

GCE

History A

Advanced GCE **A2 H506**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H106**

OCR Report to Centres June 2016

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

OCR 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 2016

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE History A (H506)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE History A (H106)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
F961/01 British History Period Studies – Medieval and Early Modern	4
F961/02 British History Period Studies – Modern 1783-1994	9
F962/01 European and World History Period Studies – Medieval and Early Modern 1095-1609	13
F962/02 European and World History Period Studies – Modern 1795-2003	17
F963 /01 British History Enquiries – Medieval and Early Modern 1066-1660	23
F963/02 British History Enquiries – Modern 1815-1945	27
F964/01 European and World History Enquiries – Medieval and Early Modern 1073-1555	33
F964/02 European and World History Enquiries – Modern 1774-1975	37
F965 Historical Interpretations and Investigations	43
F966/01 Historical Themes – Medieval and Early Modern 1066-1715	46
F966/02 Historical Themes – Modern 1789-1997 – Late	50

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

From Anglo-Saxon England to Norman England 1035–1087

Question 1

The better responses to this question tended to divide the reign into stages, discussing Edward's strength at his accession, especially the circumstances of his arrival and his relationship with Earl Godwin, and then the reign before and after Godwin's death. Edward's decline, and increasing preoccupation with religious issues was discussed in conjunction with Harold Godwinson's role as Subregulus, with some concluding that his loyalty and effective military service meant that in effect Edward had not in fact lost the power to do what he wanted as king. Less effective responses either considered only Edward's strengths or weaknesses, coming to very imbalanced conclusions, or made two lists of ways in which he was and was not powerful, and found it difficult to either link or assess them to a judgement. Some also conflated his lack of an heir with lack of power, whereas strong answers examined whether the failure to ensure a clear succession constituted weakness.

Question 2

Most essays attempted to set the named factor against the others. As ever with a question in this format, the named factor must be considered. The question may be disagreed with of course, and nearly every answer did, but the named factor may not be ignored, or the answer is deemed not to show a full understanding of the requirements of the question.

Successful answers considered a number of reasons for the Godwins' influence, and either justified their ranking of the marriage, usually as a relatively minor factor, or attempted to show how it might have impinged on the others. Less successful answers were either characterised by a failure to justify the linkages between the factors, or simply having less knowledge. At the lower levels the Godwins were treated as a single entity, with no differentiation between Godwin and his sons. Most did at least know something about Edith, though a few were side-tracked by the issue of why her marriage to Edward was childless.

Question 3

There were many strong responses to this question, and candidates found little difficulty assessing William's brutal actions against those which avoided brutality. There were certain patterns of difficulty. A small minority seemed to think that the violence of the Battle of Hastings was a major factor to consider: weak candidates regularly conflate 1066 with the reign of the conqueror. Modest answers focused too heavily on the Harrying of the North. Nearly all answers showed knowledge of this. Often it was contrasted simplistically with the decision to pay Dane geld. It was only the better answers which really showed understanding of the Conqueror's use of brutality – that he was brutal when he felt it necessary and then without compunction. They saw the Harrying in the context of his handling of the other revolts and challenges to his rule. The best of the answers which could do this were impressive, and showed a detailed knowledge and understanding of the opposition to William's rule.

Lancastrians, Yorkists and Tudors 1450–1509

Question 4

The weakest responses to this question described the rule of Edward up to 1480, but most went further. The majority of candidates were able, in varying levels of detail, to describe the reasons for Edward's loss of the throne. Nearly all had a fair amount to say about the Earl of Warwick, and many were sharply critical of Edward's dealings with him, particularly of the effects on Warwick of the Woodville marriage. Most considered the significance of Henry VI and his family. Few had much to say about Clarence, but many picked up on Edward's youth, relative

inexperience and relative softness towards Lancastrians. The key lay in the word “assess”. Successful essays had to make judgements about the relative importance of these factors. If Warwick’s disillusionment was the crucial factor, this had to be explained and justified. This was in short a classic question, and required a classic answer structure for a very high reward.

