

History A

Advanced GCE **A2 H506**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H106**

OCR Report to Centres

January 2012

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, 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 2012

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)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
Overview	1
F961–2 General Comments	2
F961/01 British History Period Studies – Medieval and Early Modern	4
F961/02 British History Period Studies	9
F962/01	13
F962/02 European and World History Period Studies – Modern	17
F963 and F964 AS History Enquiries	22
F965 Historical Interpretations and Investigations	29
F966 Historical Themes	33
F966/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1066–1715	35
F966/02 Modern 1789–1997	39

Overview

If there is a common theme that runs through these AS and A2 Principle Examiner reports it is that candidates need to focus on answering the question set rather than writing about the topic in question. Broadly speaking, the AS Period Studies, A2 Themes and Investigation questions require candidates to make good use of their knowledge and not simply use their knowledge to assert events. They also need to construct an argument that is coherent and relevant, and to reach a judgement that is at one with the argument. Thus how knowledge is applied is critical to achieving a good result. The AS Enquiry and A2 Interpretation questions expect candidates to focus on the key elements of the question, to read the sources carefully and to integrate an evaluation into their answer. Effective source evaluation therefore generates the highest marks, and formulaic responses should be avoided at all costs.

Since the profile of candidates for the AS and A2 exam papers is quite different, it is hardly surprising that the outcome of each set of Units this session has been very varied. Only a minority of AS candidates use the January session as a repeat exercise and the total number of entries was around 25% of the total cohort. Thus the majority of entrants were sitting the papers for the first time. Some of these new candidates were very able, well prepared and achieved very high marks. On the other hand, in six out of eight units candidates produced weaker performances than the corresponding mean mark in January 2011. The majority of A2 candidates were repeating the paper and came from single entry Centres. The Coursework entry was down on last January whereas the Themes entry showed a slight increase. As a result, although there were some outstanding performances, the standard overall at A2 was not as strong as in previous sessions.

The quality of English across the four Units was generally sound but the use of text language has made an unwelcome appearance. Informal language and slang are inappropriate in an examination. The use of abbreviations remains an issue at A2 rather than at AS but handwriting was still a problem in several AS and A2 exam answers. Centres are reminded that they can help their candidates by informing OCR of any handwriting issues and make the necessary arrangements for a word-processed entry or a scribe to produce legible scripts on behalf of their candidates.

F961–2 General Comments

The overall quality of scripts seen by examiners varied considerably. The best answers had strong, persistent question focus and argued well, using knowledge to support the arguments pursued. Where appropriate, counter-arguments were advanced and there was cross-evaluation of factors leading to a judgement about relative importance. However, there were also a significant number of very weak answers, where the candidates failed to grasp the demands of the question and even appeared either confused about the topic or displayed only vague or generalised knowledge, which placed them in Level VI. It was noticeable that most candidates did at least try and pursue an argument, even if some of the arguments are rather weak. A direct consequence of the increased attempt to address the question has also meant the continued decline in the descriptive answer and the awarding of Level IV for AO1b. However, some candidates do need to ensure that the level of knowledge used to support their arguments is developed if they want to convince the examiner that they have a sound understanding of the issue in the question.

During the present round of INSETs we have placed a great deal of emphasis on the importance of candidates establishing a thesis about the issue in question in their first paragraph and avoiding lengthy introductions that simply set the scene or place the events in a broad context. We have been using the phrase the ‘vital opening paragraph’ rather than introduction and it is a line that Centres might pursue with some benefit. Examiners do want to know what the candidates think about the issue in the question and students should be encouraged to flag their view up at the start; it might be worth reminding them that it is not a mystery tour or detective story where the answer will suddenly emerge at the end. Candidates should be encouraged to pursue an argument throughout, with a series of interim judgements that leads to an overall judgement that follows logically from what has come earlier. Candidates should be discouraged from introducing a new idea in their conclusion, if the idea is that important it should have been considered in the main body of the essay. Where candidates are unable to reach a series of interim judgements before their overall conclusion they should be encouraged to write a lengthy final paragraph that reaches an overall judgement as this can lift them at least one band in AO1b.

The depth of knowledge displayed was very variable, but Centres should also be aware of the wording in the mark scheme for AO1a. The criteria require candidates to ‘use’ their knowledge and not simply put down everything that they know. The knowledge must be being used to support the argument if it is to be given high level credit, simply showing that you know a lot will not access the higher levels unless it is there for a purpose. Candidates would be well advised to ask themselves two simple questions: *Why am I telling the examiner this? How does it add to or support my argument?*

Although many showed a grasp of the demands of the paper there were still a good number of candidates who were less secure in these key skills: they opted for bolt-on judgements; they offered weak conclusions; they generalised; they listed. It was noticeable that many of the list type responses did not simply list the events and analyse them, but produced a list of all the factors in favour of an argument and then a list of all the factors against the argument. The major problem with this approach is that some factors appeared in both columns and the examiner was left with no indication of which point of view the factor supported. Candidates would be better advised to take a factor and consider both sides of the argument in the same paragraph and then reach a judgement about the factor in relation to the question set. Some candidates do need to be reminded of the Board’s advice on question stems and key command words. Previous reports have explained what is required for each type of command and the ceilings that apply if candidates ignore the named factor or deal only with the named factor. Candidates do need to write a good paragraph about the named factor, even if they conclude it was not the most important. It is also important that they do not simply discuss the named factor; they do

need to consider a range, even if that does not mean all the possible factors. As general guidance they must ensure that they cover the important factors; for example an answer on the rise to power of Hitler would seem a little strange if it ignored the Depression. However, examiners have been told that they cannot expect coverage of everything in 45 minutes and that it is the quality of analysis and judgement that is important. Inevitably, some responses are better than others at establishing links between factors and where possible candidates should be encouraged to show this as it is another way to access the higher levels.

As has already been mentioned, few offered just descriptions and lower marks were more often the result of not responding to the question or simply insufficient knowledge rather than trying to respond to an analytical question with a narrative answer. Questions which asked 'How far?' or 'How successful?' and sought some judgement about a view were often answered better than questions which required evaluation of factors or reasons or consequences, perhaps because the wording encourages candidates to reach a judgement. Thus, in the very popular Russia section on F962/2, Question 13 was better done than Question 14. It remains very difficult for many to go beyond explaining factors or offering assertions about 'the main reason'. Attempts to rank reasons sometimes end up with every factor being the main one or the candidate beginning to argue that one factor was the most important only to end up with another one, suggesting that relative importance is not something that has been carefully considered when preparing for the paper. Knowledge varied quite considerably and there were some 'gaps', particularly the events of February 1917 and the geography of Eastern Europe. Repeating answers done to related, but essentially different, questions continued to be a problem, especially in Questions 25 and 24 on F962/2.

Timing was not a problem for many and there were very few scripts where candidates attempted only one question or produced seriously imbalanced responses in terms of length. However, some did write out over-long essay plans, and this limited the time available to write the actual answer for which marks are awarded.

Handwriting was better in most instances, but where Centres do have candidates whose handwriting is poor it would be advantageous to the candidate if the Centre applied for the use of a word processor or scribe. The use of specialist terms did present some problems – the use of 'demographic' for 'democratic' gave one candidate's answer on Napoleon a strange feel. Military terminology remains weaker than economic terminology and understanding. Topics after 1945 should be studied with the same level of factual support as earlier topics.

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

- 1 Most answers focused almost exclusively on the role of the Godwin family, who were seen as a destabilising influence, ignoring the instability that followed the death of Cnut. However, the better answers examined the crisis of 1051–2 and the succession crisis at the end of Edward's reign. Unfortunately, many answers were descriptive and looked at the reign of Edward the Confessor without any awareness of the earlier reigns of Harefoot and Harthacnute, which might have been effectively considered in terms of stability. It was often assumed that Edward was the stabilising factor simply by virtue of being the king and there was little consideration of the validity of such a view and whether his qualities did help to bring stability to the period.
- 2 This question drew two types of response; some candidates described the reasons for the succession crisis, with perhaps an occasional attempt at evaluative comment, and those that offered the sort of sharply focused assessment that the question required. However, whatever approach was adopted, all candidates blamed Edward for the succession crisis because he had not made clear who his heir was. There was some awareness of the possibility that Edward chose not to have children with Edith as a riposte to the power of the Godwins, but most simply felt that Edward allowed matters to drift because he was indecisive. There was awareness of the claims of William of Normandy and of Harold Godwinson, and some knowledge of the Norwegian claim, but Edward's lack of clarity was the favoured explanation.
- 3 This question attracted a variety of responses; some answered it quite well and showed a proper understanding of elements of continuity and change during the two reigns. Most answers offered some sort of argument rather than mere description; the best were thorough and analytical. However, some candidates showed few signs of being aware of writs and there were only brief mentions of sheriffs, with little analytical development. Castles, soldiers and Domesday Book were the main focus of most responses – with some seeing the question as meaning '*How did William establish himself as ruler of an unpopular minority regime?*' rather than looking at the nature of government.
- 4 The quality of responses was very varied. Many candidates struggled to link their knowledge to the actual question set and focused on how order was restored, rather than whether Edward was successful. Many candidates who considered the issues of both finance and foreign policy were unable to link the policies to the idea of success, although some did comment that strong finances enabled him to be more powerful, but this needed to be developed, whilst some commented that foreign policy, particularly the war in France, occupied the nobility and therefore prevented disorder at home. Those who did pursue an argument often took the line that his first reign was unsuccessful in restoring order, but his second was more successful. There was some consideration of Warwick, Clarence and the impact of Edward's marriage on his ability to maintain order.
- 5 The question produced a range of responses, with the higher level responses able to reach a judgement on both 'able' and 'unlucky', whilst some candidates ignored one of the elements, often the first. Some candidates struggled to support their argument that Richard was able and often used material from his brother's reign and claimed therefore that he would be an able monarch. However, some were able to discuss his progress, benevolences, and the meeting of parliament as evidence that he was able, but balanced this against his inability to manage patronage with his reliance on northern nobility. The question of 'unlucky' was handled much better and many were able to write about Bosworth and the support for Henry Tudor as well as the question of the Princes in the Tower.

- 6** As with the other questions in this section, this produced a wide range of responses. There were a significant number of candidates who wrote generally about Henry's management of the nobility and did not give specific evidence of the Yorkist problem. Many answers did consider the problem of Simnel and Warbeck, but in some instances they were confused and failed to analyse the threat posed at Stoke or the impact on Henry's foreign policy. Knowledge of the threat from the de la Pole's was variable, but, where it was understood, enabled candidates to look at the threat into the 1500s. Better answers were able to consider the reign as a whole and argued that Henry was able to ensure the peaceful succession to his son; these answers also considered issues such as the dating of his reign and his marriage.
- 7** Although this was a popular question, the quality of responses was very variable. There were a considerable number of candidates whose knowledge was limited and the number of issues discussed was very narrow. A significant number of candidates had very superficial knowledge of the legal reforms, whilst the issue of taxation was sometimes confused and social reforms often ignored. The question of the divorce might have been given some significant coverage as it did bring about his downfall. The better answers often established Wolsey's aims in the introduction and then related the material back to his aims, often focusing on the need to please the king, hence the importance of taxation and the divorce and therefore concluding that at the start of the period Wolsey was successful, but became less successful in the later period.
- 8** This question was answered well in many instances. Most candidates had a clear understanding of the events of 1540–7 and were often able to link them back to Henry's aims. As in the previous question, many of the better answers established his aims in the opening paragraph and then compared events to his aims. Many argued that in Scotland there was initial success, but it was only superficial as he was unable to secure the marriage of Edward to Mary, whilst in France, although he achieved military glory, the cost and benefits made the conquest almost meaningless. Candidates might have suggested that, when compared to the other monarchs of the period, Francis and Charles, Henry was the only one to make territorial gains in the period and therefore his prestige increased.
- 9** Questions on Mary's government have often been a challenge for candidates, but this question did result in some more encouraging answers. Candidates were often able to identify the problems the government faced; whilst weaker answers described the problems, the stronger answers were able to assess the government's success in dealing with them. Candidates were often able to consider a range of problems, including marital, social and economic, foreign policy and unrest. There was also discussion of religion, which although not on the Specification was credited, although those who ignored it were not penalised. There was some confusion over her management of the economy, particularly over debasement, but many argued that she was unlucky as many of the social and economic problems were out of her control. Many argued that her foreign policy was not a success, but did not really assess the French threat and the need to neutralise it after the aid given to rebels at Scarborough.
- 10** There was a good spread of answers – the question enabled strong candidates to demonstrate their evaluative skills. Some used historiography successfully, though the top levels were attained without it. At a high level there was a sense of the strength of the church but also of the growth of challenge, while weaker candidates struggled – some conflating the attacks and views of Fish and Colet, for example. Some were simplistic in criticising pluralism – abuse tout court – rather than being aware of the problems of the structure of the church. Weaker answers also concentrated on outlining the problems of the church, often confining their response to the question to little more than assertions that things were 'serious' or 'not very serious' (because people left money in their Wills to the Church). The best answers offered a critical review of the evidence from Episcopal

Visitation and church court records as well as the testimony of men like Fish and Colet to evaluate the seriousness of the problems, stressing the vitality of late medieval Catholicism to demonstrate that the English people did not either hate their priests or their church.

