct linkage to the question. Another problem with responses to this question was that candidates lacked specific knowledge regarding the period prior to the outbreak of the Boer Wars. Candidates discussed the nature of support in general terms reasonably well, although many of the weaker essays simply described the propaganda and education efforts of the government and assumed these to indicate support, for the overall period but often could not offer specific examples. Treatment of the Boer War issue was much more thorough for most of the candidates, but tended to mean that a lot of the essays were unbalanced towards the latter end of the period. Often the Boer War of 1899-1902 was used to illustrate both sides of the argument, with contrasts between the 'khaki election' and the news of concentration camps, suffering and unease over military performance. Jingoism, music halls, popular press (especially the advent of *The Daily Mail*), popular literature were all cited as evidence for support, often in good detail and with a sense of issues. Electoral issues focused on 1895 and 1900; there were references to Gladstone and the Midlothian campaigns, which strictly speaking were outside the compass of the question but were given credit if they were not excessive and well linked to the focus of the question. Some compared the thrust of those election campaigns to the subsequent high points of imperial-electoral events in 1895 and 1900. Some candidates did try to interrogate the nature, scope and unevenness of imperial fervour, occasionally seeing the inherent vicissitudes of such enthusiasm and observing the attitudes of the Conservative and Liberal parties either side of 1900.

9 'The growing threat of Germany was the most important reason for the improvement in Anglo-French relations between 1902 and 1911.' How far do you agree?

This question produced a wide range of quality. The main problems that candidates encountered was linking the different possible factors together, as many saw the various international incidents in isolation, and also a large number resorted to a purely narrative approach. Occasionally, candidates turned this into a question on Anglo-German relations (a past question) and far too many candidates at the lower end simply described the poor relations between Britain and Germany, but failed to make explicit why these relations would lead to a rapprochement with France – this was simply tacked on to the end of many paragraphs. However, this question was done well or very well by many. Most of the better answers could make links between Anglo-German issues (imperial, economic, especially naval) and Anglo-French (Entente Cordiale, talks, amity, moves towards Russia, the responses to the Moroccan Crises). As can be the case here, some answers cited the influence of pro-French politicians and Foreign Office figures, mentioning such as Lansdowne, Grey and Crowe, and showing good knowledge of those influences in the shaping of policies. However, few candidates saw European relations in the round, failing to focus on Russia and her changing relations with France and Britain. Very few could see how France wanted to secure better relations with Britain.

10 Assess the progress made by the Labour party between 1918 and 1931.

Although this was a popular question, the quality of responses was poor. Many candidates were unable to focus on the idea of progress or party and instead described the success and failures of the two Labour governments. This involved lengthy comments about the performance of Labour in foreign relations with little link to the idea of progress. The better answers often took a thematic approach and considered issues such as election results or the replacement of the Liberals by Labour as the alternative to the Conservatives. However, even here attempts at balance were often poor as candidates did not assess the impact on progress, in terms of shedding its perceived links with Communism or issues like the Zinoviev letter or the Campbell case. Knowledge of Labour's position in 1918 was often weak and there was frequent confusion between Macdonald and Henderson in the war-time coalition. There was also a distinct lack of knowledge about Labour's constitution. Very few answers went through to 1931 and compared the situation with 1918 which would have allowed them to point out that Labour had gone from being a new party at the start of the century to having formed two governments, albeit minority governments.

11 To what extent did the economy recover between 1931 and 1939?

This question attracted a large number of very disappointing responses. The knowledge of many candidates was very limited and the number of issues covered was very narrow. There was a tendency to focus heavily on government legislation, but this was often poorly linked to the question of recovery. Many wrote at great length about interest rates or tariffs without showing how or indeed whether it did lead to economic recovery. However, there were some candidates who did provide detailed information about the growth of new industries, particularly housing, and were able to make valid comments about the regional differences between the north and south. Unemployment rates provided some with a way into the question and where this was linked to the actual idea of recovery was perfectly acceptable. There were also some answers that discussed issues such as improvements in standards of living, holidays and the opening of new shops and again if this was linked to economic recovery was acceptable. Some argued that it was only with rearmament that recovery began and this was a valid approach.

12 'The achievements of the Labour governments of 1945 to 1951 were limited.' How far do you agree?

Although many candidates knew a great deal about the legislation and actions of the Labour governments they were often unable to link this knowledge to the idea of limited. Some struggled with the idea of 'limitation' thinking it meant external factors which limited the labour government rather than the limitations of their achievements and therefore didn't say much about what they actually did and failed to do. Better answers established a set of criteria against which to judge the measures and this usually resulted in a focused and evaluative response. Many wrote at length on the issue of the NHS and often argued that although charges appeared to limit the initial aims, its survival against opposition from within the profession suggests that it was a formidable achievement. The execution of many of the ideas behind the Beveridge report also allowed candidates to argue that the reforms were not limited. Better answers also placed the achievements in context of the economic plight of the country and the demands of the Korean War and severe winter of 1946-7. Some candidates discussed foreign policy or imperial policy and as the question was open-ended this was perfectly acceptable.

13 How successful was British foreign policy from 1945 to 1964?

There were some reasonable answers to this question, although some were often over-generalised and over-descriptive answers. Some answers spent too long on Decolonisation, so creating imbalance. A good number of candidates found it hard to truly identify what was 'foreign policy'. Aims were not always that clear. Quite often the Cold War featured rather thinly. Better responses did make use of the Cold War, looked at relations with the USA (at times uneven relations) and the USSR, the importance of nuclear weapons, Suez and the shifts in thinking at the end of the 1950s. Europe was usually mentioned and the issues of the emergent EEC, EFTA and attempts to enter the EEC were addressed, however this was sometimes rather descriptive. Many candidates wrote at length about decolonisation and only fleetingly about actual foreign policies, therefore limiting their overall progress through the levels. Weaker candidates gave priority to the Suez invasion but often assumed Suez was a colony.

14 Assess the reasons why there was a continuing debate about nuclear weapons in Britain in this period.

A significant number of candidates did not understand why there was a debate about nuclear weapons and as a result many simply described British nuclear policy. However, those who produced reasonable answers often focused on the context of the Cold War, the issues of the USA-British relations and the sharing of technology, the testing of A and H-bombs, V bombers, the advent of missiles and submarine-launched systems. There was some consideration of party politics, bi-partisan approaches and divisions within Labour ranks. Some argued that costs were important, with better answers placing those into the context of domestic politics and pressures. However, it was a surprise that many did not engage with the issues of CND and public opinion.

15 Assess the reasons for British decolonisation after 1945.

This was the most effectively completed of the three questions in this section. Most candidates understood that there were a range of possible reasons for decolonisation and effectively compared them against each other. However, listing did occur and there was a need of links for cross-evaluation. Most could cite a good range of factors, though, at times, supporting knowledge was variable and not enough made of the different phases of time in this process. Economic and financial reasons, strategic overstretch, the general legacy of World War Two, a Labour Government from 1945, the Suez Crisis, threats from nationalist groups and internal unrest, changing orientations towards Europe, often featured; the pressures of the Cold War and

from the USA to decolonise were mentioned by better candidates. The best candidates adopted a thematic approach and fitted their examples to the different themes. A significant minority of candidates attempted to look at specific examples of decolonisation and then attribute reasons to them – some candidates did well with this approach, but many lapsed into description or at best simple repetition of causes from previous examples.

16 How successful were the Labour governments of 1974 to 1979?

There were some good answers but the weaker candidates tended to focus on Callaghan with little reference to Wilson. This often led to an emphasis on the 'winter of discontent', whereas good candidates included Wilson as well as Callaghan and the problems of minority governments. They also mentioned the Lib-Lab agreement, though often as a coalition rather than a pact. Most candidates dealt well with the IMF crisis and with the Winter of Discontent. Weaker candidates often stated that the only domestic achievement was a Health and Safety Act. Better responses focused on economic problems, the IMF loan, the relations with the trade unions, the 'Winter of Discontent', the Lib-Lab Pact and the coming of Thatcher as a consequence of failure by Labour; very occasionally Devolution was mentioned. Some weaker candidates confused areas of the 1974-79 and 1964-70 governments, often citing social reforms from the later 1960s as part of the successes of the 1974-79 government.

17 'The failures of Wilson as Prime Minister are more significant than his achievements.' How far do you agree?

Many candidates did not cover both periods effectively and some candidates turned the question into one explaining why Wilson won the 1964 election. The period from 1964-70 was usually better known and covered with 1974-76 often restricted to mention of the legacy of Heath, the Referendum on Europe and Wilson standing down as PM. Most candidates agreed with the statement, with many focusing heavily on the issue of the economy (usually the role of the IMF and the devaluation of the pound) and industrial relations. Some did produce comparative assessment of the attitudes towards the trade unions, focusing on 'In Place of Strife' and its fate and the 'social contract'. Knowledge was impressive in some answers but not enough was done to link such to good analysis and evaluation. There were also confusions here (and in Q. 16) over the three day week, some placing it firmly inside Labour periods in office. Where successes were mentioned, the better candidates referred to Jenkins' reforms.

18 Assess the reasons why Thatcher's economic policies were controversial.

This was the most popular question in this section but many candidates either did not concentrate on economic policies, or gave a narrative on Thatcher's policies or did not focus their analysis on the issue of 'controversial'. Some answers tended to be more about how successful were her policies than the controversial dimension; some bolted-on comments about the latter to the end of each paragraph. That said, there were some strong or very strong responses. Monetarism, supply-side economics, privatisation, de-regulation, treatment of unions (this had to be shown to link to the economic focus of the question), the poll tax, all featured, often with good knowledge shown. The best responses tried to link the impact of economic policies to social groups and regional areas; some referred to those in the Conservative Party who were disapproving of aspects of the policies. Some weaker candidates included the sale of council houses as solely controversial. Occasionally, candidates wanted to write about foreign policy and the Falklands War. A small number tried to answer the January question.

F962/01 European and World History Period Studies

1 “Religious devotion was the main reason for the success of the First Crusade.” How far do you agree?

This is a familiar question, but one that some candidates found it hard to focus on. Too many wrote about how far religious devotion was a motive for the crusaders. A disappointing proportion of candidates devoted significant time to discussion of the Pope and the calling of the crusade, and the reasons for its popularity. At best this was background. Even those who focused on religion as a reason for success too often had little detail to back it up. The named factor was dealt with highly effectively by a few, and there were some outstanding answers, but they were a minority. More frequent was undeveloped description of what actually happened during the Crusade; sometimes identifying issues and examples such as the Holy Lance, but lacking proper explanation or link to the question. In general, treatment of the named factor was disappointing.

More was known by most about the role of leadership and Muslim disunity, which was for most the primary factor. There were some excellent answers, often well-argued and well-supported, particularly with reference to Muslim disunity, where there were insightful explanations of political, territorial and dynastic rivalry between Muslim leaders and their impact on the outcome of events. Weaker candidates tended towards a listing of causes, combined with an assessment of the strength and weakness of different factors to the success of the Crusade. Too many, however, although capable of writing analytically about each factor, found linkage hard to establish and merely asserted relative importance. It should be noted that candidates were not penalised for rejecting the named factor, but for failing to evaluate its relative importance. Another example of poor technique was to claim that because one factor was the most important it was all-important. For example some candidates asserted that because Muslim disunity was the most important, military leadership was irrelevant to the Crusade's success.

2 Assess the reasons for the failure of the Second Crusade.

Some weak responses demonstrated confusion between different crusades and even when the right crusade was chosen, knowledge tended to be generalised and insecure, which often led to assertions rather than substantiated analysis. It was apparent for a significant proportion of candidates that this was their second preference question.

There were, however, a good number of candidates with good knowledge of the crusade. Most could identify a fair list of reasons for failure, and at least describe them relevantly, with varying levels of supporting detail. There was a considerable variety of opinion about which was the most important reason, though, sadly, there were some centres where the candidates had clearly been drilled and all gave a similar hierarchy. What most found difficult was to move from asserting a hierarchy to supporting it. Too few candidates, therefore, were able to attain substantiated judgement.

3 How successful was the Third Crusade?

This was a question which many candidates found difficult. There was good knowledge in very many cases of the outcomes of the crusade, set against the scale of the challenges faced. This was good. Nearly all said sensible things about Jerusalem, and most could comment on the significance of the coastal towns, and support for the Crusader States. A good number also

were able to comment on Cyprus and other gains. Most had a fair idea of failure against the stated aim, but that was not the whole picture. However, too few really had detailed understanding and knowledge, and most appeared to find themselves without enough to say. Many candidates spent a significant proportion of their answer explaining why the crusade failed. Knowledge was often good and reasoning sound, but it did not address the question set, and was only marginally creditworthy.

Most candidates were aware of the need for a balanced approach even when they did not do it very well. Some used a thematic structure (political, economic, military etc.) that was not necessarily the most useful approach, with less able candidates tending to fit the information to the structure rather than the question.

4 How important was noble patronage in the development of the Renaissance in Italy?

The best answers exhibited a wide range of knowledge on all aspects of art. They were able to provide many accurate examples and tie them to detailed analyses that addressed the question with some depth. Plenty was known by good candidates about the role of the nobility and this was reassuring in a topic which can often lack concrete support. Some candidates successfully judged that other factors were just as important but some of the best answers focused on the role of patronage as a whole, including the Church and Guilds. Weaker answers tended towards narrative descriptions. Some candidates misunderstood the term 'patronage' or did not distinguish from other forms of patronage. A successful approach was also shown in a balance against other factors to demonstrate the relative importance of the given factor. Overall this was a question which candidates handled well, and on which they found it relatively easy to display their knowledge and understanding.

5 To what extent was Renaissance art new?

There were many good thoughtful answers to this question with the main discriminator being the extent to which candidates could back up their general comments with plenty of examples. There was more focus on the imitation of classical art but the best candidates could point to plenty of innovations as well. There were some patterns of weakness in answers. There were some good attempts to argue that classical models were not only meant to be imitated but surpassed and therefore were 'new' but supporting examples were sometimes limited; others had a weak/flawed argument trying to argue that the influence of the classical past reflected continuity and seemed to disregard 1000 years of medieval history and the 'recent' absence of classical influence. In general, many candidates tended to cite examples which were not fully explained or were sometimes inaccurate. Some listed examples which did not 'fit' with the basic explanation, throwing in the names of artists and works. Some candidates were limited to a descriptive approach and had little real explanation of how art was new and developed beyond medieval art. Other influences on art such as the continuity in religious subject matter were not really explored therefore the argument was weak. Alternatively some tried to claim Christian themes were 'new', again showing the limitations of their chronological understanding.

6 To what extent was the Northern Renaissance different to the Italian Renaissance?

Most candidates answered this question. There were many excellent answers here, which clearly recognised the issues involved. They were often well-structured and organised pieces of writing supported by detailed illustrations and provided well-substantiated judgements, demonstrating in-depth understanding. However, many weaker candidates found the question difficult, tending towards a listing of 'new' and 'classical' elements, without directly addressing the question. Analysis, where it existed tended to be implicit or was rather simplistic. Weaker candidates tended to be rather confused about how to tackle the question, with some attempting

simply to match up individual works from the north and south. There was some rather weak understanding of the nature of Christian Humanism and a general failure to recognise independent northern developments such as the *Devotio Moderna*. Many were also muddled in terms of references to printing. The main assumption and weak argument was that printing was purely a Northern/German phenomenon and therefore 'different' to Italy although printing was prominent in Italy/Venice at the end of the 15th century; stronger answers made the more valid distinction between the types of work produced.

While many candidates were confident on what made the Italian Renaissance flourish, they were on shakier ground when discussing the Northern version and most had fewer examples to draw on. They also seemed to want to separate the two rather than seeing how the Italian version influenced their Northern neighbours. The question asked for differences, but an awareness of the degree of overlap, commonality and mutual influence would have strengthened the context of this.

7 Assess the reasons why Portugal was able to establish an overseas empire in this period.

The wording of the question 'why Portugal was able.....' caused problems for many candidates, who had clearly prepared for a different question. This was not a question about the motives behind Portuguese expansion and some candidates were distracted by discussing the Portuguese need for gold and slaves. Indeed the drift into discussion of motivation was the principal pattern of failure in answers to this question. There was also a surprising lack of discussion of the explorers themselves or the lands and routes they discovered. Weaker answers tended towards narrative and generalisation. There was some good explanation but it was not always backed up by specific supporting examples; other factors were not always developed but rather 'listed'. Knowledge tended to be fairly superficial with some candidates not maintaining focus on Portugal and discussing exploration in general.

8 How important was Cortes in the acquisition of a Spanish Empire in the Americas?

Whilst it was theoretically possible to achieve good marks by simply discussing Cortes, few candidates did so and better answers were almost always where comparisons were drawn between Cortes and other individuals such as Columbus and Pizarro. Some offered generalised responses and failed to develop any detail. Where candidates did have better knowledge, they tended to be rather descriptive. Better responses recognised that there was an extent to which he built on the work of those who went before him and laid the foundations for those who followed him.

