

**History A**

Advanced GCE A2 H506

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H106

**OCR Report to Centres**

---

**June 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

## CONTENTS

Advanced GCE History A (H506)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE History A (H106)

### OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
F961/01 AS Period Studies – General comments	1
F961/01 British History Period Studies – Medieval and Early modern	3
F961/02 British History Period Studies	11
F962/01: Medieval and Early Modern 1095-1609	17
F962/02 European and World History Period Studies – Modern	25
F963 and F964 AS History Enquiries	32
F965 Historical Interpretations and Investigations	40
F966/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1066-1715	44
F966/02 Modern 1789–1997	51

## F961/01 AS Period Studies – General comments

The overall standard of the scripts seen was very similar to that of previous sessions. The examination technique of most candidates was good. Time was allocated more or less equally to each question and it was a small minority only who showed signs of a rushed second answer because of lack of time. The best students seemed capable of focused argument without planning; weaker students might find it profitable to plan their response briefly and then check for relevance before they start writing, thereby focusing precisely on the question actually set, rather than the one they imagine has been set. This said, those who made very lengthy and detailed and elaborate plans were not making the best use of their time. Most candidates were able to give the appropriate time to each answer – though this was sometimes an issue for good candidates, who had lots to put into their first answers. There were some legibility issues – some answers were very difficult to follow and it required a lot of time and patience to sort out whether there was actually any merit in the evidence and argument being presented. There was no evidence that the rubric was misunderstood.

A lot of time was wasted by some candidates who wrote lengthy plans, and didn't develop them in the essay. Candidates are reminded that a plan is treated as such and not marked. Some candidates wrote lengthy introductions and then repeated their points in the main part of the essay without really elaborating any further. Similarly some weaker candidates, aware of the need to write a conclusion but not really able to develop judgement, repeated comment from the body of the essay without elaboration of evaluation.

However, there were some excellent responses this year with well written, knowledgeable answers that clearly addressed the question set. Many candidates were able to adapt their knowledge and use the most prescient evidence to support their case. Most candidates outlined their answer in the introduction and gave an answer to the question which is an encouraging sign. However, many conclusions tended to be a summary of points made rather than reinforcing a case for importance. Centres would also do well to remind their candidates that an essay is an argument, not merely a regurgitation of learnt knowledge.

It was pleasing to find few answers that resorted to straightforward description and little else, most candidates are able to display some ability to argue and therefore reach Level III. The descriptive approach was certainly present in some answers, but was usually accompanied by attempts to relate the information offered to the question set. This is evidence of widespread preparation for the examination. Most candidates approached the paper with a clear idea of what was expected, and understood the importance of producing an analytical response to questions, although some lacked sufficient understanding and/or content to make this convincing. Stronger responses were analytical throughout the essay and often made links back to the named factor, weaker ones tended to write a list and give some basic analysis at the end of paragraphs or in a brief, summative conclusion.

On the first point many candidates clearly do not understand what the command 'assess' actually means. Centres would do well to remind their students that assessment is not listing, there has to be a judgement of importance. It was a similar story with 'how far' type questions. Many essays had a good depth of knowledge but written as a list ensuring that they could not access the higher bands on A01B.

Candidates also need to be reminded to actually answer the question that is set not the one they are expecting or have practised before – for example on q.23 on F962/2 many gave a perfectly good answer on how the Nazis controlled the German population but failed to address whether they were successfully able to implement their social policy. It might help candidates if they understood what was meant by the terms domestic, economic, social etc as many simply wrote everything they knew about a topic.

There were several symptoms of imperfect understanding. Introductions to an answer that announce what the candidate intends to write or which rehearse the question are a waste of time and ought to be discouraged. Instead candidates should see the first paragraph as vital and use it to set out their thesis or point of view, which should then be followed through in the remainder of the essay. As a result the conclusion should follow naturally from the opening and reinforce the line that had been taken; this involves thinking through the line of argument before starting to write and adds further weight to the need for a plan that focuses on the question and is not simply a list of events and dates that the candidate intends to bring in to their response regardless of the question. Candidates who knew less tended to limit their answers to assertion and generalisation. Weaker candidates found difficulty in developing their conclusion. Candidates are reminded that historiography is not a requirement at AS. Allusions to historiography need to be discouraged. In the hands of the less able it can easily degenerate into name-dropping or, more dangerously, lead a student into wasting valuable time on marginally relevant meditation, or description of historians' ideas which was no more creditable than any other description.

However, there did seem to be more factual errors this year- confusing domestic and foreign policy for example but also confusing dates and events. Once again students would benefit greatly by learning a simple timeline of events as part of their revision.

Candidates should be reminded that it is a huge help to examiners if some space is left between the two answers, to allow room for marking.

Some centres seem to prepare their candidates through the teaching of essays rather than skills. There is a tendency for candidates to have prepared formats which puts them in a straight jacket they find difficult to get out of. – this led to some extremely formulaic responses which used similar phrasings and vocabulary but which did not seem able to analyse, explain convincingly or provide judgements. This prevented candidates from achieving the highest levels. This approach is rarely successful and while it makes sense to be well prepared, the students should be encouraged to think on their feet and be flexible when applying their evidence to the actual question asked. This is especially true of questions with a less familiar focus such as the one about Charles V's foreign policy (15) where a ready made answer can be a serious handicap. The vast majority of candidates understand the rubrics, and gave equal time to each essay. Some of the less frequently set questions were well answered and this demonstrated in general a better understanding of **more** of the topic. There was some very detailed evidence used which showed an impressive breadth of knowledge. Candidates should be reminded that it is a huge help to examiners if some space is left between the two answers, to allow room for marking.

## **F961/01 British History Period Studies – Medieval and Early modern**

### **Question 1**

Most candidates attempted to produce a balanced analysis, either adopting a for/against or a thematic approach. There were several good answers which noted the length of the reign, from 1042 to 1066, and the low threat of invasion or war. The handling of Godwin and his sons, especially in 1051-2, formed quite an important element in the answers. The death of Godwin in 1053 was seen by most to be a turning-point in the reign. There was however a neglect of the Church and of the succession problem. Very few mentioned the recall of Edgar Atheling. Candidates made the points that Edward was limited by the system of government set up by Cnut and by the existing power of the already prominent Godwin family. Most maintained that Edward's character managed to keep stability, apart from the years 1051-2, using Godwin power. Relations improved with Harold Godwinson, though the uncertainty over the succession was not conducive to stability. Unconvincing speculation from a number of answers suggested that Edward should have stripped the Earls of their power. Weaker answers lacked range and precision, often concentrating almost exclusively on the crisis of 1051. Better answers drew material from the entire range, and were confident in handling contrasting points of view.

### **Question 2**

This was a less popular question, and generally answered less strongly than the other two in the section, with many patchy responses. Some candidates attempted to duplicate information used for Question 1. A few referred to Godwin's support of Edward's accession. Most were weak on the Godwin land holdings or the number of earldoms held by his sons over the years. They reported Edward's marriage, referred to Swein and possibly Tostig, but neglected Harold's role as 'subregulus'. Only a minority of answers could evaluate a range of valid reasons; most thought the question required an outline of fluctuating Godwin fortunes, and spent too long assessing why the Godwins were *not* powerful. Good candidates gave a range of reasons: Cnut's legacy; large powerful families; Edward's need for support coming from Normandy; Godwin's control of Wessex; Harold keeping the peace effectively for Edward - mostly with detailed support.

### **Question 3**

This was very popular question and elicited the most thorough and wide-ranging of the three answers in this topic. The best answers compared Saxon with Norman tactics in the battle: shield wall; cavalry; archers (Harold's in London); composition of armies and preparation for the battle, especially Harold's fighting in the north and march south; William and Harold's leadership; papal support for William; luck especially the weather and tides. Most strong answers made the point that the sides were evenly matched and it was a lengthy encounter. Although most candidates were able to assess a range of reasons, only a minority could offer a convincing judgement as to which reason was most important. Strong answers used links between factors to substantiate their concluding judgements. Weaker candidates tended to take peripheral points and develop them at length, such as the papal banner, while others like Gate Fulford or the importance of Edwin and Morcar were barely mentioned. The numbers in each army varied from candidate to candidate! Most candidates were aware of the advantages of cavalry and mobility on one hand, and of the shield wall's pros and cons on the other.

### **Question 4**

This was a very popular question. The expected factors were considered, such as undermighty kingship and overmighty nobles. Some were able to build effective paragraphs around such less obvious themes as unwise marriages. The best answers deployed an impressive level of detailed factual support; a minority spent too long considering Henry's weaknesses before 1450. In some centres the question caused major issues as it had a terrific range in terms of the dates

and even better candidates struggled to get beyond 1455. Most started in 1422 with the minority of Henry VI and the losses in the 100 Years War. Some candidates spent too long on what was in effect background rather than material directly addressing the question. A number attributed the fighting to the Black Death with unsuccessful linkage. A small number of answers took the answer to Bosworth and then had less time left for a second answer. Many telescoped the formation of two armed camps unaware that the divisions of Yorkist and Lancastrian emerged later on and the sides were not distinct as many nobles changed sides (Stanleys for example) linking these groupings to war and peace. Most were unaware that it was Henry VI who re-engaged in the war in 1449. Many blamed all the civil war on Suffolk who was killed in 1450 as the answers revolved around 3 points all based on the reign of Henry VI leaving the response incomplete in more than one centre. A number confused Suffolk and Somerset. Bastard feudalism was less prominent than in previous years and few examined Richard of York's land and military holdings. Weaker candidates refer to York as the Protectorate rather than Protector and many confuse crown and country when discussing revenue and debts. Prince Edward hardly got a mention. Candidates generally used one of two approaches: chronological or thematic. There were several problems with the former approach. Some candidates spent too long sketching in the background prior to 1450, whilst others failed to cover the reign of Edward IV at all. At the higher end one of the commonest factors holding candidates back was a failure to look at the period after 1461 and the continuation of the wars under Edward IV. There was also a tendency to describe events rather than analyse them. The thematic approach enabled students to compare factors in a more effective manner by examining and assessing such issues as the mistakes and frailties of Henry VI and Edward IV, the role of powerful magnates such as York and Warwick as well as the difficulties created by Margaret of Anjou and Elizabeth Woodville. This approach ensured that most of the period 1450-1470 was covered in the answer.

Stronger candidates were able to weigh up several factors before coming to a judgement. Almost every candidate suggested that Henry's weaknesses were the underlying cause of the wars, and that everything else stemmed from this.

### **Question 5**

This was not a popular question: it was answered at two levels. For some it was a straightforward question: those who had studied Edward IV's finances in some detail, who knew the difference between ordinary and extraordinary revenue and who could discuss the chamber, crown lands, customs, feudal incidents as well as benevolences, parliamentary grants and the French pension. Then there was the second level. Here many candidates did not have enough detailed knowledge of finance to assess success in any meaningful manner. As a result many answers could only offer a broad picture with much assertion and not enough argument. There was a lot of misunderstanding of "Chamber Finance" which did not help. Many candidates gave no dates or figures at all and few were able to argue that only after 1471 did Edward's finances really improve. Many candidates quickly ran out of directly relevant information and extended into other areas of policy some of which had occasional financial connections. Some weaker candidates simply wrote about whether Edward's reign was a success, with little regard for financial issues, whilst others focused almost exclusively on his management of the nobility. Although familiar with what Edward did to try and boost royal finance, stronger candidates were held back by a difficulty in establishing any criteria by which to judge success - often candidates looked at his policies and simply explained that these were/ were not "successful". Responses which were able to establish a criterion for success - restoration of confidence in royal finances, ability not have to resort to taxation, for example - were strong, but very much in the minority. Again there was confusion among the weaker candidates who referred to the 'country's' finances, relevant on the trade agreements but not elsewhere.

### **Question 6**

This was very popular question. It was often answered well, as candidates dealt with a range of appropriate problems, and managed to maintain the focus on the issue of success. Whilst most argued he was successful, a minority were able to argue that he was not. However, it was

important for candidates to establish the problems that he faced and not simply discuss Henry's policies in isolation and not link them to his problems. There were also a significant number of responses which were very narrow dealing only with the Yorkist threat and rebellions, which limited the overall judgement that could be reached.

Candidates generally had a good knowledge of the domestic problems faced by Henry, but often struggled to bring in any substantial argument with regards to his success in dealing with them. When looking at Simnel's Rebellion for example numerous candidates explained that Henry was successful simply because he was able to defeat it. It was only a minority who were able to weigh up Henry's effective management within the battle against his lack of effectiveness early on, where his lack of an effective spy network allowed the rebels to gather in Ireland unopposed. There were so many possible domestic problems available for discussion that most candidates achieved a reasonable content though sometimes too descriptively. They were strongest as usual on pretenders, but also good on attainders and taxes as the cause of rebellions. A few mentioned Henry's marriage as some resolution to the warring factions. Again the understanding of finances was limited; crown revenues were regarded as national income and the terms ordinary and extraordinary income were rarely employed.

While some focussed exclusively on them, a number of responses made no mention of rebellion or pretenders. Some got their pretenders mixed up, and there was also an over-reliance on one or two noble examples, most notably Surrey. A good number answered "how successfully" without reference to problems. Some confused Star Chamber and the Chamber. Many erroneously claimed that there were no over mighty nobles. A number confused whom Simnel and Warbeck were pretending to be. Few of the weaker responses commented on Henry's financial policies and his treatment of the nobility was often ignored. Whilst some referred to foreign policy and successfully linked it to domestic concerns, others used material that was tangential at best.

Most candidates addressed a range of factors, however some candidates drifted into answering a question on how successful Henry's policies were. Stronger responses started each section by clearly identifying the problem that existed, providing a framework for their arguments.

### **Question 7**

This question was generally answered extremely well, with most candidates establishing criteria by which to judge success in the introduction, and then evaluating Henry's success in achieving each particular aim each in turn. The most common success criteria took the form of: the desire for glory, the "Great Matter" and recognition within Europe. The strongest responses identified how Henry's foreign policy aims evolved over time, and in line with unexpected European and English developments (such as having run out of money after his early invasions of France, he looked to obtain glory through peace). Rather than adopt a strictly chronological approach they considered how successfully these aims were achieved at certain moments of the reign. There were very few purely descriptive answers and a number of very good candidates who showed excellent knowledge and a high level of understanding. Strong candidates often pointed to English isolation by 1529 to measure concluding that Henry VIII was not successful. Most candidates referred to Henry's acquisition of Tournai and Therouanne, but concluded that this failed to give Henry the glory he craved, with many successfully arguing how Henry was outmanoeuvred by more experienced European figures such as Ferdinand and Maximilian. One pattern of performance was that candidates were stronger on the years 1509-1521 than on 1521-1529. There was frequently a gap between 1520, the Field of Cloth of Gold, and 1529, the Treaty of Cambrai, but many candidates could discuss the 1523 campaign and the aftermath of the Battle of Pavia, although some claimed that Henry was very close to being crowned king of France. Many analysed the importance of Flodden and its relative success in contrast to the Battle of the Spurs. A surprising number of answers ignored the divorce.

Weaker answers were characterised by descriptive narrative, tending to become vague about both aims and significant detail after 1520. The best answers, having defined Henry's aims, split the relevant material into manageable chunks, providing evaluative judgements by placing aims alongside outcomes.

### **Question 8**

Candidates, even the very best, seemed unable to answer this question without resorting to what was the often imperfectly understood historiography, tending to describe rather than make evaluative use of Professor Elton's arguments. The "Revolution in Government" thesis may well have had its day but the cavalier disdain shown by a minority of candidates to this eminent historian is inappropriate. Many candidates, however, had a strong knowledge of relevant historiography (the Elton Thesis and its challengers such as Loades, and utilised this successfully in order to fully address the question. Most candidates referred to Cromwell's reforms of the Privy Council, before challenging the extent to which these were his work. Following on from this, many studied his reforms regarding regional government, before comparing these with the reforms/ systems that had gone before him. Considerable attention was also given to Cromwell's role within bureaucratic reforms such as the Court of Augmentations. Some outstanding answers, while giving due weight to Cromwell's innovations, argued that the system of government in 1547 was not fundamentally different from what it had been in 1532. The institutions of government remained slender and inadequate. Government still depended on personal influence and relationships: of the monarch with his ministers, of Councillors with MPs and JPs. It also depended on the cooperation of the political nation to enforce its decrees.

Many candidates clearly knew the areas that they should discuss, but it was equally obvious that some did not really understand what they were talking about. Terms like sovereignty appeared frequently, but were not always used appropriately; words like Parliament and Privy Council were also used carelessly and interchangeably in some answers. Where a candidate was confident a strong answer was often the result, with areas like Parliament, sovereignty, the Council and finance discussed in a balanced and well supported manner. Candidates were safest on the Privy Council. Few could identify any particular finance court or its function. The role of royal secretary which did endure was omitted. There was some misunderstanding of the incorporation of Wales and the abolition of the liberties and little mention of the role of parliament. Finally the spelling of bureaucracy is a perennial problem.

### **Question 9**

This question elicited some very strong answers. Most adopted a thematic approach, and argued that Somerset was less effective than Northumberland. There were many well structured analyses comparing Somerset and Northumberland on each area of government: Scotland; France; the economy; social issues, succession, and some including religious change as well. These tended to be strong on the character of each government and the nature of the coups which toppled each man. When establishing criteria for "effectiveness", most candidates opted to address Somerset and Northumberland's handling of finances and of foreign policy. The general consensus was that Northumberland was far more pragmatic and therefore successful when it came to foreign policy, with attention drawn to the Treaties of Boulogne and Norham, which cost English pride, but greatly benefited English finance- a contrast with Somerset's unsuccessful garrisoning policy. The events surrounding the downfall of Somerset and his reliance on proclamations (which isolated members of the council) and his poor handling of the events of 1549 were viewed by many as proof of his lack of effectiveness, however relatively few candidates made any reference to the demise of Northumberland and his failed Devise for the Succession.

The candidates who adopted a thematic approach usually out-performed those who answered in a chronological fashion. There remains some confusion about "enclosure" with some student s thinking that Somerset was in favour of it and Northumberland's policies invariably received insufficient analysis. What happened after Edward's death was ignored by many answers, with

the result that Northumberland's effectiveness was exaggerated compared with Somerset's. The main confusions were that some candidates called both men Protector, some failed to understand the difference between passing and repealing legislation, such as the Treason Act, and in some essays Edward VI received no mention at all.