- 11** The common theme of many of these answers was that Henry put down all opposition to his religious changes so he must have been very effective. Many answers focused almost entirely on the Pilgrimage of Grace, often in a descriptive way, and sometimes with accurate historical and geographical knowledge. Henry's trickery in dealing with Aske and others was mentioned as a sign of effectiveness – people were too scared of ending up like Aske to oppose the king's wishes. Little was apparently known about other opposition to Henry's religious changes apart from Thomas More and the Maid of Kent – again, often descriptive rather than analytical. However, there were a number of sophisticated responses that successfully assessed the effectiveness of a wide-range of government initiatives including the Treason Acts, use of the printing press, and Thomas Cromwell's 'reign of terror' – the punishment of opponents, the use of informers, the maintaining and enforcement of a religious revolution.
- 12** The candidates seemed to find this a difficult question. There was frequently considerable irrelevance either in terms of timescale and failure to focus on 1559, or lapse into description. Very few wrote convincingly about the degree of support in parliament, and even fewer discriminated between the Lords and Commons. However, many of those who answered the question actually set did so effectively, reviewing both opposition and support for the Settlement within and outside parliament. There should not have been any difficulty in the time period relevant to this question: it should be clear to candidates that they need to focus on 1559, which may mean going back a little into Mary's reign and perhaps forward a little into the early 1560s, but they do not need a long survey of Edward VI's reign or the later Elizabethan period.
- 13** As with the question on Mary, there were a significant number of candidates who described the problems that Elizabeth faced and did not address the issue of her success in dealing with them. There were also a number of candidates who went well beyond the dates in the question, some producing surveys of the whole reign, and they did not receive credit for the material. The most common feature was spending too long describing the problems and not enough time assessing whether Elizabeth was successful in dealing with it. Most candidates were aware of the range of difficulties she faced and were able to consider a range of issues, usually including foreign policy, religion, finance, government, and marriage and the succession. In places, some of the knowledge was quite generalised, particularly over foreign policy and religion. In dealing with foreign policy, knowledge of the peace with France was often lacking and details of the religious settlement were also absent when discussing the success of her religious policy.
- 14** Questions on Elizabethan government have often produced weak answers, but this session saw many solid responses and some excellent answers. Most candidates avoided simply describing the historical debate and those who referred to historians were often able to use them to support their argument. It was encouraging to see that many candidates were aware that Parliament included the House of Lords as well as the House of Commons. The better answers focused on role and influence and considered a range of issues, however there were still a significant number who ignored Elizabeth's right to prorogue or dissolve the house and therefore limit its role and influence. Many candidates displayed a very thorough knowledge of issues such as Monopolies, the execution of Mary Queen of Scots and the question of marriage and the succession. These events were often used to help construct an analytical answer, with many suggesting that its role and influence did not increase as it was summoned only when Elizabeth needed supplies and that she was usually able to get her way through a number of management techniques.

- 15** This should have been a straightforward question, but a number of candidates wanted to describe the problems or drift into a general comment about the social and economic conditions prevalent in England with no link to the financial problems of Elizabeth. There were often lengthy descriptions of the population rise, poor laws and inflation without sufficient link to how they caused financial problems. The question also required candidates to evaluate the relative importance of the causes of her problems, but many answers did not go beyond a description and limited themselves to Level IV.
- 16** It was very pleasing to see the number of very strong answers to this question, with candidates able to place the Spanish marriage in its wider context, but still remain focused on the actual question set. However, a handful of candidates tried unsuccessfully to turn it into a general question about tensions between Crown and Parliament. Most candidates were aware of the Protestant nature of Parliament and the horror of MPs at the prospect of the heir to the throne marrying a Catholic. Most candidates were aware of the terms of the proposed marriage contract. The Gunpowder Plot was often mentioned, although some candidates had a shaky grasp of chronology and gave the impression that they believed the Plot, the arrival of Gondomar, the Commons' Protestation and the visit to Madrid were all within a short period of time. Few gave credit to James for a genuine attempt to sustain peace – *rex pacificus* was generally dismissed as unrealistic both before and after the Bohemian revolt. The few candidates who seemed aware that James had attempted to dissuade Frederick from Bohemia attributed this to his weakness over the Spanish Match. Few candidates considered the view that in 1621 the Commons were seeking to encroach on the royal prerogative: most seemed to accept without question that Parliament in the early seventeenth century had the same powers as now. Better answers were able to show how the sudden dissolution of the 1621 parliament was because the Commons had criticised the king's preference for negotiations with Spain to assist the Palatinate rather than the armed intervention favoured by patriots in the Commons, demanding that his son should marry a Protestant; this caused James to threaten punishment for those who meddled in matters of state, provoking the Commons to draw up their Protestation.
- 17** Most candidates agreed with the proposition in the question on the grounds that since Charles had to summon Parliament in 1640 he had clearly failed to establish a form of government which could last on its own. A number of better answers argued that Charles was successful until about 1637/38 in terms of new forms of finance and the lack of opposition to Laudian reforms of the Church. The best answers argued convincingly with clear factual support that Charles was superficially successful but that his methods over Dstraint of Knighthood, Forest Fines and Ship Money were simply provoking resentment that would erupt in 1640. Most candidates identified the attempted religious innovations in Scotland as the turning point, although others made a case for the judgement in the Hampden Case. The Bishops Wars were usually described in a simple way, but there was some confusion between the Truce of Berwick and the Treaty of Ripon, although most knew about £850 per day. A few candidates mentioned Bastwick, Burton and Prynne and commented on the nature of the punishments but few commented that such punishments were generally used on common criminals but not on gentlemen – thus Charles and Laud were offending their core support even more.
- 18** There were very few good answers to this question, possibly because candidates lacked the detailed knowledge needed to understand why war broke out and why parliament was unable to prevent it. A handful of candidates emphasised that a war was impossible only for so long as the king lacked the support necessary to fight it. From this premise they evaluated some of the reasons why two sides emerged between 1640–42 to make war possible, using this to explain why the Long Parliament was unable to prevent the outbreak. However, some answers to this question were little more than general surveys of the causes of the Civil War, although it is a good development that few adopted the tactics which were seen frequently a few years ago of extending the question backward to the start of the reign of Charles I, or even James I. A few candidates did refer back to the

Personal Rule to argue that fundamentally the Long Parliament was unable to deal with an untrustworthy monarch. A number of answers made a good case for Pym as a major cause of the outbreak of conflict since he drove on radical measures which alienated more moderate MPs. There is a huge amount of material for candidates to consider in this question, and several seemed somewhat overwhelmed by the sheer quantity of facts: the most convincing answers took key events and built a case around them, showing some clear factual knowledge and analysis of relative importance. It is not necessary to list all of the Grand Remonstrance, but it is important to demonstrate an awareness that it covered religion, law and administration and that it portrayed Charles I as both weak and unreliable. The best answers explored the issues rather than simply giving a narrative of events leading up to the raising of the Royal Standard at Nottingham.

F961/02 British History Period Studies

- 1 This continues to be a very popular topic and therefore attracts a very wide range of responses. Candidates handled the question well in many cases, though some became too descriptive and some did confuse events under Liverpool with Pitt's period in office. Some found the idea of the French Revolution rather challenging but most could get across points about radicalism in its English context. There were very few candidates who were able to assess the nature, extent or appeal, of radicalism, or in a number of cases the answers became generalised with only a few displaying detailed knowledge of events. Pitt's reactions were understood and detail was often sound about the measures, legislation and methods. However, few candidates mentioned the war with France. A few mentioned the importance of patriotism, the appeal to loyalty to the Crown and the role of the Crown itself, although a fair number had useful material on forms of government propaganda used.
- 2 As with the previous question, this was a popular topic and produced some good, occasionally very good, answers. However, there were some candidates who confused the period under consideration and wrote exclusively about the repressive measures used by Liverpool's government in the earlier period of the administration. Many of the better answers started by defining 'liberal' and put it into context and then used this as their criteria against which to judge the measures. Some described measures but many assessed their nature and impact, with moves towards areas of freer trade, domestic reforms (gaols especially) and Catholic Emancipation being prominent. Many were able to weigh up the arguments for and against the measures being liberal and reach some judgement on each of the various groups of reform. There were very few responses that considered the issue of political reform, which would have allowed another angle to be taken.
- 3 This was the least popular of the questions in this section and also caused the greatest difficulties. Although some candidates did have a good knowledge of the fiscal reforms and did engage with budgets, fiscalism, prudent spending, cost-effectiveness; some tended to ignore these rather too much. However, the problem for many was assessing their achievement as they were unable to establish a set of criteria against which to make a judgement. Often too much time was spent on social reforms (none of which were of Peel's own making). Ireland and especially Maynooth featured quite extensively, but in some instances knowledge was rather superficial and conclusions drawn about the success, or otherwise, of the measures was limited. The Corn Laws featured also; some used the material well, some simply diverted into issues of Repeal and the effects on the party, so unbalancing their answers. A few did pick up on contextual areas: the burgeoning economy, railways and Chartism's potential threat, and discussed how far any of his measures were able to address the problems created by these issues.
- 4 This was a popular question and most handled it well, some very well. There was some description of policies and actions but usually knowledge was used to illustrate arguments. Many defined Gladstonian liberalism in the opening paragraph and used this as the criteria against which to assess whether the measures were liberal. Some answers dwelt too much on foreign policy areas at the expense of domestic. Some made links to electoral appeal and support. Ireland often featured; so, too, Army and Civil Services reforms, the Secret Ballot, Licensing were prominent. Some candidates were a little too selective; better ones had range of illustrations and they argued for and against the proposition.
- 5 Some very good answers were read displaying a strong understanding of issues, context and range. Imperial and foreign policies were handled well, with links to the 1872 speeches, but most also went into great detail about Suez, Queen Victoria as Empress of India and events in Afghanistan and South Africa. There were a number who wrote in great

detail about the Eastern Question, particularly the Congress of Berlin, without any link to the idea of Empire, and this did not score well. Weaker answers often confused foreign and Imperial policy. Many candidates balanced the emphasis on Imperial against issues such as Tory Democracy; domestic reforms, above all social. Occasionally, answers veered into reasons why Disraeli lost the 1880 election and a few answers tended to write rather more about the successes of the 1874–80 administration than about the actual thrust of the question.

- 6** This was the least popular of the questions in this section and there were many who displayed very little knowledge about the actual topic. Some wrote about the First Ministry or tried to pass off their knowledge there for the Second and Third. When candidates did focus on the correct ministry many described aspects of the policies; fewer contextualised or assessed effectiveness and success levels. Surprisingly, Home Rule was omitted by some, and even where it was covered knowledge was often superficial and Land issues often featured less than expected. The tie-up with Mainland politics was appreciated by some, above all for Home Rule. Better answers linked measures to aims and Gladstone's desire to 'pacify Ireland' and also saw the combination of concession and coercion. Some interesting points were made about Gladstone's relations with Parnell.
- 7** This was a popular question but many answers focused almost exclusively on the period from 1856 to around 1878 with impressive knowledge of the later 1870s or the consequences of the Crimean War, but there was a tendency to describe too much. There were very few answers that had real range up to 1902. Trade, strategic needs, the collapsing Ottoman Empire, fears of Russian intentions linked to the legacy of the Crimean War, all were adduced as reasons; less was made of the balance of power *per se*. Better answers were able to establish links between some of the factors and this helped them to reach the higher levels.
- 8** This was the least popular question in the section. A significant number of candidates still displayed some confusion over the differences between Alliances and Ententes, with many making too many claims that the 1904 and 1907 Ententes were Alliances (something found also in answers to Q. 9). Some were able to delineate the context and reasons for the shift to an alliance with Japan in 1902, but many also ignored this or did not appreciate the details and implications of the agreement. However, most could say something about 1904 and France, though less about 1907 and Russia. Anglo-German relations featured, often at the expense of other issues, suggesting that was the topic that many candidates had hoped would be covered. Some answers were quite strong on imperial and strategic-commercial factors, which were used to set events in a wider context.
- 9** The balance of power was understood by some and contextualised well enough but a significant number of answers were thin or vague on the named factor. Many answers were dominated by a consideration of Anglo-German relations, with particular focus on naval and imperial rivalries, but less on economic issues. Many had a clear knowledge of the various crises in Europe during the early twentieth century and most wrote intelligently about the importance of the invasion of Belgium. There were some answers that considered the domestic context even if they concluded that it was less important in the final decision. There were some overtly descriptive routes; but some were able to analyse and assess. The importance of factors and their cross-evaluation were less appreciated in weaker answers.
- 10** This was done well or very well by a significant number of candidates, an issue sometimes being the amount of space devoted to the named factor of Chanak. Some candidates made useful links to Lloyd George's foreign policy as a whole. The link to the Carlton Club meeting and Conservative fears over Lloyd George was understood by some and sensible points were made about growing backbench disenchantment. Some picked up on renewed Tory confidence to act alone, particularly in light of the Newport by-election result. A good

number saw Lloyd George as the ‘man without a party’. The issue of Lloyd George’s political style and the scandals was either ignored or attracted detailed coverage, particularly in weaker answers where it often dominated. Domestic failures, Ireland, and industrial unrest did feature but were often not linked enough to the thrust of the question and simply used to assert that therefore he lost support. Some spent too much time on the ‘wrecker of parties’ idea, citing pre-1918 evidence or saying too much about the effects on the Liberals.