There were patterns of failure. Very few slipped to mere description of Cortes, and understood that an analytical approach was required. Some, though familiar with Cortes, found it hard to weigh up his contribution and compare him to the role of other conquistadors and factors such as disease. However, some candidates were able to attain the middle levels by sections on Cortes and a couple of the other major figures and attempting some comparison.

9 Assess the impact of the Portuguese rule on their overseas empire.

Few candidates answered this question and those that did tended to lack the detailed knowledge to do it justice. Some referred to 'impact' in general mixing references to Portugal with Spain; many also drifted from the question to discuss the impact on Portugal itself rather than its empire. Where analysis was attempted at all, it considered the impact on Portugal rather than the other way round. Knowledge was rather sketchy, though one candidate did deal with the

cultural impact and long term effects. The majority appeared not to have anticipated the question and to be making the most of such applicable knowledge as they had.

10 “Consolidating royal authority was more important than religion to Ferdinand and Isabella in their domestic policy.” How far do you agree?.

This question challenged the stronger candidates to produce some very analytical answers which distinguished between the motives of pragmatic Ferdinand and pious Isabella and showed how their priorities changed through the reign. The most successful answers were able to assess both aspects within the question and draw links between them. Other candidates were obviously aware of the need to do this but were unable to explain or substantiate the links they attempted to make. The quality and range of evidence varied greatly from those that demonstrated great depth and range of knowledge to those that had difficulty explaining the policies, especially the Reconquista. Balance between the two factors was sometimes a problem, with some candidates concentrating solely on religious factors, whilst others misinterpreted the question and discussed how important religion was to the consolidation of authority. Some realised that the emphasis shifted during the reign. A small minority unfortunately just focused on religious policy and left out royal authority completely.

11 How serious were the problems Charles I faced from 1516 to 1524?

There was some good understanding of the context here with many candidates able to describe the problems faced by Charles in some depth. This provided a good foundation. Typically, there was knowledge both of Charles' personal problems and those inherent in the situation in Spain. There was usually some coverage of the *Comuneros* and the *Germania*. However there was often much less secure evaluation of their seriousness. Candidates did best where they defined 'seriousness' and were thus able to evaluate it effectively in relation to particular problems. This kept their answers relevant and evaluative.

Two principal patterns of failure emerged. Candidates all-too-often strayed into solutions and beyond the date given. Sometimes the candidates appeared to have come to the end of their relevant knowledge and to be attempting to widen the treatment, but it is worth noting that conflation of problems and solutions or policy is a common error which candidates need to be warned against.

12 To what extent was Charles I's rule of Spain after 1524 a failure?

Whilst some candidates just tended to give lists of successes and failures, many others were better structured, again the most successful ones being where they attempted to define success and failure. Most could develop a fair list of aspects, one discriminator being the detail in which they could support them. Specific examples were needed. Where they did develop a list, there was often good assessment of the relative significance of issues. There were good discussions of finance, economy and royal government although religion sometimes ignored, perhaps because it was relatively stable at this time. Lack of balance was sometimes a problem with far too long being spent on a particular issue or a conclusion drawn which was totally at odds with the main thrust of the answer. Some otherwise excellent candidates strayed into foreign policy which might have been made relevant had its impact on domestic policy been considered. However, often this was not the case.

13 Assess the reasons why Charles V faced difficulties in his relations with the princes.

Fewer candidates answered this one; responses tended to be more generalised and lacked supporting detail or explanation despite identifying issues.

There were many reasonable attempts at this question, but few excellent ones. Candidates identified a range of reasons why Charles experienced difficulties particularly religion, the size of the monarchia and the distraction of foreign wars, though many failed to consider Charles' constitutional position vis a vis the princes, which might have helped them judge his difficulties more easily. There were many rather ungenerous assessments of the ability and contribution of Ferdinand which relied on personal judgement rather than evidence.

14 To what extent did the spread of Lutheranism in the Holy Roman Empire depend on the attitude of individual princes?

Although there were often well-supported arguments in response to the question, some candidates did have difficulty in dealing with individual princes as well as lacking specific detailed knowledge in other areas too. For the named factor the key word is individual. Most could mention Frederick the Wise, but for too many he formed the only example, and apparently the only prince they knew. Treatment of his contribution varied very widely in terms of both knowledge and understanding. Some very basic errors emerged, such as describing him as a Lutheran. General discussion of the princes as a group, as if that group was homogeneous, tended to have modest success, though incisive comment on different individuals proved very valuable. In addition most candidates achieved a consideration of a range of factors and their relative importance but these were often not well-substantiated. The question was in general well-understood, and the most important discriminator tended to be supporting knowledge and ability to evaluate the factors against each other.

15 How successful was Charles V in dealing with the threats posed by France and the Ottomans?

There were some very good answers to this question. The best answers were generally those which measured Charles' success against his aims, although this approach did have its limitations. Another feature of success was a balance of treatment of the two issues, France and the Ottomans both in the Mediterranean and on land, and, where appropriate, the extent to which they interacted. Knowledge of France and his policy towards her was generally good, but when discussing Ottomans a proportion of candidates tended to lack focus on the Holy Roman Empire and either drifted too far into Spanish policy or lost focus completely and referred to the German princes. Few candidates demonstrated good knowledge of the various treaties, which was unfortunate as they provide good signposts to the situation when they were signed, and the relative success of the signatories. Some argued only about the extent of failure and had limited focus on success; others occasionally catalogued examples of success or failure with little real explanation. Any verdict on this question must be mixed, and too many candidates got set on either success or, more usually, failure. Charles had both.

16 Assess the condition of Spain at the time of Philip II's accession in 1556.

There were some good answers here, particularly where candidates had taken a thematic approach and provided detailed evidence in support. Weaker answers tended to show patterns of failure. They tended to stray from the terms of the question, either beyond the given date, or into the measures Philip took to deal with problems he was facing, or into foreign policy. Whilst some candidates made the latter relevant by examining its impact on the economy and thus stability of Spain, many did not. There was a lack of specific detail in many answers, so even

though candidates could show they understood the question, they were unable to provide information to support their judgements, thus limiting the mark they could achieve. Questions like this sometimes lead to a very generalised approach and too many candidates got no further than sweeping statements with little support.

17 How far was Philip II personally responsible for the problems he faced ruling Spain?

There was a range of responses to the question. The best answers addressed the implications of the word 'personally' and argued that Philip's style of government sometimes had an adverse effect. They were able to assess effectively the degree of personal responsibility Philip bore for the problems, assess the impact of his inherited problems as well as evaluating Philip's role within other issues. Religion was sometimes ignored while the role of faction was little understood. Many responses were fairly weak and made generalised comments about Philip's character with little development of other issues and limited supporting detail. Most candidates managed to be more convincing about Philip, with their focus being on one man, than his varying problems and the situations he inherited. Many weaker answers saw only the weaknesses of Philip's character and failed to comprehend his strengths. Some went no further than to quote the confusing and in many ways inapposite phrase "paper king".

Weaker answers failed to link Philip's personal qualities and failings to the actual problems, whilst many had only a simplistic grasp of the issues. Again there was a tendency to stray into foreign policy without making it relevant to the question. More skilled candidates linked this to the economy and the weakness of both conciliar government and Philip's personal style of ruling, but some weaker ones tended towards a description of Philip's relations with France or England.

18 Assess the reasons for the success of the Northern provinces in the Revolt of the Netherlands.

This was a popular question and some very strong responses emerged. Candidates were on the whole aware of a good range of factors and were able to demonstrate sound relevant knowledge. Many were able to analyse a good list of factors, while the strongest were able to substantiate and support their assessment of the relative importance of these, achieving judgement between them. Typical were considerations of geographical issues, Orange and Maurice of Nassau, Parma's distractions, the growing economy of the North and Calvinism. . There were some very sophisticated considerations of the decidedly mixed role of William of Orange and the better candidates were aware that Dutch victory was by no means a foregone conclusion.

There were some patterns of failure. Some candidates changed the slant of the question, focusing on Spain's failures rather than successes of the north. Whilst such issues are clearly relevant, focus on the actual question needed to be sharper. There was a lot of general description and assertion, where candidates did not appear to have a strong enough grip on the material to be able to answer the question fully. Some candidates focused too much on the causes of the revolt rather than the reasons for northern victory. Moreover some, in dealing with Spanish actions, used Alva as their chief exemplar. Given that he was asserting Spanish power in the Southern and central provinces, his career needs very careful analysis to be relevant to the success of the North, which took place largely after his departure. It is always helpful for candidates to know their dates!

F962/02 European and World History Period Studies – Modern

1 'Napoleon's military successes were the main reason for his rapid rise to power by 1799.' How far do you agree?

Answers were good or very good in many cases, blending the military with domestic politics and seeing the role of individuals, the problems of the Directory, Napoleon's ambition and opportunism allied to self-publicity as important. Some could have made more of the triumphalism that achieved notice at home and of the bonding with his troops, again to serve him well in the coup. The coup events were usually covered in some detail, at times a little too descriptively. The same could be said of some treatments of the campaigns, description getting in the way of analysis and explanation. Occasionally, some candidates neglected military areas to focus on other factors. Able students were usually able to discuss in an impressive amount of detail Toulon and the Italian and Egyptian campaigns. Candidates argued the case for Napoleon's ambition, political ability and 'luck' playing a part in his rise to power most effectively. They also argued at length and very persuasively on the roles of Josephine, Barras, Sieyes and Lucien Bonaparte's part in the coup de Brumaire and could assess the relative importance each played in Napoleon's rise to power. The colourful early life of Napoleon proved a temptation for many weaker candidates and some did not relate the military exploits of the young Napoleon to his accession to power. Some did offer a balance between the military successes and the circumstances which led to the Coup.

2 'Napoleon was nothing more than a dictator in his rule of France between 1799 and 1815.' How far do you agree?

More able students sensibly defined the characteristics of a dictator in their introduction and then went on to test how far Napoleon adhered to these qualities. They were helped by a wide knowledge of the various constitutions and plebiscites, the organization of the administration and government, the measures of the police, political prisoners, censorship and propaganda. They also discussed the move to Empire and the role of the church, education, the law and economy. They were able to give lengthy analytical answers with substantiated conclusions and so scored highly. Some were so knowledgeable that the detail took over the answer and it became a list. Some able candidates relished the chance to deal with 'more than a Dictator' and were aware of different views of Napoleon and the concept of 'dictator'. The question did produce quite a varied response, generally, from accounts of the reforms of the consulates to sustained discussion between arid police state dictatorship and more productive enlightened despotism. Relatively few engaged with the key concept of whether constitutionalism was quite the sham that has been stated. Some wanted to write about whether he was a revolutionary or a reactionary, usually finding it hard to do other than make tenuous links to the question. However, a good number wanted to take on the question and counter-argue. A few looked at regions as well as the phases of dictatorial ruler, picking up on intensity of such after 1808-10. Both these routes added to the quality of answers.

3 Assess the reasons for Napoleon's downfall in 1814.

This was the most popular of the questions in this section, and one which showcased very good knowledge and explanations. The main drawback in some cases was a lengthy explanation of the Peninsular War and/or the Russian campaign at the expense of analysis or assessment. Nevertheless, there were some impressive answers. Spain, the 'Spanish Ulcer' and Russia all featured and there was some good analysis of military tactics, strategy, the use of resources,

over-stretch, over-ambition, the belief in invulnerability and the longer-term corrosive effects of the Continental System. Britain, her naval power, her resources and involvement in Portugal and Spain featured quite strongly in many responses. Most candidates presented a strong case for the Russian campaign and all its consequences being the beginning of the end. However, the British contribution to Napoleon's downfall was disappointingly thin, especially on the diplomatic material. The military contribution was implicit rather than explicit. Similarly, the specific knowledge on the alliances was a little thin. Often in weaker answers the explanations were of the failures in Spain, Russia and of the Continental System rather than linking these failures with downfall. There were long accounts of the retreat from Moscow but fewer discussed whether this was the fatal blow or whether even after 1812 Napoleon might have remained in power. The period between the return from Russia and his abdication of 1814 did not seem to be very well known.

4 Assess the reasons for the 1830 revolution in France.

The overwhelming majority of candidates tackled this question in a chronological order, although there was a range in quality. The excellent answers made consistent links between Charles' early years, his conduct in power and generally identified the economic collapse as the trigger cause. Many candidates were able to avoid the list approach and were able to make judgements about the relative importance of factors. Weaker answers were heavily reliant on narrative, describing Charles' actions before he came to power in lengthy detail, and oversimplifying his personality traits. The weaker answers typically listed causes, making little analytical comment or links. Many candidates offered the simple argument of increased significance of causes as time progressed, but offered little further insight or explanation. Overall the knowledge of the topic was strong, the "assess" element of the question needed further focus and development. Though only a short reign, many candidates managed to leave a lot out jumping from 1825 to 1830, thereby omitting the dissolution of the National Guard, the election (both 1827), the resignation of Villèle, appointment of Martignac (both 1828) and the appointment of Polignac (1829). However, many were able to emphasise the economic context at the time of the Four Ordinances but few actually wrote about what happened during the Three Glorious Days.

5 How successful was Louis Philippe's domestic policy?

Unfortunately, many answers showed a disappointing lack of knowledge about Louis Philippe's domestic policy was and so it was difficult to award more than Level IV. There was not enough known by students to be able to decide how successful he was. Surprisingly quite a few wrote on his foreign policy not his domestic policy. Some wrote mainly on foreign but added a few lines on domestic and did not really seem to know the difference between the two. A significant number of answers were very one sided. Some weaker answers strayed into 'explain the fall of Louis Philippe.'. Many candidates tackled this question by examining Louis Philippe's political, social and economic policies, and if they were a success or not. The excellent answers were equally balanced on all elements, but were able to place higher significance on one; for example one outstanding answer argued that overall his policies were a failure as they failed to cope with economic pressures which ultimately led to his downfall. The political and social elements were tied into this central argument. The weaker answers were typically more narrative in approach, being able to discuss the specifics but failing to offer an answer to the question set.

6 How far did Napoleon III's rule of France become more liberal from 1852 to 1870?

Many candidates did this quite well as they were able to cite in detail the three phases of liberalisation; however, what was missing was any argument as to why Napoleon liberalised. Although the question was how far rather than why, the fact that Napoleon III still retained considerable powers was significant for the dynasty. After all, his only son was very young (b

1856) and the Emperor was very ill with kidney stones. He wanted a viable transition that satisfied the opposition, yet retained real power. Many candidates drifted off the issue of whether Napoleon's rule became more liberal as it progressed and instead focused on why he eventually lost his throne. A large proportion discussed the changed, more liberal constitution, how society on the surface appeared to liberalise, and the 'liberal empire'. Candidates appeared to place stress on the foreign policy of Napoleon III, some arguing that it showed liberalism (often pointing to his actions in Italy as evidence), whereas others stated that it illustrated Napoleon's illiberalism (pointing to Mexico). Although overall this was a question answered well, the very strong answers focussed on the issue of change – how far it became more liberal over the course of 18 years in power and reaching nuanced judgement. An example of this was a balanced answer which argued that this liberalism was only due to his hand being forced by opponents.

7 Assess the reasons why the Native Americans lost their lands.

This question was tackled quite well with a good balance of factors (Indian divisions, federal policy, nomads vs farmers, destruction of the buffalo, warfare, broken treaties) and a range of examples over the century, though weaker candidates had a narrower chronology. Many answers had a wide-ranging focus that allowed a degree of flexibility in the examples candidates could use to illustrate their explanations and support their arguments. On the whole the scripts tackled this well and most responses were lengthy and scored well. Where there was some shortfall, it was in including a discussion on the Native Americans' disunity and therefore relative weakness. However, as with all the American answers many produced lists of reasons, some of which were relatively general but most were focused. Some were very keen to prioritise but could not think of why some reasons might have been more important, so the result was a somewhat formulaic and tedious answer repeating the phrase 'this reason is less important than that reason' without explaining why.

8 Assess the reasons why westward expansion caused friction between North and South in the 1850s.

Many had seemed to be expecting a question about the causes of western expansion and seemed to find some difficulty in relating this knowledge to the question. There were relatively few detailed explanations of the disputes about the Territories in the 1850s and the conflict was dealt with in quite general terms by some. Better answers sustained a good focus on the sectional conflicts. In most answers the central theme was slavery. Again, as with question 7 the detailed level of knowledge was impressive, and candidates on the whole were able to frame an answer using their detailed knowledge as evidence. The stronger answers were able to explain seamlessly the significance of the key terms of the 1850s, avoiding a simple narration of events. Some weaker answers were unable to avoid this, with some focussing more on the topic, discussing events in the 19th century as a whole. A popular approach with the stronger candidates was to introduce the civil war into their conclusions which allowed for a smooth and coherent analysis of the question whilst placing it in its context. Other weaker candidates failed to focus on Westward expansion as a cause of friction and instead gave an overall account of why there was friction.

9 'The South never had a chance of winning the Civil War.' How far do you agree?