### **Question 10**

This question produced some excellent answers. At best, candidates were able to make a distinction between evidence of the advance of Protestantism as an act of state, initiated and controlled by government, and therefore slow and limited but likely to advance rapidly after 1547 because of the education of Edward VI and the eclipse of the conservatives at court; and evidence of a steady change in beliefs that influenced the hearts and minds of individuals in London, the home counties and, crucially, at court, irrespective of the will of the king. Henry's own position tended to be understood by only the strongest candidates. Many candidates found the question difficult and gave much time to describing the more obvious changes in the 1530s, many of which did of course affect the 1540s but they were very short of evidence on the named period.

A good number of candidates erroneously assumed that Henry VIII was Protestant. Many started with the changes of 1529 missing the date in the question. Better responses were aware that Henry distanced himself, for example Bishops' Book not the King's book and the replacement of the Ten Articles with the Six Articles in 1539 based on traditional Catholic belief in transubstantiation; the issuing of the Great Bible 1539 and its restriction in 1541. What only the strongest could do was to set this against the predominance of Protestants on the regency Council, Henry's support for both Cranmer and Catherine Parr, and the Protestant tutors for Edward VI and Elizabeth. Weaker answers tended to describe the changes without having much idea of how Protestant might be characterised.

### **Question 11**

This question was generally well answered, with the emphasis on assessment and evaluation and an appreciation of how the lack of a Catholic heir, together with the brevity of her reign, limited the success of Mary's policies. The quality of responses very much depended upon the ability of candidates to identify criteria for "success." Candidates generally argued that in the long term Mary's religious policies were unsuccessful given the fact that Elizabeth undid much of the change, but that she did have some successes within her life time, most notably her marriage to Philip. Candidates provided a wide range of examples to demonstrate the popularity of her religious changes, but were also keen to comment on the relative unpopularity caused by the Marian persecutions, although little evidence to support this claim was provided. Very few candidates made reference to her failure to restore the monasteries. There was some drift to the marriage but many were aware of the reversal of Protestant legislation; the restoration of Papal Supremacy and the reforms of Cardinal Pole. Some overestimated the restoration of monasteries but were aware of the recovery of statues, icons and church plate. There was some discussion about the effectiveness of Catholic preaching and propaganda, but few candidates were aware of recent work on these issues. Many ended with speculation that if Mary had had an heir and lived longer then she would have been successful. As she was barren and seriously ill it was more rewarding if candidates worked from the known issues and noted the limitations to her efforts.

### **Question 12**

Candidates were aware of the dissatisfaction felt amongst certain Puritans towards Elizabeth, however most found it difficult actually to quantify the severity of this, making it difficult to access the higher marks. Consideration was given to their activity and potential threat within Parliament; however candidates generally concluded that this decreased as the period progressed following the appointment of Whitgift as Archbishop of Canterbury. Puritan activity in the parishes was effectively assessed in better essays, together with the Presbyterian campaign for 'Further Reformation'. The issue of whether or not Elizabeth exaggerated the threat was sometimes

discussed together with the impact of Whitgift's insistence on conformity and the consequent collapse of clerical and parliamentary attempts to change the structure of the church.

Most candidates explained how the lack of a suitable replacement helped reduce the threat, however a general lack of precise knowledge prevented many from accessing the top levels. A common weakness was a lack of accurate knowledge of any puritan belief or practice, confusing classes with prophesyings. Remarkably few assessed the significance of the suspension of Grindall. Too many weaker essays gave no name of any archbishop of Canterbury, and showed no knowledge of any parliamentary activity. Comparisons were made with Catholic opposition, but most avoided the pitfall of turning the entire answer into a comparison. Many answers drifted off into an account of why the Puritans were or were not threatening to Elizabeth (hardly mentioning the church). Some candidates found it difficult to distinguish between moderate, broadly conformist Puritans who were never a threat, and the Presbyterians and Separatists who, arguably, were.

### **Question 13**

Too many candidates who attempted this question were ill-prepared to do so. This showed in both a lack of factual knowledge and a failure to demonstrate an understanding of the nature and functions of the Court. There was a cloud of mystery over the political role of the Court. It was frequently confused or conflated with the Council which was confused with the Privy Council. Parliament was rarely mentioned, although in some answers that was also confused with the Privy Council. Many answers discussed the importance of the monarch and individual ministers rather than the organs of government.

It appeared difficult for many candidates to muster enough material for a viable answer and a lack of understanding of the crucial issue of 'court' meant that many answers were very weak and confused, yet this is a key feature in the indicative content of the Specification. There were brief references to faction, patronage, progresses and displays but with little if any link to government. Most drifted into a description of the privy council's powers and influence. The courtiers mentioned were Burghley, Leicester, Raleigh and Essex.

### **Question 14**

This question produced many general answers and some strong responses. Informed answers discussed social and economic issues – decline of cloth trade; moving the staple from Antwerp due to Netherlands Revolt; the rising population; Inflation; the effects of the long war against Spain 1585-1604; social instability and the Poor Laws of 1598 and 1601; the drift to the towns. Some answers failed to distinguish between financial and economic problems. Those that did so seemed better equipped to deal with the latter. Although candidates were aware of the importance of inflation, they seemed uncertain about its effects. In particular, few candidates were aware of the dramatic fall in the value of the subsidy or of the weakness of the system of assessment which was too deeply ingrained in the structure of local government to be eradicated. Some candidates looked at Elizabeth's financial problems and others discussed England's as a whole. However, the greatest discriminator was whether candidates were able to assess the severity of the problems, rather than simply explain what the problems were or what had brought them about. Many tried to compare these problems with others like religion and hence had long irrelevant sections. It was a common tactic to look at causes of problems, such as foreign policy, rather than consider how serious the problems were. Above all there was little understanding or discussion of inflation in the period. Many candidates don't know the difference between economic and economical.

### **Question 15**

This question caused some difficulties. Answers focused on the causes of her declining popularity in the main. Some answers addressed the issues associated with her age, the loss of her old counsellors and the increasing number of eyes looking northwards to James VI. Many thought the war with Spain started the drop in popularity, with some missing the propaganda value of the defeat of the 1588 Armada. Many considered that the Irish rebellion caused her to

be unpopular but didn't necessarily make an appropriate link and similarly with the Essex rebellion overestimating his support in 1601 though again better answers were aware that the mob deserted him. Monopolies also caused some loss of popularity but the Golden Speech restored it to a degree. Exactly how much is difficult to measure. Many were able to discuss the issue of social problems with some suggesting that the food riots and the Oxfordshire Rising were clear evidence of declining popularity, without seeing that these were not really aimed at her, whilst others suggested that government policies to deal with the social and economic problems helped to maintain her popularity.

Answers here were often disappointingly thin with some lingering over a description of the defeat of the Armada, while ignoring events such as the monopolies debates, the Golden Speech, faction in the council, Essex's rebellion and the succession issue. The question does encourage candidates to make unfounded statements on Elizabeth's popularity. A common fault is to regard Ireland as foreign.

### **Question 16**

This question elicited some very strong responses: those which put the emphasis on assessing how serious particular conflicts actually were while at the same time providing the necessary supporting detail. There was general agreement that the religious policy of James was broadly acceptable to most Puritans and that there were no attempts in parliament to reform the church, as there had been under Elizabeth. Conflict over such things as the king's refusal to enforce the penal laws, which prompted protests in every parliament of the reign, never escalated into the sort of serious conflict over religious issues that flared in the next reign. This point was made eloquently in some outstanding answers which, while giving due weight to conflict over James's religious and financial policies, went on to argue, with examples, that the fear of MPs that James intended to rule without parliament caused serious conflict in 1604 (the Apology), 1610 (Impositions) and 1621 (the Protestation); but that this fear, when carefully examined, was not serious until after 1625. One impressive essay concluded that the number of statutes passed and subsidies granted, is proof positive that the relationship between Crown and Parliament under James I was generally amicable.

Many responses to this question were not particularly strong, with too many candidates struggling to address the question. Rather than assessing the severity of the conflicts between James and his parliament, the majority of such candidates turned it into a question on the reason for conflicts between James and his parliaments. Even those students who did focus on the issues in the question struggled to identify any criteria by which to judge "serious", making it difficult to access the higher levels. Very few students made any reference to the Great Contract, with most choosing to look at the monopolies debate, and conflicts with regards to foreign policy. In one centre most answers were on foreign policy only and failed to cite any individual parliaments; in particular they neglected the events of 1621. Only a small number of moderate and weaker candidates were able to differentiate between Parliaments. The most common limitation of all was that a large number of candidates struggled with the idea of assessing seriousness: they were content to describe conflicts, but did not explicitly consider whether these were serious or not. A list of factors was described, sometimes in some detail, but comments on their seriousness were bolted-on assertions.

### **Question 17**

This question was generally well answered, with most candidates focussing their argument around the extent to which Personal Rule brought about religious and economic stability. The best answers were able to examine different areas of policy – financial, political, religious – while focusing sharply on the key issue of how far they brought stability to the realm. Students were generally keen to explain that although Ship Money brought a degree of resentment as shown by the Hampton Case, collection rates were generally relatively healthy, leading to a degree of economic stability, challenging the assumption it caused great unrest. In contrast, Charles' actions during personal rule were seen as evidence of how Personal Rule caused religious

instability, with many drawing attention to the unpopularity of Laud's reforms, and how these caused problems with Scotland, culminating with the Treaty of Ripon.

There were some patterns of failure among those who handled the question less effectively. Some were not able to demonstrate an understanding of the word stability. A common error was to spend too long on Ireland and/or Scotland, but not to link this back to English problems. There was often very little on the work of Wentworth, especially in comparison with Laud, and the imposition of the prayer book on Scotland was missed by some weaker candidates. There was also confusion between England's debts and Charles'. A surprising number of answers included the years 1625 -29 in their discussion of Personal Rule. Some noted the absence of any disagreements with Parliament as a symptom of stability and of contentment with Charles' rule, apparently unaware that Parliament was not in session.

### **Question 18**

This was a popular question. Some strong answers were able to build an effective analysis balancing Pym against other factors, most obviously the role of Charles. However candidates' success depended upon the extent to which the role of Pym was the central strand running through the essay. Weaker candidates wrote one section on the role of Pym, before addressing several other causes with little consideration of relative importance and the links between factors. Stronger responses however adopted a more thematic approach, with the role of Pym running throughout the response. Charles' attempts to arrest the Five members was cited by numerous candidates, and proved a good discriminator. Weaker candidates explained how this proved that Civil War was in fact Charles' fault, stronger candidates weighed up the extent to which this was the result of divisions caused by the actions of Pym. Knowledge of 1640-1642 was often good, with the best students confident in discussing factors such as the Grand Remonstrance, the Army Plot, and Pym's manipulation of the London mob. Only a few struggled to go much beyond the attempt to arrest the Five Members.

Some candidates wrote the standard essay evaluating the causes of the civil war, failing to note that the question was about the outbreak of war rather than its causes. Those who got the focus right concentrated on evaluating the various factors that determined the sides taken by the participants, giving proper consideration to the part played by Pym.

## **F961/02 British History Period Studies**

### **Question 1**

The question was wide ranging in its scope and many candidates were able to discuss a good range, whilst also ensuring that their ideas were well developed and supported. At the higher levels candidates were able to produce a balanced response, using issues such as taxation to show that not all of Pitt's policies were a resounding success. Some argued that that some of the high profile taxes produced little money and were highly unpopular. However, in many responses this was balanced against the concept of the 'National Revival' and many were able to discuss the sinking fund, the reduction of national debt and the ultimate creation of a surplus. Most candidates were very knowledgeable about the issue of smuggling, although in many weaker answers this was often the dominant issue and created a rather unbalanced response. A significant number considered the issue of the radical threat and again at the higher levels candidates were able to balance the success and failures of the measures and discuss whether the problem was solved or simply driven underground to create a problem for Liverpool's government. There were some responses that suggested that Pitt's policies must have been a success because he dominated politics for so long or that they pleased the monarch and were therefore successful because he appointed the Prime Minister.

### **Question 2**

The stronger answers ensured that the focus of their responses was on 'how far' and avoided simply listing the successes and failures of Liverpool's policies. Most candidates were able to consider at least some aspect of Liverpool's policies, such as the suspension of Habeas Corpus or the Seditious Meetings Act, although the most common consideration was the effective use of spies. The use of force was also discussed as part of 'government policies', although the better responses did discuss whether this was effective as it helped to create further tension by promoting sympathy for the radical cause. This argument was taken further by some who suggested that some government policies, such as the Corn Laws actually caused unrest and therefore the government could not take credit. In some instances, such as with the Luddites, the use of force was argued to be a success, but this was often contrasted with the use of the yeomanry at Peterloo. Many responses argued that the weakness of the radical threat was the main reason for the failure, noting the lack of a common aim, the geographical diversity and the small numbers involved, arguing that events at Peterloo or Spa Fields should not really be seen as symptomatic of the radical challenge, but rather peaceful rallies that got out of hand. Some argued that it was the improvement in economic conditions at the end of the period that brought about an end to the radical challenge.

### **Question 3**

In many instances, it was the named factor that caused candidates the greatest challenge and they were unable to support their claim that it was or was not the main reason. Knowledge about the Political Unions and their role was surprisingly thin in most responses, but some were able to write in greater depth about the riots and disorder in Bristol and Nottingham, the days of May and the call to 'go for gold' to stop Wellington. At the highest level some candidates noted that much of the unrest was due to poor or changing economic circumstances and pointed to events such as the Swing Riots, which had little political motivation. Candidates were generally better at discussing events in Parliament, although even here it would have helped if candidates had had a clearer chronological grasp of developments. Stronger answers were able to place the passing of the Act in the wider context of the break-up of the Tory party after Catholic Emancipation and argued that without it reform was not possible. Most were able to consider the Whigs and Grey's motives for reforms, suggesting political opportunism as well as the desire to separate the wealthy middle class from the lower class. Some candidates focused largely on the corrupt nature of the electoral system, but where this dominated the answer candidates did not score well as this failed to explain why the act was passed, after all the unreformed system had been challenged before, but without success.

#### Question 4

Candidates were usually able to consider a range of reasons, but found it harder to support their arguments with precise detail and often resorted to sweeping generalisations about the Peelites or the appeal of Palmerston's foreign policy. Many responses focused very heavily on the role of Gladstone and made reference to the 'People's William' without really grasping how few of the lower classes actually had the vote. Nonconformity was discussed, but without really understanding why nonconformists supported the Whigs and Liberals. The weakest area of consideration was reserved for a discussion of the Conservative party and the leadership of Derby and the failings of Disraeli's budgets. Candidates often seemed unaware of economic developments and the associated prosperity that was increasingly seen to be linked to the issue of free trade and therefore the Whigs and Liberals. There were also very few answers that considered the importance of the Willis Room Meeting and the growing appeal of the Liberals among the newly enfranchised middle class.

#### Question 5

As with other questions that use the command 'how far', this was the discriminator, with better answers going beyond the list of reasons why the Liberals lost the 1874 election. Very few candidates seemed aware of how important non-conformity had been in the Liberal victory in 1868 and this made it harder to argue that loss of their support, over issues such as the Education Act were important. Many candidates appeared confused over the role of the Licensing Act and suggested that this was also responsible for a loss of nonconformist support. Many weaker responses simply went through act by act and explained who the act would have annoyed, but once again there are a significant number of candidates who suggested that acts such as the Licensing Act or Trade Union legislation annoyed the working class without showing an awareness of how few of the working class actually had the vote. Greater consideration could have been given to Ireland as some of the measures did worry those with landholdings there and linked with other attacks on privileges may have caused a loss of support. There was some awareness that Gladstone's greater emphasis on a moral foreign policy, when contrasted with Palmerston, may have caused disquiet, but examples to support this claim were often limited to the Alabama Incident and candidates seemed unaware of issues such as the Franco Prussian War.

#### Question 6

This was a popular question, but a significant number of candidates lacked the range of knowledge to produce a well balanced answer or concentrated on either foreign or imperial policy. There were some who misread the question and focused on domestic policy, whilst others, who were probably hoping for a question on 'Tory beliefs' argued that foreign policy was part of Disraeli's 'One Nation Conservatism' and tried to simply argue that it did or did not achieve that goal. However, there were others who were able to draw on a wide range of examples, considering India, Afghanistan and southern Africa when discussing imperial policy. Many argued that although it might be claimed Disraeli was successful in his imperial aims, the 'men on the spot' let him down, whilst others suggested that it was often difficult to determine his imperial aims given his earlier claim about colonies as 'millstones'. There was much discussion of Queen Victoria and the Empress of India, with many arguing that this was a success because it pleased the Queen. However, others discussed, in some detail the acquisition of the Suez shares and argued that this was Disraeli's greatest success. The Congress of Berlin and the Bulgarian atrocities played a significant part in most answers and many were able to write about 'Peace with honour' or comment about the value of gaining Cyprus.

#### Question 7

This was a popular question, but many candidates were unable to display a knowledge of the topic across the whole period, particularly when dealing with Russia. Most were fairly strong on the early period from post Crimea to the 1880's, but struggled after that. Many candidates balanced the fear of Russia against issues such as trade, the empire and the balance of power and this often enabled candidates to link factors together and therefore access some of the higher levels. There were very few candidates who were able to use the Anglo Japanese treaty

of 1902 to take the problem of Russia through the whole period and this was rather disappointing. However, some were able to argue that towards the end of the period the fear of Russia was replaced by concerns about the growing power of Germany or that the fear of France, particularly in imperial issues, was a more pressing concern. At the top levels candidates did deal with the issue of 'how far' rather than simply state that a fear of Russia was one of a number of concerns and issues that affected British foreign policy and were willing to make judgements about the relative importance of the factors.

### **Question 8**

This question saw a wide range of responses, unfortunately there were a significant number of candidates who focused on why support for imperialism declined, simply assuming that it did, rather than addressing the issue of 'how far' it declined. Most who did try and address the question suggested that the decline was quite significant from the attacks on Gladstone's lack of support for Gordon through to the Boer War and suggested that this lack of support manifested itself in the 1906 election result. Some candidates suggested that some of the evidence used to support the view that there was widespread support for imperialism in the earlier part of the period also needs questioning and that therefore support for imperialism was never as great as has been suggested. A significant number argued that the result of the Khaki election was not evidence of massive support for imperialism as the winning margin for the Conservative party was actually quite narrow in terms of votes cast. Many argued that signs of popular imperialism could be questioned; for example attendance at music halls was simply for entertainment or that street parties after victories were due more to the survival of sons and relations or simply an excuse for a good time. However, most did suggest that the Boer War was significant in its impact on support. Most candidates had a good range of knowledge, what mattered was their ability to deploy it to answer the question.