Question 5

The Battle of Bosworth and Richard III’s last charge and heroic death: fortunately no candidate thought this was all there was to talk about, but it is sad to note in these days of formulaic examinations that none used it as an attention-catching introduction. This was a well-answered question on the whole. Essays contained lists of reasons for Richard’s fall: his various weaknesses, the actions which cost him popularity and Henry’s skills before and on the day of Bosworth. No candidate made the mistake of totally agreeing or totally dismissing Henry Tudor’s skill as a factor. The weaker answers either contained a list of factors with more or less support and analysis, or two contrasting lists with no successful linkage and balance. Stronger answers evaluated the reasons and came to a judgement. There was no correlation between quality and conclusion. Some good answers agreed, on balance, with the question, and some did not.

Question 6

Most answers displayed plenty of knowledge about Henry VII’s domestic government and their main problem was how to select material to illustrate their arguments. A few weaker responses included discussion of foreign policy as a separate issue, although concern about aid to Pretenders was legitimately included by better answers. Better responses also focused on analysis of effectiveness and recognised that this is not necessarily the same as success and certainly not the same as popularity. They also were able to use well-chosen examples to show Henry’s methods and avoid lengthy description of what he did. Answers based on historiography did not often reach higher mark levels as they tended to consist of an account of the views of historians with limited direct focus on the terms of the question.

Henry VIII to Mary I 1509-58

Question 7

Most responses recognised that Wolsey’s foreign policy was not pertinent to this answer, except insofar as its financial demands impinged on his raising of revenue. Weaker answers were able to describe what Wolsey did but less competent in judging his achievement. Some condemned him outright as only interested in his own advantage and he was even accused of creaming off the income from taxation. These answers maintained, therefore, that he achieved nothing, since he fell from power and nothing apart from a college at Oxford survived him. More perceptive responses showed a nuanced judgement and argued that there were long-term gains from the subsidy and that Cromwell inherited some of the economic policies. There seemed to be a general view that the failure of the Amicable Grant cancelled out the earlier achievements in finance. Clear understanding of the impact of both the legal and taxation reforms was not often seen.

Question 8

Weaker answers to this question were not able to define *administration* accurately. They wanted to include every aspect of the reforms introduced by Thomas Cromwell and often saw the Church as part of governmental administration. Hence there was irrelevance in these answers. In addition such responses struggled with the concept of change and continuity and sometimes had insufficient understanding of the administrative bodies in the early 1530s. There was, in addition, much description of reforms like the centralisation policies. However, there were good quality answers which analysed the impact of Cromwell in aspects of the administration such as raising taxation, the role of the Privy Council, the extension of the activities of the secretary, local government in the north and in Wales and the keeping of law and order. Some answers considered the use of Parliament and this was relevant as long as the argument concentrated on the administrative function.

Question 9

This question was often answered well as the responses defined Mary's aims in their introductions, and then assessed her success at the end of each paragraph or in a summary in their conclusions. As long as a number of aims were identified and evaluated, answers did not need to cover all that Mary tried to achieve. Weaker responses claimed she was a total failure and mounted no counter-argument, while others were assertive in their judgements. Better answers were able to suggest, with support, that Mary enjoyed some success in her aim to mount a bid for the throne and in her aim to defeat rebellion. They then indicated that she had short-term success in her aims to marry into the Habsburg family, to follow a conciliatory foreign policy and to restore Catholicism. Her economic and financial aims were seen as having more impact after Mary's death and therefore some eventual success.

Church and State 1529-89

Question 10

This was not a popular question and few answers showed much knowledge about the role of Thomas Cranmer. His influence on the divorce proceedings was rarely explored, but his input into the Ten Articles and the Bishops' Book was better known, along with his contribution to the Great Bible and his general support for the Erastianism of Cromwell. Most answers went on to argue, usually convincingly, that Cromwell and Henry VIII himself had a greater influence on religious policy as they outranked Cranmer and had more say in the direction of events. A few answers strayed into the 1540s and one or two argued that Cranmer's greatest influence came in the succeeding decades.