- 11 Many candidates struggled with this question and did not get the focus of the question correct or simply did not know enough about the specific events and reasons. At the higher levels candidates produced sound analyses of key reasons, linking background problems to immediate events in 1931 and the roles of the King and Baldwin as well as MacDonald’s own position. However, too many used this to write about the Second Labour Government’s record or – a minority – about what the National Government did to address the economic and financial crisis. In such cases, relevance was a serious problem.
- 12 This drew some sound responses with candidates seeking to balance the named factor against other factors. Some spent too much time on Churchill as war leader with not enough said about the 1945 election. The effects of coalition government on the Conservatives and Labour were understood by some. Many were able to write quite clearly about Labour’s revival and domestic focus; reorganisation and electoral appeal did figure (less was said about Conservative problems in those areas). The Beveridge Report was usually cited but more could have been said about the mindset of many, including middle classes, seeking real change as the war ended. Some were able to place Conservative defeat in a wider context and pointed to their association with Chamberlain and the problems of the 1930s, but surprisingly very few commented on some of Churchill’s comments about the Labour party.
- 13 Candidates often struggled with this question; many were unable to compare the foreign policies of the two parties. As a result a significant number were reduced to describing in a chronological framework the policies followed by the parties and so failed to cover the latter part of the period in anything more than superficial depth. Where there was some analysis many saw the similarities, but others suggested that different circumstances were the main factor for the differences in policy.
- 14 Although many candidates displayed a very good knowledge of the topic and events there were a significant number who found it much harder to mould their material to the precise demands of the question. Some focused too much on the issue of decolonisation rather than Europe and even fewer were able to focus on the concept of ‘change’ as the question required. There was also a tendency for candidates to give less coverage to the period after 1962 when there was a necessity to give coverage to the reasons for Britain joining the EEC in 1973. Many answers spent too long on the earlier period and gave undue attention to Suez, the desire to maintain great power status and the changing special relationship between Britain and America.
- 15 This was a popular question and better answers clearly identified Thatcher’s aims in their opening paragraph before linking the rest of their material back to the aims. However, many ignored her aims and simply considered whether her policy was successful, often with little more than a bolt-on comment at the end of the paragraph. Many considered the issue of the Falklands and argued it was a success as it allowed Thatcher to restore pride and demonstrate that Britain was a major power, but very few suggested that the actual Argentinian invasion could be seen as a failure of British policy. Most were able to write about relations with the EU and suggested that although the rebate was a success, the long term impact on relations meant that it should be seen as a failure. There was a great deal of focus on relations with the USA and issues such as the bombing of Libya and Grenada. Candidates did discuss the question of the Cold War, but found it much harder to make judgements about Thatcher’s success there.

- 16** Some responses eschewed the named factor too much and some were either simply descriptive or too wedded to why the Conservatives lost power. Many answers would have benefited from a closer link between the economic prosperity and election results. In some answers the economic position was explained very clearly, but it was then assumed that this helped bring about electoral victory. However, better responses did try to evaluate economic success areas (affluence, housing, televisions, cars, H.P., middle class growth) and linked these to both electoral outcomes and policies such as 'Stop-Go'. The relative weakness of Labour was often the key other factor, though some omitted this altogether. Leadership of PMs, above all Macmillan, did figure in most answers, but many candidates were unsure about its relative importance given the failings of Churchill and Eden in the 1950s. There were a small number who picked up on superior party organisation and linked this to party appeal.
- 17** Although many candidates displayed good knowledge about the two leaders, very few were able to adopt a comparative approach and reach a balanced judgement. Better answers identified key themes such as economic performance, relations with the Unions, social policy, and popular appeal, and when this thematic comparison was the basis of the responses they were usually able to access the higher levels. A few did try to compare but most looked at each in turn with a little end comparison. Surprisingly, some wrote more about Callaghan than Wilson. Some answers got too involved in electoral outcomes (why elections were won or lost). The Winter of Discontent often drew out over-long descriptions. Not enough was made of industrial relations and trade union power and conduct (In Place of Strife, strike levels, the Social Contract) or of economic issues. There was some confusion over devaluing the pound and the role of the IMF. Social reforms did figure quite often, but many candidates were unsure what to write about the Callaghan administration. Some responses did have useful points about political skills but some became too absorbed by media images of both PMs. There was some argument that Wilson was a better leader as he won two elections and Callaghan had not won an election and lost the only one he called; this could have been linked to his failure to call an election the previous autumn when the result may well have been different.
- 18** Questions on modern Ireland have not consistently attracted good responses, but it was pleasing to see that there was a number of candidates able to display a good understanding of a range of factors and who produced some detailed and well focused answers that did not rely upon sweeping generalisations. Some answers were descriptive and often a chronological route was preferred, but a good number tried to address and assess the terms of the question, linking problems in Northern Ireland to the Mainland and to how UK governments tried to respond. More was known about c.1969 to mid-1980s overall. A wide range of issues were considered to varying degrees including Civil rights, housing, education, religion (and the inextricable political links), violence, terrorism (IRA, UDF, etc). Bloody Sunday was a regular feature and was often used as the key example of the creation of mistrust that prevented a solution.

F962/01

- 1 Good knowledge was shown for both religious and more worldly motives and the best answers were able to prioritise effectively. Some of the better answers were able to give examples of individual nobles and their land grabbing tendencies (eg Bohemond and Antioch), while others wrote effectively about the importance, nature and effect of religious enthusiasm. Some pointed to the religious zeal of the peasants who followed Peter the Hermit. Candidates were able to recall relevant factors and suggest their relative importance, though their conclusions did vary – some centres placed inordinate emphasis on the issue of primogeniture and the need for younger sons to seek their fortunes by going on Crusade and consequently placed less on the religious zeal and the quest for salvation. Some responses offered effective evaluation of just one factor (material gain) and only generalised evidence otherwise; this approach should not be encouraged as candidates do need to consider a range of issues. Weaker answers displayed a reasonable knowledge of a few issues, but showed rather weaker understanding. They were rarely able to assess factors effectively. Religious issues were dealt with somewhat cursorily, though better answers set them firmly in their religious context. Central issues such as the treatment of Christians by Seljuk Turks and the desire to recapture Jerusalem were rarely mentioned, whilst more nebulous issues such as obedience to the Pope and the nature of feudal society took central stage. Such issues proved difficult to support with any factual knowledge. A few candidates drifted into explaining the motives for the Pope calling the First Crusade, and candidates do need to be reminded of the difference between motives and causes, but on the whole most found this a straightforward question.
- 2 Only a small minority of candidates tackled this question. There were some excellent responses, which showed an understanding of individual kings and their strengths, and considered policies adopted by Crusader states to keep their non-Christian subjects content. There was variable treatment of the given issue – some candidates well able to support the issue with wide-ranging knowledge throughout the period, others tended to stop after Baldwin II, whilst still others scarcely dealt with it at all or failed to name any kings. The structure of answers tended to be good, with better answers setting this issue against other factors such as military orders, castles, western aid and divisions among the Muslims, but these were rarely dealt with in any great detail and had limited support. There were some very weak responses, by candidates who had either very little specific knowledge and generalized as best they could, or drifted into tangential description of the kingdoms, or in a few cases into irrelevant discussion of the failure of the Second Crusade.
- 3 Whilst some candidates saw the question as an assessment of successes and failures, most candidates did not and focused on the idea of 'limited success'. However, several saw the failure to take Jerusalem as a cause of limited success, rather than the limited success itself. Nevertheless, there was some good discussion of the nature of the Crusaders' limited forces, with the loss of many of Barbarossa's troops, the issues between Richard and Philip of France with some good linkage on how these problems were compounded by the greater unification of Muslim troops under the leadership of Saladin. The better answers also pointed out that there some successes for the Crusaders. Candidates tended to know a lot about the Third Crusade even if they were unable to use their knowledge effectively. This helped as they were able to balance the failure to take Jerusalem both against specific knowledge of battles won and towns taken and in many cases an awareness of the strengthening of the position of the Crusader States as a result of the Crusade.

- 4 There were some very good responses. Strong candidates had a good knowledge of a range of artworks and were able to support their arguments on the importance of individual states to the beginning of the Renaissance, showing a detailed and sophisticated appreciation of the factors contributing to the Renaissance. However, there was occasionally some drift beyond the 15th century. Moreover, other factors were less well dealt with, particularly the importance of the political structure of the city state.
- 5 Candidates displayed much good knowledge on the nature of church patronage, but too often this was not set against any other issues, making it rather difficult to assess how important this was. There was some tendency only to consider Church patronage and to drift from this into Church influence on the nature of the Renaissance. The failure to compare with other factors limited access to the higher levels of the mark scheme because the relative significance was not considered.
- 6 Most candidates displayed good knowledge with a range of arguments (though sometimes too exclusive and flawed) as to why the Northern Renaissance was an independent event. However, too often these conclusions were only reached by ignoring any influence of the south on the north. Thus, Erasmus was simply seen as using Greek in a different way and artists such as Durer and Holbein were not mentioned, leaving answers rather unbalanced. Some candidates tended to slip into an explanation of the differences. The question, however, elicited some well-considered answers and the better answers demonstrated good knowledge and maintained a clear focus on the question, as well as an ability to consider linking as well as independent factors.
- 7 This was the most popular question in this section and it posed fewer difficulties for the candidates than the other two in this section. There were some strong, well balanced and wide-ranging responses. The focus was occasionally quite narrow, with little more than the named factor and religion being considered, with some failing to even refer to the issue of Renaissance curiosity. The distinction between exploring and conquest was fine, with weak answers conflating exploration and empire-building, and many offering Cortes and Pizarro as examples of the named factor. While candidates might consider they were exploring as they conquered, the emphasis needed to be on voyages.
- 8 Some interpreted the question as requiring a comparison of the relative importance of da Gama and Cabral and did not consider the contextual issues – a not unreasonable reaction given the wording of the question. Where these issues were considered there was occasionally drift into the importance of facilitating factors like economic need and geography. Sometimes there was even description of technological advances, but this tended to be by candidates who had already failed to demonstrate an effective knowledge of the named factor, and were making weight with material which was at best tangential.
- 9 This was a question which candidates did not find easy. A few strong answers were able to discuss a range of factors and to distinguish between Mexico and Peru. However, these were a minority. A significant number of weaker answers assessed consequences for the Spanish, or descended to description of the effects, but most attempted to focus on Mexico and Peru. The treatment was often quite narrow – little more than population loss and culture and with very little detail on any benefits.
- 10 The stronger answers showed a command of several issues – the defeat of Juana, the marriage to Ferdinand, policies towards towns and nobles, and an ability to compare and evaluate them. Many candidates were able to give a range of issues, but then tended to generalise, with rather obscure points being made at the expense of more centralised issues, such as the victory at Toro and the 'bringing to heel' of the nobles. Analysis was generally weaker than knowledge, with many candidates failing to explain clearly and fully how the given issue led to the consolidation of power. There were many who were unable to evaluate the relative importance of factors or show links between them and simply

produced a list of reasons why Isabella was able to consolidate her claim to the throne. Some weaker answers also demonstrated a poor command of dates, confusing their arguments as a result, and often relying on material after 1479.

- 11** Strong answers were characterised by a sense of balance, and a realisation that Ferdinand and Isabella were in no position to establish absolute authority over their nobility. They were therefore aware of the need to be clear what constituted success. Weaker answers often lacked balance with candidates simply focusing on the lack of success of Ferdinand and Isabella and ignoring any issues to the contrary. Whilst there was some reasonable analysis, other arguments tended to be rather spurious and led to very one-sided conclusions. It was good to see the early problems of Charles I considered: but again, weak answers drew too simplistic a conclusion of failure from the revolts.
- 12** Although candidates occasionally strayed into success and failure, knowledge was generally impressive. Candidates often carried out a good internal analysis of each factor, weighing up whether each could be considered a strength or weakness. Sound and substantiated judgements were often made and an over-arching view given in the conclusion. Weaker answers either tended to focus exclusively on finance, or to lose focus on 1556 and drift to discussions of the strengths and weaknesses of Charles, and even of the legacy of Ferdinand and Isabella.
- 13** This was the least popular question in this section and most candidates tended to avoid this question. A few managed some factors, but there was a high proportion of candidates who struggled to go beyond very generalised comments. There was little development of theological or other reasons, and some descent into narrative.
- 14** This question evoked some strong responses. While nearly all the answers mentioned Frederick the Wise, it was good to see specific knowledge of other princes and of their roles. Most answers spent enough time on the named factor before comparing it. It was also pleasing to see stronger answers which discriminated between the response of 'protestant' and 'catholic' princes. Here some emphasized Charles' international preoccupations – often with good knowledge of his movements while others focused on his difficulties within Germany, emphasising both his constitutional weakness and the attitude of Catholic Princes who had no intention of allowing the Emperor to become too strong. There was a general sense of a question which was expected and which candidates were well prepared to address.
- 15** This question did not pose too many problems for the majority of candidates. Weaker answers were at least able to describe his reasons for being at war. The stronger were increasingly competent in their ability to compare and rank these factors. They tended to be stronger on personality, especially his rivalry with Francis, and few seeing the strength of Henri II's dislike of Charles. Burgundy, too, tended to be well handled. Usually there was less specific knowledge of the origins of the Habsburg-Valois rivalry in Italy which Charles inherited, but knowledge of later events was often more secure and detailed.
- 16** This was a question which elicited some sound answers but none which probed its full implications. Many candidates were aware, for example, of the Council of Trent, but few considered the tensions between Philip and the Papacy, or later the Jesuits. Moreover, in stressing Philip's devotion to orthodoxy, few reflected on the heavy taxation imposed on the church, or the implications of the limited personnel and funding of the Inquisition. Some candidates considered actions against the Moriscos to be religiously motivated and therefore treated them as religious policy. It was also pleasing to see some awareness among the stronger answers of some of the regional problems and the weakness of basic Catholic doctrine among the peasantry which was addressed during Philip's reign. Weaker candidates who attempted this question only considered Church reform and failed to look at other aspects of his religious policy.