Many answers started well but shifted gear after a few paragraphs into why the South lost the war – a question that many would have preferred and had prepared for. There was too much anxiety to get the factors down as quickly as possible and not enough reflection on the implications of the question as set. More thoughtful and focused answers which balanced different possible views were, however, impressively argued and supported. Most candidates

were able to argue that the slant of the question was incorrect. Many focussed on the personality and character of General Lee, and linked this successfully to the defensive aims of the confederacy. The more complicated answers were able to explain that the longer the war continued the economic superiority of the North was able to be increasingly demonstrated. Many argued that once the war became a war of attrition, something it was not at the beginning, it was indeed true that the south was unlikely ever to win. Once more the knowledge and evidence for this question was impressive, with many candidates achieving high marks for AO1(a), demonstrating high levels of knowledge.

10 Assess the reasons why trouble in the Balkans led to the outbreak of war across Europe in 1914.

The most significant problem here was a ready recourse to write about the causes of war in Europe in 1914 without much on the Balkans or much linkage. Often other causes predominated and this did not score very highly. The question was not about the relative importance of the Balkans in bringing about war or Germany's guilt and the question did prove difficult for those who could not use knowledge flexibly in response to this particular issue. For many the Balkans were a vague geographical area. Those who did manage something on the Balkans picked up on Sarajevo, Serb nationalism, Austro-Hungarian fears (linked to the 'blank cheque'), militancy and rising tensions and occasionally the Russian dimension. Very few candidates wrote about the Balkan Wars or of the fragile state of the Ottoman Empire, or else such coverage was very perfunctory. Much was often written about German ambitions, rivalries, alliances, Anglo-German tensions, Belgium and was not linked to the demands of the question. However, stronger answers explained the Balkan conflicts in their wider context and offered a sustained assessment.

11 'As a peacekeeping organisation, the League of Nations was a total failure.' How far do you agree?

Unfortunately, some answers had only a partial knowledge of the League and focused too much on either the 1920s or the 1930s. The Aaland Islands exerted a mysterious fascination for some who barely mentioned the much more significant events after 1931. There was some assessment in the responses with many candidates identifying success in the 1920s against failure in the 1930's. Stronger answers argued that the league was a success in solving minor disputes – Aaland Islands, and Silesia but was unable to solve major disputes – Manchuria, or when the great powers interests lay elsewhere – Abyssinia and Spain. Surprisingly, very few mentioned the rise of Hitler or disarmament and weaker candidates drifted into general discussion about the League without focusing on the key term of peacekeeping. Most focused on disputes and used a chronological route to cover the decades, contrasting successes with failures. Sometimes the 1920s were rather neglected. At times description took over from analysis and explanation. Few candidates considered the structural issues (Covenant, procedures in the Council, no peacekeeping force, etc).

12 Assess the reasons for the outbreak of world war in Asia in 1941.

There were some good answers on this topic with candidates able to cite both long term and short term factors. However, weaker candidates did run out of steam prior to the crucial final years of 1940 and 1941 thereby omitting the European implications for the Far East, the Japanese occupation of French Indo-China, the US reaction thereto and the appointment of Tojo as Prime Minister. These omissions rather undermined all that were before. Many candidates based their answer around Japanese ambitions and were able to argue successfully that an aggressive foreign policy led to war. Better responses also tied this in with a lack of response from the West and the actions of the USA. Weaker responses tended to give a list of factors and

several gave in depth accounts of Pearl Harbor. Much was made of Japan's leadership, of events in China and of expansionism using a powerful set of armed forces; less was often made of relations between Japan and the USA and few explored the deterioration of 1940-41 leading to Pearl Harbor. Occasionally, Japan's place within the League of Nations and the latter's responses to Japanese actions was considered.

13 How far was Tsar Nicholas II able to restore his authority after the 1905 Revolution?

The question was seen by many as a chance to talk about the causes, course and results of 1905. Those who engaged with the concept of 'authority' and wrote about the period after 1905 unsurprisingly scored more highly. There were some strong discussions and some clearly had considered the debate about authority. However, knowledge of the 1905-14 period was often variable. Candidates were generally able to build an argument that answered the question set, but many struggled with the 'how far' element. The strongest answers were able to explain the Tsar's response to 1905 and focus on this. Often the impact of World War One was discussed as a key turning point in his fortune, with the implication that he was blamed for Russia's involvement, failures and subsequent collapse. The weaker responses tended to state that the Tsar only dealt with the revolution temporarily, pointing to the 1917 revolutions. This had a tendency to lack detail and so came across as assertions which lacked any detailed analysis. Few were aware of the 1912 celebrations, and very few showed much awareness of Stolypin. The worst answers turned into a discussion of why he lost power in 1917, with a lot of material on the war, Alexandra and Rasputin. On the other hand, there was some good material discussing the October Manifesto/Fundamental Laws/Duma area. The concept of consolidating power was not always understood.

14 'Lenin's leadership was the main reason for the success of the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917.' How far do you agree?

Many were prepared for this and this question yielded some strong answers which convincingly set Lenin against other factors and reached a supported judgement which went beyond a list of causes of October 1917. There was some better knowledge of Trotsky than has sometimes been the case. Some candidates struggled in answering this question. There was a higher than expected proportion of students who failed to deal with the set issue adequately; Lenin's leadership was often only discussed casually, or in overly generalised terms. Many candidates' knowledge of Lenin was unsatisfactory, and his role lacked explanation and was often underdeveloped. This was especially true of the 'how far' element of the question. The role of Trotsky was used as a counter to Lenin's, although candidates perhaps could have equally developed further the weaknesses of the provisional government, and other events linked to this such as the Kornilov plot, which is indeed what the stronger answers did. However, an alarming number of candidates wrote about the February Revolution instead of the October Revolution. Other problems were that candidates ignored Lenin as a factor or were very general about his role which kept them in Level III or level IV. Also, many had written too much on Q13 and so ran out of time or lacked the knowledge to argue as analytically as they had done in the earlier question. Many did not appear to realise they need to include the role of Trotsky and wrote remarkably little on Lenin except that he was a good speaker and came back to the USSR on a train courtesy of the Germans. However, the best candidates were able to weigh up effectively the role of Lenin against other factors and some concluded that the weakness of the Provisional Government was more important. Some were unsure about what Lenin actually did and a few unfortunately thought the essay was about the Russian Civil War.

15 'Stalin's economic policies in the 1930s were a disaster for the people of the USSR.' How far do you agree?

This did separate those who attempted to respond to the question as set and those who simply offered lists of successes and failures of Stalin's policies, economic and otherwise. Knowledge was often present in abundance but relatively few focused on the people. However, overall this question was tackled well. The vast majority focussed on the specifics of the question set, and possessed impressive knowledge of the key issues. Perhaps surprisingly many were quite sympathetic to Stalin, pointing at the industrial expansion, defeat of the Nazis and the post Cold War superpower developments. In this way, sometimes the thrust of the question was lost in narrative, although if an argument was successfully construed candidates were credited with this. The social costs were discussed, such as the agricultural problems and famines, although perhaps some candidates needed to consider in more detail the social costs of Stalin's economic policies when making judgments. If anything, the real horrors of the industrial workers were generally not fully addressed. Weaker candidates often showed detailed knowledge of Stalin's economic policies, and applied their impact to the USSR generally, but not really considering the people specifically. When candidates answered this question well, they did so really effectively, but some turned it into an evaluation of Stalin's economic policies over all, so failed to achieve higher levels even when their knowledge and evaluation was very good, they were just not specific to it being a disaster for the people.

16 Assess the reasons for Mussolini's rise to power by 1922.

Most candidates produced a list of reasons; some were able to link them and to offer a supported view about their relative importance, but this was not a common feature. Oddly, Mussolini's own skills were sometimes relegated to a sentence while the failure of 'the Liberals' and the divisions of the opposition figured prominently. Some offered excessive accounts of background events going to the 1890s and beyond sometimes at the expense of any reference to events after 1918. Very few candidates offered a wide-ranging answer. Most considered the Red Threat, though Mussolini's use of this was not often perceived. The failure of the Liberal governments was not usually covered very well. Many candidates went back to 1871 and/or Adowa, and talked at too great length on these, rather than the issues caused by World War One and its aftermath. More could have been made of socialism's perceived advances and of fears over communism. Fascist violence was explored but, as so often, the strengths of Fascism as a political-parliamentary were exaggerated. However, there were some answers where candidates spent far too long describing in detail the events of 1922.

17 'Mussolini was able to consolidate his power after October 1922 only because the opposition was divided and weak.' How far do you agree?

The named factor was not always given enough attention, or in some cases any attention and for many the difference between Mussolini's acquisition of office and the development of the dictatorship did not seem to have been studied. This produced some rather mechanical lists, rather than attempts to evaluate the relative importance of a range of factors and some indiscriminating choice of material. However, some did discuss the relative importance of violence and persuasion and the lack of effective alternatives. A significant number of candidates were confused over events such as the Acerbo Law and the murder of Matteoti and where this involved chronological confusion it created some very peculiar attempts at analysis. Candidates do need to be secure in their grasp of chronology if they are to develop a convincing argument. Quite a lot was made of the links to the elites and to the Church hierarchy, culminating in the 1929 Lateran Treaty. Most saw Mussolini as lucky, skilful, opportunistic and able to ride out the storm over the Matteoti murder. However, rather than seeing it as a 'reason why Mussolini could consolidate his power' question, many saw it as 'how did Mussolini consolidate his power?' or even 'was the opposition divided and weak?'

18 'Mussolini's foreign policy was successful in the 1920s but failed in the 1930s.' How far do you agree?

This was better done than Question 17 and many did see the distinction between the rise to international prominence and successful bullying in the 1920s compared to Italy's entering into unprofitable wars and being drawn into the Hitler orbit in the 1930s. Some even questioned the distinction, arguing that Italy was not achieving much in either decade. There were some candidates unable to adapt to the demands of the question who wrote well rehearsed essays about whether Mussolini's foreign policy was successful or not. There was also an imbalance over the period with much made of the Abyssinia crisis and little of the 1920s or events after 1936. Surprisingly, some did not leave enough good space to examine the changes in relations with Hitler; the Axis was mentioned, less so the Anti-Comintern Pact; the Pact of Steel was recognised, but often misdated; the Anschluss and the significance of that could have featured more.

19 Assess the reasons why the Nationalists under Jian Jieshi failed to win popular support in the 1920s and 1930s.

This was the least popular of the questions in this section. While many candidates were able to discuss Jian Jieshi's success against the war lords, this was often exaggerated. Many also spent much time writing about his fatal obsession with the CCP and neglect of the peasants and his blindness to the Japanese threat, whereas, few wrote about the corruption, lack of democracy, kow-towing to industrialists, bankers and landowners and weak economic progress. There was a lot left out and many answers showed little depth of analysis. The question seemed to encourage some candidates to list all the reasons why the Nationalists failed to win popular support and even this was weakly supported with evidence. Consequently there was also much repetition of the same few facts.

20 To what extent did Mao's policies in the 1950s and early 1960s bring benefits to the Chinese people?

There were some good answers here in terms of knowledge but candidates often just listed what Mao did and failed to analyse whether they brought benefits to the people. Even where there was some analysis, there were a number of candidates who did not address the 'to what extent' and simply listed whether they did or did not bring benefits, without any real discrimination. Weaker candidates omitted key events such as the Great Leap Forward and put policies in the wrong order or simply described his policies. Some simply stated this was good, this was bad etc.... Many candidates showed very strong knowledge of the content in terms of Mao's policies, but also were able to structure an argument around 'how far' not just state yes or no, thus demonstrating a sophisticated writing style and analytical skills. Most were able to focus on the people rather than China overall. The best answers recognised that costs far outweighed benefits and that different sections of society were affected in varying ways.

21 Assess the consequences of the Cultural Revolution.

Many candidates underperformed in this question because instead of assessing the consequences they discussed which were short-term and which were long-term. This limited their attainment significantly because there was not clear judgement of which consequence had the most impact. However, the strongest candidates did talk about long term and short term consequences, but they also skilfully considered the overall legacy and did manage to achieve the highest levels. However, many candidates were brought down over all in the paper by this question because they did not consider the main impact; instead they talked generally about how long the consequences lasted. Some candidates appeared unsure how far to take the

consequences, some limited their impact to the very short-term, whilst others saw the consequences as still having an impact today.

22 How effectively did Weimar governments deal with the problems they faced in the 1920s?

This question was a popular choice. Often candidates focussed on the political problems of the Weimar government, discussing the left and right wings after World War One. This was credited, but to score higher candidates also needed to discuss other factors, such as the economy, the peace treaty and other linked social problems. At times answers were too narrative. The stronger candidates were able to link together separate factors and reach a balanced answer to the question set. Perhaps the impact of the Treaty of Versailles could have been developed in candidates' responses; one memorable answer was able to link it to the economy, the political extremism and the depression and reach outstanding judgement in the conclusion. Other sophisticated responses were correctly able to assert that 'Germany was dancing on the edge of a volcano' and were credited with this. Some of the better responses tried to contrast the early and later 1920s, looking at surface recovery and stability set against serious underlying problems. Weaker responses confused the 1920s with the 1930s or confused hyperinflation with the Depression or focused solely on the early events up to 1923. Thinking candidates realised that even in the 'Golden Era' Weimar was in trouble with high unemployment, high welfare costs and a weak agricultural sector. However, little credit was given to the Republic for surviving 1919-1923 and even good candidates cited weak coalitions as a weakness not realising the continuity of personnel. Stresemann was often under-valued, with the international implications of Locarno and Kellogg-Briand not explored. Similarly, the implications of Dawes and Young, especially in 1929 were often not developed. Surprisingly few observed that the underlying problems had not been resolved.

23 To what extent was Hitler's leadership the main reason why the Nazis came to power in 1933?

The main issue of Hitler's leadership was often underdeveloped. The extent of his significance as leader of the Nazi party needed more consideration in many candidates' responses. Characteristic of weaker answers, alongside narrative, was discussion of the years 1933-1945 which was not relevant to the set question. Stronger answers successfully linked Hitler's undoubted skills as a leader with other factors and reach an evidenced conclusion with judgement on the set question. The knowledge of the methods used by the elites to help Hitler into power was a popular discussion point, as was the role of propaganda and Goebbels. It was surprising that many candidates failed to mention the depression and the subsequent fear of communism, issues that required more analysis. The main weakness in the less able answers was a sheer lack of knowledge. Where they had the knowledge, the answers became very descriptive. The main problem for weaker candidates was often a misunderstanding about what was being asked. They discussed the Nazis and Hitler as the same. Many missed out the political intrigue of the conservative elites and instead they focused on the use of terror and propaganda. Some wrote almost exclusively about consolidation of power after January 1933. Most knew about the 'backstairs intrigue' but few could contextualise that, the attitudes of the elites, the anti-democratic tendencies, the uses of Article 48, the failures of government especially in 1932. In some responses not enough was known about the nature of the economic crisis after 1929 (deflation was the theme, not hyper-inflation) and only a small number identified the social groups duly affected. Crucially, given the question, Hitler's leadership was often an after-thought or else it was covered in generalisations; few could illustrate even if they knew of charisma and a wide appeal.

24 How successful was Hitler's economic policy to 1945?

Overall this question was answered well. Nearly all candidates discussed unemployment, with nearly everyone discussing autarky and rearmament satisfactorily too. Fewer candidates considered the success of the war years and the total war economy. Those that did tended to be higher order, more analytical answers. Evidence and knowledge was very strong with statistics being used particularly well to back up arguments on the subject of unemployment. It was disappointing that so many candidates readily accepted Nazi statistics, with some even being dismissive of women and minorities who were not counted. Knowledge was less clear on the other issues, although once again stronger answers were able to link together the key themes to produce strong, coherent responses. Many stopped in 1939, and so missed the war economy and total war and could therefore not access the top levels as the full period had not been covered. However, with some weaker candidates there seemed to be uncertainty as to what economic policy encompasses with weaker responses drifting into general policies on youth, women, the church etc. Against this, there were some top marks as students had obviously prepared well and could discuss Schacht's and Goering's policies and those of Todt and Schacht. They identified the characteristics of economic success in their introductions and returned to this in their conclusions.

25 'American policies were the main reason for the developments of a Cold war in Europe in the period to 1949.' How far do you agree?

As the relative responsibility for the Cold War is such a major part of the topic it was surprising how little sustained discussion there was. Many simply ignored Stalin and gave the impression that the USA was merely being unreasonable. Some were more balanced, but others simply ran through key elements with limited discussion of the question. At times, not enough was made of American policies or else these were not prominent enough in argument and counter-argument. Surprisingly, many responses did not examine Stalin's attitudes, ambitions and actions, even though they were aware of the fall-out from the wartime alliance and of ideological tensions. The USA features were the attitudes at the Conferences (again, more possible on Soviet lines of thinking and responses there), the possession of the Bomb, Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan, Berlin, NATO. Better answers took analytical themes; less good ones simply described a sequence of events. Where Soviet thinking and actions were engaged with, there was useful material on Stalin and his suspicions, his creation of the Eastern (security) Bloc, his heavy-handedness in the Eastern lands, the responses to the Marshall Plan, occasionally his motives in blockading Berlin. Very few picked up on the importance of misconceptions, mistrust, false perceptions; a small number mentioned Kennan and the 'Long' Telegram.