Question 11

This was a popular question which saw a wide range of responses. Stronger answers were able to focus on 'popular support' and consider a wide range of issues to reach a balanced judgement. There was often reference to the defeat of Lady Jane Grey and the population reaction to Mary's accession, the passage of legislation through parliament- particularly over monastic land- and, of course the exiles and burnings. However, the issue of the burnings was often the weakest part of the response as candidates were unable to assess the scale and its significance in a balanced way. Some assumed that the number suggested there was little support and similarly with the number of exiles. Few were able to look at the issue of prosecutions and how they came about. Some became side-tracked by attempts at reform. However, others were able to place Mary's policies in a wider context and argue that many welcomed the restoration of Catholicism as England had seen only a limited period of Protestant reform under Edward or that the difficulties Elizabeth encountered suggested that Catholicism was popular.

Question 12

The command term 'Assess' is used frequently, but there are still a large number of candidates who simply produce a list of reasons and this question was no exception. The response also drew a number of narrative driven answers with only the occasional comment as to why policies became more severe. Stronger answers were able to explain why, after 1568 and the arrival of Mary Queen of Scots, policies became harsher. However, having introduced Mary some then produced an essay that focused on her threat rather than policies towards Catholics. Stronger answers were wide ranging and considered issues such as the Northern Earls, plots, the arrival of seminary priests and Jesuits and the threat of the Armada.

England under Elizabeth I 1558-1603

Question 13

This was not a popular question. In a number of instances candidates struggled with the concept of faction and saw it as anyone who opposed Elizabeth, whilst others were unable to link their knowledge to ‘threat to the power of Elizabeth.’ Some did see how faction impacted on Elizabeth through issues such as marriage or with foreign policy and were able to link some of the material to the challenge to her prerogative. Some argued that it was not a threat and Elizabeth was able to manage it and use it to her advantage.

Question 14

There were some good answers to this question, particularly where candidates were able to place the issue of Mary Queen of Scots in a wider context and consider issues such as Elizabeth’s personal security, the question of her legitimacy and the succession and both foreign and religious policy issues. Some argued that Mary personified many of the problems that Elizabeth faced and it was a greater problem as they had manifested themselves in one person. There were some who argued that Mary was a problem because of the way that she was handled, but others suggested Elizabeth was in a difficult position and could not win. Weaker answers adopted a more descriptive approach and, unfortunately, there were some who confused her with Mary Tudor.

Question 15

This was a popular question and candidates who focused on ‘preserve her power’ often produced some good answers, whereas others wanted to answer a different question and look at how successful Elizabeth was. In considering the preservation of her power responses often focused on her relationship with parliament, the issue of her councillors, particularly Essex, and Ireland, whilst some were able to bring in the success of her religious policies in the 1590s in defeating threats. There was some discussion of the Oxfordshire rising and social problems, but this was often less well linked to the issue in the question.

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

Question 16

This was the least popular and least successful of the questions. Too many responses did not have the range of foreign policy issues and focused almost exclusively on the Spanish marriage, whilst even some of those that were able to bring in events such as the Thirty Years War or 1604 Peace with Spain were unable to link the material to the actual question of how it impacted on James’ relations with parliament. Stronger answers did discuss the link with religious and financial issues, whilst some also considered the question of prerogative or James’ image as ‘Rex Pacificus’.

Question 17

This was answered by a significant number of candidates and most had a sound knowledge of the reasons for James’ financial problems, but perhaps the weakest element was the question of ‘inherited financial problems’. There were few who were aware of the out-dated assessment system or the problems that inflation had created, whilst knowledge of James’ inherited debt was often confused. However, where responses were stronger were in discussing James’ extravagance or his failure to work with parliament to solve the problems, with most considering the Great Contract. Some answers looked at the question of parliament and why it was reluctant to grant supply, balancing extravagance against their concern to control the purse strings and using it as a lever to ensure they were called.

Question 18

This was often answered well, with candidates able to provide a well-developed list of reasons for the dissolution in 1629. It was pleasing to see many responses that were able to place the dissolution in the wider context of Charles' aims and his attitude towards parliament following their approach to finances and the death of Buckingham. Knowledge of the events of 1628-9 was often quite impressive and it allowed a detailed account and explanation to be offered. A number argued that it was a short-term measure in response to events, but became a more long-term policy once he was aware he could survive financially, whilst others argued that he was a believer in the Divine Right of Kings and therefore had little time for parliament even before the events of 1628-9.