### **Question 9**

This was the least popular question in this section and was also the least well answered. Candidates found it easier to answer why relations declined and struggled to address 'to what extent'. There was very little knowledge shown of attempts to improve relations or to examine reasons why it was not in either Britain or Germany's interests to go to war. Instead most candidates assumed that because Britain and Germany went to war in 1914 a decline in relations was inevitable and therefore an explanation of the reasons was all that was required. In arguing that relations did decline some mention of the widening of the Kiel Canal and quicker access for the German High Seas Fleet to the North Sea saw scant consideration, but this could have been balanced against the fact that Britain had won the naval race by 1912 and therefore an area of tension had been removed. Some did argue that relations did decline because of Britain's improved relations with France, but often this led to long descriptions of the Moroccan crises. Very few candidates were aware that contemporaries had commented on the improvement in relations and for candidates to access the higher levels it was important that there was some balance to the answer and consideration of the evidence for an improvement; candidates could even have suggested that economically it made sense to avoid conflict as the two nations were trading partners.

### **Question 10**

The better responses established criteria against which the issue of success could be judged and then considered both ministries against these criteria. Candidates did not have to achieve a balance between the two ministries, but some answers simply ignored or wrote in little depth on one of the periods. It was surprising that a considerable number did not place the ministries in context and suggest that in terms of legislation it was always going to be difficult for the governments as they lacked a majority and in 1924 were not even the largest single party. Many focused on whether Labour was able to distance itself from Communist links and appeal to moderates; however this was often contrasted with the disappointment of many socialists who felt that Labour achieved very little. The Second Labour government appeared to present more difficulties to candidates than the First and knowledge of their handling of the economic crisis was often confused. Candidates were often more secure in their consideration of foreign policy,

but at times domestic issues were given very little consideration. A few candidates were able to place the significance of the ministries in their wider context and argued that they were successful because it resulted in Labour replacing the Liberals as the alternative to the Conservative party.

### **Question 11**

Despite appearing to be very straightforward, this question caused a significant number of candidates difficulties. A surprising number either wrote exclusively about the causes of the strike or simply told the story of the events and did not explain why it failed. Other answers simply listed the reasons and were unable to make any judgement about the relative importance of the reasons for the strikes failure and simply listed the government actions and preparedness, the attitude and actions of the miner's union and of the TUC . Specific knowledge about the miners union and the TUC was often thin, whereas candidates did know more about the government and its preparations, although excess weight was often given to government propaganda. At the higher levels candidates did contrast the actions of the government against those of the unions and argue that this provides the best explanation for the outcome. However, others took a more long term view and argued that Trade union reluctance to support the miners always meant the chances of success were very limited and that government action served only to reinforce their weaknesses.

### **Question 12**

The responses to this question were often rather disappointing. In order to score well candidates did need to identify the social and economic problems that Labour inherited and not simply assess the reforms of the Labour government, which seemed to be the preferred route of many. Candidates could have considered the long term issues inherited from the 1930's as well as the obvious problems from the war. It was surprising that not more candidates considered the scale of the problems Labour faced, particularly in terms of finance. Candidates were better at dealing with the social measures, but a closer link to the problems they were meant to deal with would have been beneficial. The issues raised by the Beveridge Report provided many candidates with the basis of their answer, but there was much confusion about the Butler Education Act, with a significant number ascribing it to the Labour government. Many were able to write well about the housing problem and argued that the policy of prefabs did much to solve the housing shortage and better candidates even contrasted that with the policy after World War One, although that was not essential. The issue of living standards was also considered and many linked this to the question of rationing, with some candidates displaying a good knowledge of developments. The greatest difficulty came in linking the policy of nationalisation to inherited problems. Many concluded that the social reforms were, at least on a simple level, successful as they provided welfare from 'the cradle to the grave.' In this instance candidates could have either looked at the war time developments or the problems that remained from the pre war period and argued that nationalisation allowed modernisation in the coal and iron and steel industry as well as the rail network.

### **Question 13**

Most candidates were able to explain a range of reasons as to why Britain did not join the EEC before 1973. However, what determined whether they reached the higher levels was an ability to link their material to the question of 'how far' and to the year. Most were able to explain the role that imperial issues played, but the better candidates usually argued that this was the key to explaining Britain's decision in the earlier period and became less important as the period progressed, particularly after Suez. However, some also suggested that by not joining at the outset it made it harder for Britain to join in the 1960s and therefore imperial interests were crucial. Other candidates suggested that the issue of sovereignty was crucial, particularly as the institutions of the EEC grew more powerful. Candidates also considered issues such as the attitude of France, Britain's concern to preserve her special relationship with the USA and concerns over agricultural policy, hence the decision to be involved in EFTA. Some argued that the most important reason was the attitude of the De Gaulle, noting that soon after his death Britain did join.

#### **Question 14**

As with Question 13, candidates did need to focus on the key command phrase ‘how much’ if they wanted to access the higher levels. Candidates also needed to show some coverage of the whole period if they wanted to score well. Either a thematic or chronological approach was acceptable, provided candidates assessed the scale of domestic opposition. Many were able to see the fluctuating nature of the opposition and a large number commented on the problems created by Labour’s policy of unilateral disarmament in the 1980s and pointed to their poor performance in elections and contrasted that with the earlier period and the scale of the Aldermarston marches and the camps at Greenham Common. Some also argued that there were concerns about the close ties it forced Britain into with the USA because of the cost of an independent deterrent. The better answers were able to link this to how much, whilst weaker candidates tended to focus on why there was opposition with little link to the idea of how much. However, others suggested that there was a realisation that with defence costs escalating the policy pursued made sense, otherwise funds might have been taken from other areas of priority. The strongest answers drew a distinction here between those who still opposed nuclear weapons on ideological grounds, particularly some Labour MPs, whilst others were more pragmatic, particularly at the height of the Cold War and this lessened opposition.

#### **Question 15**

Better answers began by defining the criteria needed for great power status and then tried to relate this to Britain’s position throughout the period. However, a significant number of candidates struggled to cover the whole period and thus produced a very unbalanced response. There were many answers that focused almost exclusively on the earlier period and then briefly mentioned the Falklands War to argue that Britain remained a great power throughout the period. Some of the stronger answers took a more thematic approach and considered issues such as Britain’s place in the UN, the issue of nuclear weapons, dependence upon the USA or the question of Empire to argue either for or against retaining great power status. In arguing that Britain did not remain a great power the most common example used was Suez, although some suggested that joining the EEC was also a recognition of a declining power. There was little consideration of when and where Britain did act independently, such as over Vietnam or in the Falklands which could have been used to counter the argument that she was dependent upon the USA, although some did suggest that the USA was able to bully or ignore Britain over the bombing of Libya or Grenada.

#### **Question 16**

Better answers were able to identify the problems that Macmillan had to deal with, rather than simply write about whether he was a successful Prime Minister. However, in many answers the problems were simply implied and the examiner was left to do the work and identify the issues. Candidates were somewhat unsure about the economic problems, although they often knew a great deal about what Macmillan did, with the ‘stop go’ policy, but this would have been better if it had been linked specifically to the question. However, many argued that his policy at least appeared to be successful as it was a time of affluence and could be contrasted with the preceding period of austerity, pointing to Macmillan’s claim that ‘you have never had it so good.’ The same was true of the changing social context, candidates were unsure of the problem, but were able to write about Macmillan’s attempts to change the image of the party, often considering the problems created by the ‘Night of the Long Knives’ and adapt to the new media age, but others contrasted that with a party that appeared to be dominated by the upper class and public schools. Candidates were stronger in dealing with his handling of scandals and were able to discuss whether they did damage the party. Many argued that he must have been successful because he was able to stay in office for a long time and that he had also been able to manipulate the economy at election time, but underneath this apparent success he was building up problems that would come to haunt the party in the later 1960s.

### **Question 17**

Although candidates did not have to directly compare the two administrations throughout their answers, they did have to reach a judgement as to which was the more successful. Most argued that it was the earlier administration and usually pointed to the economic problems and 'Winter of Discontent' to argue that the later administration was a failure. Often the better answers did adopt a thematic approach and considered issues such as the economy, the management of the Unions, social policy and living standards. Some candidates also considered the question of election results as an indicator of success and argued that the earlier period was more successful as Labour was able to win a second term in 1966, whereas in 1974, although they won two elections, they were a minority. Financial policy also provided a useful point of comparison as both administrations had to seek loans from the IMF, but there were also periods of success as devaluation which brought the pound down and therefore helped exports in 1967, whilst inflation was also brought down during the last months of Callaghan's administration. Some candidates took this further and argued that if Callaghan had called an election in the autumn of 1978 he would have won and historians would have had a different view of his ministry. Most argued that relations with the Unions were problematic in both periods, with the failure of 'In Place of Strife', but this was usually seen as less dramatic than the 'Winter of Discontent.' A few candidates did put forward the case for seeing the later period as more successful and this was acceptable if they supported their argument.

### **Question 18**

Although candidates often knew a substantial amount about Thatcher's social and economic policies they found it harder to explain why they caused opposition and even more difficult to assess, rather than simply list the reasons. Some argued that the policies were seen as controversial and that was a characteristic of both social and economic policies, from selling off the 'family silver' to an attack on the welfare system that had been created after the Second World War; it appeared to many to represent an end to consensus politics and the start of a new form of confrontation. One of the weaker areas for candidates was the question of monetarism and the concern to tackle inflation which appeared to be pursued regardless of the social consequences, most particularly rising unemployment and the unrest that followed in some inner city areas. Some argued that her attack on Trade Unions was controversial, particularly her handling of the miner's strike, although a number argued that this was largely popular reflected in her election victories and ability to win the support of many working class voters. Candidates could also have considered the consumerism culture associated with her period in office and argued that this was both controversial and undesirable.

## **F962/01: Medieval and Early Modern 1095-1609**

### **Question 1**

A fairly standard question on this topic produced standard answers, presented with varying degrees of detail. Many candidates knew exactly how to meet the evaluation needs of the question and access the higher levels in AO1(b). As a result there were some excellent responses. There were some high-scoring essays where candidates demonstrated an impressive breadth of knowledge and ability in terms of making substantiated and occasionally nuanced judgements.

Stronger candidates did discuss a range of material but judgements were not always convincing as the quality of support varied (e.g. arguing the importance of Muslim disunity but without having developed it fully). It was notable that despite the fact that the questions set on this topic clearly and regularly differentiate between motivation and success, some candidates still discussed religious motivation and failed to link it to 'success'. Otherwise, most candidates recognised the need to deal with a range of factors. A large number of candidates struggled to provide links and judgements, however, opting for stock answers which stated levels of importance rather than explaining or analysing their material. This tended to become a 'list' and often led to generalisations and limited supporting detail. This hampered achievement. Discussion of Muslim disunity and crusade leadership often didn't go beyond the identification and general explanation of their role, without clear supporting examples proving their impact on success. Alternatively some candidates had limited knowledge and became confused with examples (e.g. referring to Acre when they meant Antioch etc).

Some candidates were distracted by motives for going rather than reasons for. As a result there was a tendency for tangential material to appear, and there were some long explanations of religious background and land hunger which lacked focus.

### **Question 2**

Generally the quality of attempts to this question were better than in previous sessions. Breadth of knowledge has overall increased and more candidates were able to make a creditable response. It remains clear, however, that this is very much a 'back-up' question for many candidates. Once again there was a high quantity of stock answers that relied on relatively flimsy evidence. There tended to be a number of small but revealing errors that compromised the argument of such answers.

Most candidates tended to argue against the question and felt that Muslim unity was the key reason for the failure of the Second Crusade. However, some candidates did not develop their argument fully and support it with relevant examples. Many candidates also didn't deal with the named factor (poor leadership) and therefore didn't answer the question fully or merely identified the lack of a clear aim without linking it to leadership. Therefore when poor leadership was referred to, it was often brief and undeveloped either mentioning only one crusade leader or discussing them all in a generalised manner. There were some stronger candidates and answers tended to show some knowledge but most answers did not support their discussion of factors with clear examples of where/when failure occurred due to those reasons. A few candidates were muddled between the Second and Third Crusade.

Some answers were very confused and many lacked much in the way of specific detail – relevant factors had been learnt but were not adequately supported.

Many candidates did not know enough about poor leadership and some of the weaker ones got very muddled with the Third Crusade and Richard the Lionheart and Frederick Barbarossa both made unexpected appearances. Even the stronger essays often lacked the detailed support seen in essays about the First Crusade and this topic seemed to be little understood by many.

### **Question 3**

There were some good quality responses that focussed strongly on the question and were able to use detailed evidence to support strongly constructed arguments. On the other hand there were a significant number of responses which used irrelevant evidence as the basis of most of the answer. These answers used material from the Third Crusade and did not take account of the date span in the question, which clearly affected their level of achievement. Many responses were less strong or generalised with a very limited range of issues discussed. Most identified Saladin's strength but many tended to be generalised when discussing Muslim unity and the concept of jihad. Few candidates supported this fully with examples of where or when this clearly caused success. Most candidates failed to develop answers fully with reference to the leaders of the crusader states or lack of resources – it was not clear they understood what happened during the 1180s. It must be noted that, although this is a less common question, it is one of the key issues on the specification and, as such, should be explored to the same degree as other more common issues.

### **Question 4**

There was a full range of answers in response to this question. The very best answers used many and varied specific detailed examples to support their arguments and at time the range was very impressive. They were able to draw from a range of political, economic and ideological factors and came to logical conclusions from their exploration of the question. Some showed a detailed understanding of the issues and context, though economic issues were not much considered. Some candidates were able to develop some very sophisticated arguments. However, evaluation was not often integrated into the argument explicitly but it was considered in the closing argument. Weaker candidates did drift into description of developments rather than explanations of them. Many candidates used a much narrower range of factors, however, some limited their responses to rivalry of different types. This had a understandable impact on the analysis and explanation that could arise from this.

Answers were frequently weak in terms of grasping the argument and providing adequate supporting explanation and detail. Many candidates misinterpreted or didn't understand 'rivalry between cities' and were unable to understand the issues of political diversity, civic pride and the link with patronage. Some wrote simple statements about separate cities and failed to discuss the reasons for the Renaissance as a whole or only discussed 'internal rivalry' within Florence. Some candidates were also determined to discuss Florence, Rome and Venice in turn and failed to adapt their format to this particular question.

When examples were given, they were generally listed and the essay lacked explanation and analysis. There was also some inaccuracy with the examples used (e.g. the wrong artist identified with a work of art). Also, few candidates used the opportunity to mention literature and politics with most examples relating only to art.

### **Question 5**

There was an interesting variety of responses to this question. Some compared the classical influences to Eastern and northern influences. This approach was successful when reinforced with specific and detailed evidence although if this was absent it led to particularly vague answers. Some fluent arguments emerged with interesting detail but evaluation was all too often merely implicit. Answers tended to contain some simple description of classical influences and only a few examples of architecture were referred to overall. There was also some inaccuracy matching architectural examples with the correct architect. Also, many candidates made sweeping statements claiming that some churches were designed in classical style, when they

were actually built before the Renaissance in the medieval period and only had Renaissance additions (e.g. a façade, chapel etc). Although a challenging question due to its narrow range purely on architecture and the fact that classical influences were significant, few candidates managed to justify and explain the proposition sufficiently. Candidates seemed to be trying to devise an answer with little real knowledge. A number of candidates misread the question and included painting and sculpture when the focus was very clearly on architecture. Even the well focused answers often generalised and few architectural examples were referred to. Some successfully balanced classical with other influences such as Gothic and Byzantine and those that brought in other factors such as patronage and economics were also given credit. Few managed to identify an alternative argument and when they did, it was merely stated and not developed or it was inaccurate by referring to Turkish and Arabic influence rather than Greek/Byzantine. Some candidates however did recognise the importance of papal patronage and wealth in the production of architecture.

Others evaluated the influence of the classical world against politics, patronage and wealth. This was generally successful. It was evident that some candidates were unfamiliar with both architecture and humanism. This led to rather sparse answers which used examples from art and sculpture with only a very few architecture specific examples. These tended to be from a limited range, for example Brunelleschi's dome and the Tempietto.

### **Question 6**

There were some very good responses to this question, which used a very wide range of evidence from different areas of Europe and different media. In terms of factors, classical influences were the most frequently assessed cause and strong candidates generally demonstrated a good understanding of the impact of this factor. Patronage, politics and the fall of Constantinople were also popular reasons and these were generally well explained. Less frequent was exploration of either civic or Christian humanism. While some essays dealt with the influence of named scholars, weaker candidates struggled, outside of the often explored Brunelleschi or Michaelangelo, to find specific examples, particularly examples of scholars or writers. Saying that, the best answers did cover writers, philosophers, artists, architects and sculptors with great confidence. The detailed knowledge and effective argument of the best answers was impressive.

### **Question 7**

This question was generally successfully answered by the majority of candidates, who had prepared well. Most candidates identified a range of reasons and tried to work through factors to come to a conclusion. However, this often didn't go beyond making generalised statements or basic explanation and there were some weak arguments claiming that geography was the more important factor without justifying why geography should be so important then rather than centuries earlier. Some candidates had good details and examples, providing solid answers. Others tended to support only one factor briefly and the quality of the essay was uneven or the argument unconvincing due to limited specific support (e.g. little linkage with details about the empire to prove the point). If any area was under-explored it has to be the explanations of the success of the Conquistadores once in the Americas (e.g. reactions of local inhabitants, exploitation of divisions). The 'European' explanations were explored in detail and generally convincingly – particularly the economic reasons and technological developments. Some candidates drifted to discussing 'motives' rather than linking this to how it 'enabled' Spain to develop an empire, however, this pattern of failure was less common than might have been predicted.

This was one of the questions where it was evident that considerable efforts had been made to teach to the possible questions on this topic. This produced standardised responses, varying only in the depth of detail and quality of explanation. Some candidates only considered Cortes and Pizarro. There was little consideration of cultural influences.

### Question 8

Candidates mostly considered and compared a number of factors and there were clear efforts at evaluating relative importance. Some were very good with enough explanation and support on royal patronage as well as other factors, although in many cases there could have been more linkage between factors and more convincing judgement to achieve the higher levels. Some identified a range of factors and showed good knowledge with royal patronage but tended to list examples rather than explaining them or purely drew reference to Henry the Navigator. Again, references to geography and technology were weak and generalised without any clear supporting examples of discovery/exploration to prove their importance. Some candidates argued against the question and failed to deal with the named factor which meant their answer was undeveloped even if they had an analytical approach.