- 17** There were competent answers to this question, but most candidates were limited to assessing whether Philip was successful, and few explored his aims. Although historiography is not a requirement at AS to achieve any level, given the debates that exist on the subject, it was nonetheless surprising that few showed awareness of it. An awareness of Philip's aims, which better answers considered in the opening paragraph, and of the possibility that they changed through the reign, was important – and rare. Competent answers tended to take his policy country by country and some reached a series of judgments of his aims and achievements towards each. Some weaker answers included the Netherlands as an example, and while they did mention the relevant areas of interest, could offer no detailed support.
- 18** While a few candidates were able to write effectively both about Orange and about his relative importance, few showed real mastery in their answers. A common flaw was a weakness of chronology, with little idea of when Orange's contribution was at its most important. He was often credited with bringing England into the war, despite the fact that it was his death which forced Elizabeth's hand. His role and his limitations as a military leader tended to be well handled, especially when contrasted with his son. Religion and his relations with other grandees tended to be weaker, and most tended to assume his popularity to be universal. Weaker answers produced very generalised responses. There was some sense of the issues in general terms but a significant lack of development and some inaccuracy. Sadly very few, even of those who knew of his title of Father of the Fatherland said anything about his legacy, assuming his influence to end abruptly with his death. A significant number wanted to focus more on other factors and how they brought about success for the Dutch, but the focus of the response had to be on William and if these issues were brought in they should have been set against William. Those who simply listed all the reasons for Dutch success could not score highly.

F962/02 European and World History Period Studies – Modern

- 1 Most of those answering this question were clearly aware of the main reforms, and were able to address the 'extent' of benefits. Several made the distinction between benefits to France and those which benefitted Napoleon's authority/power. Many candidates displayed reasonable knowledge, although some were uncertain what constituted the Consulate, but most offered some argument rather than a description of the reforms or nature of government. Some balanced the benefits by reforms with the disadvantages of personal rule, censorship and repression. The most common weakness was a failure to understand what the Civil Code was, and seeing it as a sort of general expression for the changes made.
- 2 As Napoleon rose to power as a result of his military career, waged war for most of his time as ruler of France and has been regarded even by his detractors as one of the greatest commanders ever, candidates who study this topic should be prepared to come to terms with military history. The question polarised candidates. There were some extremely well-informed answers which showed considerable knowledge of relevant campaigns and military matters. But there were also answers which were often very generalised and weak, with little understanding of the military history of the time and explanations which were over simplistic. Some very detailed answers did not show the judgement about the relative importance of factors and some were so keen to show knowledge that they went on past 1809. As always with this topic the use of examples is helpful. Sometimes even the most famous Napoleonic battles were not mentioned.
- 3 The level of detailed knowledge about the Continental System was limited and too often candidates wanted to show their knowledge of the peninsular war and the Russian campaign, and the explanation of the links between these and the Continental System was not always well made. It would be good to see more discussion of the extent to which the Continental System was actually responsible for these important campaigns. It would also be good to see more analysis of the system on France and the Empire. However it was encouraging that relatively few veered away to why the system failed.
- 4 Responses to this question were generally less good. Candidates lacked a developed understanding and were not able to fully explain the significance, let alone the relative significance, of factors. Many candidates answered descriptively and a little generally at times. Thus while some were aware of the terms of the Second Treaty of Paris, they did not know when the indemnity was paid off and when the army of occupation left. They often mentioned factors which were relevant but did not develop the analysis enough to warrant higher marks awarded for developed judgements. In addition, candidates were confused about the economy, talking of prosperity 1816–18 (when in fact there were bad harvests and unrest) and going on to talk about industrial development and railways when in fact the era of prosperity 1818–26 was very much led by agriculture. There were a number of candidates line of argument was unclear as after a difficult start Louis XVIII recovered his authority and passed on a stable and relatively peaceful kingdom to his brother. This surely constitutes success, yet many candidates described his reign as a catalogue of failures.

- 5 Many candidates correctly identified the two main factors for the Republic's demise – its lack of popular support and the ambition of Louis Napoleon. However, many cited Louis Napoleon's books as reason for his popularity when in fact the majority of voters were illiterate and were simply responding to a name they recognised. The narrow Parisian nature of the republic was frequently overlooked as was the context for Louis Napoleon's first coup: the restriction of the presidency to a single four year term. However, many found it difficult to go beyond a basic understanding and were not able to fully explain the significance let alone the relative significance of factors.
- 6 This was generally well answered with a good balanced judgement and enough detail to support the conclusions made. Many candidates followed the acceptable line, success in the 1850s, failure in the 1860s, though the latter decade was usually marred by omissions and sometimes tended to be descriptive. Some candidates seemed unaware that Napoleon III's principal initial aim was the overthrow of the 1815 Vienna Settlement (which he achieved). In the 1860s few mentioned how Napoleon was outmanoeuvred by Bismarck. It should also be pointed out that the Mexican debacle had its real impact in 1867 when news of Maximilian's execution arrived just in time to spoil the opening of the Paris Exhibition. Failure to obtain Luxembourg in 1868 was also omitted by many – quite an important episode on the 'road to war' in 1870.
- 7 Many candidates did not find this an easy question, but the main problem seemed to be the absence of any sense of chronology. So, candidates might begin in the 1860s, jump to 1890, then back to Tecumseh. Candidates should understand the first half of the century consisted principally of the eastern half of the United States (which confusingly encompasses the mid-west) – the Louisiana Purchase, Tecumseh, Seminole War, Indian Removal Act, Trail of Tears etc, whereas the second half should deal with the opening up of the plains and the far west – the Laramie Treaties, the wars of the 1860s and 1870s, the destruction of the buffalo, through to Wounded Knee in 1890. With this framework of cause and effect, the answer becomes more manageable. Candidates did give good reasons for no lasting peace – cultural differences, federal policies, broken treaties, white greed, Indian savagery etc – but too often the material was put down in a haphazard way and lacked any real coherence.
- 8 It was even more important to have a sense of chronology – of cause and effect – in this question but few answers displayed it. Many would start in 1857 with Dred Scott, then jump back to the 1850 Compromise, then forward to the 1860 election. There was no real appreciation of how events unfolded, how tension grew over time as one episode followed another. The other problem with answers to this question was that many candidates tended to mention, for example, LeCompton or John Brown, but then fail to explain what actually happened – so we were told the Dred Scott decision was inflammatory but not what the decision actually was. The better answers were aware that there were factors other than slavery that caused the worsening relations and at the higher levels were able to establish links between them.
- 9 This question usually elicited better responses than the other two though many candidates seemed programmed to respond to why the Union won and failed to go into sufficient detail about Lincoln's leadership – a classic case of neglecting the named factor. However, at the higher levels candidates were able to discriminate clearly and make judgements about aspects of Lincoln's leadership, which were then compared with other factors.
- 10 There was a large amount of material that candidates could consider and examiners were reminded that they must not expect coverage of every factor and that what mattered was the quality of analysis and judgement. Many candidates were able to explain the role of alliances and the growing German power, but there was some confusion over the Balkans and the role of the 'blank cheque'. There were a few chronological, narrative answers, but this was rarer than in the past as most candidates were able to offer some explanation of the causes.

- 11** Unlike the previous question, there were a significant number of answers where a description of the terms of the Treaty dominated with only a 'bolt on' comment that these terms were either fair or unfair. Those candidates who established criteria against which to judge fairness usually scored well and ensured that they linked their material back to the actual question set. There were also a number who had obviously answered a question before on the motives of the 'Big Three' and tried to twist that response to this question, but with little success.
- 12** This question attracted very few responses. Those who did tackle it often got sidetracked into an account of Italian foreign policy and missed the focus of the question. In order to score well candidates needed to weigh up the impact of Italian aggression against other issues and many seemed to find this difficult.
- 13** The Russia topics suffered from the failure of some to have revised much beyond 1906. Thus there were too many answers which offered 'causes, course and effects of the 1905 Revolution' in this question and then repeated some of the material in question 14. However, there was more attempt to offer a balanced judgement in question 13 than in some other questions on the paper. Many did try to evaluate the political changes made in the October manifesto and used knowledge of the Dumas to support their argument. Fewer were as successful with the other changes. The agrarian reforms were not as well known and criticism of them was often vague, as was that in the improvements for the workers. Many simply repeated generalisations about Russian backwardness. There was quite a wide variation in quality of responses to this question, but encouragingly, many went beyond a list of factors showing change/continuity to some judgement.
- 14** Disappointingly, few knew much about the events of February and March 1917 and there were a lot of answers which simply repeated lists of reasons for the fall of the Tsarist regime; some going back to 1894 and repeating points about 1904–05. Knowledge of the effects of war was often relatively limited and there were too many generalizations about starving peasants with little to support this. Some were able to comment about the loss of support for the Tsar among the various elites within Russia, most notably the nobility and the army, whilst some even commented about his failure to utilise the Duma. Better answers did attempt some discrimination between factors, but judgement was often missing or poorly developed.
- 15** 'Consolidation' and 'in the 1930s' were key words in this question that many did not heed. There was often a standard 'rise of Stalin' response which was focused entirely on the 1920s, or which came before an account of the purges and terror. However some were aware that Stalin might have used propaganda successfully and also that his modernization programmes might have been approved of by the party and by some in the country. There was a fair degree of description in answers.
- 16** This topic continues to produce quite generalised answers about regional differences which are not well linked to political instability. However there were more signs of knowledge about the political situation and there were some quite full explanations. Most candidates wrote about political, social and economic issues and some were able to link foreign and imperial events to the question. There was also a considerable number who wrote about events of the 1870s, without making them relevant to the question. Moreover, many candidates simply agreed with the question's premise ignoring the fact that Giolitti actually brought an element stability by being in office for eight years in the early twentieth century – a remarkable achievement given the difficulty in creating coalitions often based on local interests rather than parties. Added to this, there was industrial development (in the north), some sound social legislation and a successful war. Judgement was in rather shorter supply and too many continue to see 'assess the reasons' as being 'explain the reasons'. Better answers were full explanations and offered a clear judgement about relative importance of different factors.

- 17** This question produced some of the strongest answers in F962/2 and there was a lot of evidence of candidates being able to analyse Mussolini's political skills and not just his actions, and to set them against other factors. There was some good understanding of the links between the threat of socialism, Mussolini's ability to adapt his political message and tactics, the nature of the political system and the role of the royal family and the elites. Few produced narratives of either Mussolini or the rise to power: most offered explanation and analysis of various quality and supported with a varied level of detail. However, where some candidates were not so strong was on the named factor ie Mussolini's political skills. In particular, candidates maintained that because of his oratory and propaganda he was very popular – when in fact the party only obtained 7% of the vote in 1921 (He was certainly popular with the elites). A second omission was his switch from the left to the right. Indeed embracing the church and monarchy were really quite late developments. The final omission was the events of October 1922 and the crucial role of the king. However, good answers were *au fait* with all these factors.
- 18** This was the least popular question in this section and although it did produce some balanced responses which went beyond lists of successes and failures and evaluated different elements, there were a significant number who did not identify the economic problems, or did so only implicitly. Most candidates were able to do a sound job evaluating the battles (lira, grain, marshes); better answers began with Di Stefani ('22-'25) and also went into the 1930s to discuss the beneficial effects of the I.R.I. during the Depression. However, few discussed the economic impact of Mussolini's foreign policy adventures from 1935 – which undermined much of what had been achieved before.
- 19** There were insufficient responses seen to be able to comment on this question.
- 20** Although there were only a small number of responses to this question, it was mostly done quite well, with reasonable to good knowledge of relevant economic policies, and clear attempts to reach a judgement about the statement. In the main, candidates argued successfully that earlier policies had resulted in real achievements before the Great Leap Forward, and were usually able to support their points with some quite detailed information.
- 21** Once again, the number of responses was quite small, but this was generally well done, with candidates making clear and relevant distinctions between economic and political change, and adequately establishing 'before and after' in order to address 'to what extent'. However, although arguments were usually clear, many candidates seemed to have less detailed knowledge than for Question 20
- 22** The named factor presented the greatest challenge for many candidates as most were unable to write about politicians other than von Papen and von Schleicher, who strictly speaking were not leaders of political parties. Often, when there was discussion of the policies of the 'leaders' the comments were vague and generalised. Many offered quite limited lists of 'factors in the rise of Hitler' and as usual knowledge after 1929 was often vague. There was more knowledge than has been the case of the events which led to the appointment of Hitler as Chancellor, but too often this was appended as a sort of bolt on paragraph to a list of factors and the sequence was not always accurate. Candidates need to be more aware of the causal links between economic crisis and the rise of Hitler and of the difference between inflation and deflation.