26 How effectively did the Soviet Union deal with the threats to its authority in Eastern Europe in the 1950s and 1960s?

This question was often poorly answered with a few notable exceptions. Many candidates clearly did not understand the question and discussed the question in terms of the Cold War with the USA. Most noticeably, many candidates were unable to focus on the idea of 'effective' and instead wrote about success. There was also a great deal of factual error. A common one was to have the Red Army invading Poland in the 1950s or confusing Czechoslovakia and Hungary. Others discussed the Solidarity uprising in the 1980s. There was almost no mention of East Germany in 1953 in many answers. Most candidates limited their answer to two or three events, usually Hungary and Czechoslovakia. A few good answers were able to recognise that force and coercion kept the USSR in control but long term resentment built up in the satellite states. This was usually done in a chronological manner, often militating against real analysis. More could also have been made of the methods of control: the Red Army as an occupying force; the Warsaw Pact as an intervention force; police, informers, controls of the press; a climate of fear; elites bound closely to Moscow.

27 Assess the reasons why the overthrow of communism in Yugoslavia was followed by civil war.

This was the least popular of the questions in this section. The best were able to recognise that the collapse of communism led to civil war as central control over ethnic groups was lost and that without the iron hand of the Communists age old rivalries emerged. Others saw the war as a response against Serbian nationalism. However, weaker candidates showed little understanding and often discussed events that led to communist collapse in the USSR with long discussions about the impact of Glasnost and Perestroika. Often candidates failed to manage to include enough precise detail and in one case although the answer was well argued, it had no supporting evidence at all. The essays tended to be generalised and patchy.

28 'Nasser's policies were the main reason for the Six Day war in 1967.' How far do you agree?

Candidates answered this adequately and showed good subject knowledge that was broad and varied. However, many candidates failed to focus in enough detail on Nasser's policies and so even though their argument was good and their knowledge was good, they failed to address the main factor fully and so were stuck in level III or sometimes IV. Some candidates disappointingly failed to address the thrust of the question, merely describing the role of Nasser during the six day war. Nasser's personality was the emphasised factor in general, although weaker candidates had a tendency to oversimplify and generalise. The counter factors, when discussed, tended to result in strong argument and analysis, and this is something that the weaker candidates failed to consider.

29 Assess the reasons for the difficulties in solving the Palestinian question since the Yom Kippur War (1973).

This was a wide-ranging question and there were a wide range of valid reasons that could be considered. Most were able to handle the broad range of material, although some found it more challenging to evaluate the importance of the factors. However, most candidates showed a good understanding of the question and answered with broad and fairly detailed knowledge. Weaker candidates tended to go too far back before 1973 and not balance their answer with evidence after the Yom Kippur War. Stronger answers analysed a range of factors which went up to the present day, making links as they progressed. The weaker answers had a tendency to focus on the PLO and the role of Yasser Arafat. These answers were at times little more than a narration of events. The role of the western powers, especially post 1951, was not generally discussed in detail, or if it was, was limited and patchy. The importance of the other Arab states was not particularly well discussed either.

30 'Concern over oil supplies was the main reason for Western intervention in Iraq in 1991 and 2003.' How far do you agree?

This was not a popular question and some candidates seemed unsure how to tackle it. When discussing the main factor (oil) weaker candidates were happy to assert rather than explain or analyse in detail. Some candidates chose to deal with the two wars separately; this allowed for individual analysis but often produced a fragmented and inconsistent argument. The stronger essays tended to deal with the question thematically, discussing oil as a cause, and then analysing both 1991 and 2003 together. This approach worked more successfully as it allowed for a more cohesive argument and analysis of the set question. Perhaps the importance of oil as a global commodity was at times overlooked; some candidates stressed "power" or "imperialism" in vague terms, which were credited, but at times were little more than assertions.

F963 and F964 AS History Enquiries

General Comments

Many candidates seemed aware of what they needed to do and genuinely tried to put this into practice with varying degrees of success. However, in managing the collection of sources rather too many impeded their debate and resolution of the views and ideas presented in the question by a desire to tick the skills they think we want. Thus most were too eager to comment, in isolation, on content and particularly provenance, across the collection. Although some approached the sources with confidence, using historical terminology and knowledge with ease, a large number failed to integrate content and evaluation. They still tended to proceed sequentially, particularly now in part (b), referentially and descriptively. Candidates are advised not to go through source content (grouped) and then go through all the sources again to 'evaluate' them, usually in a formulaic manner with little awareness of whether a criterion was appropriate to use (or even what it meant). Evaluation must be linked to analysis and must be integrated into the discussion of content. Comments should be in relation to the value of the source's contribution to the key issue or question. Not all criteria are relevant for comment on every source. The skills required by Enquiry papers, noticeably in the handling of concepts, evaluating sources, either individually or in groups and in integrating knowledge into this process, need practice in the classroom. Nonetheless, at the top end many scripts were a pleasure to read and a credit both to themselves and to effective teaching.

The answers on F964 01 did a little less well than their more modern, 02 which made up just under 50 of the total F963/F964 entry, and British 01 and 02 equivalents but the candidature here was smaller and perhaps less representative. Particularly pleasing was the performance on the largest unit, F964 02, where higher marks than is customary were seen, and on some of the newer units. Churchill (F963 02) attracts some very engaged candidates, whilst the Cold War in Asia (F964 02) is clearly gaining in popularity. Topics like the French Revolution seem to be gaining ground. A topic on a major unit, Q4 (F964 02) on Post War Germany 1945-49, which was part of the specification but which, by virtue of its recent inclusion, had not featured before, saw some less than certain responses by candidates.

Most levels candidates were trying to do the right thing, although many, having grouped their sources, proceeded to discuss them sequentially within their grouping, missing the opportunity to cross reference and engage with both specific content and provenance. At the lower levels some lapsed into description, narrative or referencing. Arguing points by source reference and well used stand-alone own knowledge will confine candidates to L3 at best. They knew that they had to evaluate but preferred to do so in 'bolt-on' or discrete sections that did little or nothing to move the argument on in relation to the question. Candidates need to evaluate the sources to establish their relative contribution to the debate set up by the question and arrive at a substantiated judgement on the sources as a collection.

There was also much evidence of careless reading, both of the sources and the questions. Whilst it is important to establish the overall thrust of a source far too many candidates ignored detail to the detriment of their answers. Thus on Q2(a) in F963 01 (Mid Tudors) many misread the question in (a) to be on the succession rather than on views of a foreign marriage and in discussing Source A pronounced that Edward opposed a female succession despite it laying down Lady Jane Grey as his heir; on Q1(a) in F963 02 (Condition of England) many missed the focus on the causes of the Swing Riots preferring instead to discuss poverty and the Old Poor Law, the topic for part (b); in Q1(a) in F964 02 (French Revolution) many failed to note the date of Source A, thinking it to be written the day before the storming of the Bastille (its subject) rather than two days later; in Q3(a) and (b) on the US many misread Douglas in Source D to be saying that Lincoln intended to abolish slavery when in fact he is saying that many in the South believed that he did, despite italicisation of '*believed*'; in Q1(a) in F964 01 (the 1st Crusade) far too many

misread the question, seeing 'why' rather than 'who' went on Crusade. They found themselves answering the second question rather than the first. There are many other examples of this sort and whilst exams are always stressful time spent reading and thinking about wording and language will always be well spent.

This year has continued to see the development of our **programme of topic related Inset**, combining script analysis, discussion and materials to assist effective teaching practice, a lecture from a visiting expert and a resonant location that could be used as the basis for learning outside the classroom. We have now covered the Mid Tudors at Hampton Court, Churchill at the Churchill Archive in Cambridge, the Crusades at the Victoria and Albert Museum and the Museum of the Order of St John, the French Revolution at the British Museum and the Wallace Collection, Germany at the Imperial War Museum and the Cold War in Asia at the School of Oriental and African Studies. The feedback has been invariably positive. It is eventually hoped to cover all of our topics in this way. These events also allow Centres to get in touch with others teaching their topics.

It is to be hoped that teachers use the generic mark scheme and candidates are familiar in a general sense with its terms, skills and concepts. This will assist in delivering the relevant skills and history. It must also be said that Centres do no service to candidates by setting up rigid formulas for ticking 'skill' boxes. This impedes an engagement with what the sources say and the relative importance they need to accord to them. It gets in the way of effective history. Although it may seem obvious this is a **source based paper**, not one based on knowledge. Knowledge merely serves to enable understanding and to test the points and provenance of a source. The focus in Q a) is on the comparative value of two sources as evidence for an issue, and in Q b) on how effectively a set of sources support or refute a given interpretation.

Question (a) Comparison of Sources as evidence for a given issue

The focus in Q a) is on the comparative value of two sources as evidence for an issue.

AO1 (worth 14% marks) requires –

- A sound **conceptual understanding** of the key issue and sustained **focus** on it.
- Relevant use of **well-selected context**.
- An awareness of the **key points raised by the two sources** in relation to the key issue and the extent of similarity and difference between them.
- Linked and developed **comparison** supporting convincing **judgement** on the sources **as evidence for the issue (not on the issue itself)**.
- **Clarity, accuracy** and **coherence** in writing.

AO2 (worth 16% marks) requires –

- **Analysing comparatively** the **significance** of source **content** in the light of provenance and context.
- **Evaluating** the relative value of the sources, by **comparing** their provenance **linked to what they say** and assessing their comparative use and reliability as a means of establishing a judgement on them as evidence.

The sharpness of focus on the question marked out the best answers. As above it is worth stressing that the question asks the candidate to compare two sources '**as evidence**'. This means assess them in relation to each other, not extract information from them about the focus of the question. Equally, a *general* analysis is not what is required. If this happens the candidate is likely to be placed in L4. There should be links to and focus on the key issue in the question. These were often implicit. Candidates frequently ignore the key issue and would be well advised to highlight it on the paper as an aide memoire. Many simply compare content and provenance

regardless of the issue. For example Q2(a) on the Reformation in F964 01 asked about evidence for views on Indulgences. Despite a focus on these in the two sources many simply wrote about Luther and Tetzel. Also the judgement reached should be about the Sources as evidence, not about the key issue. This example, from Q3(a) on F963/01, the English Civil War, is of a typical general conclusion: '*neither side seemed able to control the areas they were based in*'. Such a statement does not judge which of the two Sources provides the better evidence on the issue (the problems faced by both sides in controlling larger cities) and explain why. Some candidates seem to think that to use the sources illustratively to support a view is what is required on the grounds that they are explaining the utility of the source, saying 'Source A is useful, it shows us that...' In Q(a) this leads them away from the comparative issues towards sequencing. In Q(b) it leads to a general answer and a generalised historical understanding rather than on specific knowledge, in which the sources are used to illustrate 'knowledge' points rather than as the central body of material for evaluation.

For AO1 please remember -

- There are **no** marks for extraneous knowledge, only for bedding a source in its context. Credit is given for demonstrating a concise and clear understanding of the **context of an issue** (eg issues involved in agricultural disturbances; achievements at the Congress of Berlin; French intentions in Italy in 1858-9; post war economic policies in Germany) and of any **concepts** involved, for example in the latter an understanding of mid 20th century attitudes to economic policy in relation to the communist and capitalist worlds. Aim for a **light touch** here; say a sub clausal reference or at most one or two sentences.
- Many candidates simply focus on the topic, the Eastern Question or Female Rule instead of the **specific issue**, attitudes to achievements at the Congress of Berlin or views on foreign marriage for a female ruler.
- They refer to the sources to extract information for a general answer to the topic, rather than **comparing them as evidence** for a key issue. The consequence is a sequenced approach, a level 4.
- Many candidates, at some point in their answer, resort to randomly juxtaposing dissimilar points. They do not **compare like with like** or point out that one source may make a point which is absent from the other.
- Some are satisfied with **basic or undeveloped cross references**, often losing the question in the process.
- **Judgement** is often asserted at the end. Judgement on the value of the sources as evidence was rarely convincing. It must arise from an evaluation of the quality of the content, either throughout or in a developed concluding paragraph. A failure to judge will confine a candidate to level III and below. **Judgement is all too frequently on the issue itself, rather than on the evidence for it** (see above).
- It is vital that candidates **identify the relevant issues** arising in the two sources and use these as their comparative focus. For example in Q4(a) on Churchill most identified the Empire as an issue between Roosevelt and Churchill but very few identified the power relationship or the Atlantic Charter as others. Their comparison was thus partial. This does require some thought before putting pen to paper. Failure to do so leads to description, paraphrase or at worst copying out what is there, word for word.
- **Sequencing** remains a problem for some and confines them to L4 or below – for a large part of the answer they will describe or discuss just one of the sources and then the other. Any comparison is either implicit or rushed in a concluding paragraph.

For AO2 please remember -

- This has the **higher mark weighting** and should focus the candidate on the sources as evidence.
- A **formulaic approach** often diverts the candidate from both the issue in the question (and the appropriate content) and the need to compare provenance, integrating it into an explanation of similarity and difference and arriving at developed judgement. 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. Whole paragraphs are devoted to authenticity. Generic comments on reliability and utility are made without any reference to the content and nature of the specific sources supposedly under discussion.
- 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 them to discrete comment. For historians all evidence can be used. Issues such as reliability are factored in and only then are conclusions drawn from it. It is a part of considering purpose, tone and audience. Simply to comment in isolation on reliability is not evaluation, only a relatively minor part of it. **Some ignore or simply fail to use the introductions and attributions**. These contain vital information to support the understanding of source content. For example in Q4 on Churchill (F963 02) Source D was described in the introduction as 'Churchill paying tribute to Roosevelt a few days after the President's death', yet it was often accepted at face value as a normal 'truthful' comment.
- Most candidates **sequence their comments on provenance and deal with them separately**. They should seek to integrate them in a holistic approach. 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 more difficult.
- Candidates will often take sources at **face value** failing to consider them in the light of purpose or audience, eg Napoleon III writing to Queen Victoria about French intentions in Italy or the ironic reference to marriage and breeding by the Poor Law Commissioner when quoting a local tenant farmer.
- **Misinterpretation of the Sources**. Candidates need to read the material very carefully. It should ring bells in terms of their own understanding of the issue. Sources are fairly short but have been edited to contain real historical 'meat'. The language and points made need careful consideration and cross referencing which can only be achieved by attention to detail.
- There is much **assertion**. Candidates claim that something is useful or reliable, or biased without explanation, development or example. We are still faced with much 'stock' comment as a result. Stating that the author of a primary source 'has an agenda' so is unreliable, is as uninformative as asserting a modern historian to be reliable due to his research. A new variant on this is to argue that a source is limited because it only gives one point of view. For example on F964 02, on Q4, on Germany, Source D is a Communist newspaper and limited because it does not give a balanced point of view.

Q(b) Using knowledge to assess the value of the evidence in grouped sources to support or refute the suggested interpretation in the question.

AO1 (worth 22% marks) requires –

- A **two- or three-sided argument** (depending on what is in the sources) driven by effective, sustained **grouping** and **cross-referencing** of the sources - to support or refute the interpretation.
- A developed **analytical explanation** of their significance for the interpretation.

- A careful, substantiated **judgement** on the **value** of the sources in supporting the interpretation, **based** on the preceding analysis of provenance and content.
- A **use of relevant, well-selected knowledge** to extend, confirm or qualify the contribution of the sources to the interpretation in the question.
- An **integration of knowledge** to assess source provenance and content in the discussion of the interpretation.
- A sound **understanding** and accurate use of **historical terms**, with **clear communication** and a **well-organised** and **structured** answer

AO2 (worth 48% marks) requires –

- **Analysis** of both individual sources and linked sources.
- **Discrimination** between groups of sources for the **comparative value** of their **provenance** and **content** in supporting or refuting the interpretation
- **Bringing together judgements** on the comparative value of groups of **sources**, different interpretations emerging from the set of sources and **well-selected, integrated knowledge** to form a **synthesis** which answers the question.

Most now know to attempt a grouping based on the assertion in the question and will tend to do this immediately. Then, unfortunately, they proceed sequentially, often in two halves. There is a discussion of each source, entirely discrete and often descriptive, and then a bolt – on section where the provenance of each is discussed, again discretely. **No attempt is made to relate the provenance to a relative weighting of respective views. The analysis is thus entirely self contained and is not linked in any way to the argument about what may be the more convincing view or interpretation.** This divorces the material from the question and prevents candidates from integrating their points into the wider discussion of an interpretation. They fail to make the appropriate links. Candidates need to sustain their grouping by linking and cross referencing within it, establishing why two or three sources contribute 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. 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 on a variety of content and provenance issues.

Some candidates are careless in their grouping. Although there are several permutations and some candidates are adept at bending sources to their argument there are clearly some mistaken and less than convincing groupings. Examiners will check whether links, pairings and groups work or are historically valid. Some candidates seem to pluck links and groups out of the air and will usually be, of necessity, brief and vague in developing these.

Thus the two key areas where candidates underperformed were in using knowledge to assess the sources and in applying the analytical and **evaluative** skills required to meet the requirements of the question effectively.