F961/02 British History Period Studies – Modern 1783-1994

From Pitt to Peel 1783–1846

Question 1

Most candidates could write about, indeed describe, features of Pitt's actions, policies and measures (often mixing legislation with his range of policy activities) but often they did not relate this coverage to the needs of the Question. Some simply wrote a standard Pitt essay. The best answers did focus well in the Whigs, their weaknesses (leadership, policies, the connections with radicals and with France) and were good on such other factors as the role of the monarchy and loyalism. Quite often too much was written about the nature and scope of the radical challenge; better answers picked up not just examples but extent of Whig problems and contextual factors as well as internal divisions and organisational problems, linking such to Pitt's measures and successes, with the Crown pleased with his endeavours.

Question 2

Most attempted to define and explain 'liberal'; a few wrote about 1815-22 to show that was illiberal; most covered the salient features, often spending much time on Catholic Emancipation and so unbalancing coverage. Surprisingly, some did not say that much about Peel's work or of Huskisson and Robinson and trade and the wider economic issues. Most were able to write, often at length, about Peel's reforms and compare those with other reform activities. They examined the nature and extent of the reforms, usually embracing Catholic Emancipation and querying the absence of parliamentary reform. The best answers were aware of the debate over liberal values and contextualised (briefly) against 1815-22. However, there were those answers that became too immersed in the earlier period.

Question 3

Generally this was answered well, with some strongly developed responses. Some candidates wrote too much pre-1841; a very few wrote about events in the 1832-41 period. Those who had good focus were able to engage and assess a range of issues and themes: fiscal and economic policies (the Budgets, taxation), the drive for free trade, events in Ireland, the saga of the Corn Laws, often set in the context of his uneasy relationship with many in the Party and the fissures that opened up in 1844-45. Some answers drifted into reasons for the repeal of the Corn Laws. Candidates still write lavishly of the social reforms of these years as though they were inspired and driven by Peel. Most candidates could engage with some sense of Peel the statesman set against the party leader. The very best did this persistently and strongly.

Liberals and Conservatives 1846–95

Question 4

Generally, most candidates could describe actions, policies and reforms, though some strayed into foreign policy too much or became too immersed in discussion parliamentary reforms, especially in the 1860s. Better answers linked examples to aims and so appeal – the tenets of what emerged as Gladstonian Liberalism were discussed - and related contents to outcomes, usually electoral and political (class issues). Links to the splits within the Conservative Party as well as to Non-conformity were often well made. Favoured areas included the development of policy ideas, (free trade being one), the impact of big personalities (Palmerston, Gladstone), the uses of newspapers, the sense of security provided by Liberalism (including foreign policy), organisation. Some good answers identified key social groups attracted by emergent Liberalism.

Question 5

Here a key need was to balance reasons for Disraeli's defeat against reasons for Gladstone's victory, both set it in the context of emergent Conservatism and Liberalism and the cut-and-thrust of parliamentary politics. The context to the Reform Bill of 1867 was explored as was the interplay of powerful personalities, party organisation, party appeal and some times how the media of the day captured the competition and rivalry, the nature of the election campaign and the sense that the Liberals were a safer option than the Conservatives (with doubts over Disraeli's integrity and trustworthiness featuring). Quite often the Liberals' promises of wide ranging reforms were mentioned, though this led some candidates to move beyond the parameters of the Question by discussing the Ministry of 1868-74.

Question 6

Most candidates who attempted this question found it challenging. Better responses set out a framework for comparison of the two stated periods by stating the criteria that could be used to measure successes of the Liberal ministries. Thus, some took the route of matching Liberal aims with the policies adopted over Ireland, the Empire, other foreign challenges and domestic issues. This allowed such candidates to make comparative judgements about each issue before drawing a more general conclusion. Others dealt with each ministry separately, making a judgement on each one before arriving at a summative assessment. Each approach was effective in allowing candidates the opportunity to reach the higher levels on the generic mark scheme. However, weaker answers were characterised by either descriptive, narrative based commentary and/or imbalance; often the ministry of 1880-85 was dealt with in more depth than that of 1892-95.