- 23** As the term 'consolidation of power' is a common one in most text books, it was disappointing to see so much general and unfocussed writing on aspects of the regime. Some were determined to write about racial policy regardless of the question. Many did not mention the Reichstag Fire, the Enabling Law or even the Night of the Long Knives so eager were they to get on to the Edelweiss Pirates and the Holocaust. There was sound knowledge on elements of terror, but less evaluation of its relative importance. While many identified propaganda, indoctrination and Hitler's personality as other factors, very few commented on the popularity of specific policies – hardly any commented on foreign policy successes before 1939.
- 24** There was evidence of some detailed knowledge of West Germany, but answers were characterised by some lack of understanding of the term 'political stability' and how economic development or the political predominance of Adenauer contributed to it. Some either adapted answers on the successes and failures of Adenauer or attempted to reproduce lists of factors about West German success without being too sure how they linked to the issue of stability. Relatively few were sufficiently on top of the issue to be able to offer judgements about the relative importance of different explanations; but those who were produced some convincing and well-developed analysis with extended judgements.
- 25** The question was not consistently done well for a variety of reasons. The dates were a pitfall for some and some wanted to explain either why or with what justification rather than 'why the Soviet Union was able'. The knowledge of eastern European geography was not strong and too many clearly wanted a question on Yalta and Potsdam. Some candidates were able to write about the development of the Cold War (though not always in chronological sequence), but few knew what was actually happening in the individual Eastern European countries.
- 26** The level of knowledge about these events was very variable. Some got them muddled up; others reproduced answers which included Poland and East Germany. Some did focus on the level of seriousness and offered some valid comparative judgements. However, many found this a little easier to get to grips with than the previous question, though there was some ignorance of the international context in both 1956 and 1968. With regard to the former some did not mention destalinisation, few mentioned Poland but very few mentioned Suez. As far as '68 was concerned, very few candidates mentioned US preoccupation with Vietnam though that is hardly surprising. However, many did not realise that the Brezhnev Doctrine came about as a result of the Czech crisis – the latter was often described as an example of the Doctrine's application.
- 27** Many candidates were more knowledgeable about the USSR itself than about Eastern Europe as a whole which seems in some cases to be a rather vague area. The links between Glasnost and Perestroika and the breakdown of control were not generally very well made. Many candidates knew very little about what actually happened in the Eastern European countries. Some simply wrote about the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union – not irrelevant, but few focussed on the events of 1989, on East Germany, Hungary, Poland etc. Perhaps candidates were expecting to answer a different question? However, there were a few where there was some good evaluation, though generally there needed to have been more thought of why changes in the USSR impacted on the republics it dominated.
- 28** There were not enough answers to this question to be able to comment.
- 29** There were not enough answers to this question to be able to comment.
- 30** There were not enough answers to this question to be able to comment.

F963 and F964 AS History Enquiries

General Comments

This session saw a mixture of candidates, some, possibly most, entering for the first time after a term's study. Some approached the sources with confidence, using historical terminology and knowledge with ease. However at both the middle and lower end there was evidence that some candidates had, conceptually, not got much beyond GCSE. Their failure to integrate content and evaluation was particularly noticeable and they tended to proceed sequentially and descriptively. The skills required by Enquiry papers take a little time to mature, noticeably in the handling of concepts, evaluating sources, either individually or in groups and in integrating knowledge into this process. Nonetheless examiners were impressed with the fact that much of what we have said over the years is now grounded in some effective teaching. Most candidates knew what they were supposed to do (comparing for the key issue and evaluating the sources for interpretations) and failed only because they misinterpreted the sources, failed to see what was there or lacked the sound contextual background required. For a few the skills required for this paper were simply not grasped.

Most candidates ranged between 40–80 marks, mainly achieving levels II, III, and IV. Most found it difficult to get into the 90s, although more were seen in the 80s than is usually the case. Answers and standards were comparable across all four components. Topics which were part of the specification but which had not featured before were handled in the same way as those that had, in various guises, appeared before.

At most levels candidates were trying to do the right thing, although it seemed that many, having grouped their sources, proceeded to discuss them sequentially, often in a rather random order. There remains much description and referencing with provenance tagged on in a discrete manner. It is important that the provenance is tied into the evaluation of an interpretation and not just commented on in isolation. It has to work to answer the question. It was disappointing that many in the middle and top ends preferred to argue their points by source reference and well used stand-alone own knowledge. They knew that they had to evaluate but preferred to do so in 'bolt-on' and discrete sections that did little or nothing to move the argument on in relation to the question.

There was much evidence of careless reading, both of the sources and the questions. The most effective answers read the sources and their introductions and attributions carefully to aid their use of grouped sources. The extra information in the introductions would aid candidates with limited understanding in accessing the question but lower level candidates did not read the sources carefully or their introductions and attributions. They seemed to expect to pick up a general impression of what the sources say by osmosis, spurning links by quoting without comment as though each source 'speaks for itself'. A few had little knowledge and did not understand the sources, grasping only the basics of content or provenance. Irrelevant knowledge was added separately and provenance was listed together at the end of answers.

We hope that teachers use the mark scheme with their candidates, perhaps in watered down form. Familiarity with its terms, skills and concepts will assist in delivering the skills we reward. The errors which occur tend to be those that have always marred responses. We therefore make no apology for reiterating where candidates continue to lose marks and make some suggestions for points to work on.

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

Many reasonably good candidates missed the need to compare in Q(a), offering a general sequential analysis, often without considering the question. In some cases, there seemed to be a sudden realisation, halfway through the answer, that the question named a particular issue and that they needed to identify points of agreement and disagreement on it. A plan would be helpful here. Several stated wrongly that 'both sources gave both sides of the argument'. A few had 'wish-lists' of limitations, and some substituted poorly understood quotes for meaningful comments. The least skilled wrote thin paraphrases or descriptions. Some seemingly quite able candidates had little grasp of the sources in relation to the question because of weak skills of text analysis. Other able candidates treated the comparison exercise as a general English-style text analysis and had very little sense of the historical context to explain significance, for example on the October Riots in 1831 in Q1 on F963 02 (Condition of England) or the Northern Rising in 1569 in Q2 on F963 01 (Mid Tudor Crises). In Q(a) as well as Q(b), lower level answers referenced sources for information, within a general explanation or narrative.

It is worth remembering that the question asks the candidate to compare two sources 'as evidence'. This means assess them in relation to each other, not extract information from them about the focus of the question. Equally, a *general* analysis is not what is required. There should be links to and focus on the key issue in the question. Candidates frequently ignore this and would be well advised to highlight it on the paper as an aide memoire. Many simply compare content and provenance regardless of the issue. For example Q4 (a) on Churchill in F963 02 asked about evidence for his attitude to Communist Russia in the 1920s. Many simply wrote about Communists in general rather than Communist Russia, missing the opportunity to talk about the Comintern, Zinoviev and the election of 1924 let alone spot the contrast between the sources where Churchill's account is focused more on the external threat of Russia, Guedella on the issue of communist penetration within Britain itself. In Q (a) on the Normans in F963 01 many failed to focus on the 'way the Normans behaved', and wrote more general answers on opposition or the ways William established his rule. Also the judgement reached should be about the Sources as evidence, not about the key issue. It needs to judge which of the two Sources provides the better evidence on the issue and explain why.

In both questions the commonest mistake is in the use of phrases such as 'this shows us that', which is neither a comparative nor an analytical approach to the sources. Some candidates seem to think that to use the sources illustratively to support a view is what is required on the grounds that they are explaining the utility of the source, saying 'Source A is useful, it shows us that...' In Q(a) this leads them away from the comparative issues towards sequencing. In Q(b) it leads to a general answer in which the sources are used to illustrate 'knowledge' points rather than as the central body of material for evaluation. It is important to consider the skills we reward and how to work with candidates on these. **The following points need careful consideration:-**

AO1a and b: Use of knowledge; clarity of expression; Comparing the contribution of two sources to the issue and arrive at a judgement on which may be the more useful.

- 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 the economic interests of North and South, the debate on whether the Crimean War would advance the Italian or Piedmontese cause, government educational aims on both elementary and secondary education and the impact of religious attitudes on the Crusaders) and of any **concepts** involved, for example in the latter an understanding of 11th century attitudes on religious behaviour. We are looking for a **light touch** here; say a sub clausal reference or at most one or two sentences.

- Many candidates simply focus on the topic, parliamentary reform or on Tudor rebels, instead of the **specific issue**, attitudes towards the reform of parliament or the way in which governments sought to discredit rebels.
- 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. It should 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. Also **judgement is all too frequently on the issue itself, rather than on the evidence for it.**
- It is vital that candidates **identify the relevant issues** arising in the two sources and use these as their comparative focus. Failure to do so leads to description, paraphrase or at worst copying out what is there, word for word.

AO2a: Analyse and evaluate the two sources as evidence.

- This has the **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. **A formulaic approach will often be damaging.** Candidates 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. Although this is less frequent it continues to crop up in many guises and can tend to be a whole Centre feature.
- 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. Many ignore or simply fail to use the introductions and attributions. These contain vital information to support the understanding of source content. 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.** They need to probe.
- **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. Our 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.

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

Most did plan and tried to sustain a clearly structured answer that did try to focus on the question and answer it. Many had an argument, albeit of varying quality and endeavoured to reach a judgement of sorts. Most now know to attempt a grouping based on the assertion in the question but unfortunately many then still 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. 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. This needs to be done both in terms of the issues and content discussed and on provenance which may affect the relative weighting given to their points. Some candidates still prefer to write general essays about the topic, either for the majority or for part of their answers. Others simply quote from the sources, sometimes quite heavily. The sources need interpreting with comments.

Candidates would be well advised –

1. To **read the sources with care** in relation to the question.
2. **Plan** using grouping; **cross referencing** those sources that can support two or more views. A structured argument is one of the keys to an effective answer.
3. Then **assess the value of their grouping** (evaluation) building in any relevant knowledge at this point. Content, provenance and knowledge will then enable an evaluation of the linked sources to occur. It is important that there is a specific and applied approach to using historical knowledge rather than the broader brush. The grouping needs to be according to view for the sides of an argument rather than for undeveloped cross reference that loses sight of the question.
4. Use pertinent **evidence within the date range of the question**, not from the broader topic.
5. **Not to rush into writing** everything in an 'ad hoc' manner. A more concise, reasoned and considered answer is often more convincing. Thinking about a judgement and conclusion before starting to write and planning accordingly is very important.
6. To remember that a **judgement** on the value of the sources as evidence, whether here or in Q(a), needs *support* to be convincing. It cannot suddenly be asserted or come out of the blue.

Teachers need to think carefully about the following assessment objectives:-

AO1a and b: Integrating knowledge selectively and appropriately to assess the interpretation of the Sources in a clear manner. Analysis and explanation of the question with substantiated judgement

- It is worth remembering that there are **22 marks** for this.

- Some candidates simply wrote an **answer based on their knowledge** with the sources used for illustration or reference. Some implicitly referred to or quoted Source content to create a general narrative about the topic. Others knew that they needed to keep the focus on the sources, so dealt with this requirement by **bolting on their own knowledge**, either at the end, or scattered through the answer.
- In some cases candidates seemed to have little beyond a **general contextual underpinning**. They confined their comments to what was in front of them. This was either because it was as yet unconsolidated or because there were some sizeable gaps. In some cases it was simply inappropriate and led the candidate away from the focus of the question. It is important to realise what the **role of knowledge is in this question**. It is there as a means of evaluating the sources, extending, confirming or questioning what they say. It is **particularly important in evaluation**. Selection and use of the most appropriate evidence in evaluating the sources *for the key issue* was the key to a high level mark for AO1a and AO1b. Many candidates used limited evidence within the date range of their questions, often preferring to drift irrelevantly outside it. Knowledge can only be credited if it informs the use of the sources. Many candidates missed key opportunities for **evaluating views within the Sources by use of knowledge**. This resulted in a lack of balance, where candidates rarely spotted the counter-arguments within the sources. This was true of the Nazi question where candidates failed to spot references to the welfare of women because they saw all the sources in sexist terms. 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. Candidates would latch onto a preferred 'big' issue and analyse the sources generally. They 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. 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...*'

AO2a and b: Analysis and evaluation of the Sources; Synthesis of grouped Sources and integrated knowledge in evaluation of the interpretation

- **Most marks** are given for this – **48**
- Candidates need to **spot the main thrust of argument or view in a source**. All too often they pick on a minor phrase and mistakenly make it central to their case or they allow knowledge to overwhelm it. They then need to analyse and integrate content and provenance for *use* in argument, rather than describe them.
- Candidates must *use* sources for the question, rather than copying out their content sequentially, or paraphrasing their general gist and noting their author and date.
- Sources need to be judged beyond *face value*, in the light of their context, purpose or audience.
- Comments on provenance need to be meaningful and linked to the use of source content.