For AO1 please remember -

- **Not** to write an **answer based on own knowledge** with the sources used for illustration or reference. Some implicitly referred to or quoted Source content to create a general narrative about the topic based on their own knowledge. This is something that appears to be on the increase, and not only in Q(b). 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.

- However 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 either because they knew very little or because there were gaps in their knowledge, as on Occupied Germany or the Eastern Question. In some cases it was simply inappropriate and led the candidate away from the focus of the question. It is important to realise the **role of knowledge on this paper**. It is there as a means of evaluating the sources, extending, confirming or questioning what they say. It is **particularly important in evaluation**. Selection and use of the most appropriate evidence in evaluating the Sources for the key issue was the key to a high level mark for A01. Many candidates used limited evidence within the date range of their questions. Knowledge can only be credited if it informs the use of the sources. Thus for example it was necessary to know about religious change and politics in Q2 on the Mid Tudors. Without this the sources could well be taken at face value – Edward VI could be seen as regarding female rule in general as a serious problem. Source (A), at face value, states that his objection to Elizabeth and Mary's succession was their illegitimacy and ancient law and custom, when knowledge would suggest that his objection was more likely either on grounds of religion (Mary) or on political grounds (Northumberland and the Lady Jane Grey marriage). This would then contribute to a discussion of 'A' and its contribution to the debate on the seriousness of female rule in the 1550s. On Q1 on F964 02, the French Revolution, it was necessary, to interpret Source E effectively, to know something about what had happened to the Church in the revolutionary period. 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. In Source D in Italian Unification (Q2b) an understanding of Plombieres, Villefranca and Piedmont's activities and policies in relation to the Central Duchies would have helped candidates to use the source, either as evidence for the centrality of French support or as evidence that there were limits to it and Piedmontese diplomatic initiatives were the more important. As it was many were unable to use this source properly. The message of the cartoon in the same question, that France sat back, let Piedmont do the work and then took all la gloire gets a candidate only so far. They need to know about Magenta and Solferino to prove the cartoon to be emphatically wrong. They can then evaluate the accuracy of the cartoon and perhaps speculate about why a British cartoon should be so anti-French. In Q2b on the Eastern Question a lack of chronology led many to conflate the Black Sea Clauses issue in 1871, the Bulgarian Massacres in 1876, the Russo-Turkish War of 1877 and the Congress of Berlin in 1878 with some bizarre results. The Asquith- Lloyd George split on Q3b saw much confusion about which Coalition government was being referred to, about the Cabinet and the proposed war Committee and about who were in these bodies.
- 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 thus only 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: *Justice for all* in Norman government or the *quality of military leadership* in deciding the outcome of the 1st Civil War. On the 02 versions: *a demoralised poor* as the most important reason for Poor Law reform or *how far Asquith was responsible* for the Liberal split in 1916. Did Lincoln *intend to end slavery*? For each of these questions candidates would latch onto a preferred 'big' issue –Norman government; the Civil War; the New Poor Law instead of the Old; Liberal decline; Slavery and the causes of the American Civil War. Too many candidates analyse the sources generally and are drawn away from the question or key issue.
- **The structure of the argument** was often seriously flawed. 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 or a bolt on and discrete piece of source evaluation. Some made no attempt to drive the answer

using Sources, which became an essay with brief nods to the Sources by letter only, often in brackets.

- **Judgements and conclusions** were often **divorced from the sources**. Even candidates who had attempted a reasonable focus on the sources suddenly forgot that they were **assessing them as evidence** in their judgements. Instead they resorted to knowledge points **on the issue in general**. The answer would become topic based rather than what the sources have to say about a particular issue. Conclusions which make no reference to the sources are not answering the question '*assess how far the sources support...*'

For AO2 please remember -

- The need to **spot the main thrust of argument or view in a source**. All too often candidates pick on a minor phrase and mistakenly make it central to their case or they allow knowledge to overwhelm it.
- **The need to evaluate**. Candidates used to confine their discussions on provenance to Q(a). They now know this is crucial on Q(b) but their approach is to do so **discretely**, commenting in isolation on each individual source, failing to link their discussions to the grouping and the key issue in the question. They compound this by **failing to evaluate the source's relative contribution to the main debate**. This confines them to Level 3 and below. They cannot access Levels 1 and 2 unless the source is given relative 'value' in its contribution to the argument.
- That by tackling the sources **sequentially and discretely** candidates inevitably move into Levels IV and below. It prevents them making the necessary links within and between sources, and with the question.
- No credit is given for **'stock' and formulaic source** analysis that is de-linked from the content and provenance. When a historian is used as a source it will often produce stock comment. The key here is to assess what is said in terms of balance, slant or perspective. Many candidates had learnt a series of stock provenance points that were trotted out for each source. For example there would be much talk of utility based on whether a source was typical or atypical, usually with little or no reference to what the source actually said. Others would claim that a source could not be useful if it 'had a purpose' so that any source deemed to have this was instantly dismissed. Others would condemn a source as useless because it was not the entire source and the author could have changed his mind later on. Some evaluation is ambiguous running along the lines of – 'Source X is or may be reliable because the author was there and/or it is his opinion and therefore must be true, but it may also not be reliable because the author may be trying to win votes or put a favourable view on something'. This will often be entirely divorced from the history and then there is no resolution as to what the candidate thinks.
- Candidates need to focus on **what is said** in the sources and provide a detailed and historical assessment of it.
- Weaker candidates will often simply **describe the introductions and attributions**, as if this constitutes evaluation. It does not.
- At **Level 5 and below** answers 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. At the highest levels, there were some perceptive answers with impressive awareness of detail and the use of well chosen evidence in evaluation of provenance as well as content. Other able candidates lost marks for using Sources at face value and not considering their provenance, reliability or use.
- **Evaluation** is best achieved as part of the grouping, either within it, in terms of establishing relative importance, or as part of the grouping (all Protestant or American or Communist views; all pre or post war). It should always be related to establishing its value in relation to the question.

- **Synthesis** is about **bringing together all the above skills**. In particular this is where integration of knowledge and relative balance (unevenness moving towards imbalance) is rewarded.
- Many candidates seemed not to realise the 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 will underachieve on AO2 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. Evidence is not linked or active in assessing 'how far *the Sources* support . . .'
- Some answers **failed to find more than one view** in the Sources. This was particularly true of Q1 on the Old Poor Law, Q3 on the Asquith/Lloyd George split and Q2 on the Reformation. The most successful answers made impressive use of the clues and saw that some Sources might be used for more than one side to an argument.
- Often some better answers **lost sight of the Sources in the final page or so**, meaning that the conclusion and judgement were limited on how far the sources supported an interpretation, undermining synthesis.
- There were many examples of **weak or unclear English** and some inappropriate use of slang, or of terms that were anachronistic in their use. Informal language is inappropriate in an examination.

Both candidates and teachers need to ask, in class and in their written exercises, the following questions –

In Q(a) when comparing sources as evidence –

- *Is there focus on the key issue in the question?*
- *Are the correct sources being compared?*
- *Are the sources understood, analysed **compared** and developed clearly in relevant, well-selected context?*
- *Are comparative links sustained and consistent?*
- *Are both **provenance** and content compared, linked, evaluated for relative value?*
- *Is there a supported **judgement** on 'the sources as evidence for' the key issue?*
- *Is the judgement convincing and based on source evaluation?*

In Q(b) when assessing the sources for their contribution to an interpretation –

- *Is there, in the **introduction**, a clear focus on the interpretation? (if there is an asserted judgement at this stage is it convincing?).*
- *Do the sources drive it, or does it just have a general essay-style?*
- *Are the sources accurately grouped for an argument of two or more sides?*
- *In the **development section** of the answer is knowledge accurate, relevant, integrated, used for evaluation? (or are chunks of it imparted and standing alone?).*
- *Are there interim judgements at the ends of sections to hold the argument together?*
- *Is any grouping at the start maintained throughout the rest of the answer?*
- *Are sources linked consistently to drive a sustained, developed argument or are they treated individually? (or is the answer driven by knowledge, with the sources playing little part or merely as illustrations or references?)*
- *How well integrated and evaluated are source content and provenance?*
- *In the **conclusion** is there synthesis, integrating knowledge with source content and provenance?*

Examiners' Reports - June 2011

- *Does the conclusion follow on from any interim judgements and is it based firmly on the established source groupings?*
- *Is there a supported judgement based on the grouped sources and knowledge?*

And, finally – “have I written an effective piece of **historical analysis** in answer to the question or merely a generic, formulaic and stock wish-list?”

F965 Historical Interpretations and Investigations

The majority of centres have developed a sound understanding of the requirements of coursework and the application of the mark scheme and there is much good practice in the unit. There has developed a sense of cooperation between centres and OCR and there has been a great deal of very worthwhile work showing that the skills of understanding complex material, evaluation, synthesis and reflection are being well developed. These skills are important and transferrable, but it is also apparent that historical understanding is being deepened and that students are benefiting from pursuing independent study and taking responsibility for acquiring and using a variety of historical sources. The very careful marking and the care taken with internal moderation are a reflection of the professionalism of teachers and their desire to achieve outcomes which are fair and realistic.

The comments of problems must be seen in this general context. There are still some basic requirements which are not being universally met and there are difficulties in understanding and applying mark schemes. It is hoped that this, as well as the previous reports on this unit and the advice available from OCR in terms of inset provision and coursework guidance material will make some of what follows unnecessary to write in subsequent years. It must be stressed that it does not apply to most centres.

First, the mechanics of administration and marking. It is important that the CCs160 form be sent with the coursework as this is the centre's certification that the work produced is the candidates' own. There were very few instances where there was any doubt about this, but it is a requirement that this form is submitted and failure to do so may endanger certification. The new coursework cover sheet was intended to be helpful to centres, including a check list of what must be done. It would be helpful if all centres used it. Sometimes elements were ticked that had not, in fact been done, especially putting the cumulative total of words on every page. There were still cases where the word limit had not been observed. In some cases work had to be returned to centres, as the moderator cannot make a decision about which parts to mark and which to ignore: that is the centre's responsibility if candidates have been allowed to submit work which is over the word limit. The word limit is not a guide and there is no tolerance; it is mandatory and candidates must not exceed it. If the skills being assessed have not been demonstrated in 2000 words, it is unlikely that they will be demonstrated by writing any more, and it is part of the task to focus sharply on key elements and choose supporting information with discrimination. What should also be included is the record of study for each candidate which shows what else has been studied and confirms that the coursework does not overlap with other units. Moderators would like to make a plea for plastic folders not to be used. It is preferable for all concerned that the Interpretations and Investigations answers for each candidate should be stapled together with the cover sheet, with the name and number of the candidate on each sheet. There is no need for plastic or cardboard folders and no need for any covering letters. If there are matters for the moderator to consider then this should be decided by OCR and any correspondence should be sent to the Board directly, not to the moderator.

An important requirement is that Interpretations should be answered from the current year's questions and not from the previous year's. Some centres did not observe this requirement and were technically in breach of regulations. There is a rolling programme of change and centres are asked to be very sure they are using the current questions.

Once again arithmetical and transcription errors wasted valuable time. Centres are asked to be very careful in ensuring that marks on coursework are the same as the marks on MS1. Moderators simply cannot guess which mark to use – that must be the centre's decision and sending back work for checking is time consuming.

In terms of actual making, there are still centres that put no annotations on the work at all and offered only terminal comments, sometimes not relating to each assessment objectives. In future work without comments will be returned as a matter of course and centres are reminded of the great importance of moderators being able to follow centre marking. Marking should be in red and comments should relate to the key elements in the assessment criteria. Ticks and underlining by themselves simply make the work more difficult to read and are of no value to anyone. If markers are addicted to ticking, then it is recommended that a piece of paper be put next to the work and ticks are put on that and not the work. Also it is unhelpful for levels to be put beside individual passages – the level should be a reflection of the work as a whole not an individual sentence or two. A comment such as 'good use of OK' or 'strong evaluation by X ref' is much better. If there is no 'eval' in the margin, then a mark beyond Band 4 is not going to be likely for A02. If there is a lot of 'strong eval' or 'well supported' or 'good use of passage to eval' then a higher level mark for A02 is going to be likely. Sometimes the final comments were not consonant with the marginal comments.

It is helpful to see internal moderation, but if marks are changed, it is very helpful for the OCR moderators to see why. It must be stressed that moderators are not re-marking work, but trying to understand centre marking and come to a view about whether it is justified by reference to the mark scheme. Marking should offer a clear guide to moderation and thus effusive comment not linked to AOs is not really helpful. The moderator and not the student is the target audience for these comments.

Standards

Interpretations. There were fewer answers which used the Interpretations selectively to illustrate points that candidates wished to make about the issue in the question. It may well be that in the course of this thematic approach, there is evaluation, but on the whole, picking extracts from the four passages does not lead easily to a clear engagement with the interpretations presented. This is not to recommend a serial survey of each passage in term. Better answers will group passages and certainly point out cross and counter references as a means of evaluation, and they will consider the passages as a set. However, there is the need for the responses to be passage-driven and for the passages to be considered as a whole, not simply ignoring the parts that do not seem to fit with a candidate's argument. If centre marking was not focused on the evaluation of the passages, then the use of knowledge could be over-rewarded. AO1a is not simply for the insertion of knowledge, but for its use. The key elements are the selection of knowledge to test the interpretations as a whole and the use of evaluative reference to other passages. The aim is supported judgement about the passages' views of the key issue – not about anything that the passage happened to say about the topic generally. The distinction between simple comparison and grouping and the evaluative use of other passages should be made in the marking. 'A agrees with B' is not evaluation. 'A corroborates because it provides clear evidence for the point that B is making about....' is different.

Many candidates now do try to use knowledge, but marking should make a distinction between the application of basic or generalised knowledge and the selection of knowledge more appropriate to A2 level. There was some tendency to assume that any knowledge however basic would be worth Band 2 in AO2a and justify a top mark in AO1a. This led to many reductions made by moderators. Very detailed and specialist knowledge is not required, but marking should make more comment on the depth and appositeness of contextual knowledge, especially as candidates have access to material and do not need to have memorised it and they also have plenty of time to consider and research. Some centres seemed to have rather low expectations for higher level mark bands. At the top end there was some excellent use made of knowledge – not necessarily requiring access to very specialist or obscure monographs or learned articles, but showing focused research of appropriate AS level books, websites and articles. Candidates themselves could do more in the way of self-assessment, perhaps, to ensure that there is knowledge rather than just a survey of the passages but markers must offer more in the way of decisions about the quality of that knowledge, using their specialist

knowledge of the topics. They should also comment more in some cases on the relevance of the argument and the sharpness of focus on the actual issue in the question. The 'default' mark for AO1b should not be 5 or 6 if the issues have been imperfectly addressed. More marginal comment would often be helpful to both marker and moderator. 'NTQ' (not the question) might be helpful annotation. As well as that, 'excellent focus' or 'strongly argued' which in many cases would have been well justified could also be used more. Before level 1 marks are awarded, there should be some checks.

Have all the passages been used?

Is there 'evaluation' throughout in marginal comments?

Is there strong and well-used knowledge?

Are cross and counter references being used to support judgement or merely to make comparisons

Is the argument and focus all relevant and is the focus on the question sharp throughout

They may be some unusually perceptive judgements and comments should be made on this – though some explanation is helpful – but the 'bedrock' of strong answers is supported evaluation and consistent relevant argument.

Both candidates and teachers seemed more at home in some cases with the clear task of the interpretations than the more open-ended Investigations which does demand high level skills of choosing materials, identifying possible debate, integrating assessment of sources into a well sustained argument. This is a summation of skills developed throughout a candidate's historical studies and there are no 'short cuts'. It needs research, sustained reflection and a commitment. It goes against the tendency for quick answers and better responses show a maturity of judgement and a willingness to consider issues.

The most common 'short cut' was for candidates to offer an essay on the issue in their chosen question which was not source-led. In extreme cases, this meant that hardly any evidence was mentioned or references, so what candidates were offering was an extended period studies answer. Given the number of marks given specifically for source analysis, this was not a good strategy.

More common were responses which offered an essay illustrated by evidence. This could be a few words quoted from a source on the lines of Disraeli was an "outstanding statesman" – there were sometimes a large numbers of snippets from sources, but they merely confirmed what points the candidates were making and they offered little opportunity for evaluation. If the marking focused on the understanding of the issues and the argument rather than the use made of sources, then marks were likely to have been reduced on moderation. This remained the most common source of disagreement between centre and moderator marking. Though it can be emotionally draining to award low marks to what is in itself a good essay, nevertheless, the mark scheme is clear in its demands. AO2 which carries most of the marks is about the candidate's treatment of evidence, not his or her essay writing skills per se. Self assessment should reveal to the candidate where evaluation of evidence has or has not taken place and may be essential if disappointment is not to arise.