There was some rather hazy knowledge of what constituted 'royal' patronage here. Some candidates focused on patronage more generally, or limited their discussion to patronage, royal or otherwise. Others were unaware of which figures were royal. This rendered their arguments rather vague due to uncertainty. Strong candidates confidently explored a range of ways (and geographical areas) in which royal patrons contributed to the voyages of discovery. Again, technological developments and economic imperatives were discussed very well. There was some confident discussion of the nature of the nobility in this question, as well as the role of individual explorers.

### Question 9

The best answers to this question understood the terminology and were able to undertake quite a subtle examination of the extent to which Portugal did benefit, encompassing the problems as well as advantages of overseas colonisation. Answers tended to be weaker and they were generalised and referred to the effects of the Portuguese empire, for example the work of missionaries and conversions, rather than considering benefits to Portugal. Some good knowledge was shown though but sometimes this was listed rather than as a result of developed explanation. Alternatively, there was some solid general explanation and argument but it was not supported fully with specific examples. Some, for example linked an area or aspect of the empire to a clear benefit. Most candidates dealt with the benefits too but failed to consider the costs of the empire or merely mentioned them without development. Some referred to the inability to gain the monopoly over the Red Sea but did little more than refer to it as a 'failure' rather than linking it to the question. The main problem with this question was that for some candidates it was difficult to define or explain 'benefit'. This obviously led to some general answers that demonstrated some of the candidates' knowledge but which lacked focus. The responses tended to rather generalised but the specific evidence was thin. The key area of economic benefit was underdone and the religious benefits were not clearly linked to the question except as a prestige.

### Question 10

There were some very good answers to this question which used very detailed evidence to support a consistent and well formed argument. These answers tended to include interim judgements about the extent to which a particular policy (religion, for example) demonstrated unity in Spain. The skills of these candidates were particularly impressive and should be commended. Some different approaches were adopted – some considered the degree of unity within each of the states and argued quite convincingly that the subordination of Aragon actually made unification inevitable, because Aragon was systematically sidelined. Others looked at the issue of social disunity – nobles, Moors for example. As is to be expected with a more common question there were also many more basic answers which listed policies and stated, rather than explained, whether this meant unity or not. These candidates evidently had an awareness of the requirements of the examination but struggled to provide the analysis and judgements required for achievement at the higher levels. There were many standard responses which went through the motions of 'unity' or not and didn't truly develop enough issues to support either side of the argument strongly or listed examples without developing explanation. There was often little discussion on economic aspects other than listing the *ecellente* coin, about which there were

some very widely differing conclusions. Alternatively, there were some analytical answers which showed strong understanding but which failed to develop supporting evidence sufficiently. There were some quite generalised responses – candidates knew the appropriate issues but could offer little in the way of specific supporting detail. A minority of candidates argued that if the motives behind an apparently unifying policy were different, this undermined any argument for unity. One pattern of failure was to drift into consolidation of royal power as opposed to unity. A few students seemed prepared for an essay about the authority of the Spanish crown and failed to adapt to one about unity.

### **Question 11**

This question was generally well answered, eliciting a range of responses from the stock response with relatively basic support to some nuanced and well argued essays. Most candidates did limit their discussion to events up to 1524. This was encouraging, possibly indicating that more candidates had a understanding of their material. A minority of candidates struggled to produce balanced essays, dwelling solely on Charles' problems, whilst the most common pattern of failure was to misunderstand the term 'consolidate'.

Some focused more on the problems faced than they did on how successfully they were dealt with – occasionally not considering the issue of his success at all. There was often confusion between the Germania and Comuneros revolts, which undermined their argument. A significant number attributed the handling of these revolts entirely to Charles V and ignored the fact that he was not there for much of the time and that the nobles played the leading role – this invalidated their argument as to Charles's success. Charles's presence after 1522 was often not mentioned as a significant element in his success. Many candidates only considered his failure to consolidate in the early part of his reign and skimmed over (if they dealt with it at all) the relevant period after the revolts in which he did make progress. They seemed prepared for a question on the problems he faced but not for how he got over them.

The candidates who were confused by the word 'consolidate' tended to take one of two routes. Some successfully considered how far Charles had overcome his early difficulties by 1524 but many just vaguely referred to his foreign nature and unpopular advisors.

It was common to see a lack of focus with a lot of explanation and description of problems and little development of how Charles dealt with them. Many answers tended to argue consolidation or failure but lacked specific support of Charles' actions to justify their points (or only did this on one side of the argument). Some drifted to success or otherwise in general and became generalised in saying he had 'changed his ways' by 1524, referring to action such as the appointment of Spanish officials but not giving any specific examples or development of how they contributed to consolidation.

### **Question 12**

There were some very good answers indeed but the problem of relevance was rather an endemic one in this question. It was pleasing to see that most candidates did constrain themselves to post-1524 discussion. However, too few saw the need to be clear about his aims in order to be able to evaluate his success. There were some good answers but most tended to be generalised and there was little depth or detail about what Charles actually did in terms of domestic policy. Most candidates mentioned religious aspects in terms of the failure of the spread of the Reformation and many referred to economic weakness/eventual bankruptcy under Philip. However, this wasn't linked clearly to Charles' actions and therefore didn't truly refer to 'his rule' but just to the good/bad points about Spain by the end of the period. There was very little reference by candidates to administrative or governmental reform.

Many candidates struggled to stay focused on 'Spain' in this question, many straying into a long discussion of foreign policy rather than examining Charles' success in domestic policy in Spain.

One or two suggested a quite sophisticated approach in the introduction and failed to follow it through with their argument in the body of the essay. A number of candidates dealt with the monarchy and foreign policy, linking it to Charles' success as a ruler in a way that could be credited.

### **Question 13**

There were some fluent and detailed responses to this question. There were some strong answers with focussed argument and a range of relevant supporting detail. Strong candidates tended to provide precise support to the links and interrelation of factors, notably the role of printing and the role of the princes/towns with the power of Luther's ideas. Most candidates tended to work through a list of factors and there was significant focus on the strength of Luther's ideas as well as the role of printing. Too often, however, there was little in the way of evaluation of relative importance, so some very knowledgeable candidates could not access the higher levels. Few were able to say anything specific about Luther as an author, and there were only some essays which showed knowledge of the contribution of specific princes. Some essays detailed support to back up their arguments on this question and produced rather generalised answers. Some were rather too simplistic in their assessment: Luther himself was not given much credit and Charles V blamed much too comprehensively.

Some weaker candidates identified the role of the princes, generically, and showed awareness that Charles' absence was important but without explaining or supporting it fully.

### **Question 14**

Candidates found this a challenging question. Most of the candidates found it difficult to structure an effective response – they struggled to organise what they knew. Some drifted into the effect his absences had on his handling of the French and Ottoman threat. Many had some general sense of what the question required but could not offer sufficient specific examples. On the other hand this quite complex question was often handled well. Responses were well-structured and showed a good grasp of the complexities of this issue. However, even the better candidates tended not to see how they could link factors such as absence and Princely desire for independence effectively.

Some tended to be fairly generalised and weak. Although most recognised Charles' absence helped to cause the spread of Lutheranism, there was little identification or discussion of other factors. Some seemed confused by the wording of this question and their answers often drifted into the causes of the Italian Wars and Charles's enmity with France, with little focus on Charles' effectiveness and a lack of detail on the situation within the Holy Roman Empire when they considered foreign policy. Some candidates did identify other issues and had stronger answers but supporting detail was still limited. Even when there was a better focus on Charles as Emperor his absences were little commented on.

### **Question 15**

This was a tricky question whose dual focus caused problems for some candidates. The best responses were very strong and showed that it was a question which candidates were able to demonstrate their understanding. Careful planning was needed and those that could respond flexibly to the demands of the question had the material to do so and did very well: there were some strong answers in which candidates were able to link their discussion of factors closely to relevant supporting examples of key battles and events. Most managed to identify and discuss a range of factors but there was often a lack of balance and limited discussion of Charles' rivalry with France. As this was the named factor this needed significant treatment, although no specific answer was looked for. Although all candidates referred to it, their treatment was sometimes very brief and descriptive about the existence of rivalry and neither developed fully nor linked to the context of how it affected Charles' success against the Ottomans. Some candidates failed to see the connections between the impact of Franco-Ottoman alliances and French rivalry. Some had an analytical approach but their focus tended to drift to reasons why the Ottomans had less success on occasions and failed to link this back to their argument.

A few candidates had weak focus and discussed reasons for the ‘limited success’ of Charles in general in terms of foreign policy.

#### **Question 16**

This is clearly a question with which many candidates are familiar. Most focused on problems of government and finance, making a respectable attempt to analyse Philip’s success in these areas. There was some good consideration in the stronger essays of Philip’s religious inheritance, the Morisco question and other issues he had to face. Others dealt with Philip himself and his style of government, although with varying success – some produced a list of Philip’s personal failings which did not really address the question of whether he dealt with problems. One major area of difficulty was with keeping the answer restricted to Spain and her problems rather than ranging more widely – this was relatively restricted but when it occurred tended to have a serious limiting impact on achievement.

Some essays described Philip’s problems and therefore drifted away from discussion of his actions and ‘success’ and some lacked focus on Spain itself and discussed the Netherlands or even his problems with the Turks. Others identified areas for discussion, mainly focussing on problems of finance, but tended to be generalised and failed to discuss what Philip actually did to deal with various problems. In the process, very little depth or range of knowledge was displayed. One pattern of failure was for candidates to ignore the word “inherited” and thus not demonstrate any awareness of the legacy of Charles I.

#### **Question 17**

There were some very good responses, which showed excellent understanding of this complex issue. It was well answered on the whole with a full consideration of religious, political and economic causes and the main protagonists getting plenty of attention. Moderately successful candidates tended to identify and explain reasons briefly with limited supporting detail. Real analysis and the relative importance of factors was rarely developed or if so, it lacked supporting evidence and was merely asserted. Most candidates focussed on religious factors, taxation and Philip’s absence – the range of discussion was limited. However, there were some stronger answers with a clear range of supporting detail and proof. The role of religion was covered fairly well but only the most able candidates were confident enough to discuss economic and social problems in any depth.

There was some generalisation – references to hedge preachers and the Tenth Penny without saying what they were but attributing some significance to them. Some candidates appeared to lack a structured knowledge and tended to drift into a description of the outbreak of the revolt without emphasising the reasons it broke out. They would have done better to see this issue in terms of long term, short term and immediate causes.

Some wandered past the 1572 finish date and others seemed to think that all the Dutch had converted to Calvinism by the end of the 1560’s.

#### **Question 18**

There were some strong responses to this question. Issues were clearly understood and handled in quite a sophisticated way by many candidates. The range of knowledge was variable but was mostly dealt with in appropriate detail. However, many candidates had limited evidence concerning the named factor and so they found it hard to discuss it adeptly. This limited the credit that could be given. Other factors were more convincingly handled, especially the role of leaders and the diversion of Spain’s resources at key times. Some candidates mixed up diversion of Spain’s resources to fight foreign wars with the named factor of foreign support and intervention – most likely because they did not have enough evidence for the named factor itself. Although a variety of other factors were identified, they tended too often to be generalised on the basis of geography, leadership and Spanish weakness/distraction. When references to foreign support were made, it wasn’t always tied closely to success. Overall, there were some

competent answers but few candidates went beyond general explanation and actually proved success by citing relevant examples. Some also drifted into discussing 'causes'.

There were occasional errors, mostly concerning the sequence of events rather than their significance. One factor that was rarely given the prominence it deserved was Spain's financial position and the associated mutinies of unpaid Spanish troops. The best candidates had plenty to say about support from England and France but on the whole concluded that other factors such as Spanish weakness and Dutch strength were more important. As ever, no specific answer is looked for, and there is no requirement to agree with the question, only to give significant consideration to the importance of the named factor. The weaker candidates very rarely had much to say about foreign support and some got very muddled, especially with the role of the French and Anjou.

## **F962/02 European and World History Period Studies – Modern**

### **Question 1**

This was a popular question. Most candidates had a good understanding of how Napoleon rose to power but few were able to really explain the named factor. The Directory and its weaknesses were not very well known and there were quite a few limited descriptions of parts of Napoleon's early career, giving undue emphasis to Toulon in some cases. There was often a lot of detailed knowledge of the actual Brumaire Coup which candidates found difficult to use in an argument. Better answers were able to link the weaknesses of the Directory to Napoleon's rise explaining, for example how Napoleon was able to use his military strengths to expose the Directory's frailties. Many answers drifted into a general discussion of his rise to power or treated the named factor as one of several that allowed Napoleon to seize power. At the lower levels a significant number of candidates spent a great deal of time explaining Napoleon's background, and although this had some relevance it was given undue weight. There was a lack of knowledge about the actual weaknesses beyond some comments about being unable to pay the army or a lack of decision making. Very few candidates discussed the internal politics of the Directory or the role of Sieyès and his wish for a tame general. The best candidates were able to use their knowledge to successfully argue that the weaknesses of the Directory gave an opportunity to Napoleon but his own ruthless ambition and record of military success allowed him to take advantage of this opening.

### **Question 2**

Very few candidates answered this well, many drifted into a description of what Napoleon did as emperor and discussed events beyond 1804 without relating them back to the question. The minority of candidates who did deal with the question tended to give a list of reasons without really assessing the importance of factors. A small number of well written responses argued that he did so to consolidate his authority, to establish a dynasty, eliminate opposition and went on to argue a case as to the most important reason. A few analytical responses saw Napoleon's actions as a logical progression in his increasingly dictatorial rule and went on to show this by considering his actions after 1804. Discussion of his actions after 1804 was acceptable provided they were linked back to the actual argument and question. There was also some convincing argument that Napoleon became an emperor to gain recognition from the other Kings of Europe, establish a dynasty and therefore legitimise his rule. Many candidates discussed at length Napoleon actually placing the crown on his own head with only a few able to thread this action into their response to support the case that he wanted to demonstrate that his status was approved by the church and therefore God given.

### **Question 3**

Not a popular question, weaker responses wrote about policy within France and drifted into irrelevance. Many candidates clearly did not understand what was meant by the term 'the Empire outside France' and instead wrote tangentially about general policies that affected France. A few better responses successfully tackled the argument, agreeing with the premise on the whole and justifying their argument through examination of Napoleon's demands on the empire in terms of taxation and manpower for the army. Better responses also understood that the Continental Blockade was a disaster for the economies of the Empire countries and was embarked on to suit Napoleon's needs in his disputes with Britain and that he expected the rulers of the empire to states to completely subordinate themselves to the needs of France, citing the example of his brother Louis as King of Holland. Some candidates were able to offer some balance by pointing to the positives that French rule brought to the empire, mentioning government and the introduction of revolutionary ideas and the rewarding of able servants of the empire. There were some responses that argued that it did not bring benefits to France, but rather to Napoleon and his own family and cited the gains they made.

There was also some discussion of the apparent gains for areas outside France, with issues such as the Civil Code or the ending of feudalism considered.

#### **Question 4**

In Q4 a common problem was candidates not dealing with the main issue in the question in the required detail; as in previous years failure to tackle the named factor limits the candidate to Level IV for AO1b. Weaker candidates tended to simply describe the fall of the Bourbons, rather than analyse the significance. For some "the liberal opposition" was never defined at all, whereas with many others the liberals (bourgeois constitutional monarchists with a great fear of the republican-inclined Parisian *peuple*) were conflated with the radical and republicans. Hence in these essays it was the liberals who took to the streets in July 1830, which of course flawed the entire answer. There was also confusion with some candidates between the events of 1830 and 1848. A few better responses were able to compare the growth of liberal opposition with other factors (Charles X policies, Polignac, economic crisis) and reach a judgement on the relative importance.

#### **Question 5**

This produced better responses, with most candidates dividing their answers thematically between factors that were Louis-Philippe's responsibility (his foreign policy, his nervous collapse in 1848) and those that were outside his control (the death of the duc d'Orleans, the economic crisis of 1847) and coming to a judgement. Most candidates tended to give excessive weight to foreign policy - perhaps having pre-prepared an essay on the topic - when in reality it was only a background cause of discontent. Weaker responses tended to give a narrative account of Louis Philippe's lifestyle – lack of a mistress, lighting his own fires and his likeness to a pear without really relating that to the set question. Stronger responses were able to give a judgement on 'how far' by comparing his actions with other factors, particularly the long term problems of poverty, unemployment and the desire for reform.

#### **Question 6**

The least popular of the three questions. Most candidates had some basic knowledge of economic policies but failed to use this to make a judgement on extent. Many struggled with the limited scope of the question, and found it hard to develop areas they had identified. Some candidates paid too much attention to Paris' development and its 'benefits'. Others delved into foreign policy. Better answers saw a pattern of initial benefit followed by problems and assessed separate matters as well. There was surprisingly little mention of the free trade policy which arguably had the biggest effect on the French economy under Napoleon.

#### **Question 7**

This was done well by many candidates who divided their answers between the named factor and additional factors. Others wrote almost entirely about the named factor (Federal Policy) prioritising within it. The best answers noted an interweaving between the factors, with the federal-sponsored Lewis and Clark expedition opening the way for farmers and miners, which in turn necessitated federal intervention to improve security, which in turn enabled an influx of ranchers and more farmers to take place etc. There was potential overlap between this question and Q8, as some included federal policy towards the native Americans. Weaker responses tended to drift into a list of reasons for Westward expansion without reaching a judgement on the importance of the named factor. However, most were able to explain the role of other factors such as miners, the railways and agriculture.

#### **Question 8**

A wide-ranging focus that allowed a degree of flexibility in the examples candidates could use to illustrate their explanations and support their arguments. On the whole candidates tackled this well and most responses were lengthy and scored highly. Where there was some shortfall, it was in including a discussion on the part played by Native Americans' disunity at expense of white ambition and Federal Government actions. Once again, weaker responses tended to give a list of reasons without really assessing the most important reasons for the destruction of Native

American society. Disappointingly this year, there was little mention of the destruction of the buffalo herds and the dependence of native Americans on them.