Foreign and Imperial Policies 1856–1914

Question 7

Two major issues emerged with respect to answers to this question. The first was that many quite well informed candidates did not stick to the geographical region stated in the question (the Balkans). The second was that probably the majority of answers muddled together aims with policy. Some answers started by stating what the aims were but then proceeded to describe how policy developed. Others simply provided a narrative about foreign affairs more generally, often bringing in discussion of the Empire. The very best responses focussed on using separate policy aims as themes (balance of power, threat to Empire, prevention of Russian expansion, the protection of the Ottoman Empire and so on) and analysing the extent to which each changed and/or continued over the whole period. Unless candidates focused on measuring change it would have been very difficult for them to arrive at judgements pertinent to the question.

Question 8

The question asked candidates to 'assess the reasons' but a significant number ignored this and either listed the reasons and added some basic description and explanation or simply narrated British imperial policy during the period. With the latter type of response discussion of India appeared which, unless linked to strategic importance of Egypt (and the Suez Canal) was not relevant. Even where there was focus on Africa alone, some only considered a part or two (north, south, east and/or west) while others did not differentiate at all with respect to regions. Another disappointing feature was that quite a few answers signposted or stated judgements, often at the end of each paragraph, without substantiating them. Such an approach was not enough to get answers to the higher levels; reasons needed to be explained, developed and linked to show how they were being assessed in terms of importance.

Question 9

There were some very good answers to this question from well informed candidates who realised the importance of sticking to the stated time period. They were able to frame their answers around reasons for improved relations with Russia (and not whether they actually did improve) including discussion of the 1902 Anglo Japanese agreement, the Entente with Russia in 1907, the issue of protecting the British Empire and the challenge of maintaining a balance of

power at a time of rising German hegemony. Unfortunately there were many essays that looked extensively at events before 1902 (and were, thus, largely irrelevant) or that described British foreign policy more generally after the named date. This question revealed that a substantial number of candidates continue not to read questions a carefully enough and to think about what they demand.

Domestic Issues 1918–51

Question 10

The best answers to this question started by analysing the importance of the First World War before moving on to consider other factors that led to the decline of the Liberal party. There was often sound discussion of the Lloyd George/Asquith split, the weaknesses of the Liberal wartime coalition government and Lloyd George's success in dealing with the economic and social challenges that emerged from the war. Some candidates decline to discuss the war, seemingly as they appeared to know little about it, and jumped straight into discussing the weaknesses of Lloyd George as a political leader in comparison to the relative strengths of the Conservatives and a rising Labour party. There had to be some meaningful explanation of the importance of the First World War for answers to reach the higher levels on the generic mark scheme but there was a substantial number of potentially good answers that failed to this.

Question 11

This was the least popular question in this section and, although there were a few good answers, most answers did not address the question well. Few responses provided a wide range of reasons with very few making the distinction between long and short factors or between cyclical and structural unemployment. Most responses provided some weak and generalised knowledge of government policies with many responses unclear as to which government they were referring to. Very few responses were successful in providing an accurate assessment of the relative importance of the factors.

Question 12

This was a popular question but generally it was not well answered. Very few candidates addressed the three elements in the question. The main weakness was that many candidates did demonstrate a clear understanding of the term 'impact' or aware of the significance of long or short term impact. Secondly, some candidates did not focus on 'social and economic' and some seemed unclear as to the difference between them. Finally, some candidates did provide analysis of 'impact' but did not fully assess the factors to provide a judgement of their relative importance. Some candidates used the opportunity to describe and explain the Beveridge Report and others to turn the question to one on an assessment of the Labour Government of 1945-51.

Foreign and Imperial Policies 1945–90

Question 13

This was the least popular of the questions in this section and it attracted a significant number of weak responses. There were a number of responses that did not realise the requirements of the question and simply provided a description of events in the post-war period. The responses that did make an attempt to address the question tended to show an understanding of one or two but not all three elements of the question. Some responses did not provide a comparison of the two political parties and simply described events relating to Europe. Some responses did attempt a comparison but then included a range of issues rather than concentrating on Europe. Some responses did a comparison concerning Europe but did not cover the period 1945-73 which was stated in the question.