Another short cut is the creation by candidates of their own source-based exercise. A number of sources are gathered and the answer takes each in turn, commenting on them. The problem with this approach is that it does not lead to a developed argument and can easily degenerate into a series of comments some of which would not score highly at GCSE. If a candidate writes that for instance, a map of the Treaty of Versailles – Source A in the list – is reliable because it is a primary source and available in a well respected A level text book which would have no reason

to lie about the boundary changes and that Source B, the second on the list is a speech by Hitler who was well known for his extreme views, this reveals some underestimation of the depth of study required at AS. Though some evaluation may result, the approach is limiting and is not recommended as a means of demonstrating the depth of argument required for higher levels. Reductionist approaches are simply not possible in A2 coursework. Candidates have to read round the issue to understand its implications and the different possible views about it; they then have to consider evidence that they have found about the different aspects of the issue; they have to consider how to evaluate the evidence in the context of that discussion, reach interim conclusions and then ensure that their final judgement is consistent with the analysis of the evidence. To read thoughtful and well-structured analyses which were firmly based on a critical study of evidence was a real pleasure for moderators and this unit did produce some well considered thoughtful and extremely worthwhile responses. However, candidates must be aware of what is required and be alive to the need for critical evaluation. Some resorted to commentaries on the authors rather than their arguments or evidence. This was sometimes of considerable use with primary sources; it had little use when referring to secondary works, particularly text-books and led to some weak and speculative comments referred to in the feedback to centres as 'stock evaluation' and it would be helpful if centre marking could make more distinction between extended and supported judgements and weaker ad hominem assertions.

For top levels it might be helpful if marking referred to and was quite confident about the following points

Whether the answer is firmly focused on the candidate's own question

Whether there is critical use of evidence or whether evidence is merely illustrative – is there, for instance, a lot of the giveaway phrase "assays" which merely repeats an earlier point. Whether the evidence is leading the whole investigation or whether the candidate's own summary of different points and arguments is leading

The extent and quality of supporting knowledge used to support or contradict evidence

It does follow from this that judgements may be more difficult in topics which the candidate has chosen and with which the centre is not familiar. There is little indication that candidates choosing their own areas for investigation makes much difference in their actual performance, but there is some indication that the judgements made by some marking about relatively obscure or unfamiliar topics is not so focused on the quality of supporting knowledge.

In general, if there was a mismatch between centre assessment and moderator assessment it was more likely to be about the investigations, and this is an area where some centres do need to consider the points made in this and in previous reports on this unit.

Best practice would indicate that a shared understanding of the assessment objectives between candidates, teachers and moderators is essential. The more the candidates themselves take responsibility for assessing how far their work meets requirements, the less frustration and disappointment there is likely to be. The demands of the coursework that this is independent work sets limits on the redrafting possible, so the more candidates are aware of how far they have met basic criteria before they hand in work, the better. Obviously, there are limits; but a candidate offering no evaluation or no contextual knowledge would not be in a position to expect to gain a high mark.

Examiners' Reports - June 2011

There is a danger that reports such as this accentuate negative elements, so it is important to end on a very positive note, the coursework does place considerable demands on candidates, but ones that yield important rewards in terms of skills development and preparation for higher education and the world of work. Failure to evaluate ideas and process information can have disastrous results in the real world. The majority of candidates have engaged to different degrees with vital elements of understanding complex data and taking a critical view. Teachers, students and moderators should not lose sight of the enormous value of this and the important role that this subject plays in the future development of young adults.

F966 Historical Themes

The overall performance of many candidates on the two papers was creditable. There were a significant number of candidates who were able to produce well structured and analytical answers which took them comfortably into Level III for AO1b. There seems to be either a reluctance or inability amongst some candidates to structure answers in such a way which provides direct cross comparison of material from different historical periods. This is a pity, because many candidates clearly have plenty of relevant knowledge at their disposal, and could boost their overall mark by a whole level or more by simply making more direct cross comparisons within paragraphs. This observation applies particularly to a category of AO1b Level 3 response, which might, in almost all other respects satisfy the criteria for Level II, apart from the near absence of any synthesis. In order to progress beyond Level III candidates must show some reasonable level of synthesis. Some simply seem unaware of the importance of synthesis or think that it simply means piling up a list of examples from across the period they are studying. This is not what is wanted – candidates must make links between their examples and show clearly that there are patterns of similarity or difference, whilst obviously relating this material to the actual question set. As AO1b carries twice the number of marks, centres would be well advised to give this skill greater attention and perhaps consider giving less time to the teaching the topics in depth, or try and ensure that the course is delivered in a more thematic way. Undoubtedly, the candidates who performed best are those which indicated some cross comparison in their opening paragraph as a way of establishing a particular thesis/argument in relation to the question set. In this opening paragraph, they establish which themes are relevant to the question, then structure the rest of the essay around discussion of these themes. The highest scoring essays will make consistent comparisons between different historical events relevant to the themes, often on a sentence by sentence basis. It might therefore be suggested that candidates need to spend a significant amount of time planning their answer and thinking about the themes they will use before they begin to write. The length of the examination was extended to two hours and this should mean that candidates have plenty of time to think and plan before they begin to write as we do not want them to use this extra time to write more description or narrative as this often gets in the way of their argument. This thematic approach is much to be favoured over the chronological approach, where candidates write on one event in a paragraph, then make a more limited comparison with another event in the next paragraph. The weaker candidates, scoring Level III or below, will generally adopt a chronological approach, with synoptic assessments being made in a more haphazard manner, sometimes being left until the very end, or seeming to emerge in an incidental fashion fairly infrequently in the course of the prose.

Turning point essays still present candidates with a problem. Many simply produce a list of possible turning points and then analyse each one in turn, but this does not allow synthesis or comparison between different turning points. This year a number of candidates attempted to look at themes as turning points, this was particularly noticeable in the German nationalism topic, but it is not successful. The development of the economy over one hundred years cannot be a turning point. The two most successful ways to approach this type of question are to select four or five major events that might be considered turning points and then approach it thematically by analysing their impact in terms of issues such as political, social, economic etc. In this way candidates will ensure that they compare the events and can conclude that event X might be a turning point in terms of political change, but event Y is more of a turning point in terms of economic development. This is the type of approach to be encouraged. However, there were some successful answers where candidates did analyse events separately, but in each paragraph they did make comparison with both the named turning point and other possible turning points so that synthesis was clearly present. This latter example was very noticeable in approaches to the question in the Civil rights section on women's rights.

As this is A2, candidates do need to ensure that they focus closely on key words and phrases in the title. Two examples where good answers could have been even better if this had been done were on the Tudor Rebellions section where candidates did not focus on taxation as the main cause, but instead wrote about causes of unrest in general. The second example was in the Russian section with the question on the peasantry, where candidates did not focus sufficiently on the word transform and wrote more about whether their lives changed, yet there is a significant difference. Candidates should also be aware, that as with turning points, there can be a negative transformation of lives. A similar comment could also be made about the question on African American leadership, where candidates did not focus sufficiently on leadership, but wrote about leaders in general.

As ever, a significant number of candidates reverted to pre-prepared questions, and some grasped at different foci before giving up and imparting general information. This especially applied to the Tudor Rebellions option, which had unexpected slants this year. A few, as usual, realised they had entered a cul de sac half way through, after misreading the question, and as ever their attempts at cosmetic surgery produced bolt on conclusions. Those with the confidence and flexibility to adapt their knowledge to a new angle managed well. In the middle were those so well informed that they swamped their ideas with unwieldy knowledge which they imparted, often irrelevantly. There were again some tedious, repetitive answers padded with information relevant to the topic not the question. As usual, weaker answers would have produced better structured arguments if they had used a thematic rather than chronological approach, plodding discretely from monarch to monarch or issue to issue. There were also several occasions where candidates either misread or misunderstood the question and therefore its requirements. This led to answers falling short of Level III, even with some good analysis. This was particularly noticeable in the theme on Ireland. Candidates must read the question carefully. Even if the question appears to be similar to one set in the past, it is likely that it will have a slightly different slant and candidates who want to reach the higher levels do need to pick up on the slant. Once again this is further caution about the pre-prepared question.

Many candidates produced plans which looked detailed and promising, but owing to a lack of analytic and synoptic skill the resulting essay proved ineffective. Plans should not simply be a list of events that candidates intend to put into their answer, but a list of themes that they intend to cover and if they can adopt this approach in their planning they are much more likely to produce a thematic response.

Very few candidates seem to have trouble with timing issues, producing two essays of a reasonable length. Some candidates did write too much on a first answer, so squeezing their response time in the second answer, but at times this actually helped them as their answer was more focused and linked to the question with a far greater emphasis on the skills needed. There are some candidates who, by writing too much do allow either description or narrative to take over and their argument to be lost in a welter of detail. Even fewer seemed to produce only one answer of any value. There were also very few answers where candidates did not attempt to answer the question or showed little understanding at least of the topic.

The use of abbreviations continues to be a source of concern – often, candidates make clear they are going to use such (eg NA, CRs, Govt, even TP for turning point) from an early stage. However, this is a formal examination and they need to be informed that this is not acceptable. Literacy levels were generally satisfactory and although neither literacy levels nor abbreviations would determine a level a candidate was awarded, they might impact on the mark awarded within a level.

F966/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1066-1715

English Government and the Church 1066-1216

1 “The main changes in English central government took place after 1154.” How far do you agree with this judgement of the period from 1066 to 1216?

Answers mostly focused on the key issue of changes to English central government, and achieved structured, thematic argument. The majority made distinctions between the period pre- and post-1154 and attempted to differentiate between continuity, evolution and change. The best made interim judgements based on supported evaluation of continuity and change, the better ones sustaining comparative evaluation throughout their essays as a basis for final synthesis. At the lower end were more general discussions of general chronological change in central government. Some lost focus and branched into treatment of local government, but the better answers succeeded in making the links to central government to give this approach some credibility. Weaker answers failed to link or compare factors, instead adopting a list-like approach. Some candidates made assumptions about the level of knowledge of the examiner and did not define things such as writ or pipe roll, which required definition.

Some candidates dealt with no element of government apart from the high officers and the king. Some did not think about the force of the question and resorted to the ‘description plus comment’ approach. Better efforts made comparisons across the stated date. These candidates knew that if they were to write about ‘changes’, they had to make comparisons. Nevertheless, few distinguished between ‘main’ and less significant changes.

2 Assess the view that the archbishops of Canterbury in the Anglo-Norman period, from 1066 to 1154, did more to strengthen the English Church than those in the Angevin period, from 1154 to 1216.

Good answers focused clearly on the key issue of strengthening the English Church, in some cases equating this with its independence. The less convincing answers explained the chronological actions of Archbishops with little attempt at evaluation. Often the strength of the Church was defined by the level of royal or papal support or opposition. Better answers established relevant criteria for comparing and assessing their relative contribution to strength by linking the two defined periods. Most seemed to grasp some key issues of continuity and change such as political power, investiture, primacy, the papal reform movement, independence, canon law and church courts. The main problem with the poorer answers was that candidates did not demonstrate a clear understanding of the meaning of ‘strengthen’ in this context.

3 “Anselm’s time as Archbishop of Canterbury was the main turning point in the impact of the papal reform movement in England.” How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1066 to 1216?

The best answers clearly focused their arguments on turning points, developing and comparing the relative significance of these for the *impact* of the papal reform movement. Some saw wide date ranges as turning points, which failed to convince. Most answers began chronologically, with only a few anchoring their argument from the start in Anselm’s work and sustaining this as a comparative link throughout their arguments. The problem for weaker candidates was that they failed to grasp the significance, for the papal reform movement, of their scanty knowledge of Anselm’s work. Anselm himself was not well discussed, while Langton’s involvement usually revolved solely around Magna Carta. Anselm’s achievements were well-understood by many while those of Theobald were often noted to have been more important than those of Becket.

Many thought the latter's contribution was negative while that of Stephen Langton brought the full force of Innocent III's caesaropapism to his dealings with the English church and king. Whole centres were, as usual, confused about theocratic kingship which was what Lanfranc and William believed in. This led them to answer on a more general focus on the papal reform movement itself rather than on its impact. Some better answers broadened their arguments to include a wider social impact. There was a pleasing tendency to define what a "turning point" was and this enabled candidates better to plan their responses.

Rebellion and Disorder in England 1485-1603

4 "Taxation was the main cause of rebellion in the Tudor period." How far do you agree?

The best answers not only focused on the key issue of main cause' but traced the factor of 'taxation' across the whole period and evaluated it comparatively with other factors such as political faction, succession, religious change and social and economic grievances. At the lower end, and there were many candidates who fell into this category, the answer became a tired sweep of types of rebellions, often developed with thin narratives of events or evaluation of success - both irrelevant to the question. Some candidates fell into the trap of just explaining why rebellions occurred. Those who realized that the point of the question was to compare taxation with other factors considered whether it persisted throughout the period, or caused more rebellions than other factors. Only the very best efforts noticed the words 'main cause', while many disposed of this essential element by asserting in the first paragraph that there were many 'factors' and going on to illustrate these lavishly in the rest of the answer. Many argued that taxation was the main cause of the Cornish, Western and Amicable Grant rebellions and a subsidiary cause of other rebellions. There were subtle attempts to show that what really lay at the root of some of these taxation rebellions was a fiercely-held objection to centralization. The best candidates had accurate and differentiated knowledge of types of taxation as a cause of rebellion and saw patterns of change over time. These candidates were able to integrate taxation into their evaluation of other causes, whereas the arguments of weaker answers misrepresented the main cause of other rebellions. In fact, many did not focus on 'main' cause, but talked about frequency, threat, success or failure and, of course, general causes (even 'aims' or 'nature' in some instances). Some misguided answers sought to explain issues such as why the people of the South West and Yorkshire objected to paying taxes; the circumstances in which these objections occurred; why taxes were levied in the first place.

5 "Most Tudor governments under-estimated the threat presented by rebellions in England and Ireland." How far do you agree?

Only the very best candidates were able to balance their argument using knowledge of governments' limitations or distractions which explained why governments might have *seemed* to underestimate rebellions. Candidates too often ignored key words in the question. While few ignored 'and Ireland', 'Most' was not dealt with effectively by many candidates. Some resorted to a more general focus on what constituted a threat, such as timing, location, aims. Sometimes this was developed reasonably relevantly by linking this to government reaction. Some merely explained how governments dealt with rebellions, or whether or not rebellions succeeded or failed. Sometimes an essay contained a range of different foci in an attempt to find a route into the question. In some cases, when candidates had run out of relevant ideas, they twisted the question to argue that governments overestimated the threat of rebellions. Ireland was sometimes added and dealt with quite effectively. Mixing the concept of under or over-estimation with an analysis was often beyond many candidates who often just tacked on a sentence at the end of a paragraph about how the government dealt with rebellion. Many candidates evaluated the statement by examining the reaction of the governments rather than

the threat, though the analysis was sometimes limited to assertions about the success or failure of the response.

Weaker candidates produced general unsupported answers with little analysis. Many tried to answer a question on the level of threat rather than the reaction to it.

6 “Local authorities were more important than central government in maintaining political stability in the Tudor period.” How far do you agree?

While this question did elicit some excellent responses, many candidates struggled. Many weaker answers merely described the role of some of: nobility, JPs, Parliament (often inaccurately saying it gave the common people a voice), local churches and sometimes the King. Few mentioned the Privy Council or regional councils. This approach usually produced a more general answer on political stability. At the top, however, there were a few really excellent answers full of comparative evaluation and links between the two authorities which created an argument balancing their relative significance in preventing disorder and unrest balanced with the impact of them failing to do so or leading rebellions. Few knew enough about change throughout the period.

This question was an invitation to analyse and synthesise which brought out the best and worst; there was considerable confusion about what was local and what was central government: few attempted a definition of the two. The role of Lord Lieutenant was not well understood. The general deficiency in approach was that most candidates wrote about general features of central and local government without having much accurate idea about what these were. In many cases answers were littered with general, hopeful assertions: the weakness was that candidates did not have sufficient knowledge to come to a balanced and supported conclusion.

Tudor Foreign Policy 1485-1603

7 How far did the Tudors have consistent aims in their foreign policy?

This was answered well by some: almost all candidates found it very accessible; it was generally answered very well. Candidates tended to write thematically and were largely well-informed. Most candidates were able to identify a number of aims and to assess (at varying levels) which monarchs pursued which aims. Henry VIII's were probably the least well analysed as they were usually just brushed off as 'fame and glory'.

Some weaker candidates wrote about foreign relations rather than aims. Others discussed policies rather than aims. Some did focus on the key issue of aims, but prioritised them, which was not required by this question, rather than evaluating their consistency. One Centre adopted a very formulaic approach, which less able candidates clearly did not understand. This led to considerable confusion and inaccuracy, making attempted arguments unconvincing. For example, it was stated that few rulers aimed for national security, instead prioritising dynastic security. Some wrote irrelevantly about domestic issues such as the Break with Rome, Henry VIII's wives and domestic religion under Elizabeth. Many structured their answers sequentially ruler by ruler, failing to make synoptic links between their aims. There was a common misconception, among candidates from one Centre, that Mary I sought glory abroad like her father. Many did not clearly grasp the foreign policy aims of Henry VII and Elizabeth I.

8 “The years from 1547 to 1550 were the most important turning point in England’s relations with Scotland.” How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1485 to 1603?