### **Question 9**

A popular question which produced some good responses, with responses discussing the title factor and weighing its role up against others. It discriminated well and better candidates did draw links between resources and the way that they were used. There were good answers which drew a distinction between the different phases of the war. It was effectively argued by some that because Northern military strategy did not deploy the resources available in the early years, then they were of less importance at the beginning of the period; but when Grant made it a war of attrition then resources became all-important. Many did see the links between resources and other elements like diplomacy or leadership. Knowledge of the actual military events apart from Gettysberg is rather a weakness, though.

### **Question 10**

Candidates struggled with this question with many drifting into general discussion of the course of the war. Many blamed trench warfare without explaining how it came about; indeed instead of starting in 1914 many dived in at the Somme and went from there. Many gave generalised answers about barbed wire and weaponry; few could actually say what happened 1914-17. Moreover the obvious point – that there was parity in numbers and technology- was rarely made. There was also little discussion of the fact that both sides lapsed into a war of attrition from 1915. Very disappointingly a large number of candidates were able to make reference to specific battles and relied almost entirely on generalisations about the fighting. Often there were descriptions of failed attacks (going over the top etc) and glib remarks about stupid generals. Some centres had prepared answers on why the war lasted so long and clearly some of the material did not fit: there was some mention of the war at sea for example. A few better candidates went beyond 1917 to explain why stalemate lasted for so long and was finally broken in 1918.

### **Question 11**

Candidates were happy to discuss the weaknesses of the League of Nations but only the better candidates had much to say about the named factor: the USA. Most would describe its Wilsonian origins and then point out the US didn't join and not develop their ideas further. Only the very good answers argued that the USA, as a Pacific power, might have been able to prevent the development of the Manchurian crisis if they had been a member or that their wealth and size of army might have been useful for the League. Some could point out the significance of US 'isolation' re Japan in the 1930s and trade with Italy during the Abyssinian crisis, but not many. Better responses were able to discuss other weaknesses of the League- lack of an army, other key powers missing eg Russia and contrast these with the named factor. However, these answers were few and far between, most gave a topic based description of the League without addressing the question.

### **Question 12**

This was not well answered by most candidates who seemed to have little knowledge of inter war British foreign policy and tended to discuss the weaknesses of the League of Nations and the culpability of Hitler. There would be mention of appeasement but few knew the sequence of events 1938/9 and some omitted Munich. Weaker candidates tended to jumble events up and quite a few went backwards so by the end of the essay the focus was on the Treaty of Versailles. A few better responses were able to link appeasement with encouraging Hitler in his foreign policy gambles and even fewer recognised that the invasion of Poland was a step too far even for Chamberlain.

### **Question 13**

It was encouraging to see many candidates identifying the problems in their introduction although others did not do so, and therefore missed the opportunity to write a problem-by-problem analysis coming to an overall conclusion and judgement. Students were generally well

aware of a range of problems faced by the Tsar, but candidates do need to ensure that they link this to the idea of effective and not simply substitute successful for effective. Some effectively divided them into political, economic, military, social etc. Surprisingly this year a greater number did not mention the 1905 revolution or if they did, it was covered briefly. Also although many mentioned the October Manifesto, the Fundamental Laws and the Dumas few mentioned all or even two of them. Many showed little appreciation of how the Tsar tamed the Dumas, although able candidates could often go into great detail. Some candidates went all the way to 1918 and so did not spend enough time on the pre 1914 years. Some also missed out the Russo-Japanese War or muddled it up as part of World War One. Many, but not all, were better than in previous years on the economic factors and the role of Witte and Stolypin. Candidates also seemed to know more about the Lena gold field strike this year and about peasant resettlement in Siberia, and encouragement of land ownership, but also the limitations of such policies. A significant proportion of weaker candidates changed the question around to 'why did the Tsar lose power' and so lost the focus of the question and therefore although they had accurate knowledge, their understanding of the question and response was weak.

#### **Question 14**

A well answered question – often better than Question 13. As usual candidates discussed the abilities of Lenin and Trotsky in detail and accurately, but this year more also investigated the significance of the Dual Authority and Order number One and the Kerensky Offensive. Some forgot the Kornilov Revolt, however most discussed this very well and argued that it was a key, if not the key, event. The best answers often linked the failures of the Provisional Government with the attractions of the Bolsheviks. Once again, weaker responses tended to drift into listing points without addressing significance. An alarming number of candidates wrote about the February Revolution instead of the October Revolution. Other problems were that candidates ignored Lenin as a factor or were very general about his role which kept them in Level III or IV. Weaker candidates tackled the question in a list like way or over stressed the weaknesses of the Provisional Government almost ignoring the named factor.

#### **Question 15**

This was the least popular of the 3 questions in some but not all centres. The best answers showed some awareness of geography and knowledge of the fighting on different fronts as well as detail of the mixture of forces who opposed Bolshevism. Many answers still write very generalised responses contrasting the White weaknesses and Red strengths in a rather formulaic way or lack specific examples, such as white leaders. Most had a good list of reasons which included lack of coordination of effort, the lack of clear aims, strategic difficulties and supply problems, quality of leadership and size of opposition armies, the role and support of the peasantry and the ambivalent attitude of the Entente Powers despite their presence and supply of arms. They were good on the relative advantages of and strengths of the Bolsheviks: central position and control of key transport links although there was surprisingly little reference in many answers to War Communism. Most candidates were more able to explain and discuss Red Strengths with precise examples, rather than White weakness.

#### **Question 16**

Well answered, particularly because most candidates were able to tackle the named factor, some with impressive knowledge e.g. of casualty figures. Many mentioned the 'mutilated victory', the costs of the war, economic dislocation, inflation and unemployment. Most did set the impact of the war in the context of other factors that help to explain Mussolini's rise including the north-south divide, growth of socialism and the biennio rosso, the failure of the liberal governments of Nitti and Giolitti, the ability and opportunism of Mussolini and the fascists. Unfortunately some forgot the role of the King and the March on Rome. Some candidates got the dates for World War One wrong causing problems, and some thought that Mussolini was the leader during the war.

### **Question 17**

Probably the least popular question of the three in the group. It was encouraging to see some candidates identifying the characteristics of an effective dictator in their introduction although others missed out on the meaning of 'to what extent' and wrote descriptive chronological accounts of the consolidation of power after 1922. Many were well informed on the Acerbo Law, the abolition of the party system, the rule by decree and the fusion of the state and party under the Duce. Most mentioned censorship, propaganda and OVRA. To balance this they often discussed the Concordat, continuing loyalty to the Pope and the continued existence of the monarchy. Unfortunately some candidates tried to include other aspects of would-be totalitarian control such as the economy and the various battles without relating them to the question.

### **Question 18**

Even though the question clearly asked about 1920s and 1930s, a significant amount of candidates wrote about Italy's progress throughout World War Two. However, in general there was good linking between aims and what was achieved. Candidates were also generally good at showing how the successes in Abyssinia and Spain were really hollow victories, showing how Spain had left them under-prepared for World War Two. Some candidates successfully showed how Hitler made Mussolini look foolish by not consulting him over key issues. Better candidates could successfully identify some aims in their introduction and some dealt with different aims in turn, while others wrote more chronological treatments often able to show however the way in which the aims changed over time. Most were able to show that while Mussolini had victories and successes they came at a great cost.

### **Question 19**

Candidates answered this well and grasped the concept of 'assess' effectively. Clear detailed knowledge was accurately applied in most cases. Candidates produced balanced arguments considering both reasons why the Nationalists were unpopular, but also showed a broader knowledge and evaluation of why the Communists were more appealing. Many candidates could identify reasons for instability in their introduction and some structured their answer round these rather than a chronological framework. Unfortunately some went too far back and so ran out of time and wrote very descriptive essays. Many also tended to describe the relevant reasons but only discussed their relative importance in the introduction and in the conclusion.

### **Question 20**

Many candidates seemed to expect this topic and so knew a lot and could achieve their potential. They were able to rank the reasons as to their relative importance in leading to the communist victory in 1949. They were able to discuss Mao's appeal to the peasantry, the promise of land reform and the role of Communists in the defeat of Japan, the leadership and the ideas of Mao, the organization and approach of the Red Army both to the rural peasants and to the conduct of the war against Japan and then the Nationalists and the failure of the Nationalists under Jiang Jieshi: corruption, the failure to win over the workers, loss of middle class support, poor performance in the war against Japan. Many also effectively discussed the impact of the Nationalists having to accept the help of the Communists in the war.

### **Question 21**

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

### **Question 22**

A very popular question with a wide range of responses. Better candidates were able to assess Stresemann's role in bringing stability or gave a judgement on just how stable the Republic was. Many responses were often too focussed on the 1920s 'Golden Years' period in general and not on the specific issue in the question and would have benefited from giving Stresemann more focus. There was good knowledge of international politics and economic recovery, but not many mentioned Stresemann's role as foreign minister as being significant – many described him as simply the Chancellor of Germany. There were some good answers to this question but too many candidates would jump in without placing Stresemann's chancellorship in context: so, there would be no mention of reparations, the occupation of the Ruhr, passive resistance or even hyperinflation. Weaker responses tended to open with a new currency and a statement that it brought stability without explaining why. A lot of weaker candidates wrote about cultural developments which were not linked to Stresemann and several omitted foreign policy or, more noticeably, the question of political stability. Moreover, even better candidates stated that there was political instability because there were coalition governments, ignoring the fact that there was remarkable continuity of personnel – Stresemann himself being the obvious example. Of course many thought he was Chancellor throughout. Better candidates did appreciate the fragility of Weimar's recovery and even appreciated that Stresemann appreciated this too with his comment about 'dancing on the edge of a volcano'.

### **Question 23**

Students found this question challenging, either writing a descriptive list or more commonly discussing policies and methods rather than ideas and success in imposing them. Those that did understand the question and defined what Nazi ideas about society were and then tested how people reacted to their attempts to enforce them did well. Many started by talking about Volksgemeinschaft which was quite effective. They discussed their policies towards children, education, women, workers, farmers, race and the church. They tended to argue they had the most success with the young but that waned in the war. Some could analyse the impact on various groups noting examples of reluctance, non-conformity and also inconsistency. For example, many successfully argued that Youth policy failed because the Nazis had to make membership of the Hitler Jugend compulsory in 1939 and there was increasing opposition from youth groups as the war progressed. Perhaps the biggest weakness was a lack of understanding about what is actually meant by society – women, youth, education, workers, the church and possibly culture. There was a great deal of tangential discussion of propaganda and terror and the general imposition of Nazi rule without a focus on society.

### **Question 24**

This question was generally well answered although it was probably the least popular in this section. Some candidates could discuss reasons for the division of Germany, but only had very naive assertions to offer about the extent of responsibility such as "This shows the Soviets were to blame for not being willing to comply with capitalism." A conviction that division was inevitable often got in the way of analysis. However, some candidates were able to look at events from a Soviet angle explaining ideological and security fears. Better candidates were able to recognise that the lack of a common enemy brought out old conflicts, surprisingly few discussed Stalin's paranoia and desire to keep Germany in a weakened state.

### **Question 25**

A popular choice and often quite well answered. Many discussed the longer term context of ideological differences and tensions which developed during World War Two which led to mutual suspicion and then focused on issues raised by Yalta and Potsdam. Some listed reasons, others were able to link them successfully e.g. the influence of the arrival of the atom bomb in changing FDR's accommodating stance, keen to secure Soviet help in defeating Japan, to Truman's more truculent one.

### **Question 26**

Most candidates found this difficult and drifted into listing events of the Cold War including events outside Europe, Cuba being the prime example. The more able, well prepared candidate discussed the consequences of the Berlin blockade, NATO, the creation of East and West Germany, Stalin's death and 'peaceful coexistence', Hungary, the Berlin Wall and Detente and the Prague Spring. Most concluded that relations were very poor for most of the 1950s and early 60s and that the improvement thereafter was relative. A few candidates misread the question and discussed relations between the USSR and her satellite states in Eastern Europe.

### **Question 27**

The failure to see the difference between 'cause' and 'consequence' proved to be a problem for many candidates. Very few were able to come to a judgement as to whether the collapse of Soviet power in 1989 led to political instability in the old Eastern bloc countries. The vast majority of candidates either discussed why Soviet power collapsed or discussed events within Russia. It cannot be over stressed that questions do need to be read carefully and basic historical terms should be understood at this level. Here was a classic instance of weakness in basic English having a major effect on the quality of answers. Unlike questions 25 and 26 subject knowledge was a real issue here and many could only offer generalizations about the key topic in the question.

### **Question 28**

Candidates answered this adequately and showed good subject knowledge that was broad and varied. However, many candidates failed to focus in enough detail on Nasser's policies and so even though their argument was good and their knowledge was good, they failed to address the main factor fully and so were stuck in level III or sometimes IV when really little evaluation. Again many candidates were able to help themselves by identifying the reasons for the failure of the Arab states in their introduction. Most thought that the major reason was not preparing efficiently enough for war. Many believed that this was less important than the strength of the Israeli army and its strategy but few discussed the merits of their generals.

### **Question 29**

Some candidates showed a good understanding of the question and answered with broad and fairly detailed knowledge. Weaker candidates tended to go too far back before 1973 and not balance their answer with evidence after the Yom Kippur War. Again, candidates did not really assess and judge the main factor; it tended to be implied but not explicit. There were a great deal of very short, descriptive answers which demonstrated very little knowledge of the topic, never mind the actual question asked.

### **Question 30**

This question was answered very well with candidates really expressing their own opinion. Weaker candidates often failed to really consider 'how far' and simplified it to a yes / no answer, but subject knowledge was varied and balanced between 1991 and 2003. It was encouraging to see so many candidates identifying the results of international intervention against Iraq in 1991 in their introduction. Some muddled up the 1991 war with the Second Gulf War but apart from this it was tackled well with many interesting results being mentioned including the increase in international terrorism and Bin Laden because of US troops being in Saudi Arabia.

## F963 and F964 AS History Enquiries

### General Comments

The total entry for the Enquiry Units was 16,170, with a breakdown on the British History Units of 2563 on the earlier period (F963 01) and 4601 on the later (F963 02), and on the European and World History Units of 1534 on the earlier period (F964 01) and 7427 on the later (F964 02).

This session saw a mixture of candidates most of whom made a clear effort to respond to the demands of this source paper. Some were too formulaic but at least made an attempt to compare, group, cross reference and assess at least at some point. Some very impressive scripts were seen with a clear sense of evaluative focus on the key issues matched with an assured sense of context and an application of knowledge to extend and question the sources. They approached the sources with confidence, using historical terminology and knowledge with ease. However at both the middle and lower end many candidates were the prisoners of a standard and formulaic approach. They grouped well initially but then proceeded to describe source content and provenance sequentially and discretely, with a judgement on the topic or issue rather than the sources as a body of evidence for a key issue. Their failure to integrate content and evaluation was particularly noticeable. The skills required by Enquiry papers require a handling of concepts, an evaluation of sources, either individually or in groups, and an integration of 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 very 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 were either too bound by a rigid formula, misinterpreted the sources, failed to see what was there or lacked the sound contextual background required.

**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 now seen in the 80s than has been the case in the past. Answers and standards were comparable across all 4 Units, although there was a noted lack of important conceptual knowledge on some of the 01 versions and those answering Q3 in F963 02 on England in a New Century struggled with an assessment of arguments in Q(b) and with using a pro suffrage source for evidence of opposition to votes for women.

At most levels candidates were trying to do the right thing, although it seemed that many, as noted above, 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 is noticeable that most candidates will discuss provenance discretely, raising issues of reliability or utility without any attempt to relate this to an argument for or against the key issue. It remains an isolated and undigested gobblet of information that does nothing to move an argument forward. It was also 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 aid the argument on in relation to the question.

Candidates seem more **careless of the content of the sources** of late. Some indeed hardly refer to it at all so anxious are they to move into provenance (often of a near theological nature). Content, what the sources actually say, is vital, although there are no marks for description and paraphrase. It is the content that is the tool for everything else – to compare, to assess and to probe in terms of provenance and utility to the question.

Candidates need to remember that there are two key things in terms of content – to establish the main thrust of the sources view or argument and to check the detail for important caveats or nuances. Poorly understood quotes were often substituted for meaningful comment on content, but this time there were more partial quotes of just a word or phrase, often obscuring or distorting its meaning out of context in the source.

There was much **evidence of careless reading**, both of the sources and the questions. This session, as before, the main question reading fault has lain with Q(a) where candidates miss the final part – ‘as evidence for...’ and thus compare generally. It is less of a problem with Q(b) although most will, at some point, drift from the focus of the question as they grapple with individual sources instead of comparing them in relation to the question for a particular view. The most effective answers read the sources and their introductions and attributions carefully. The extra information in the introductions aid candidates in accessing the question but many did not read the Sources carefully or their introductions and attributions. Some 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 minority had little or no knowledge and did not understand the sources, grasping only the basics of content or provenance. They added irrelevant knowledge separately and provenance was listed 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. Centres are again reminded to refresh themselves with what is expected by these units and to endeavour to incorporate it in their teaching. It is particularly important to use, compare and group sources as part of the teaching process to accustom candidates to handle material in this way. There are now sources on most of the topics dating back to 2000 (only the questions have changed) – 24 topics have been set using 4-5 sources each. In effect there are over 100 sources available to practice on in the classroom for each topic, a terrific resource and teaching tool as one moves through the course. These can be set formally or be used in discussion – can you spot the main thrust?; how best can its view be explained?; what is the vital context?; how might it be confirmed or questioned by what has just been covered?; How does it differ, and why, from another source? One can focus on particular aspects – purpose, audience, authorship, dates, contexts etc.