- Formulaic answers and 'limitation' wish-lists are to be avoided.
- Always consider the view in the question first, and balance it with one or more alternative views driven by the sources.
- Make an interim judgement on how convincing a group of sources are, supported by your analysis and evaluation, before moving on to the opposing group.
- Avoid paragraphs of bolted on knowledge starting 'From my own knowledge I know. . .'
- Integrate sources into Q(b) conclusion and judgement to 'assess how far the sources support the interpretation' – a purely knowledge-based judgement cannot answer the question.
- **Evaluation** was often a key reason for underperformance. Candidates used to confine their discussions on provenance to Q(a). They now know this is crucial on Q(b) but their approach can be to do so **discretely**, failing to link their discussions to the grouping and the key issue in the question. Having fallen down on analytical skills in AO1b they compound this by **failing to evaluate the source's relative contribution to the debate**. This confines them to Level 3 and below. They cannot access Levels 1 and 2 unless the source is given relative 'value' in its contribution to the question.
- By tackling the sources **sequentially and discretely** they inevitably move into Levels IV and below. It prevents them making the necessary links within and between sources, and with the question.
- Weaker answers will often simply **describe the introductions and attributions**, as if this constitutes evaluation. It does not.
- At **Level 5 and below** there were those answers which simply 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 lower levels, several answers stated that the author 'had an agenda' without elaborating. 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 underperformed by 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. 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 we reward not so much the knowledge used per se but its integration and relative balance (unevenness and then imbalance).
- 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 AO2b by failing to achieve sufficient synthesis.
- There are still some candidates who persist in **adding a bolt on** – 'and from my own knowledge, I know that . . .' This undermines synthesis. Evidence is not linked or active in assessing 'how far *the Sources* support . . .'
- A surprising number of answers **failed to find more than one view** in the Sources. This was particularly true of the Nazi question; in part the Mid Tudors; the French Revolution and the US Civil War There were obvious internal clues which might have been used as a springboard for argument. The most successful answers made impressive use of all these clues and saw that some sources might be used for more than one side to an argument.
- **Knowledge** needs to be selected for its relevance and pertinent use in integration into the argument and there were some excellent answers which did achieve this with clarity and control. Those in the middle range of the Mark Scheme were able to analyse the interpretation in the question, but less likely to balance it with an alternative view in judgement.

- Often some better answers **lost sight of the sources in the final page or so**, meaning that the conclusion and judgement were limited, undermining synthesis.
- And finally there were many examples of **weak or unclear English** and some inappropriate use of slang, or of terms that were anachronistic in their use. Sometimes there were unintelligible, 'made-up' words. For example, '*disputated*', '*providance*', '*actavistic*', '*heritial*', '*tendential*', '*allured to*' in the sources, '*propaganded*' their ideas, '*cowarding* the king', it can be '*deferred from*' the sources, source E is '*somewhat less prolific*', and, (most mystifyingly), 'a kinder, more '*lexical*' choice of suppressing rebellion'. The use of text language is clearly having its effect here. The examples of slang were many – '*guilt clauses*', '*guilt-tripping*,' '*sweet-talking*', with 'an agenda' but no explanation. 'Bias' seems to have reappeared. Informal language is inappropriate in an examination.

F965 Historical Interpretations and Investigations

The entry for January 2012 contained a high proportion of single submissions though there were larger centres. It can be difficult for centres to mark a small number of scripts as there is not the range of work to use to establish a rank order. There were some cases where there was a wider range of work, that rank order was not correctly identified. The importance of this cannot be overstated, as moderation is impossible unless centres establish this order correctly. Where rank order problems occurred, it was for two main reasons. The first was that work was being assessed by different standards from those set down in the OCR mark scheme. This was most apparent in A02. In Interpretations this concerns candidates' evaluation of the four interpretations in the exercise and in Investigations it refers to the candidates' critical use of a range of evidence that they have selected. It is, of course, possible for candidates to impress by the range of sources they refer to in Investigations and the depth of knowledge they show about the topic in Interpretations. However, though these qualities may be impressive in themselves, they are not the primary focus of the Assessment Objective in the mark scheme which is focused on evaluation. Sometimes centres did indeed state that they were not considering the mark scheme by the use of comments like 'very little critical evaluation, but a strong argument and impressive knowledge, so level 1A for A02'. By so doing the centre is indicating that they are using their own criteria, not that of the mark scheme and so will establish a different rank order from the moderator who is using the mark scheme. In cases like this, there is little alternative but to return work to centres to be remarked. The second reason is that the mark scheme is being applied, but without sufficient attention to the quality and support of evaluation and critical analysis. If the level of evaluative comments offered by candidates is low, then even if there are quite a lot of them, the overall level awarded should not be high. For example, even if there were extensive use of this type of analysis, the result would not be a level above III for A02b:

Using the convincing sources from Doran, Hurstfield and Jordan. I came to the conclusion that they all clearly state Elizabeth's hatred of losing authority. The most authentic evidence I used was from Doran's 'Monarchy and Matrimony' which was exclusively about marriage, making it reliable as Doran has written extensively about Elizabeth throughout her career. This contrasted with Mervyn who is a less compelling source, and though I used it occasionally, it is not as reliable as Doran because Mervyn wrote about Elizabeth's reign and not just marriage.

Other examples could be quoted. For example some thought that because the historian Margaret Macmillan was related to Lloyd George, her view of the treaty of Versailles would be biased. If no further support were offered for this view, then it would have very limited value. The fact that Churchill suffered from 'black dog' depressions does not have much bearing on his views of Munich. That an author has written various books on a topic does not make his interpretation necessarily valid or invalid. Basic and 'stock' ad hominem comments by themselves are not an indication of higher level critical analysis. Neither does listing authorities help to offer a very convincing argument, as the following shows

Interpretations from Collinson highlight that Mary was a threat; he has written predominantly about religion during the sixteenth century and Elizabeth herself, this causes his opinion to reinforce most argument about religion and increases the validity of the argument that Scotland was a threat; Lee increases the strength of this argument by highlighting Scotland aiding foreign intervention against England. This argument is validated by many historians. Haigh still shows a counter-argument and brings to light Mary and Dudley's proposed marriage. Lee supports this by showing Walshingham entering a special embassy to Scotland. This counter-argument is weak because of the lack of supporting historians which further suggest Scotland was a serious external threat. The strongest and most useful argument is provided by Lee who states "France became increasingly involved and therefore less threatening than Spain" this clearly shows that Spain is the most serious external threat and France decreasing to the next most prevalent

threat, this is the most useful source as it provided irrefutable argument which is later reinforced by the event of the Armada. The least useful source is provided by Mervyn who shows “Philip preferred a heretic on the English throne to a French puppet”, this is a weak source due to Mervyn providing two opposing arguments in one source, from the event of the Armada, it shows Philip wasn't content with a ‘heretic’ on the throne of England and highlights the weakness of the argument.

It is helpful to indicate when assessment is weak, for example

Mervyn was thought to be weak because she uses two pieces of evidence and therefore cannot corroborate herself.

Morgan is Welsh and therefore will be biased.

Sometimes assessment was thrown by sheer scholarship, producing an incorrect rank order.

The heavily biased chronicler Roger Wendover blames John for inaction after Normandy was attacked. However Turner considers that ‘in the face of so much treason’ (Turner p 21) John can be forgiven for inaction. Certainly the treason of the barons continued after 1204 and is a reason for John's failure to regain Normandy. In not fighting when ‘the crucial time came’ Interpretation A) the barons were breaking a binding oath of service to John. This treachery created ‘intense suspicion’ (Barrow, Feudal Britain p 201) in John leaving him ‘almost alone’ (Powicke, the Loss of Normandy p 145) and to hate most of his barons (Frank McGlynn p 328) fearing his subject's treason (Ralf Coggeshall). Power judges that John's reliance on his ‘routiers’ (Power p 135) undermined the loyalty of his supporters; Bingham, however, analyses that these mercenaries were ‘better trained’ (Caroline Bingham, p 171) and ‘more obedient..than most of his vassals’ (op cit p 171)

Though this is meticulous and scholarly, the point of the exercise – to evaluate an interpretation –has become lost. Compare with this more focused writing which takes the passages as the starting point rather than attempting an essay which integrates the passages with additional knowledge.

The passage emphasizes Elizabeth's obvious enjoyment and active use of her power as sole monarch, illustrated in her dealings with parliament and use of her prerogative and right to veto parliamentary bills. It also alludes to the delicate position in which, though Elizabeth ‘played politics’ by opening marital suits she personally had no desire to become involved. This would reflect Hurstfield's point in Passage A which calls Elizabeth's use of marriage negotiations an ‘outrageous diplomatic technique’. It seems a reasonable explanation for Elizabeth's behaviour concerning Henry of Anjou in 1571 and her early negotiations with Alencon. Both, when put in the light of the St.Bartholomew's Day massacre in 1572 and the religious wars in France, show Elizabeth could not viably have gone through with marriages for fear of revolution, and that the negotiations were not opened with an eventual marriage in mind. However, the passage does not refer to any of the serious marriage prospects that had risen around the dates it references. For example a year before the source cites Elizabeth saying that she would rather be single, she was petitioned by the Privy Council to marry Robert Dudley and seriously considered doing so. This lends a double meaning to the words the source cites and may be taken to mean that Elizabeth was restricted by her duty as a queen...

Much of the assessment by centres did focus on the assessment objectives and though there were still examples of brief comments, or no marginal annotation at all, on the whole, marking was thorough. Administration was generally efficient and caused few problems. In many cases the moderators were able to report that marking was within ‘nationally agreed standards’, a phrase which indicates that the mark scheme was applied consistently and that there was no adjustment needed, even if there was not total and complete agreement with every mark for every AO. Where there was disagreement it was usually about the following issues:

1. **Relevance.** The centre's marking did not make reference to failures of candidates to answer the question set. If the question is about the impact of the Spanish inquisition on the people of Spain, for instance, then that should be the focus of the answer and not about whether it dealt with Protestants. If the question is about whether John was to blame for the loss of Normandy, then that should be the focus of the answer and not just whether he was a bad man or not. Drifting from the point or failing to engage consistently with the issue in the question should be clearly indicated in the marking.
2. **The use of passages.** If candidates do not make the passages the focus of their answer, then they make it difficult to show if they have interpreted them properly and weighed them by using evidence from the other passages and contextual knowledge. A 'thematic' approach, where they look at aspects of the topic and then try to use the passages and their own knowledge is not always helpful in demonstrating their ability to weigh interpretations. It often makes marking more difficult and consequently the focus shifts away from the key element of evaluation.
3. **The use of knowledge.** As this work is not done under examination conditions and candidates have every opportunity to research the topics, it is reasonable for judgements about passages and, in Investigations, sources, to be supported by knowledge. Marking did not always comment on the quality and extent of that knowledge which should be 'excellent' for top level marks and 'very good' for marks over Band II. If detailed knowledge is present in the answers, but not effectively used, then marking should indicate this. It was a tendency for some candidates to forget why they had researched, and to put in knowledge about the topic not related to either passage or source evaluation, but to support a general view about the topic. As detailed discussion, say about the shortcomings of the treaty of Versailles, were expounded, the passages seem to have been forgotten. If passages are treated very briefly and only partially considered, sometimes with just a single phrase being used, then marking should indicate this and high marks should not be awarded.
4. **The use of sources in Investigations.** Many candidates are still using evidence to support views in a fairly uncritical manner. This can either be by short and fairly pointless extracts.

Appeasement can be 'defended up to a point' but was often 'mistaken'¹ because British 'public opinion'² was 'not so firmly against war'.³ Cato was critical of the policies but they have been defended by Taylor who saw Munich as 'a triumph'⁴ and Lee also explains why appeasement can be defended.

Thus it is important in marking for comments to be made about how critically sources are used. If they merely illustrate, then no more than LIV should be given. If there is evaluation then higher levels may be justified, but simply cross-referencing sources is not making a convincing argument. "Chapman and Farmer concur and put forward a strong argument" is not a helpful comment unless there is evidence to show why their argument is strong.

In this extract, the marginal comment is 'evaluation of source', but the centre really needed to comment on how well the evidence had been analysed and evaluated.

Churchill's ideal alternative instead of appeasement was to create a "Grand Alliance" that would have been a "Treaty for mutual defence against aggression" (Churchill speech 1938) which was to be based around Britain and France. There is value to this source as it is taken directly from Churchill's speech at the Commons. However the practicality of this source is debateable. Churchill has been known to be a warmonger, therefore it is obvious that he would favour going to war against Germany sooner or later. As John Charmley argues "it was not practical politics.

¹ Farmer p45

² Boxer p176

³ Henig p 95

⁴ Taylor

Britain was not ready for war, nor were the French. Russia caused more problems than she solved as a member of a potential alliance”, this is referring to the fact that neither Poland nor Romania would tolerate Russian soldiers on their land. As well as that Churchill was suffering from his ‘Black Dog’ depression, which doesn’t make him a reliable source of opinion.