The big differentiator between the responses to this question was the ability of candidates to develop the turning points. In some centres even modest candidates were successful. 1560 was seen by most as the most significant change in relations, though 1504 was also considered. Candidates then developed from this, according to their depth of knowledge and their ability to analyse and compare or just to describe. The best answers made good judgements based on the extent of short-term or long-term change. Few candidates discussed the earlier Tudor period and the Anglo-Scots relationship under Henry VII. There seemed to be some uncertainty also about the role/importance of the Auld Alliance. While many did compare the Mid-Tudor period with others, some wrote narratives with an attempted focus in a final, desperate, paragraph. Those who had difficulties with the concept of a ‘turning point’ struggled, and only a limited number had relevant and solid knowledge of the significant events in the period 1547-50 *in relation to Scotland*. Few such candidates focused on *relations* between England and Scotland, and instead explained events relating to the two countries. Most undermined the quality of their analysis and evaluation by taking a chronological approach. Some drifted too far into policy towards Scotland to be fully relevant and some even talked about Mary Queen of Scots and domestic plots without linking to foreign policy.

9 Assess the importance to England of Burgundy and the Netherlands in the period from 1485 to 1603.

This question was answered extremely well by a few but posed challenges to many candidates. There was some confusion about the difference between Burgundy and the Netherlands – some started in Henry VIII’s reign, so avoided mentioning Burgundy at all. Others talked about Burgundy/Netherlands across the period as though it were a joint kingdom. Most mentioned trade, but rarely knew the Magnus Intercursus. Some confused the collapse of Antwerp with the Sack of Antwerp. When themes besides trade were developed, eg strategic location, religious change, a convincing argument emerged, but this rarely was the case. Some weaker candidates wrote a general essay on changing relations with Spain, often chronologically structured. Even if themes were traced, there was rarely a convincing assessment of continuity and change in importance of the region to England. Many weaker candidates seemed not to understand the relationship between Burgundy, the Netherlands and Spain and how it changed over the period so their answers were consequently rather muddled. Also, many students did not balance the importance of Burgundy and the Netherlands against other nations such as France. Some candidates knew little about Burgundy beyond the backing given by Margaret to Simnel and Warbeck. They tried to compensate by being well-informed about the Netherlands, at any rate after 1570. There was less inclination to narrate events though the importance they sought to assess was mostly restricted to security and trade.

10 How accurately does the term “Counter Reformation” describe the developments in the Catholic Church in the period from 1492 to 1610?

Some candidates were very knowledgeable and handled the question very well. Many saw the developments from Ximenes de Cisneros through the *devotio moderna*, the 5th Lateran Council etc. as a continuum of reform given a fillip by Luther and Calvin. What mattered was to see the aim of the question: how far were the developments in the Catholic Church a response to the challenges of Protestantism and how far were they a continuation of developments which preceded those challenges? One issue was not just that there were attempts to reform before Luther, but the extent to which they were ineffective, and that the challenge from outside forced the Church into more active measures once the scale, scope and nature of that challenge were appreciated. There was also the balance between the desire to address issues of corruption and

those of theology. There was of course a degree of “Counter” in the Catholic Reformation, but that was far from the whole story. Candidates needed effective focus on the word “accurately” to achieve a high level response.

11 To what extent was the Council of Trent the major factor in the revival of the Catholic Church in Europe in the period 1492 to 1610?

“To what extent...Council of Trent...” This was a question requiring the candidate to demonstrate an understanding not only of what the Council achieved, but how those achievements related to other factors. A few weaker candidates tended to write about the Council of Trent only resulting in a very unbalanced answer. Descriptive detail, even when impressive, was not effective in addressing the question. Candidates were mostly able to balance the effects of the council of Trent against other factors like the mood, the work of individual popes, the religious orders, but were less than ready to deal with ‘extent’. Approaches could focus on the collaborative nature of the different factors, or contrast them, but comparison was essential. Strong candidates found plenty to say here and plenty to support their ideas with. One danger, particularly for candidates choosing to challenge the centrality of the Council’s role, was to get side-tracked. A descriptive treatment of the candidate’s chosen major factor was only of limited value. The Jesuits were undoubtedly important, but a discussion of their strengths could only take the candidate some of the way to the answer and description of the ever-widening spread of their missions in and beyond Europe was tangential.

12 How far did the Catholic Reformation achieve its aims in the period from 1492 to 1610?

This was a question which appeared to elicit responses in which candidates did not always do full justice to their knowledge. What was needed was a focused awareness of the aims of the Catholic Reformation. Only candidates who had a clear view of these, and moreover, an appreciation of how these developed over the period, particularly in the light of the need to respond to the Protestant challenge, could deploy their knowledge of achievements to full effect. Too many candidates were not conspicuous in their determination to marry achievement with aims. Indeed, description of achievements was sometimes the best that was on offer, finishing off with the assertion that despite the attempts made to improve the parish clergy, little had been achieved by 1610. Some placed their focus too heavily on the attempts to counter Protestantism. As a result their conclusions were excessively negative, ignoring the reforms in place or in train, and the huge changes that had taken place, in the strength and reputation of the Papacy to give just one example.

There were some surprising non sequiturs repeated by a few of the candidates who said that the late 15th century desire for lay spirituality was answered by the foundation of new religious orders.

Sixteenth Century France – Development of the Nation State

13 To what extent was the reign of Henry II (1547-59) the major turning point in the development of France as a nation state in the period from 1498 to 1610?

There were good answers to this question. Most candidates defined themes significant for the creation of a nation state and what would constitute a turning point. The best ones placed Henry II at the heart of their answers and made comparative, thematic links across other reigns. When they sustained their argument with evaluative interim judgements they produced a high level of synthesis. Many reached a judgement that the reign of Henry II was a negative turning point, while a more significant and positive turning point lay in the reign of Henry IV. Almost all dealt

well with this question; almost all agreed with the statement, however, a few delivered an essay on the development of France as a nation state and ignored turning points.

Most candidates were able to make a good attempt to analyse a turning point but there tended to be little depth of knowledge about the issues in this question. Religious issues and the minorities of Henry's sons were the points regularly raised. Foreign policy and administrative changes were dealt with less often. Many of the answers decided that the death of Henry was a turning point, not his reign. Some failed to concentrate on the notion of 'major turning point' so the comparative element of the question was lost, resulting in flaccid narrative.

One weakness was to leave points unexplained. Some, for example, wrote that 'Calvinism increased' during the reign but failed to say how this made the reign of Henry II either more or less of a turning point.

14 Assess which social groups in France benefited most and which suffered most in the period from 1498 to 1610.

Better candidates tended to adopt a thematic approach by class – usually predominantly focused on the First and Third Estates, with sometimes a mention of the merchants and bourgeoisie, but rarely the clergy. Top level answers made a comparative evaluation of the relative benefits and suffering of these classes at significant moments in the course of the period, middle range answers traced synoptically those who benefitted followed by those who suffered. The less strong structure was sequential by individual class across the period, with a synoptic conclusion bolted on. There was some irrelevance at the lower levels, when religious groups were included unconvincingly as 'social groups' and one or two irrelevantly included the monarch as the one member of a social group all his own.

Many saw that 'benefitted most' was vague and needed definition before it could be usefully discussed.

There was much sympathy for those who suffered from the Paulette, mistrust of the noblesse de robe in general. Weaker candidates frequently assumed that the peasantry and the Third Estate were the same thing. Many weaker answers were also characterised by the comparison of fewer, or even just of two, social groups. However, even the weaker attempted to reach a conclusion based on comparison and supported by evidence.

15 "There was more continuity than change in the way the French Church influenced the development of the nation state." How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1498 to 1610?

This question was poorly answered by many candidates. The focus was usually a general one on continuity and change in religion. What candidates found more difficult was to make an effective link to the development of the nation state. Huguenots were too often seen as part of the French church, when the question asked about the French Church, ie the institution responsible for the overseeing the established Catholic faith and uniting the French people under its umbrella. In some good answers, an emphasis on the significance of the Catholic League, as part of the official Church, aided development of argument, making it more convincing.

Many candidates wanted to give a straightforward answer on the development of France as a nation state and concentrated on other factors, the monarchy, for example, with just one paragraph on the church's contribution to its development. None of them included any other factors other than the growth of Protestantism and the wars of religion.

The question sparked some discussion of the rise of Humanism and the spread of Protestantism, but very few wrote about papal relations, doctrine or the condition of the clergy. Some candidates made the error of thinking that the question was about the religious development of France rather than the contribution to it of the French church.

The ascendancy of France 1610-1715

16 How far were French kings absolute monarchs in the period from 1610 to 1715?

Differing approaches to this question could be, and were, attempted with success by candidates. It helped to define absolutism, to set a clear framework for the candidate's answer. The absolutism of the political theorists could be contrasted with the reality of the nature of royal power. Only then could the limitations of that royal power be measured against the extent to which the kings were really "absolute monarchs". Some candidates took the straightforward approach of dealing with the kings in turn. A proportion attempted to deal with the question thematically – nobility, religion, finance, relations with the parlements, control in the localities – but then sometimes failed to do so in a number of ways. Similarly, while absolutism was frequently defined, elements of the definition were not incorporated into the fabric of the answer. Some candidates became side-tracked into discussion of how absolutism was achieved or how the governments encountered and responded to threats to it.

17 Assess which minister contributed most to the development of France's economy in the period from 1610 to 1715.

Any question asking "assess" poses problems for less able candidates. Most knew about Richelieu, Mazarin, le Tellier and, for nearly half the essay, Colbert. Most could describe their works and successes. Moderate candidates tended to do this and to try to put the ideas together and achieve comparison in a lengthy last paragraph. It took a strong candidate with secure knowledge to attempt a successful thematic approach, though some highly effective and well-structured answers emerged. Most argued, some almost by default, that Colbert contributed the most. Many took Richelieu at his own self-deprecating assessment and underestimated his work. Many wrote about mercantilism.

To achieve a fully effective answer to this question, candidates needed to be secure in their focus on treatment of the French economy. For too many this was conflated with comment on and description of fiscal and financial issues, policies and problems.

18 To what extent did fighting wars hinder the development of French power in the period from 1610 to 1715?

This question required to be read carefully, and candidates were too often let down by imprecise interpretation of the question, leading to generalised writing of moderate relevance. For example too many candidates wrote accounts of the development of French foreign policy rather than achieving the sharper focus on how fighting wars 'hindered the development'.

Moreover, few thought about what constituted 'French power' while those who did consider it thought it meant no more than French standing in Europe. This failure to think about terms often led candidates into the blind alley of the effects of war on French society.

Some made an appropriate and effective contrast between the initially cautious policies of Louis XIII and the over-ambitious aims and actions of Louis XIV which left France surrounded by Habsburgs. Effective answers dealt with the problems caused by fighting wars: financial problems, strains on the economy, growing discontent among various groups in society which limited the power of the government and the strength of the country, and the growing antagonism of other countries leading to the coalitions against France which limited her power abroad.

F966/02 Modern 1789-1997

- 1 In this question the better answers were very clear about popular appeal, and German nationalism. There were opportunities for synthesis that were sometimes unexplored. Many students saw the role of anti-French feeling, but failed to connect its strands, such as Napoleon, the Watch on the Rhine, 1870-71 and World War One. Many candidates were dismissive of the period after WW1 and simply said that nationalism ended, rather than seeing its adaptation into a unity of resentment. Many understood the importance of popular appeal and argued that it did not take hold until the latter part of the period. 'Popular appeal' was the key here. Some answers went through a sound, strong chronological survey, with some analysis and explanation but not enough real focus on the term; others were more themed, but political, economic and social themes did not always lend themselves to the necessary development. The best answers did synthesise and compare and contrast levels and forms of popular appeal across the period, looking at the elites, emergent middle classes and peasantry and developing working class. References to regions sometimes helped also. Here, and in the other two Germany questions, some wrestled with the nature and extent of nationalism – often with useful insights. Some tried to assess the extent of nationalism – and so its appeal – narrow, sectional, Prussian, much more across Germany. Weaker candidates were unable to provide a convincing synthesis of developments across the period and many responses consisted of little meaningful comparison. The very best candidates, however, produced essays that were wholly based on synthesis with close focus on the question set and a real sense of critical judgement. Top level answers broke the issues down into a series of themes, culture, different types of nationalism and the like. They then engaged the question via these themes. A good example would be an argument that xenophobia was a constant theme through the period – citing the Napoleonic era, 1870-1 anti-French feeling and either end of the First World War – and was an example of popular appeal. On the other hand where nationalism manifested itself as culture – and there was a wide range of culture, music, literature, art, etc. – it was too high brow to be easily accessible to ordinary Germans.
- 2 This was the least popular of the three questions on German nationalism. Those who attempted this seemed under prepared on Bismarck and preferred to concentrate on the period 1789-1815 and post Bismarck. There was little reference to 1848-9 and the struggle with Austria. Weaker candidates focused on Bismarck's career and little else. All argued that Bismarck's appointment was important and most that it was the most important turning point. Discussion of alternative turning points was generally good with 1888 and 1914 being popular. Turning point questions prove hard for many still, the usual responses being to give chronological lists or else start with the named turning point, then list thereafter. Some candidates did not give Bismarck that much attention; but some gave him and his actions and policies too much space, often to the disadvantage of covering the whole period. Likely alternative turning points were 1789-93 and the impact of the French Revolution, Napoleon's actions, 1834 and the Zollverein, 1848-9, 1888-90 or else 1914. 1870-71 and especially the formation of the German Empire featured rather less prominently. Here, some wanted to rehearse the past question on the management of German nationalism and focused on Metternich, Bismarck and Wilhelm II. The better responses did try to cross-reference and cross-evaluate alternatives, though many did this in a bolt-on fashion or by an extended conclusion. The best did create a genuine sense of argument and counter-argument as to alternatives to 1862, with a proper sense of the extent of change and impact set against the reverse. Weaker scripts tended to list turning points, but some tried to do this by themes and differentiation took place when some judgement was reached. The very best answers again used themes to access the question. For example, leadership was a factor in the course of German nationalism and Bismarck provided radically different leadership that earlier Prussians, or the coronation of

Wilhelm II was the real turning point. In other ways 1862 was not the turning point, for example with regard to economics the establishment of the Zollverein was the really important turning point.

- 3 Some candidates considered unification in terms of politics and socially rather than simple geography, but more was needed on the issue of Klein/Grossdeutschland. There was often a good awareness of examples of unity and disunity, for example the Zollverein was discussed well, as was the rise of the SPD. However, many candidates produced a chronological answer with no regard for the actual question until the conclusion. Some students answered a different question and focused on "How far did levels of unity change?" rather than focusing on a comparison of the two periods. Better candidates adopted a thematic approach, although this was not always seen, and gave more or less equal weight to each half of the period. Again, with this question some wanted to rehearse Metternich, Bismarck and Wilhelm II, struggling to link their pre-packaged ideas to the actual thrust of the question, whereas some contrasted the two time periods but without really close comparative analysis and evaluation. Better answers looked at this issue thematically – political, economic, social – though there was a sense of pre-packaged material being adapted to fit the question. Better or best responses did look at social divisions, class politics, regional and religious differences and occasionally evidence of particularism. Here, as in responses to the other German nationalism questions, some candidates virtually omitted the 1890s to 1914, jumping on to the defeat in 1918 and peace settlement of 1919. This approach omitted some important material and issues. Many weaker responses took the form of two mini-essays that were bolted together in an overall conclusion. The best candidates were able to draw meaningful comparisons across the two halves of the period mentioned in the question. There were some excellent examples of fully integrated synthesis with the best scripts. Again themes were chosen to drive the response and evaluation and evidence was deployed into these themes. A good example would be xenophobia as a theme, the synthesis is that xenophobia was common across the period and united Germans so the question was rejected. Another would be territory, Germany being more united in the latter half of the period.
- 4 This was a popular question and there were some very good answers which considered the failures of generals against external factors. Weaker candidates either just produced lists of successful/unsuccessful generals with varying degrees of detail or even tried to disregard the issue of competency/incompetency and focused on technology as a key factor. There was a tendency for too much focus on Napoleon as a general and some tried to class Bismarck as a military leader. The candidates from one centre seemed determined to turn the question into another consideration of the part played by weapons. A catalogue of bad and/or good generals rarely rose above the mundane. The latter part of the period was overlooked on the whole. This question almost always produced real problems for candidates. Many simply wrote a list of generals evaluating the incompetence, or not, in a chronological order. The problem was always one of producing a structure through which the synthesis elements of the mark scheme could be accessed. This was simply not forthcoming.
- 5 This was the least favoured of the three questions. Knowledge of the Prussian general staff was quite good, but many struggled to find an alternative turning point, deciding instead that the development of railways or weapon technology was a more important issue. In general most who answered this did not seem to understand that it was about planning and control. In the better answers, candidates realised the significance of the Prussian general staff and were able to evaluate its impact on warfare. One candidate really scored highly by using the Prussian general staff to access synthesis, for example arguing they produced changes in weapon technology or utilised said in warfare, or

developed railways as a means of concentrating troops. Candidates were also able to contextualise the Prussian general staff, for example arguing that such an organisation became more vital to the successful conduct of war as warfare became more complicated and massive as the period went on. They were also able to link communications technology to its significance, or not. The turning point prompt was handled very well by candidates.