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

This is now done more effectively than in the past and fewer seemed to compare the wrong sources (or all five!). It is now a weaker minority that offer a general sequential analysis, often without considering the question, although the latter is still, alas, frequent. In these 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 might be helpful here. A minority had ‘wish-lists’ of limitations, and some substituted poorly understood quotes for meaningful comments. The least skilled wrote thin paraphrases or descriptions or massively over-quoted. Some had very little sense of the historical context to explain significance, for example on the Assembly of Notables in Q1 on F964 02 (French Revolution), on municipal government in Q1 on F963 02 (Condition of England) or the religious policies of Charles I in F963 01 (The English Civil War)). In Qa) as well as Qb), 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 often 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 on Q4 on Germany in F964 02 many simply wrote generally on opposition in the GDR, missing that the question’s focus was on government

attitudes to opposition. On F963 02, Q3, on England in a New Century many wrote about the pros and the cons of female suffrage rather than about the evidence for opposition to it. It should also be a matter for practice in the classroom that 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 in the ‘comparison’ answer need careful consideration. Each frequently lead to underachievement :-**

- 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.) 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**, 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 must arise from an evaluation of the quality of the content, either throughout or in a developed concluding paragraph. A failure to judge will confine a candidate to level III and below. Also **Judgement is all too frequently on the issue itself, rather than on the evidence for it** (see above).
- It is vital that candidates **identify the relevant issues** arising in the two sources and use these as their comparative focus. Failure to do so leads to description, paraphrase or at worst copying out what is there, word for word.
- The analysis and evaluation of two sources as evidence has the **higher mark weighting**.
- 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. **We cannot emphasis enough the damage a formulaic approach does.** Candidates desperately seek qualities on their ‘list’ that are simply not there or are of minor or tangential significance. For example a paragraph might be added on ‘completeness’ which turns into a wish list of sources that were not used in the comparison. 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 than in recent sessions it continues to crop up in many guises and can tend to be a whole Centre feature, indicating that the advice given to candidates is inappropriate. If you are reading this report and recognise this as the sort of advice and technique you recommend to students please think again and revise your teaching and advice in the light of the above.

- The key to an effective comparison of provenance is to **ask questions about the authors, their likely purpose, the different audiences and their respective tone**. For example, many candidates will devote whole sections of their answer 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 an understanding of source content.
- Most candidates **sequence their comments on provenance and deal with them separately**. A separation will often work but more effective candidates will integrate them in a holistic approach. Most however, having compared content, are then quite happy to comment discretely on authorship, tone or purpose. Without effective comparison on this they find an informed judgement much more difficult.
- Candidates will often take sources at **face value**. They need to probe. This was particularly, if rather surprisingly, the case with Q4(Germany) on F964 02. The attitudes of the DDR's Communist government and local leaders were accepted for what they said, missing the ideological and contextual points that could have been made.
- **Misinterpretation of the Sources** was rarer this session but it still occurs at every level. **Candidates need to read the material very carefully**. It should ring bells in terms of their own understanding of an issue. Often this was simply carelessness. Our sources are fairly short but have been edited to contain real historical 'meat'. The language and points made need both careful consideration and cross referencing, which can only be achieved by attention to detail. Again this is something to practice using past sources as and when the topics are encountered in the classroom. A good example of missing important detail came in Q2, albeit on the part (b) question, on the German reformation in F964 01 where, in Source E, most missed the reference to the violence 'already taking place', an important caveat when assessing Luther's responsibility for the bloodshed in the Peasant's war.
- 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. A new variant on this is to argue that a source is limited because it only gives one point of view. One will use balance as a means of assessing the view in a modern historian and it might be relevant to comment on a particular slant but most contemporary sources will be partisan to a greater or lesser extent.

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

Most now plan and tried to sustain a clearly structured answer, reasonably focused on the question. Many had an argument, albeit of varying quality and endeavoured to reach a judgement of sorts. Most know to attempt a grouping based on the assertion in the question but unfortunately, having done the difficult bit, they then still proceed sequentially, usually in two argumentative or more generally descriptive halves. It is vital not just to pay lip service to the grouping just in the introduction. There is then 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 provide a relative weighting for the respective views or to answer the question**. This divorces the material from the key issue and prevents candidates from integrating their points into any 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 via their content to a particular interpretation or challenge it, and their relative merits as evidence. Thus, instead of arguing that A and C support the view and then proceeding to discuss A in one paragraph and C in the next, they would be better advised to select the issues both raise in support or point to different ones. That way they cross reference and think about the key issues. They need to consider this more in terms of their answer to a part (a) question – that is to compare and contrast sources they deem to support the issues, remembering that

many sources are capable of supporting different views depending on certain phrases or provenance. Q4 (Germany) on F964 02 was a good example of this latter point, as were the sources on the French revolution in Q1 on the same paper. All the sources in these two instances could be used in this manner. It is also far better to integrate issues of provenance (authorship, purpose and audience) into this rather than separate out into a later bolt-on section. 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 content and the provenance, which may affect the relative weighting given to their points. Unfortunately some candidates still prefer to write general essays about the topic, either for the majority (rarely) or for part (usually) of their answers. Others simply quote from the sources, sometimes quite heavily. The sources need interpreting with comments. They must not be allowed to speak for themselves – they don't! That is the candidate's task!

**The following points in the 'interpretation' answer need careful consideration. Each frequently lead to underachievement:-**

- Candidates are frequently puzzled by how to use 'knowledge' or context. A few 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 many cases candidates seemed to have little beyond a **general contextual underpinning**. They confined their comments to what was in front of them. This was either because it was unconsolidated or because they lacked it. 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 in practice used limited evidence, often preferring to drift irrelevantly outside the key issue or the dates of a question. 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 because of this**. It resulted in a lack of balance, where candidates rarely spotted the counter-arguments within the Sources. This was true of Q4 (Germany) on F964 02 where some knowledge of living standards and DDR achievements would have proved useful in assessing both the pro and anti 'improvement' sources. **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.
- 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. Thus often effective points are made in isolation of the question and argument.
- Many answers **drifted out of focus on the key issue** in the question. The sharpness of focus was highly significant in marking out the best answers. Candidates would latch onto a preferred 'big' issue, often tangential, 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 with the judgement effectively being just a summary of what has gone before. 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 source focus 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...*’ 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.
- 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 their knowledge to overwhelm it. Having spotted the thrust they then need to analyse and integrate content and provenance for *use* in argument, rather than just describe them.
- Candidates must *use* Sources for the question, rather than copying out their content sequentially, or paraphrasing their general gist whilst noting their author and date by simply copying out the introduction or attribution.
- Sources need to be judged beyond *face value*, in the light of their context, purpose or audience. Many candidates are often surprisingly naive in this respect.
- 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**, although we saw less of the latter in this session.
- Candidates should always consider the view in the question first, and balance it with one or more alternative views, driven by the sources.
- Making an interim judgement on how convincing a group of sources are, supported by your analysis and evaluation, is good practice before moving on to the opposing group
- Avoid paragraphs of bolted on knowledge starting 'From my own knowledge I know. . .'
- Integrate sources into Qb) conclusion and judgement to ‘assess how far the sources support the interpretation’- a purely knowledge-based judgement cannot answer the Q. (see above).
- **The lack of 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 is 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. 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.
- 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. Most will have a reasonable focus with some analysis and some provenance and are thus Level 3. If they can evaluate a source and relate it to the key issue and question they will move into Level 2 and above.
- Weaker candidates 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 blatantly copied out Source content sequentially, with merely an uninformative, often repetitive, assertion in relation to the topic rather than the key issue.
- 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. However at the highest levels there were some perceptive answers with an impressive awareness of detail and the use of well chosen evidence in evaluation of provenance as well as content.

Other able candidates lost marks for using sources at face value and not considering their provenance, reliability or use.

- **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).
- Fewer candidates now 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. However some still 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 . . .'
- Only a few responses **failed to find more than one view** in the Sources.
- 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. 'Bias' seems to have reappeared. Informal language is inappropriate in an examination.

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 should take note of the following strengths and weaknesses this session in terms of the two assessment targets, A01 and A02*

**AO1: Use of knowledge, clarity of expression; structure, analysis, evaluation, judgement.**

**Positive points:**

- Most planned and tried to sustain a clearly-structured answer for Qb)
- Many did try to focus on the question and answer it
- Most had an argument albeit of varying quality and most created an argument of two or more sides for Qb)
- Many did try to reach a judgement of sorts
- Many eagerly explored every angle that occurred to them
- Some had a range and depth of pertinent detailed knowledge to use for evaluation

**Points to work on:**

- Understanding the requirements of the question and the key issue (see above)
- Avoid rushing into writing everything you know ‘ad hoc’ – a concise, reasoned, considered answer is more convincing – see ‘Instructions to Candidates’ on the front of the exam paper!
- Planning, structure and coherence are vital for comparison in Qa) and argument in Qb)
- Explain specifically what the ‘agenda’ is, if the word is to be used – ‘purpose’ is a clearer term and will focus a candidate on more pertinent questions.
- Use relevant evidence within the date range of the question, not from the broader topic unless it is of relevance.
- Use a ‘specific, applied’ approach to historical knowledge rather than ‘broad brush’ and bolt-on.
- Judgement, on the value of the sources as evidence, needs *support* to be convincing.

**AO2: Skills of Source analysis and evaluation; synthesis of grouped Sources with relevant knowledge in evaluation of the interpretation.**

**Positive points:**

- Very few this session compared the wrong sources in Qa)
- Most attempted to use provenance as well as content
- Subtleties in the sources were sometimes explored with good attention to detail.
- Most did use the grouped sources to drive their answers to Qb), and did not put their knowledge first
- Most did attempt to group the sources in Qb) with varied success, but many still in effect sequenced their subsequent approach
- Most did try to *use* the sources as well as they could, if only as quotes (they need comments)

**Points to work on:**

- Avoid writing essays about the topic with brief nods to the Sources by letter or in brackets. This prevents evaluation of the sources ‘as evidence’ for the question.
- Quote full phrases, not just *part* quotes (which can distort), and explain them rather than letting them ‘speak for themselves’.
- Analyse and *use* integrated content and provenance for argument, don’t just describe.
- *Use* Sources for the question, rather than copying out their content sequentially, or paraphrasing their general gist and noting their author and date.
- Judge sources beyond *face value*, in the light of context, purpose, audience, tone, typicality and remember that not all of these will apply to all the sources. Sometimes the key is the date. At other times it will be tone or typicality.
- Try to make meaningful comments on provenance and **link provenance to content**.
- Avoid formulaic answers and ‘limitation’ wish-lists, such as ‘letters from peasants’ or simply ‘people’.
- In Qb) always first consider the interpretation in the question, then use grouped or cross-referenced sources to develop other alternative views to balance the argument.
- Make an interim judgement on how convincing a group of sources are, supported by analysis and evaluation, before moving on to the opposing group
- Avoid paragraphs of bolted on knowledge starting ‘From my own knowledge I know. . .’
  - a purely knowledge-based judgement cannot answer the question.

## F965 Historical Interpretations and Investigations

Thanks must go to centres for efficient administration. There were relatively few problems and the checklist on CCS160 was obviously helpful. Some transcription and arithmetical error delayed moderation. There are still some centres who offer very little or even no annotation of the work, but these were in a minority and generally annotation was full and focused on the mark scheme. This was very helpful and the thoroughness of the marking was much appreciated. In larger centres there generally was evidence of careful internal moderation though there were still cases where different standards were applied by different markers. This was particularly noticeable when more than one topic was offered by centres. It is vital that whatever the topic, the same standard should be expected. Where there was variation, it was difficult for moderators to recommend either acceptance of the centre marks or scaling and some work had to be returned to centres for remarking. This decision is taken with some reluctance, bearing in mind how busy teachers are, but it is important that any mark adjustment does not disadvantage or advantage candidates who have studied a particular topic. The professionalism with which centres affected approached the task of reconsidering their marking won the respect of the moderators involved.

It may be helpful to offer some reminders about issues which arose.

- The word limit is 2000 words for Interpretations and 2000 for investigations. Work which exceeds the limit should not be read by the centre and a line should be drawn to show the moderator where assessment ended. There is no tolerance and the word limit should be adhered to by candidates.
- It is not permitted for every candidate in a centre to submit an answer to the same Investigations question. This applied even to centres of only 2 candidates. Infringements of this regulation were referred to the OCR Malpractice unit.
- The Interpretations questions must be answered from the current year's set. If discontinued questions were attempted, this was also referred to the OCR malpractice unit
- Forms CS 160 must be submitted

However, it would give a false impression to dwell on any administrative shortcomings, and samples with the correct paperwork were generally sent speedily and this facilitated the process of moderation.

**Interpretations.** Better answers focused on the passages, identifying the interpretations and analysing the whole passage. They went on to test the interpretation by applying what was often strong contextual knowledge and also used evidence from the other passages to support sustained evaluation. The key issue in the question was kept in mind throughout and a strong argument which was driven by critical consideration of all four interpretations emerged which showed depth of study and strong independent research which was well focused on the issues in the interpretations. Application of knowledge is often a challenging skill and many good answers showed discrimination and flexibility in using information, and judgements were mature and perceptive at the top end of the mark range.

Candidates who achieved lower marks often failed to interpret the passages carefully enough. An example is the question on whether Hoover's policies made the depression worse. Many answers looked at what the passages said about Hoover generally and neglected the question. Similarly a question about whether the Vietnam War had the greater impact on the USA or Asia was often answered as if the issue was what impact the war had on the USA.

Another feature of work which did not justify higher level marks was focus on the content of the passages without sufficient use of knowledge. Sometimes additional knowledge was present, but not linked to the passages and not used to evaluate the interpretations they contained.

Candidates should be encouraged to consider the passages as a whole, not to select parts of them either to support a view about the question or to test. The aim is not to pick out small sections and link these to wider knowledge, but to use wider knowledge to assess the whole view of a passage.

The passages should not be treated as sources, but as interpretations. There is little to be gained from classifying them as ‘orthodox’ or ‘revisionist’ or speculating about the intention or situation of the author. If there appears to be a lack of balance or ‘bias’ or unreliability, then this needs to be shown by applying knowledge or evidence from other passages.

However, the main distinction between successful and less successful answers was in the extent of critical analysis of the interpretations and the quality of the evidence used to make judgements. Coursework is not done in examination conditions and there is every opportunity for candidates to research additional knowledge. If only very limited and generalised knowledge is used in connection with the passages, then answers will not score highly. If there is quite extensive knowledge but it is simply included at some stage in the answer to argue about the proposition in the question rather than being used to assess an interpretation, then again it is not likely to score highly.

Previous reports have drawn attention to the requirements of the analysis of the four interpretations, but it was not uncommon for answers with little or no contextual knowledge to be given high marks and for insufficient distinction to be made between simple comparison (A says..... and B agrees) and the deployment of evidence in the passages to evaluate a given interpretation.

Some candidates had read widely and were eager to introduce different interpretations to add to those in the passages. Provided that the response identified the evidence that the new interpretations were based on, this was helpful. However when it was merely assertion, ‘Taylor agrees with Interpretation B’, then little was really added.

**Investigations.** There was quite a considerable gap between strong answers which grappled with the evidence for or against the key issue in the question and built up a strong case by looking critically at evidence and weaker responses which merely illustrated points with reference to sources or ‘piled up’ authorities without explaining what their views were based on. Thus “Bismarck had little intention of pursuing a war with France after 1866, as Taylor says ‘Bismarck did not plan for war’” is not using evidence critically – Taylor is merely illustrating a point. The candidate would need to have explained why Taylor thought that, whether the evidence was sufficient and whether or not there was evidence to support a counter view. It is also no use saying ‘but Taylor is well known as a revisionist and his view may be wrong’. This is only assertion – what would be the basis in evidence for Taylor to be challenged? This might be demanding in an examination, but coursework offers candidates a chance to read about the whole issue of war with France and to consider the evidence critically. Though this needs thought and is time consuming, it nevertheless is a requirement for an A2 unit which aims to offer stretch and challenge.

Candidates who fail to offer sustained evaluation of the evidence they select and deploy should not score highly; also, there should be an expectation for higher level marks that they offer a relevant answer to their own question. Candidates who do choose their own question should be sure that they understand its implications and also that they can access sufficient material to show that they can use a range of sources with discrimination. There is no need for sources to be very specialist, but as research proceeds, there should be some attempt to go beyond one or two basic text books or VI form guides if candidates want to show that their work is ‘excellent’ or ‘very good’.

The key element is evaluation of sources and this is different from merely juxtaposing or briefly comparing or listing historians. There is no requirement to use primary evidence, but this often does open up chances for evaluation and in some topics it might seem obvious to test secondary interpretations against primary evidence, or to consider what use the historians have made of primary evidence.

### **Centre Assessment**

Marginal annotation is very helpful and should inform final judgements. Thus if 'evaluation' or 'assessment' does not appear much as a marginal comment it is an indication that a Level 1 or II mark for A02 is not going to be likely. Similarly if 'evaluation' is written frequently, then a mark of IV or V is going to be unlikely for A02.

It is possible for there to be a lot of evaluation noted, but that the support for it is minimal and the nature of it is basic and assertive, so some marginal comment about the quality of judgements is also helpful and should inform the final A02 mark.

Where passages are not well interpreted or where the argument moves away from the question, this should be noted as this will have implications for both A01b and A02. The extent and appositeness of application of knowledge should also be commented on, as this will affect judgements about the quality of evaluation (A02) and how well knowledge has been used (A01a) it is difficult to see how a Level IV in A02 can be matched with a top level in A01a and top marks should not be awarded simply because there is some knowledge: it has to be relevant and it has to be used.

In general there was a tendency for insufficient demands to be made when assessing the support for evaluation and Level 1 marks were sometimes awarded for work which did not show excellent and discriminating application of knowledge or very sharply focused judgements relating to the question. Teachers are well placed to assess the quality of supporting knowledge as the Interpretations question and often the Investigations essay are based on a topic about which they will have specialist knowledge. It is important that work which is going to be marked as 'excellent' or 'very good' for Band I a and i b in A02 should be just that in terms of knowledge and understanding. Thus it is important to show where these qualities have been demonstrated and why the marker feels that high bands are justified. It is helpful to note irrelevance, blurred focus and limited knowledge not to be negative but to gain a realistic overall judgement, but it is even more important to show higher levels of achievement as moderators are not re-marking work but looking to understand and if possible to agree with the positive judgements made by centres.

There were many cases where centre judgements were insufficiently demanding and where assessment fell outside nationally agreed standards, and this was more common at the higher end of the mark range. It is at this level that markers should be really sure that key elements are in place.

- Relevant argument
- Substantial and substantiated evaluation of interpretations and evidence
- A sound understanding of the passages and the interpretations they contain
- Application of well chosen and high quality knowledge
- Cross referencing of passages and evidence that goes beyond comparison or juxtaposition.

Though there are suggestions for improvement both in candidate performance and in centre marking, these should not detract from the very real achievement of many candidates at different levels and in different ways to engage with some demanding passages and to research important and challenging topics independently and assess a range of evidence.

This does offer real challenges, but candidates derive considerable benefit and insight into the nature of history and historical evidence.

Centres do obviously support their candidates in a demanding but rewarding exercise and devote considerable thought and time to assessing the results, often with considerable skill and understanding. The comments in the report are to support much good practice and to offer some guidance in assessing worthwhile and interesting work.

## **F966/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1066-1715**

### **General**

The Paper differentiated well, rewarding those students who showed a good understanding of both the topic under consideration and the key skills needed for this element.