The problem here is that Churchill’s alternative has not been properly explained. There are some simplistic comments – why does a speech have value because it is delivered to the Commons and what has his depression got to do with it? It is just an assertion that he was a warmonger. Charmley does raise some valid objections, but it is not clear quite what they were referring to. This is uneven evaluation. This is a crucial argument and merely to quote Charmley’s view uncritically and with some incomplete explanation is not ‘excellent’ analysis. The points about Churchill are not ‘very good’ evaluation.

It remains true that Investigations causes more problems for centre marking than Investigations. Internal standardisation of marking does continue to present problems. If there are different marking styles, use of annotations and understanding of the mark scheme, then the final process whereby marks are standardised will be very difficult, so early monitoring of assessment is strongly advised. There were examples of very effective standardisation and of clear understanding of the assessment objectives by teachers responsible for different topics. There were also examples of where this was not the case.

Despite some ongoing problems, there is a considerable amount of good practice in assessment of demanding and complex work which has been obviously high-rewarding and interesting for students. The negatives here do not outweigh the positive achievements by candidates and their teachers in adopting a critical approach to secondary and primary evidence, which is a vital skill not only in History, but in the wider aspects of dealing with information in the modern world.

F966 Historical Themes

General Comments

It has become customary for the January session of this exam to produce a wide variety of responses, and this session was not untypical. At the extremes of the range there were both excellent and very weak performances. Several candidates scored full marks on one or both of their questions and demonstrated a remarkable grasp of knowledge, understanding, and the ability to write synoptic essays. They usually produced a good overview introduction, consistently cross-referenced and thoughtfully selected their knowledge to support an argument and counter-argument, before concluding with a clear judgement based on prior arguments. While some of these candidates were repeating the paper, many were sitting the exam for the first time after just one term's study. Their answers were a pleasure to read and a credit to all concerned. At the lower end of the mark range there were many candidates who lacked the knowledge and maturity needed to demonstrate analysis and synthesis and were patently under-prepared. Many of these essays were predominantly descriptive or comprised unrelated paragraphs, and any evaluation was 'bolted-on' at the end. Some of these weaker performances relied on remembering essays they had written before and often failed to take into account the fact that they were asked to deal with a rather different question. Some displayed general knowledge of the topic but not enough to answer the question set, while a small minority of candidates were unable to construct a relevant argument or to communicate their knowledge coherently. Some candidates wrote too little and spent too long on their plans but a more serious error was to write too much without thinking of the focus of the material and the key words of the question. Unfortunately abbreviations in essays continued to intrude; some candidates even indicated at the outset that they would be using abbreviations such as 'AAs', 'CRs', 'Alex II', 'AIII', 'HVIII', 'Govt', 'PoG', 'HRE'. This short-hand neither looks good nor reads well.

Among the variety of questions in the Themes paper, two types continue to give candidates some difficulty: 'turning point' and evaluative questions. Firstly, each session examiners' reports have commented on issues concerning turning point questions, and it will be well worth repeating the advice previously offered. Candidates need to assess the individual, issue or event that is the focus of the question, decide upon any unique or intrinsic features, and judge its legacy for the near and more distant future. Context is all important to demonstrate what changed and the extent of change resulting from this development. Most candidates are able to do this, however many fail to compare the event or development with other selected turning points in order to reach a judgement on its relative importance in the period as a whole. The weakest responses give lists of dates and events in which every new development is seen as a 'major' turning point.

Secondly, evaluative questions that ask 'how important' or 'assess' require a comparison in the context of the period. Such an evaluation can best be reached thematically since each theme is likely to explore a range of related developments over a period of time and may also reveal patterns of continuity and change, although this may not necessarily be the focus of the question. However, a chronological approach as opposed to a thematically organised answer can also achieve full marks. Indeed Centres may feel that certain topics such as The Development of the French Nation State 1498–1610 and The Challenge of German Nationalism 1789–1919 lend themselves more readily to such an approach. However, if arguments are organised chronologically, the candidate needs to keep the focus of the question as the default position in their answer and consistently compare it with each development assessed in successive paragraphs. The better candidates are able to do this by referring and cross-referring to arguments and examples throughout the essay, thus demonstrating an ability to make links and connections, to draw analogies and synthesise. Weaker candidates often have difficulty keeping their answers relevant, analytical and free from repetition when they embark on a chronological approach. Moreover, narrative and description rather than analysis and synthesis

become the dominant characteristics. There is, of course, no right or wrong way to tackle the Historical Themes questions but a thematic approach usually produces a better outcome. There were no Centre complaints or queries concerning either F966/01 or F966/02, and none of the questions merited any special consideration or concern at the examiners' meeting and in the subsequent marking of scripts. As usual, Tudor rebellions and the Catholic Reformation were the most popular topics in F966/01, and Russia and Civil Rights in the USA the most common modern topics in F966/02.

F966/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1066–1715

Individual Questions

English Government and the Church 1066–1216

- 1 This was answered by a handful of candidates. Some candidates could not differentiate between central and local government and wrote irrelevantly about shires, sheriffs and local officials. The Exchequer, Chancery and Justiciar figured in better essays and most candidates identified examples of change particularly under Henry I and Henry II. The household received less treatment and only a few candidates discussed the nature of feudalism, estate management and changes to the royal financial administration. Most candidates tended to explain the reasons for the changes rather than provide an assessment.
- 2 Candidates were expected to address how relations were affected by the primacy dispute, the role of the Papacy and English monarchs, the absence of archbishops of Canterbury and the characters of archbishops. Much was made of Lanfranc, Anselm, Becket and Langton and their relationships with York, the crown and various popes, but knowledge of archbishops of York was less convincing. The best answers developed themes in the argument and focused on reasons rather than events and personalities.
- 3 There were some good answers. Exactly what constituted the papal reform movement was not clearly known by all candidates and weaker essays focused on how far papal authority was strengthened in the course of the period rather than setting this development in the context of the effects of the movement. Better essays considered the political consequences during the periods of weak royal rule, for instance Stephen's accession, Becket's disputes and the Interdict in John's reign. Some candidates assessed how far relations between the king and his archbishops were affected, but most looked at the impact on the English judiciary in crown-church relations.

Rebellion and Disorder under the Tudors 1485–1603

- 4 This was the most popular question in the set. Most candidates were able to write about nobles' involvement in both English and Irish rebellions, though essays that focused on the concepts of 'political ambition' and 'factions' were less common. Details of nobles' motives were only given in better answers which identified religious devotion as a principal alternative to political ambition. Weaker essays considered rebellions that did not concern the nobility such as the economic and social rebellions, or wrote generally about causation. Most essays failed to define 'factions' and many failed to deal with 'best explain'.
- 5 Candidates varied in their knowledge and understanding of how government propaganda was used to combat rebellions. Few essays linked the use of propaganda to particular rebellions, indeed specific knowledge was generally not well known. Instead many candidates moved the focus of their answer onto various methods employed by the Tudors to control rebellion, which included playing for time, taking pre-emptive measures, raising troops and punitive treatment of rebels. Weaker answers often failed to compare propaganda as a strategic weapon with other methods and frequently dwelt on how political stability was generally upheld rather than how rebellions were controlled in practice. Several candidates wrote about the 'Great Web of Being', as if it explained itself, and others wrote of paintings of monarchs and newspapers that were circulated throughout the countryside.

- 6 Very few candidates attempted this question, and few tackled it well. Most essays acknowledged the importance of Kildare's rebellion in Anglo-Irish relations but few were able to compare its significance with other turning points in the period. Alternatives ranged from Poyning's administration in 1494–96 to Henry VIII's entitlement as King of Ireland in 1541; from the establishment of plantations in the 1550s to Elizabeth's reaction to Shane O'Neill's rebellion in the 1560s. In general, the long-term legacy of the 1534–37 events needed to be better known and set in the context of Henry VII's and Henry VIII's reigns.

England's Changing Relations with Foreign Powers 1485–1603

- 7 This was a popular question and generally well answered. National security was seen as a consistent motive but keeping on good terms with Spain, resisting the claims of France, and religious issues after the 1530s, were also examined. Better essays recognised the importance of personal motives and cited the difference between Henry VII and Henry VIII, and between Mary and Elizabeth in their relations with France, Scotland and Spain. Weaker essays confused motives with reasons for war and devoted too much space to describing background events.
- 8 Most candidates wrote effectively about the importance of 1558 in Anglo-Scottish relations and either agreed with the premise or assessed its legacy at the Treaty of Troyes (1564). The best answers acknowledged that the loss of Calais coincided with the accession of the new queen and how her cautious personality differed from those of her predecessors. They compared the loss of Calais with other turning points, notably the rise of Spain under Philip II, the expulsion of French troops from Scotland and the outbreak of civil war in France in 1562. Knowledge of the second half of the period was better than the earlier years, and several weaker essays narrated events in Henry VII's and Henry VIII's reigns or wrote general accounts of how Anglo-French hostility turned into Anglo-Spanish hostility.
- 9 Anglo-Spanish relations were generally well known. The best essays evaluated trade in the widest context of Anglo-Spanish relations and highlighted examples of continuity and change. Candidates who under-performed fell into two broad groups: those who knew little about trade and instead focused on other important factors such as religious differences, marriage ties, personalities and the outbreak of revolution in Scotland and civil war in France. The second group of responses agreed with the premise, wrote extensively about the importance of trade between England and Spain but did not compare it with any other influence.

The Catholic Reformation 1492–1610

- 10 This was a popular and generally well answered question. Nearly all candidates agreed with the premise and showed a good knowledge of popes. Better responses compared the reformed Papacy with other influences that affected the Catholic Reformation, especially the Jesuits, the Council of Trent and the Inquisition, before reaching a judgement. Weaker answers asserted events and developments, usually illustrating the impact of the Papacy on the Catholic Reformation before describing other vehicles of reform. Few essays evaluated the connection between a reformed Papacy and the Catholic Reformation and even fewer responses evaluated the impact of humanism and Protestant reformers on the Catholic Reformation.
- 11 Candidates were required to compare the Catholic Church at the beginning and end of the period but varied enormously in their knowledge. Many essays took a narrow view of what the problems were that faced the Catholic Church. They ended their argument in 1563, having attributed any subsequent achievements to the Tridentine decrees but without any evaluation. How well candidates handled the concept of 'essentially the same' often determined the quality of their answer; some made little attempt to distinguish between various problems. Doctrine, heresy, clerical abuses, religious orders and the quality of the Papacy were themes that appeared in many of the better essays.

- 12 Knowledge of Spaniards' contributions to the Catholic Reformation was generally sound although there was often little attempt to compare their work with that of other nationalities, such as the Italians, Germans and French. Weak essays often described events and developments of what the Spanish Church did; better answers assessed the relative importance of their contribution to the revival of the Church. Some candidates focused mainly on other factors such as the Papacy, new orders and Trent rather than on the role of Spaniards.

The Development of the Nation State: France 1498–1610

- 13 This question was the most popular of the set and generally well answered. Tolerance was exercised by examiners as to how candidates interpreted 'character of the king' but most candidates were better informed about Louis XII, Francis I, Henry II and Henry IV than about the other rulers. What was important, however, was that an attempt was made to link the character of French kings to the relative strength of the monarchy. The later Valois kings – Francis II, Charles IX and Henry III – were often described as 'weak' or in the case of Henry III 'effeminate' without explaining how these traits impacted on the government and administration of France. Better responses evaluated the importance of royal finances, domestic and foreign policies, the crown's relations with nobles and clergy, and the maturity of the monarch. Several weaker answers did not recognise that this was a question about the strength of the French monarchy and the factors that affected it.
- 14 Answers were generally competent in assessing how well religious problems were handled in the second half of the period, and contrasts were made between the ineffective management by the Valois governments after 1559 and Henry IV's successful resolution of the wars of religion. Better essays questioned the extent to which Henry had overcome his problems and showed a good understanding of the main issues raised by humanists, Protestants and other heretical groups in the early years of the period. A balanced and evaluative approach characterised the best essays.
- 15 Only a handful of candidates tackled this question and knowledge of various aspects of the French economy was at a premium. While most essays offered sound details concerning royal finances, tax assessments and collection, and some candidates wrote thoughtfully about agricultural practices and overseas colonies, little was known about domestic trade and industry. Evaluating the concept of 'change and continuity', however, was beyond the reach of most candidates.

The Ascendancy of France 1610–1715

- 16 Knowledge of Richelieu's work and legacy was generally sound and many essays compared him with Mazarin and Colbert. Some candidates wrote only about his domestic policies and compared him favourably with Mazarin; some only wrote about his foreign policy, and compared him favourably with Colbert. A minority of candidates took the view that each of the three main ministers had achievements in different spheres and any comparison would be unfair. Mazarin was generally less well handled – his responsibility for the Fronde often being omitted – and some candidates included Louis XIV because he was his own chief minister. Some answers looked at the contributions of Le Tellier and Louvois, and only a handful acknowledged the work of other ministers such as Lionne, Pontchartrain and Desmarets. A major weakness was that candidates did not define 'ascendancy of France' so that answers were often general comparisons of Richelieu with other ministers.