- 6 This was the most popular of the three questions and allowed many to deploy the full of the relative merits of different firearms or ammunition. However, there were occasions when there was perhaps a failure to relate this detail to the issue in the question. There were some vague references to war changing but no real focus on changing tactics. Many candidates seem obsessed with wanting to discuss the role of generalship etc rather than to focus on the question. Many candidates demonstrated a high level of knowledge, which if coupled with sufficient synthesis skills, would have raised them to the highest levels. Weaker candidates predictably described weapons technology. They also tended to produce a chronological narrative which nodded at the question. A common error was to assume that no development in weapons technology took place until the Crimean War leaving a vacuum at the start of the period which hindered the acquisition of synthesis. The better candidates were able to fully integrate weapons technology into general developments in warfare in a themed manner and these answers scored highly. The links and themes considered being battle tactics, logistics etc. Indeed, better candidates faced a problem controlling the mass of information at their disposal as evidence was used in such a clever manner.
- 7 This question was attempted by a number of candidates. Good synthesis was rare and answers were quite often descriptive rather than an assessment of effectiveness. In most answers a good level of knowledge was demonstrated, especially 1916-1921 though often the events were described rather than linked to the issue in the question. Not too many candidates spent a long time discussing the relative merits of *constitutional nationalism* rather than focusing on the question. However, some candidates seemed determined to bring in large amounts on constitutional nationalism, and compare it to revolutionary nationalism, so straying from the question. Weaker candidates had difficulty separating revolutionary and constitutional nationalism. More able students usually understood the concept of revolutionary nationalism, but only the best candidates were able to establish a meaningful criteria to assess how 'effective' revolutionary nationalism was – many responses simply took 'effective' to mean 'successful'. Coverage across the period wasn't always present, and a number of weaker candidates simply went through the examples of revolutionary nationalism one at a time, with only passing references to connections, similarities and differences. Many accepted that not until the very end of the period was revolutionary nationalism effective. Even better candidates were loathe to identify the aims etc. against which effectiveness could be assessed. Those answers that weren't simply descriptive did very well in this question. These often evaluated revolutionary nationalism against common themes. Most focused on Key Individuals or Groups such as Tone, the Fenians, IRA – with some completely ignoring the middle of the period. When adopting a thematic approach issues such as Leadership, support, methods and actions (set against words) featured in analyses. Some candidates reached good conclusions by comparing Revolutionary Nationalism with Constitutional, and in rare cases, Cultural Nationalism. However, at times, these comparative dimensions took over and candidates rehearsed past questions on such topic areas. Better answers provided a substantiated judgement on the actual question set and that ran throughout their answers.

- 8** There were some good answers with plenty of detail, but the focus of many answers was definitely on the Protestant Ascendancy and the development of Ulster Nationalism so that the events of the 1880s were sometimes ignored with the result that the attitudes of the Catholic and Nationalists were not considered. Many students were able to understand the concepts of change and continuity but quite a few made crucial omissions. Some candidates missed out the whole of Protestant Ireland, whilst others made no allusion to Catholic sentiment. The understanding of turning points, where attitudes might change, was generally good, but some evaluated them in quite generalised terms. The need to focus on 'within Ireland' was ignored by some, who talked in great deal about attitudes at Westminster. Some did link this to Ireland, but many simply seemed to have misread the question. Too many relied on a chronological overview of feelings towards the union rather than focussing on how support changed over time. The position of Ulster was understood and explained by many but some candidates were unaware of the nature of support from Ulster. Many candidates identified common themes by which to evaluate the support, most popularly the Protestant Ascendancy, Ulster and Religious Groups. At times, they were good at identifying different social groups, even regional groups (Ulster was an obvious area). Better candidates identified and explained change within each theme and comparatively, reaching a sound judgement in answer to the question. A lot of candidates found it difficult to range right across the period and spent much of their answers focused on the narrow timeframe of 1916-21. As a result, much of the detail of the change in support amongst Protestants was lost in more simplistic narratives.
- 9** This was the least popular question on Ireland and in many instances was not very well done. A significant number of the scripts discussed the first half of the century very briefly, though they did appreciate that the Famine actually helped agriculture to develop. In many instances knowledge of this was rather thin. The better answers considered it in more developed terms; for example they looked at the impact of the famine on tenants and landowners. They also continued other issues or discussed areas such as Ulster, with its growing industry. On the other hand, weak answers lacked precise examples, and basically said that the famine changed it for the worse, but did not really develop the idea. There were many "before and after" appraisals but too many resorted to focusing on the impact of the Famine rather than on how the economy changed. Of those that did widen their answers, some argued that the Union or the Land acts were more important and most answers made reference to the different economic experiences between Ulster and the south. There was often little reference to events post 1903 and the longer-term consequences were handled less evenly. Better candidates assessed the broad change in direction of the Famine across the whole period and evaluated the importance of the Famine on these changes. Often they had good material on the economy of the South and of the North, the burgeoning industrialisation of the latter and the issues involved. Unfortunately, such answers were rare. In general, very few candidates had anything more than a thin knowledge of the impact of the famine on the Irish economy. Therefore many answers lost focus and responded with more general analyses. Some answers were very good however in assessing levels of continuity.
- 10** The best candidates followed a purely thematic approach which led to the use of much synthesis. Most challenged the statement and were able to identify instances of continuity rather than change. Chronological routes work far less well than thematic since, all too often, comparative analysis was omitted or added as an after-thought. There seemed to be a good depth of knowledge from many, although some seemed rather hazy over Lenin and the reasons for the NEP. The vast majority made a good attempt at this question and were able to come to a supported conclusion. Some candidates seemed to have been coached into an emphasis on synthesis and were able to link the different regimes, but offered very limited factual evidence in support. The key word that candidates needed to focus on was transformed, and this was overlooked by some - who simply discussed change and

continuity and appeared to assume that change was the same as transformed. Quite often candidates wanted to assess whether life was bleak or miserable, as has been asked in previous questions. This is an important message for candidates who want to achieve the high levels: they must focus on the key word or phrase in the question. Better answers were thematic, whereas weaker candidates just went through the rulers one at a time. Some students overlooked Stalin or Stolypin, and many responses neglected the post-Stalin years, whilst others seemed to be desperate to talk about industry and the proletariat. Too many candidates were unable to differentiate between the better off peasants and the rest. Far too many wrote about the kulaks and their fate in the early 1930s without saying when and how this class of peasant came into existence thereby overlooking a key element in the transformation of peasant life in this period. Alexander II and Stalin were seen as having the biggest impact on peasant life. Living and working conditions featured, often well; repression was a major theme; the attitudes of the State and its rulers, exploitation, military demands, fiscal pressures, the nature of state-driven reforms, featured, more unevenly. More could have been made of the better or even good times, the improvements (educational, health, life expectancy, working practices and conditions, even areas of welfare), set against the obviously bad times. Collectivisation still needs to be examined more closely. A few candidates spotted generational issues in all this, with younger peasants more receptive to state-led changes. Much is written about political areas but it is moot point just how much those areas really mattered to most peasants. Overall, many cogent arguments for change or continuity in the condition of the peasantry were put forward – although only a minority really got to grips with the 'transformation' as mentioned in the question. This was a surprise as change and continuity is at the core of the unit and put in such extreme language one would think that the question form would prompt a direct engagement of this aspect of the mark scheme.

- 11 This question was again very popular. The best candidates cross-referenced the Tsars and the commissars and made good use of synthesis. Weaker candidates simply adopted a chronological approach and listed the policies of the rulers. Good candidates outlined what an effective autocrat was, and then produced a thematic study assessing each of these criteria in turn - drawing on the appropriate leaders. However, some struggled with 'effective autocrat' and just considered whether they were effective *leaders* or not. Weaker students just discussed the leaders one at a time, and therefore missed the issue in the question about who was *more* effective. Most agreed with the statement but tended to assess who was most autocratic rather than how effective they were. Once again, as with Question 7, few listed criteria against which effectiveness could be assessed. Those that were weaker tended to offload prepared material or else follow too descriptive a route. The key to a good answer here was close comparison, repression, the use of the secret police, methods and agencies, terror and fear, ideologies, the use of state power, the use of reforms, the nature of support set against how opposition was dealt with, all featured in varying degrees. Some good answers did interrogate the nature of power and the sources of rulers' authority and some assessed performance in wars. However, it was only the best candidates who were able to establish a meaningful criteria to assess how 'effective' leaders were – many responses simply took 'effective' to mean 'successful' autocrats. There were a number of answers which had a narrow focus on repression. Some candidates discussed the economy, but did not make the jump they might of arguing that such and such leader – a good example would be Stalin – was more effective because autocracy allowed a more effective implementation of economic policy
- 12 The best candidates not only distinguished deliberate attempts to modernise as opposed to pragmatism, but failed and successful attempts at modernisation. Most agreed that Stalin was the main one to modernise but few candidates picked up on the reluctance of Alexander III and Nicholas II to modernise at all. As with all responses on this paper, good answers were thematic, they clearly assessed issues such as political or economic

modernisation, and therefore could make sophisticated judgements. For example seeing modernisation in one way, but not in others. This also promoted synthesis - with a number of good candidates seeing connections between Stalin & Alexander III, for example. A number overlooked 'tried to' and just discussed whether they did modernise or not. Most confusion revolved around Lenin, and the Provisional Government was almost universally dismissed. As with previous questions in this section, some candidates just went through the leaders one at a time and effectively listed what they did. Those who did argue usually suggested that Alexander II and the communists made significant changes, whereas Alexander III and Nicholas II were the most reactionary. A pleasing number of answers looked at social changes that are often overlooked such as education, divorce, abortion and healthcare. Some looked at the question as one about motives and at the desire or need to modernise set against other factors such as ideological imperatives, personal survival, genuineness in reforms, military needs (etc). Others assessed degrees of modernisation, outcomes set against aims. Often the two overlapped. 'Catching up with the West' and 'war as the locomotive of change' featured quite often. Economic areas were usually covered, often thoroughly, though with some imbalance between agriculture and industry (often reflecting, of course, rulers' priorities). Political areas were discussed, with better responses noting the divergence between economic modernisation and political non-modernisation. Knowledge regarding modernisation was generally good with most candidates being able to draw examples from right across the period.

- 13** This was a very popular question which inevitably attracted a wide range of responses. Many students realised the need to compare the role of men like Martin Luther King to those of the presidents and the Supreme Court. However, weaker candidates spent far too much time describing the careers of various civil rights leaders. Good answers here discussed a range of factors and compared the other factors back to the one in the question. There were many who did not do any real comparison until the conclusion, whilst some only discussed one leader - Martin Luther King. A number ignored 'advancement of civil rights' or 'quality of leadership' and just discussed what they did, not with any relation to civil rights. Some students were too one-sided, discussing leaders and very little else, whilst others lacked convincing alternative factors, relying on assertion. An example was the discussion of the 'economic climate' as an alternative factor - with the evidence that more African Americans worked in the war being simply used to argue for advancement of civil rights - precise evidence was lacking, and even potentially relevant issues such as the role of Randolph's influence on Roosevelt were omitted. Martin Luther King featured prominently, of course, and his contribution was generally well explained but comparisons with other AA leaders were often very superficial. Weaker candidates relied heavily on a purely chronological approach with few if any synoptic links. Those mentioned rarely included A Philip Randolph whose contribution in World War Two is grossly underplayed. Other factors were considered by most candidates but weaker answers showed a lack of understanding of the roles and functions of government. Not enough was made of the role of the media. Leadership was dealt with, at times by simply listing leaders, either within a long paragraph or separately. 'Quality' usually meant coverage of the means and methods, personal characters and some sense of impact. Better responses did pick up on strengths and weaknesses, not least of such as Booker T Washington, Marcus Garvey and, of course, Martin Luther King. However, most answers stopped around 1968. Occasionally, the attitudes at States' level were explored. Attempts to do this question by themes were prevalent and that was welcome but too often there was not enough real comparison or else a lack of genuine cross-evaluation of roles. Many left such to the conclusion and therefore limited the level they could reach. The media, changing opinions amongst white middle classes in the North, economic and social changes, the effects of Wars (including the Cold War) were often cited, if unevenly as well as the more common themes. However, many weaker responses fell into a chronological run through of the various African American campaigners and a few Presidents without engaging with the detail of the question. The best candidates set up a criteria for what 'quality of leadership' meant and

compared campaigners accordingly (and in the context of the time that they campaigned) along with an assessment of Federal government. A lot of candidates slightly misinterpreted 'campaigners' as leaders and as a result missed an opportunity of broadening the base of the response.

- 14** This was the least popular of the three questions in this section and generally the weakest. There was some discussion of the 19th Amendment, followed by reference to World War Two and then Roe vs Wade as the main turning points. However, there were few candidates who adopted a thematic approach and compared the events as turning points by themes, yet this is essential if the higher levels are to be achieved. However, most students understood the limitations of gaining the vote and almost all said that women often voted like their husbands. Most candidates could also offer viable alternatives, such as Roe Vs Wade or the war, but they often took the form of a list of alternative turning points and there was little comparison back to 1920 - the issue in the question. Most candidates argued that gaining the vote was important but few saw it as the most important turning point. Some questioned the significance of the 19th amendment from the point of view that considerable progress had already been made before 1920. In other answers, turning points tended to be rather broad periods of time eg World War Two, the 1960s and because of this many found it very difficult to make meaningful links across time. A significant number of responses had nothing to say after Roe v Wade. At times, 1920 was not explored that much, either as to context or outcome and instead candidates focused on alternatives which included: the Wars, above all Second; the 1960s and 1970s, including the Equal Pay Act and Civil Rights Act, rise of New Feminism and the Roe v Wade case of 1973. Little was seen much before c.1900 and answers tended to fall away after the mid-1970s. Responses varied between much description, more analytical approaches, broad and general statements. There is a danger here for the candidate who does know a very great deal simply to unload that knowledge without selecting key parts to illustrate their argument and counter-argument. Most candidates were able to identify alternative turning points but only the best drew meaningful comparisons between them.
- 15** Many candidates lacked sufficient detailed knowledge to put forward a convincing argument that ranged across the whole period and some simply produced detailed accounts of the Plains Wars – there was a tendency even amongst those with better knowledge to simply describe how the Whitemen mistreated the Native Americans. However, the very best discussed the attempts of the New Deal and Nixon's Affirmative Action to improve the lot of the Native Americans and even pointed out how the attitudes of the Native Americans towards the issue of civil rights made life difficult for the government. Good candidates were clear about what civil rights were, and used this to judge the government's attitude. However, too many simply reverted to discussing the policies of the government in turn, with little synthesis. Most saw that there was change and continuity, and some candidates explained that Native Americans may not have wanted the 'civil rights' they were given- showing some perception. The later period was sometimes overlooked, but more often was discussed exhaustively - knowledge of court cases from the 1970s being either a specialism or non-existent for some. Some students omitted areas such as the Dawes Act, Meriam Report and John Collier. Such omissions automatically weakened the validity of the judgments made. Most candidates argued that until the 1930s the Federal government was a hindrance. Some very knowledgeable answers, with much sound knowledge, were seen, though the knowledge often needed better application. However, there were also a number of general answers, with understanding but much generalisation and occasional reference points to hard detail or examples. Many candidates wanted to address the help or hinder attitude, the role and actions of the Federal government and this did result in some answers losing sharp question focus. Some wrote about the changing context factors, this was often useful but was not closely related enough to the question. There were also some responses which

focused on the divisions and weaknesses amongst Native Americans, which again was not what the question required. Better answers considered the attitudes of Presidents, Congress and the Supreme Court (often with many good examples of rulings). The best answers made contrasts across time and did assess key areas such as military actions, lands, reservations, culture, assimilation, termination, educational and employment opportunities. Key reference points included: 1887; 1924 and 1934; the New Deal era; the two Wars; the changes of the 1960s and 1970s (some effective material on the Nixon Presidency, for instance). Attitudinal essays did well since they linked the Federal, the contextual and the extent of shifts and changes in perceptions and negative or positive actions. Many responses were able to meaningfully analyse the difference in 'rights' as seen by Federal government and Native Americans. The very best essays also engaged the concept of civil rights head on.

- 16** There were very few answers to this question. Candidates who responded quite well to this question, usually managed to define mass democracy before discussing the significance of the 1910s-1920s. The issue of female suffrage was discussed by most candidates, though age and ethnicity (related to the debates and legislation of the 1960s and 70s) tended to be neglected.
- 17** Most candidates tended to struggle with this question, both in terms of synoptic assessment/analysis, and topic knowledge. Most responses concentrated on the role of news papers and printed media, neglecting the critical role of television and radio. Where the latter were mentioned, it was generally inadequately discussed, with no consideration of the democratic significance of, for example, the BBC and, later in the period, Channel 4. A significant number wrote about the influence of the media on politics, rather than democracy and again it is vital that candidates are aware of the need to focus on the key words and phrases in the question.

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 2011