The impression was that many students understood the key skills and delivered well, though there was also a feeling that there had been some regression as to the quality and consistency of synthesis. Also, in some Centres, aside from the usual Centre-driven responses, there was a tendency to synthesise one answer and not another. On occasion, long answers were read, replete with knowledge, but too descriptive and often thin in areas of real argument and analysis; explanation suffered and synthesis was thin.

Pre-packaged answers, set up to offer approaches to past or to possible questions, can create problems. A goodly number of candidates will use themes such as political, economic, social, maybe cultural or military, in response to certain questions, yet at times this pre-learnt themed approach can get in the way of clear argument and explanation. This was a feature of quite a number of answers to F966/2 Questions 3, 10, 14 and 15, for example.

Some answers started with a good and strong overview of key issue yet went on to ignore those in much of what was written. The best synthesis is that built around persistent comparison and contrast, using knowledge selectively and illustratively, explaining as the answer develops. In weaker answers synthesis was confined to brief references or to the conclusions and at the lowest level was not present at all.

Some answers, however, often started with comparison and ended with such but eschewed this in the bulk of the text. Often, comparison was bolt-on or left to link words like 'similar were...' or 'different were...'

There were a goodly number also that essentially listed for example; German leaders, Irish leaders and figures or Tsars and Communists within the same paragraph without doing enough by way of linkages and explanations or evaluations. Synthesis is not simply a list of different rulers or events piled up in the same paragraph; there must be some link and or comparison between them. They do need cross-referencing and cross-overs, linking words to bring out and explain similarity or difference.

Generalisation was a common feature of many weaker answers; a sense of understanding but little really good support. Although the paper requires a 'broad-brush' approach, candidates still need to support their arguments or comments with precise evidence. Description was also a feature of weaker answers, often with limited argument or counter-argument and little meaningful explanation. But even good candidates could overdo the descriptive/chronological routes and not deliver sufficient and persistent synthesis, limiting their overall performance.

As ever, some candidates ended up answering a prior question, often unloading pre-packaged answers.

Turning point questions continue to prove troublesome to many. There is a danger of listing if candidates simply consider a series of individual events, unless synthesis can be guaranteed within each turning point paragraph. However, when following the thematic approach candidates must also ensure that they do not lose sight of the actual turning point in the question and should link their material and argument back to it. Quite a number of candidates like to write about negative turning points but sometime this does not help the argument or counter-argument.

Also, within the body of the answer, those candidates who like to write a lengthy summary paragraph after a themed paragraph impede the flow of argument and explanation and often weaken the synthesis.

Timing was not too much of an issue but some candidates did write too much on a first answer, so squeezing their response time in the second answer. While planning is helpful, some spend too much time on elaborate plans and run into timing problems as a result. Candidates could be taught to produce brief, focused essay plans.

Many wrote vast amounts and often with some style and skills, demonstrating strong synthesis and evaluation. Such answers scored well or very well in AO1B. Many answers were good – sticking within level II and III for AO1B. – because arguments were apparent but needed further development to push them higher. Some answers were also very short and irrelevant – offering little to the actual question set.

Candidates could be reminded that there is as much value in a compact, succinct, well-developed answer as in a very long one. Often the latter can lose direction. There were those who did write much but followed an essentially chronological and descriptive route; even with some analytical and explanatory comments, such answers cannot score highly because they lack the vital ingredient of comparative analysis and evaluation. Chronological routes were often apparent, which did lead to lots of narrative without explanation. Whilst some did manage to achieve adequate synthesis and evaluation with this approach, most were limited to description with bolt-on (often appearing rote-learned) standard phrases that attempted to show judgement. Some candidates offered merely a list approach and made no links between each ruler/event/leader which led to a failure in assessing real change/importance. More cross referencing was required, especially when the question deals with a named factor. Where comparative routes were offered and these worked well in providing sound analysis and synoptic judgement.

There were several occasions where candidates either misread or misunderstood the question and therefore its requirements. This led to answers falling short of Level III, even with some good analysis. Another issue was where candidates delivered pre-packaged answers without much attempt to relate the material and ideas to the actual questions set. This was particularly noticeable in Themes on Ireland and American Civil Rights.

The use of abbreviations continues to be a source of concern – often, candidates make clear they are going to use such (e.g. NA, CRs, Govt, even TP for turning point) from an early stage. Literacy levels were generally satisfactory or more in many cases but there were examiners reporting that poor spelling, punctuation and expression were impeding the flow of argument.

## **Question Specific**

### **English Government and the Church 1066-1216**

#### **Question 1**

This answer was generally done less well than Question 2 and only a fraction better than Question 3. Most structured an argument thematically, but did not handle 'royal officials' effectively and only a few noticed 'competent', yet to achieve high levels it was essential to focus on these issues and compare them with other factors. Answers mostly argued that continental possessions and the king's absence were the main factors and mentioned royal officials as a means of change. Some candidates did attempt to link royal officials with specific changes, but some took a more general approach to continuity and change, rather than 'the development'. Many were unable to give precise examples of royal officials and this also detracted from the argument. Several discussed 'innovation' and made judgements on this basis. At the lower end were more general discussions of general chronological change in central government. This concentrated on the Exchequer, Chief Justiciar, the financial system and sheriffs. There was

some overlap of material with Question 2, as some developed sections on the courts and law. Some lost focus and branched into the local government, drifting to ‘centralisation’ of government. Better answers linked this to central government for some credibility. Weaker answers failed to link or compare factors, instead adopting a list-like approach.

### **Question 2**

This answer was done better than Question 1. The majority made distinctions between the period pre- and post-1154 and attempted to differentiate between continuity, evolution and change. The best made interim judgements based on supported evaluation of continuity and change, the better ones sustaining comparative evaluation throughout their essays as a basis for final synthesis and judgement. Good answers focused clearly on the key issue of the common law, defining it as three-fold – civil law, criminal law and land law. This provided a sounder structure and allowed synthesis as the concepts of standardisation and uniformity were introduced. The less convincing answers stated their knowledge of the topic with muddled or limited explanation and at the lowest level there were a number of candidates who were clearly unaware of what was meant by ‘common law.’ There was some awareness of change, but little understanding of its significance. Specific knowledge of developments, particularly in the earlier period was often lacking and this limited the credibility of the argument. Where judgement was made, the later period was mostly accepted as more significant. In some weaker answers thoughts of a pre-prepared answer, comparing Henry I with Henry II, narrowed the scope.

### **Question 3**

This question was the least well answered of the 3 on this option. The best answers clearly focused their arguments on Becket, developing and comparing him thematically with other Archbishops for his relation with the King, the Pope, other Archbishops and the church. They also compared his personality with that of other Archbishops. The weakest answer narrated the story of Becket’s life and stated that there was no such thing as a typical Archbishop. They then wrote about a few others sequentially and stated in conclusion that Becket was different. Middle range answers made a few links between Becket and Anselm, then compared other Archbishops who had similar tenures of the office in different ways, failing to keep the comparative link with Becket through the rest of their essays. The best answers set their evaluative comparison within the changing context of the whole period and recognised patterns of change, arguing that Becket might have been more typical if circumstances had remained the same. Some argued that rather than being typical, Becket was atypical; either line of argument was acceptable provided the answer was comparative and well supported.

## **Rebellion and Disorder in England 1485-1603**

### **Question 4**

A significant number of candidates missed the wording in the question ‘*economic* rebellions’ and answered last year’s question of taxation as a ‘main cause’ generally, bringing in political, dynastic and religious rebellions. Several had limited knowledge of ‘taxation’ beyond 1525 and many stated that taxes were low during Mary and Elizabeth’s reigns or were a main cause of the Oxfordshire Rising. Some failed to focus on the whole period, particularly as taxation was not a significant cause after 1549. However, better answers argued that taxation was replaced by other issues as the main cause after 1525, such as enclosure or food prices and inflation and this was an acceptable line to take; whereas others became sidetracked into an explanation for either the decline of taxation as a cause, which was often confused, or for a more general explanation of the reasons for the decline in the number of rebellions. A number of candidates attempted to compare taxation with dynastic, political and religious causes of rebellion. At the lower end, and there were many candidates who fell into this category, the answer became a tired sweep of types of rebellions, often developed with thin narratives of events irrelevant to the question. The best candidates (not strong) had accurate and differentiated knowledge of types of taxation as a cause of rebellion and saw patterns of change over time. These few candidates attempted to integrate taxation into their evaluation of other causes of economic rebellions for

assessment of their main cause. However, where some candidates did drift it was to narrate the events of the taxation rebellions, or explain why they were successful or dangerous, rather than focusing on the actual question. Very few candidates recognised the local element of the Cornish and Yorkshire rebellions. Many did not focus on 'main' cause' at all and some irrelevantly mentioned Ireland missing the reference to 'England' in the question.

#### **Question 5**

This was the least well answered question of the 3 on this topic, although Question 3 was also weakly answered. Candidates who established a set of criteria against which to judge effective usually produced the strongest answers. However, some resorted to a more general focus on 'methods' or 'threat'. Sometimes this was developed quite relevantly by linking to speed and nature of government reaction. Most just explained how governments dealt with rebellions, and whether or not rebellions succeeded or failed. Many simply focused on the methods governments used to deal with unrest and then attempted a single 'bolt on' sentence at the end of a paragraph stating whether it was effective or ineffective. There was little knowledge of governments' limitations or distractions to explain why governments *seemed to* underestimate rebellions; they were merely seen as unprepared. Ireland was sometimes added and dealt with quite effectively. Many focused more heavily on deterrence or punishment after rebellions had been dealt with. One common mistake was to assert that the Pilgrimage of Grace rebels were pardoned, went home and lived happily ever after. Some candidates wrote very generally about rebellions without support from specific rebellions and these responses did not score highly.

#### **Question 6**

This answer saw a wide range of responses, from the outstanding where there was clear understanding of the role of the clergy in either aiding or undermining stability, contrasted with other factors or social groups, to those who replaced clergy with church and wrote very generally. Many weaker answers merely described sequentially the role of local churches, followed by the nobility, JPs, law and Parliament (some asserting it 'gave the common people a voice') and propaganda – though this was usually merely stated and no explanation given as to why Elizabeth's appearance should ensure stability. Few mentioned the monarch and even fewer the Privy Council or regional councils. This approach usually produced a more general answer on political stability. Many did not use the view that clergy were a significant part of some rebellions to assess their importance in ensuring stability. Very few attempted to evaluate the relative significance of the clergy in political stability compared to other factors. Once again specific examples of clergy and their role would have helped to move answers away from sweeping generalisations, although a number were aware of the role of Bishops in the early period, the writings of Cranmer and the role of Pole, which were contrasted with the clerical involvement in the Lincolnshire rising, pilgrimage of Grace and Western Rebellion. A similar picture emerged when the nobility were discussed; those with specific examples gave their argument greater credibility. A significant number argued that paintings or architecture helped to increase stability without explaining how or understanding how few would actually have seen the images.

### **Tudor Foreign Policy 1485-1603**

#### **Question 7**

Weaker candidates did not focus on the *influence* of economic factors on foreign *policy*. There seems to be a blurring of 'foreign relations' with 'policy'. Trade featured as the most significant element of economic factors, and sometimes financial limitations was mentioned, but overall, the key issue was not always dealt with very convincingly, and the answer turned into a more general one on dynastic, security and personal issues linked to continuity and change in foreign relations. However, there were some who were able to compare economic factors with other issues and argued that at all times economic factors were subservient to national and dynastic security and that very often financial constraints limited foreign policy, often mentioning the

events surrounding the Amicable Grant. The comparative element was traced through the argument in only the best answers.

Many argued that economic factors were more important in the reign of Henry VII than at other times, but even here they were sacrificed for dynastic security or were used to help secure Henry's position.

### **Question 8**

This question was not answered well generally. Some did not note the change of circumstances concerning the Auld Alliance in 1560 and assumed the situation remained or did not take their answer beyond this date, even ignoring the changing nature of relations with France during the Wars of Religion. There was little comparative evaluation of the relative threat of the two countries, as it was generally stated that France was a larger country with more troops, so was obviously a greater threat. Some better candidates differentiated the joint threat at times when Scotland acted alone and when France did so. Some also differentiated between the different types of threat and argued that because of the borders Scotland was always a potential menace, even if she possessed fewer resources. None noticed that the French Wars of Religion contributed to a change in the security threat, and there was some inaccuracy on the Dutch Revolt. A limited number had relevant and solid knowledge of the significant events in the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII. Many mentioned garrisoning under Somerset, but did not make synoptic links or develop the changing nature of the threat posed by Mary Queen of Scots. There were also some answers that got sidetracked into accounts about Mary Queen of Scots' presence in England without linking it directly to the question. Most explained events relating to the two countries. Some undermined the quality of their analysis and evaluation by taking a chronological approach, while there were some who did not make synoptic links, but mentioned chunks of the periods in an un-chronological order, which became very muddled, twisting cause and effect. Some drifted too far into policy towards Scotland to be fully relevant and some even talked about Mary Queen of Scots and domestic plots without linking it to foreign policy.

### **Question 9**

This question was rarely done well. Few really understood the concept of a 'turning point'. Mary's reign was seen as a turning point generally – in religion as well as foreign policy. There was some dubious 'knowledge' about the influence of Philip II in England and Wyatt's rebellion within a generally very negative argument concerning Mary 'beginning a close relationship with Spain'. There was some confusion about Anglo-Imperial policy after 1556 which undermined the argument for a question on relations with Spain. A structure which dealt sequentially with individual turning points sometimes left 1489 until last, undermining the synoptic nature of the answer, as the foundations for continuity had not been established earlier. There was some confusion about the Dutch Revolt, and many saw 1566 as a turning point, when Elizabeth's relations with Philip did not deteriorate until 1568, or more significantly 1585. The Treaty of Nonsuch was not included in most answers, and Philip II was blamed for deteriorating relations. The Armada (with a range of dates – 1558 etc) was seen as the end of the topic. However, some argued convincingly that Mary's reign was not a turning point, but rather the high point of generally good relations with Spain, started under Henry VII and ending during Elizabeth's reign, suggesting that even Henry VIII's divorce from Catherine of Aragon did little to undermine this pattern. These candidates therefore argued that the turning point was during Elizabeth's reign and considered a variety of possibilities.

## **The Catholic and Counter Reformation**

### **Question 10**

Some candidates did not compare continuity with other features of the Catholic Reformation. Some candidates who adopted an historiographical approach and this often detracted from their Centres are reminded that Candidates do not need to bring in historiography and that when used by weaker candidates it can often be purely descriptive and does not help to advance an

argument. Better answers identified a range of themes and for each of these considered whether they were best characterised by change or continuity. Issues such as doctrine, popes and the new orders were frequently discussed and most were able to produce balanced, analytical accounts that covered the period and make interim judgements about the degree of change or continuity.

#### **Question 11**

Better answers treated this as a question about the contribution the religious orders made to the Catholic Reformation but some thought the question was about the Jesuits alone. While candidates knew the names of the new orders, their comments about their work were often generalised and lacking in precise support. However, at the higher levels candidates were aware of the work and areas covered by orders other than the Jesuits and this allowed candidates to make good comparisons between them and the Jesuits, making interim judgements about issues such as education, where many considered the Jesuits to have been the most influential, or on issues such as care for the sick or the conversion of natives and winning land back from Protestantism. Many answers failed to mention the work done by the Benedictines, Carmelites and Dominicans.

#### **Question 12**

This was the least popular question in this section and many were answered in very general terms. The better answers identified and assessed the obstacles to reform, but some focused only on the Papacy and did not widen their answer to the Catholic Church in general as the question stated. Many argued that until 1534 and the pontificate of Paul III the Papacy itself had been the major obstacle to reform. Answers also considered the obstacle of poorly educated clergy, many using Spain as an example, whilst others considered the obstacle presented by some secular rulers. Unfortunately, there were a number of answers that limited their examples to Spain and Italy which did prevent a full picture from being presented. However, there were also some who explained the problems faced by the Papacy and the Catholic church, but did not consider whether they were overcome.

### **Sixteenth Century France – Development of the Nation State**

#### **Question 13**

There were many good answers to this question, but at the lower end some struggled with the concept of centralisation and simply wrote about Francis I reign as a turning point in the development of the nation state. Stronger candidates defined the themes significant for the creation of a centralised nation state and what would constitute a turning point. The best ones placed Francis I at the heart of their answers and made comparative, thematic links across other reigns. When they sustained their argument with evaluative interim judgements they produced a high level of synthesis. Most reached a judgement that the end of the reign of Francis I was a negative turning point, while a more significant and positive turning point lay in the reign of Henri IV. The reign of Louis XII continues to receive scant treatment and candidates would benefit from some greater knowledge of his reign so that they are able to develop further the concepts of change and continuity across the whole period, rather than making generalisations about his reign.

#### **Question 14**

The responses to this question were generally sound as it was a familiar topic. The better candidates adopted a thematic approach focusing upon the nobility followed by a synoptic sweep of other individual factors in the development of the nation state, such as religious change, the changing powers of kings and patterns within the economy. Stronger answers were able to support their claims with specific examples from the nobility and many argue that they could be a force for both unity and disunity in the development of the nation state, with many displaying good knowledge about their role in the build up to, and during, the Wars of Religion. However, in some answers the conclusion contained the only synthesis in the answers.

### Question 15

This question was poorly answered by many and even where there was reasonable knowledge and understanding of finance, candidates did not focus on the word 'consistently'. There was usually a general description of financial problems and a chronological explanation or description of what each successive king did to try and solve them. There were not enough candidates who had a sufficiently detailed knowledge or understanding of finance to be able to tackle this question effectively. The rest of the answer explained how other factors, such as religion, the nobility, localism and the economy weakened *France* during the period. Focus was usually a general one, rarely linked clearly to the weakening of the French *monarchy*. There was some clear awareness in the better answers of patterns of change which they linked to the word 'consistently' in the title and produced a focused argument.

### Question 16

A significant number of candidates sought to explain why French domestic problems were solved rather than to what extent. Centres should encourage candidates to read the question carefully, identify the key words or phrases and use them as the focus of their answer. By breaking down the question in this way in the opening paragraph candidates can provide themselves with a thematic structure and give themselves a greater likelihood of a synoptic and comparative response that answers the actual question set. Candidates often considered issues such as the nobility, finance and religion, but few mentioned Jansenism. Better answers did try to assess to what extent, but many simply argued yes or no.