- 17** This question was the least favoured of the set and elicited a range of responses. An understanding of the problems caused by the Huguenots, Papacy, Jesuits and Gallicans was apparent in many essays but issues raised by Jansenism and Quietism were less well known. Weaker essays tended to describe each issue without addressing ‘how effectively’ or showing synoptic links and connections between the issues. Some thought that Jansenism was a religion.
- 18** There were several excellent responses to this question. Most candidates argued that there were elements of ‘absolutism’ in both reigns but they were more widespread and apparent in Louis XIV’s reign. Examples of absolutism were provided throughout the period and most candidates also acknowledged the limitations to royal power, especially those exercised by *parlements* and at a provincial level. The best essays qualified their arguments with examples of both absolutism and limitations, and compared Louis XIII and Louis XIV and their administrations directly. Weaker answers often wrote about taxation, the Academie and the Gazette without explaining their connection with absolutism, or they produced a formulaic essay with little regard for the mismatch between appearance and reality.

F966/02 Modern 1789–1997

Individual Questions

The Challenge of German Nationalism 1789–1919

- 1 Candidates generally displayed a good understanding of the forces that led to the creation and development of German nationalism but some struggled with ‘intellectual ideas’. Some responses considered the concept of ‘creation’ and ‘development’ as separate features; most candidates treated them together and compared intellectual ideas with other factors. What distinguished the better essays from less competent answers was the extent to which intellectual ideas, such as romanticism, cultural identity, liberalism, constitutionalism, Darwinism, socialism and *weltpolitik*, were assessed and a range of other factors were synthesised. Religious, military, economic and political agencies were most commonly analysed. Some periods were better known than others: 1789–1815, 1848–49 and 1890–1919 were often given less attention.
- 2 This question was very popular and well answered. Most candidates argued that Bismarck (the majority of essays) and Metternich (the minority) managed German nationalism more effectively than William II, although there was usually something positive said about the Kaiser. The early years under Metternich were sometimes glossed over or given a narrative treatment, and it was rarely explained why he was so opposed to nationalism. Bismarck’s domestic policies were usually well addressed before 1871 but less so after 1871. The best essays defined ‘managed’ and the goals of the three leaders, and considered the changing nature of nationalism and the responses of the three men to it.
- 3 The main problem facing candidates was how to answer the question of ‘united’ without resorting to an exclusively chronological or narrative approach. The better responses focused on moments of critical importance, usually 1809, 1815, 1848, 1871, 1914 and 1919, and compared them according to particular themes such as political, geographical, cultural, linguistic, social, economic and religious. This approach worked well because it enabled candidates to cover the whole period by themes and then to compare various degrees of unity. Most candidates argued that Germany was never truly united and some made the perceptive point that most unity frequently occurred in times of national crisis. The existence of Poles, Danes and Frenchmen within Germany’s borders was used in some essays as evidence that the German people were disunited. Most candidates wrote at length about Germany under Wilhelm and Metternich but few commented on the nature of the Empire created in 1871.

The Changing Nature of Warfare 1792–1945

- 4 Candidates were expected to compare the relative importance of the quality of troops and the size of armies in the nature of warfare, and to refer to a range of battles, campaigns and wars in support of their argument. In this respect the periods 1792–1815 and 1914–45 were better known than the intervening century, although several responses made appropriate references to the Crimea, Wars of Unification and American Civil War. Few answers referred to the Russo-Japanese War and even fewer to colonial wars. Weaker scripts failed to define ‘quality’, were heavily descriptive, and reluctant to give examples of actual battles – even to the extent of not saying which side won. The best essays weighed quality and quantity with a range of examples and other assessed factors, usually generalship, strategy and tactics, and weaponry. Several argued that while the size of the army could be important, the quality of the soldiers, and especially generals, mattered more until changes in weaponry and technology in the second half of the nineteenth

century made both the size and quality less important. Moreover, while the quality of soldiers might determine the outcome of a battle, the size of an army was more likely to determine the outcome of a war.

- 5 This was a popular question but was not always well answered. Knowledge of particular theories and their authors was often rather thin although most essays were able to relate broad theories of military engagement in the course of the period, if only to demonstrate the continuity of Napoleonic ideas for much of the nineteenth century. Developments in technology on the other hand were better known. How they affected strategy and war planning, for instance, in mobilisation, communications, fire-power, organisation and supplies, was considered in good answers. The best answers linked technology issues to military theory and argued well as to their impact and whether thinking kept up with developments. Weaker answers were marred by a vague understanding of military theory which many took to mean strategy/tactics or just military practice and a preponderance towards describing the effectiveness or otherwise of the new technologies.
- 6 This was the least popular of the questions. Candidates for the most part were able to assess how the Napoleonic Wars affected the development of army organisation – the impact of conscription on large army units, the mobilisation of state resources in a total war, the formation of staff corps and meritocracy in appointing commanders – and how countries such as Britain and Prussia sought to emulate the French model. Essays were less convincing, however, when alternative turning points were considered in respect of army organisation. Some candidates focused on Bismarck's Prussia, some on the (dis)organisation of the Crimean War, some on the USA Civil War and many on the decade preceding World War One, but only the best essays offered a synthesis of developments. Coverage of World War Two was often disappointing.

Britain and Ireland 1798–1921

- 7 While most candidates focused on revolutionary nationalism and avoided making a comparison with constitutional nationalism, they did find the concept of identifying a 'pattern' quite difficult. For many, a pattern amounted to any examples of continuity over time, usually in respect of revolutionary aims, methods, internal and external support, success and failure. Better candidates provided a definition and were aware that revolutionary nationalism did change in its character and direction, especially in the twentieth century, and gave due attention to 'blood sacrifice', the reaction to Ulster Unionism, Sinn Fein, the IRA and the Easter Rising. They were able to assess shifts and continuity in tactics, timing, inspiration, leadership, organisation, appeal, foreign support and religious involvement across the period.
- 8 The question produced many outstanding answers. Most candidates started by discussing Catholic Emancipation, compared it with other key moments such as the Act of Union, the Famine, Home Rule (especially the 1886 bill), the Easter Rising and Anglo-Irish Wars, and concluded that it was the most important turning point. The best essays provided a comparative synthesis, consistently referring to the 1829 Act in each of their selected alternatives. Weaker responses gave insufficient attention to Catholic Emancipation and how its legacy impacted on subsequent political, religious, economic and social developments. The weakest answers tended to list turning points, some of which were classified as substantial periods of time, or described economic and social changes instead of focussing politically on the Union. There was also some misunderstanding as to what Catholic Emancipation entailed and the nature and purpose of Home Rule.

- 9 This was not a popular question and answered well by only a handful of candidates. Little was known on economic developments outside the period 1845–1900, and many essays focused on land issues, the Famine and Ulster. Few had enough details on the effects that the Union had on Ireland’s economy and knew little about other factors such as population trends, emigration, natural resources, landholdings and tenancies, native industries and trade, to get very far with answering ‘to what extent’. The best answers examined the North as well as the South, covered a range of industrial, commercial and trade based developments and focused on ‘hinder’ versus ‘help’.

Russia and its Rulers 1855–1964

- 10 Of the three questions on Russia, this was by far the most popular and best answered. Knowledge and evaluation of Lenin and his opposition varied from general and thin in weaker essays to detailed and extensive in better answers. The latter consistently compared how Lenin dealt with his opposition, both internally and externally, with other rulers, notably Alexander III and Stalin, and successfully applied a thematic approach. Some candidates argued that Stalin was the most successful on account of the scale of his repression but more discerning essays suggested that the quality and nature of opposition facing Lenin was greater and more threatening, and in any case Lenin’s achievements provided the foundations for Stalin’s totalitarianism. Moreover, it was argued that Lenin was the most effective leader as he was only one who had actually headed an opposition group. Coverage of Alexander II, Nicholas II and Khrushchev figured in the best essays by way of a contrast with Lenin but few referred to how Kerensky handled his opposition. For the weaker candidates, this question was an invitation to write at length on repression. Coverage of Lenin was often surprisingly thin, whereas coverage of Stalin was excessive. An alarming number of candidates asserted that Stalin didn’t experience any opposition.
- 11 The question on Russian government presented the usual problems. Weaker answers frequently focused on government policies, especially economic and social, rather than on the nature of central and local government and the changes that occurred from participating in war. Some wars were clearly more relevant than others but weaker responses often described the wars or failed to link them to governmental developments. Some essays examined the Cold War and a few candidates interpreted the revolutions of 1905 and 1917 as ‘wars’. The best candidates looked at the effects of the Crimean War, the Japanese War, Civil War, the First and Second World Wars, and picked up on the need to assess other factors such as the need for concessions, the need to ward off opposition and to survive, ideologies, methodologies, modernising reforms, structures of government and the character of rulers. A surprisingly large number of candidates failed to do justice to the momentous changes of 1917, dismissing them in a sentence rather than explaining what it meant to move from autocracy to dictatorship via liberal ‘democracy’.
- 12 How candidates structured their argument usually determined the quality of their responses. In general the question was well answered. ‘Russian people’ was interpreted in the better essays to be different types of worker (rural, urban, merchant, *et al*), religious groups, women, youths and various minorities. Many weaker answers divided the Russian people into workers and peasants without differentiating between them, and then embarked on writing at great length about everything from the Emancipation of the Serfs onwards. Most candidates assessed a good range of economic and social reforms although some included political change which was not required. Economic changes sometimes comprised a list of features such as Emancipation, the Great Spurt, Collectivisation and the Five Year Plans. Overall it was felt that the people lost more than they gained but a substantial number suggested that it was impossible to make a synoptic judgement, and so sat on the historical fence.

Civil Rights in the USA 1865–1992

- 13** Very few candidates argued that Booker T Washington was the most important leader and some even claimed that his contribution was negligible, although this judgement may have owed more to ignorance than knowledge. There was usually a good evaluation of leaders such as du Bois, Garvey, Luther King, and Malcolm X, and several candidates considered Randolph and Jackson. White leaders, particularly Kennedy and Johnson, were also cited in a few cases but their inclusion was not essential for the highest marks. The best scripts were able to assess the quality of leaders and compare their roles directly; there was good use of cross-referencing and many adopted a thematic approach. The vast majority of candidates described the achievements of a range of leaders but offered very little comparative analysis. Where the latter was attempted, it tended to be in a very formulaic manner. The poorest responses offered a chronological survey of the Civil Rights Movement or wrote an extensive account of King's career, while some focused on the impact of federal institutions on the movement.
- 14** This question was generally well answered by most candidates. The New Deal era was seen by many candidates as the most important turning point and how well it was evaluated was a differentiator between good and average essays. The legacy of Wilson's administration and the impact of World War Two were useful counter-points and contrasts but better responses also looked at the 1960s–70s, while others favoured the pre-Reconstruction era. A fair number of essays took the hint that the question was not simply about trade unions and included some good material on women and minority groups as sections of the labouring classes. Weaker candidates lacked enough relevant knowledge, resorted to general descriptions and struggled to identify other clear turning points. Some believed the Wagner Act was a separate entity from the New Deal and so treated it as a significant turning point. Many answers tailed off after 1945 before the anti-union backlash had gathered momentum. For some, 50 years constituted a turning point which, as the candidates discovered, was an interpretation that became increasingly difficult to defend.
- 15** Questions on women's rights have produced some excellent essays in recent sessions and this paper was no different. The contrast between the periods 1865–1941 and 1941–1992 was evident in most answers although a few candidates challenged the premise of the question. Reasons for particular trends needed to be at the heart of the essay and better candidates began by assessing the impact of World War Two (compared with World War One), the African American civil rights movement of the 1950s–60s (compared with the 1920s–30s), the rise of women's liberation (compared with women's movements 1865–1919) and the support of federal agencies and trade unions (compared with opposition before 1941). There were, however, many weaker essays that described progress in women's rights rather than explained or assessed the reasons, said little about the earlier period, and presented very generalised and over-assertive narratives. Some simply listed key events. There was also a widespread failure to differentiate between different types of women and how they fared, and a marked reluctance to sum up progress by 1992. Some focused too much on hindrances to the women's movement (such as the impact of Federal governments and internal divisions) and these candidates seemed to be rehearsing past questions.

The Development of Democracy in Britain 1868–1997

- 16** Only a handful of candidates tackled this question. Most candidates regarded the Labour party as important and usually looked at its links with reforms in the franchise and trade union activities but few considered other influences such as the reform of the Lords, educational reforms and developments in the media. Weaker answers referred to 'mass democracy' in general terms and rarely attempted a definition or showed sound understanding that they knew what the question was about.

- 17** There was some confusion among the few candidates who tackled this question. How regional politics affected political parties produced only vague generalisations and little analysis. Surprisingly few examples were cited and most candidates instead quickly moved on to other factors, but these were often not assessed or related with any degree of accuracy or relevance.
- 18** Examiners were disappointed with the overall quality of answers to this question. Neither the influence of various prime ministers nor the importance of other factors, such as the expansion of the civil service and economic and social changes, were well known. Few essays revealed examples of prime ministerial relations with the working of the cabinet and the contribution of their ministers.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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

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

© OCR 2012