### Question 17

Many better answers started with a definition of the 'development of France' and then linked their material back to it. The question provoked some general writing about the economy rather than a comparison of the economy with other factors. There were a number of answers where only the economy was considered or where knowledge of the economy was very generalised and in both instances this depressed the level awarded.

### Question 18

Precise knowledge of 1659 was often a problem for candidates and it was often dismissed in a few general sentences and other dates considered instead. However, better answers adopted a thematic approach and considered issues such as allies, territory and military strength, comparing the situation with other dates or periods to reach interim judgements about each theme before reaching an overall conclusion. There were many who argued that although 1659 was a significant date in the power of France, the Treaty of Ratisbon represented the pinnacle of French power. However, candidates could offer any other plausible date, provided their answer was supported.

## **F966/02 Modern 1789–1997**

### **Question 1**

There were some very good answers, but features included not as much stress on Kleindeutsch/Grossdeutsch as might have been expected, a lack of appreciation of the democratic/more authoritarian distinction and a tendency to go for change rather than continuity after 1890. Candidates did not really get to grips with this. There was some attempt to distinguish between different types of nationalism (romantic, political) but this approach was not very convincing. Clearly there was dramatic change after Unification when what had been liberal became rather right wing, but many did not appreciate this. Key aims were seen to be anti-French, unification, then European military domination if not colonial expansion. Some wrote about the aim of making Germany more unified still after 1870-1. Others spent much time on aims in the First World War or in 1919. That said, a noticeable feature here and in the other Questions on German Nationalism was the tendency to cover much before 1871 (often Bismarck was prominent) but far less afterwards. This created imbalance and hindered effective synthesis over the period.

### **Question 2**

This question was often answered well with good material on the economy and a sensible choice of alternative factors – often leadership or military power or antagonism from abroad. Weaker candidates obviously focussed solely on economic factors (or just the Zollverein) to the exclusion of other reasons. What was particularly surprising was the absence of any discussion of Kleindeutsch vs Grossdeutsch, i.e. the exclusion of Austria from the Zollverein. Some were able to make the link between economic success, industrial development and military prowess, but not all. The economic imperative was seen as very important; other factors adduced were military, political and a mixture of social and cultural, with anti-semitism seen as increasingly important from the 1870s.

### **Question 3**

This was problematical for a number of candidates who simply did not know enough about 1848-9 to appreciate its significance. Some simply went for a narrative on the causes of the revolutions, having little idea of the Frankfurt Parliament, the importance of liberal democracy and the Kleindeutsch/Grossdeutsch dilemma. A good few then fell into the trap of mentioning many significant events as if they were all important turning points; others went for one or two; very few went for the more sophisticated, thematic approach. As a consequence synthesis was at a premium. That said there were some excellent answers. What was surprising again here was the absence of the Kleindeutsch/Grossdeutsch debate. Some candidates contend there were a myriad of turning points while others ignore the concept. The simple listing of turning points without real connections and no comparative evaluation did not earn much reward. There were those here – and indeed in answers to Question 2 – who wanted to write about Metternich, Bismarck and Wilhelm II and their management of German nationalism. Turning points that did feature were 1806, 1815, 1862 (a strong contender) and 1871 or 1888-90, more occasionally 1914.

### **Question 4**

This was a very popular question given its wide-ranging nature. Some candidates took a line on how effectively did governments organised their responses to the demands of war 1792-1945. This worked well enough. Many answers set out their answers as if everything that happened was coming from the state. A new weapon, a new tactic, a new form of communication, a new campaign – all of these things came from the state – which in a way they did. But often there were not enough genuine explanation, evaluation and synthesis involved. There were many sequential narratives with little comparison or synthesis. Those who did try to build their answers around clear themes did deliver elements (or more) of synthesis. The concept of 'states' was problematical for some. Coverage included (as usual) France and the Revolutionary and

Napoleonic Wars, the Wars of Unification, the American Civil War and the two World Wars with some sensible discussion of changing needs, contexts and scale of warfare.

### **Question 5**

There were obvious problems over strategy and tactics, with allowances made for the joining together if the two or indeed a focus very much on tactics. Divorcing strategy from tactics is hard and allowance was made for this. The idea that a strategy can be the plan for a campaign and tactics are what happens on the battlefield may sound a clear distinction, but it is not. A strategy can simply be a plan, so if you plan a tactic, that tactic becomes a strategy. One thing that candidates seem unable to do is to distinguish between plans made prior to a campaign or war, and adaptation to changed circumstances that arise during the campaign or war. Thus trench warfare was seen as a strategy when in fact it might have been in Virginia in 1864 but it certainly was not in 1914, for example. Some candidates had prepared answers on strategic changes from mobile to static warfare, from decisive campaigns to attrition, and from limited to total war. Unfortunately these distinctions did not neatly fit the events that occurred, and were often not planned. Again, many offered sequential narratives with no comparisons. For many, not much changed before 1914 and, when it did, change was driven by technology.

### **Question 6**

Many gave little thought to either 1866 or turning points. Some ignored the named factor/date altogether. Others embraced turning points but also omitted 1866 or else created a simple list of turning points without evaluative comparisons. There were those who did cover 1866 and well but at the expense of other turning points. This negated the need for argument and counter-argument. A feature here and indeed in other responses to the questions on warfare was often to stop in 1918. For a good number of candidates, nothing meaningful happened before 1866 or indeed in 1866. The word 'industrialisation' did pose problems for some. Quite a number could not actually say what it was (mass production, precision engineering, etc) but wrote about it nevertheless – usually in terms of weaponry. Better and good responses did examine features of industrialisation and made sound links to possible turning points – not just 1866 but, frequently, the American Civil War, the two World Wars. Earlier Wars were used more to represent the limited effects of industrialisation.

### **Question 7**

Some were able to focus well on the thrust of the Question and assess aims, changes or continuities, and outcomes. Many wanted to compare constitutional and revolutionary nationalism. At times, there were valid links but often too much was written about features of revolutionary nationalism. Some candidates focused too much on methods, organisation and support for constitutional nationalism. Some focused on the merits of leaders (O'Connell, Parnell, Redmond) or on why constitutional nationalism failed. A good number did not explain aims that clearly or well and often coverage of the period 1914-21 was thin or non-existent, or subsumed within discussion of revolutionary nationalism. Quite often there was a listing of leaders, actions and outcomes rather than the synthesis required. Some candidates were very hazy about constitutional nationalism and tried to use it as a vehicle for extended discussions of revolutionary nationalism. There were confusions over what Home Rule actually entailed. Others felt constrained to discuss only attempts to alter the Union and not cast 'aims' a little more widely. There were some excellent answers nonetheless.

### **Question 8**

There were some good and strong answers here, with synthesis and focus on the enduring strengths of the Union. The very best focused or tried to focus on classes, appeal, geopolitical issues, the place of and attitude of the Catholic elites as well as the Protestant Ascendancy and Ulster Unionism. Quite a number focused on the latter two. Some candidates tried to turn this into a question on the fate of the Protestant Ascendancy. Some were unclear about the nature and character of the Protestant Ascendancy. Quite a number wrote too much about opposition to the Union, often unbalancing their answers. Some better responses were able to link weaknesses within that opposition (usually revolutionary nationalism) to the continued strength

of the Union. The attitudes of various British Governments featured, sometimes excessively so, and there quite a number of candidates who wanted to use this question as a means to unload ideas and material on coercion and conciliation. This approach had some validity but often took over the answer and was not related well enough to the actual thrust of the question set.

Chronological approaches often outweighed the needs for synthesis. There were those who assumed all of Ireland hated the Union and were thus unable to explain why the Union lasted so long. Better responses appreciated the benefits for many accruing from the Union and also such factors as British determination to keep Ireland within the Empire.

### **Question 9**

Some were able to focus well on 'undeveloped' and provide both knowledge and contrasts between North and South over time, agrarian, industrial, poverty, wealth, trade links, even position within the British Isles and Empire. All too often such range was lacking. The Great Famine and Land Acts featured often and there was a tendency to description as well as chronological surveys. The Famine received excessive focus in many answers – a problem seen before in questions on the economy. Often topic coverage spanned only c.1845 to c.1903 or before. This remains a hard question for many but there will often be a question on the economy and its status and changed character over the period. It remains the case that questions on the economy are difficult ones because of a lack of range in topic knowledge as well as lack of real awareness of changes across the period.

### **Question 10**

As ever this was very popular but with attendant issues raised in previous Reports. 'Development in government' still confuses quite a number of candidates, who include large sections on the economy and economic policies. At best, brief references to the economy and policies can be accepted if these are linked to an over-arching issue such as centralisation and centralised control and planning. The reality is that focus should be on governmental areas, politics, parties, one party state, structural changes, constitutions and the like; the failure to create constitutional monarchy or rule, the failure of representative government and representative bodies; repressive methods, methods of control, support, the fate of opposition will be germane too. The handling of a turning point remains problematical for many. A thematic approach usually brings synthesis but often obscures the necessary arguments over turning points. An approach based on themes such as political, economic and social or even cultural does not deliver enough of relevance on government. An approach based around turning points can become too chronological or descriptive, often lacking comparative evaluation, or else there is a listing. Some candidates adduced very few turning points so failing to cover enough of the period in range and scope. Arguments for turning points other than the named one focused mainly on 1905, February and October 1917, occasionally the Civil War, occasionally 1938-39 or 1945 (Stalin with absolute power), 1956. Most picked alternatives with varying success. There was a tendency to write off the importance Nicholas II and especially of the two Revolutions in 1917 without appreciating the significance of the massive changes generated by events in that year. There was a common formulaic dismissal of the February Revolution as insignificant simply because the Provisional Government was short-lived, ignoring the significance of the end of Tsarist rule and the way that this made October possible. Nevertheless, the best answers tended to suggest that October 1917 had more to offer than Stalin in terms of importance, often categorising by ideology, repression and liberalism and forms of benevolence. A good number of candidates presented Stalin's government as a continuation of Lenin's with Stalin taking further developments already begun, so they rated Lenin as more important.

### **Question 11**

Most candidates were able to cope with its demands, setting up argument and counter-argument around reluctance and unwillingness to reform or the reverse, willingness and commitment to reforms, and assessing a range of aims and motives. Some assessed the distinction between reforms and changes. Again, chronological approaches worked far less well. Economic areas featured large; social at times (including education and ideas for youth and women); political at

times, sometimes with a lively contrast between commitment to economic reforms set against in control set against fears of changes initiated from below. Some responses became unbalanced because they spent too much time on the outcomes of reforms, at times simply describing these. Some candidates moved into a rather standard essay on repression or reform. There were those who did know what a reluctant reformer was – they did not understand the word reluctant. As a result, all they wrote about was reforms. Better candidates did see that, say, Nicholas II was reluctant but Stalin was not; he was a determined reformer. Many got themselves into some difficulties with Alexander II who clearly was open to reform but also forced to reform by the defeat in the Crimea. Therefore he was both a reluctant reformer and not a reluctant reformer. This had some merit but usually needed better argument and explanation. The same applied with the treatment of several other rulers. There were those who wrote about war or wars as the 'locomotive of change' and some who spent much time arguing for the Provisional Government as favouring reforms but then lacked the space to write about much else. Better and good answers set out arguments that the Tsars were more conservative by nature whereas the Communists, in theory, were all for change. In addition, often they addressed how far there were rulers who were genuine reformers set against those who made great changes but not necessarily 'reforms.' Interestingly, here and in Question 12, Alexander II and Khrushchev were presented as liberal. The reality is that they were just comparatively more reformist than other rulers.

### **Question 12**

Quite a number wrote about repression versus reform. Many mentioned 'peoples' but rarely examined nationalities and indeed regions (those who did often enhanced their answers). The treatment of peasants and workers featured highly, less so other social groups. There was a tendency to group together all peoples and classes, though the best answers presented more subtle and nuanced approaches based on the treatment of different social groups and indeed regions. Much was made of repressive agencies and methods as well as of scale of repression. Different degrees of repression across the period were appreciated in a good many answers. The use of various policing agencies, the army (above all the Red Army), propaganda and various forms of social and even economic controls (grain requisitioning, starvation), all featured. Often more needed to be made of 'consistently' with better answers seeing periods of reduced repression or of alternative methods of rule and control. A common view was that the Russian peoples were consistently repressed, the only variation being in degrees of repression, Stalin worse than Nicholas II etc. Not many candidates picked up on the significance of peoples – very few mentioned the nationalities. Moreover, for most candidates Russia only consisted of peasants and workers; there was no mention of nobles, bourgeoisie, intellectuals, artists, clerics. Again this worked well but begged a more flexible approach in connection with 1861-66/81 and 1905-October 1917 than was generally forthcoming. Many tended to write off Tsarist liberal impulses as hopeless and entirely superficial, usually as a result of not appreciating the significance of 1861 or the importance of the Duma, circumscribed as it was. Many candidates wrote off or forgot the Provisional Government and its sincere liberalism. There was also a tendency to give Khrushchev much credit for being less repressive than Stalin yet forgetting that he was still a repressive Communist. The publication of 'One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich' was after all the exception that proved the rule. That said, there were a good number of strong and very strong answers.

### **Question 13**

Some were able to focus on and to explain and illustrate divisions and indeed range across much of the period. They looked at divisions around class, gender, ethnicity (some tried to turn the question into one on African Americans). Many were rather cursory or generalised, often using a few examples from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Many were more at home writing about the roles of the Federal government, the Supreme Court and Big Business, with some contextual material used (attitudinal, socio-economic). A number wanted to rehearse a rather standard help or hinder type question. Weaker responses focused on unity rather the theme of developing civil rights. Quite often coverage did not extend across the period, surprisingly petering out around 1945 or the early 1960s. That said, a large number

spent much time on the PATCO dispute and so often unbalanced answers. Generalisations were read: for example, America was too capitalist to support worker rights. Better, knowledgeable answers had range as to divisions and made links to ideas, aims, leadership, organisation and conflicting beliefs in the efficacy of methods used to secure rights; they then linked these to prevailing attitudes and actions, citing (for example) welfare capitalism, Yellow Dog Contracts, the effects of the Depression and of the Wars, the advances of the 1960s.

#### **Question 14**

Some knowledgeable answers were read, with a good focus on the concept and content of a turning point. There were those who were not that sure what the 1924 Act involved or else they knew it too well, writing too much on it. Many saw 1924 as important but no more, preferring 1887, 1934 or the 1960s and 1970s in importance. Quite a number saw Nixon's Presidency and the Indian Self-Determination Act as crucial. No matter references to 1887, often the period before 1924 received rather brief treatment. In a number of cases, far more was known about the last thirty or so years of the period. Often knowledge there was impressive but created the impression of uneven coverage and imbalance of response. Native Americans' leadership, recourse to pressure group activities, self-belief, organisation in movements, greater opportunities (legal, economic, social, educational) featured often. A feature, often seen here, was the desire of candidates to develop an answer around the overarching of ideas of help v. hinder; this did not always serve the candidate well. In all, this was a popular choice, usually answered very mechanically with a dismissal of 1924, approval of the 1970s and a few other notable occurrences thrown in. Rarely was there mention of anything before 1887 or an attempt to characterise treatment of Native Americans by theme. Really good synthesis was, therefore, often at a premium. Some candidates focused too much on issues of unity and assimilation versus divisions. Weaker responses often alighted on 1924 and (say) the 1970s and covered little else. Approaches that were built around themes such as political, economic, cultural, social rights and status often got in the way of arguments over turning points. Many answers stopped with Nixon's presidency.

#### **Question 15**

A major weakness for many candidates was their uncertainty about 'developments in the US economy.' As with Q13, they tended to shy away quickly from this and hit on other factors such as 'women themselves', the federal government' etc. Some candidates tended to turn the question into one on the weaknesses of women's movements (divisions, leadership, etc). Some wrote about turning points. Quite a number were cursory or assertive of general, contextual developments over economic developments. Most could write well enough about the campaign to get the vote, pressure group activities either side of the First World War or in the 1960s, the rise of Feminism and New Feminism, though less was often made of the importance of the 1960s. The two World Wars were seen as significant and better responses did highlight economic (and social) gains made then. Stronger responses did engage areas and aspects of economic development, not least employment opportunities, status and wage levels, though the focus tended to be very much on the twentieth century. Often focus was only on the Depression and the two World Wars. Quite a number of candidates wrote about changing attitudes to female employment and the increasing levels of women in the workplace. Again, there was some tendency to write about factors (usually Federal government) that helped or hindered progression. More needed to be made of 'advance.' In addition, care was needed when handling (say) women's groups and Prohibition to ensure that the material did relate clearly to the demands of the question. Overall, this question elicited a variable quality of response. Better candidates had a grasp of the underlying themes and an ability to make something of the earlier decades, so that 1945-92 was not their only concern.

**Question 16**

Some good and strong answers were read. Party organisation was usually set against such factors as leadership, franchisal and electoral changes, socio-economic trends, education and the media. There was some tendency to present organisation as equivalent to image, message and appeal. At times, candidates wanted to link organisation to electoral success or failure rather than the development of democracy. Knowledge range was often impressive, even if less was said about organisational areas after 1918-45. Some vigorous argument and counter-argument emerged. Usually factors other than party organisation were seen as crucial.

**Question 17**

Answers were often strong and robust, assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the Liberals' position across the period highlighting highs (1906) and lows (after 1924-29). Much was made of the strengths or otherwise of political opposition, not least the Labour Party. At times, more could have been made of class politics, linked to franchisal changes. Occasionally, Labour took over literally from the Liberals in coverage. Many spotted the squeeze exerted by the Conservatives and Labour and the importance of the period 1915-24. Factors such as social and economic changes, electoral reforms and attitudinal shifts were cited along with examination of Liberal leadership, organisation, appeal and the vicissitudes created by the first-past-the-post system.

**Question 18**

The House of Lords' status, role and activities were examined, usually within the confines of Home Rule and the Parliament Act, at times beyond those parameters. More could have been said of the revising and suspending roles. The rise of the House of Commons linked to leadership, franchisal and electoral changes, socio-economic trends, education and the media, all featured. Much was made of the roles and power of the media as well as of trade unions as obstacles. Women, their pressure group activities and impact were examined quite often, though the handling of the obstacle dimension was not always secure. Extremism (Communism, Fascist, the IRA) figured at times as obstacles. Some sturdy attempts were made to offer argument and counter-argument about these various obstacles; some arguments were more convincing than others.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**14 – 19 Qualifications (General)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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