A number of responses demonstrated that there was a lack of knowledge concerning which party was in power at any given time in this period.

Question 14

This was the most popular question in this section and was also the one that candidates did best. Many candidates were able to explain a number of reasons that led to British attitudes changing towards the Empire. Most included economic difficulties created by war, pressure from colonial national movements, attitude of the USA and reaction to the Suez Crisis. However, relatively few explained about political change in Britain, particularly the attitudes of the political parties but, more importantly many provided only a generalised assessment of the importance of Macmillan's 'Wind of Change' speech.

Question 15

This was quite a popular question which was answered reasonably well with a significant number of responses being able to provide a balanced argument about whether Britain had 'great power status' or not in this period. Some responses would have benefitted if there had been attempt to define the concept of 'great power' as this would have provided some criteria upon which to base their analysis. Also some responses needed to provide more analysis based on the key word 'undermine'. Such analysis would have addresses the key issues in the question. Finally some responses did not cover the whole period. In this question no dates were given, it simply said 'after the Second World War'. Some responses provided knowledge that only covered mainly the 1940's and, at best, the 1950's. The question assumed that the whole period of the topic, namely 1945-90, would be covered.

Post-War Britain 1951–94

Question 16

Although this was a reasonably popular question, many candidates were unable to focus on the problems of the Labour party and instead wrote about the strengths of the Conservatives or the rising standards of living and then simply commented at the end that these presented problems for the Labour party. Whilst these are valid points, they could take the answer only so far and it was important that answers also considered the actual party's problems and the divisions that pervaded much of the period over issues such as nuclear weapons or the NHS. Some candidates did make reference to these issues and also discussed the leadership and commented on how the emergence of a more youthful and energetic leader in Wilson helped to bring about recovery, reflected in the 1964 election victory.

Question 17

There were some strong answers to this question, with many commented on the scale of the victory and its unexpected nature. However, weaker answers considered the whole of Wilson's ministry and the problems it faced rather than focusing on the issues that had emerged towards the end of the period. Unfortunately, there were a number of responses, which thought that Heath led the Labour party and this led to much confusion over the measures that were discussed. Some answers were also able to link the issue of Unions and the economy to Heath's manifesto and argue that many wanted a government that would tackle these issues. Some responses also discussed the failings of the Labour party over issues such as the EEC and therefore suggested that Heath's victory was due to Labour weakness and not Conservative strengths, whilst in other responses there was also some discussion about the appeal of Heath and the new image he had given the party and the concept of "Selsdon man" and the free market economy.

Question 18

This was the least popular of the questions in this section, with responses failing to focus on 'ineffective' and instead rite more generally about policies towards Northern Ireland. However, where candidates did establish a criteria against which to judge 'ineffective' many were able to produce a well argued response, often suggesting that policies became more effective towards the end of the period.

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

The Crusades and the Crusader States 1095-1192

Question 1

Weaker answers were unable to focus on disorganisation or defined it so widely that it encompassed almost everything that went wrong in the First Crusade. Other less strong responses wrote in general terms about why the Crusade failed or gave a narrative account of events. One or two wanted to mount a counter-argument that it was not a complete failure, although the evidence they cited was not impressive. But better answers were able to weigh up factors like the leadership, the attitude of Alexius and the opposition the Crusade faced. The most common judgement was that the Crusade was never likely to be successful and that its shortcomings had been recognised quite widely even before it set off.

Question 2

This was a popular question and some strong responses were seen. The aspect that led to some less effective answers, was the lack of detailed information about military tactics. Some of the arguments were little more than assertions that the crusaders were good tacticians, without any examples being included. There was good knowledge about the effective leadership, sometimes linked to tactics, in the Crusade, the religious zeal which led the crusaders to persevere and the weakness and divisions of the Muslim opposition. Most answers concluded that it was one of these two latter factors which accounted for success and there was some sound explanation about why the chosen explanation was seen to be the key factor.

Question 3

Weaker answers turned this into a question about why the Third Crusade failed and so were unable to access the higher mark levels. Some of these included long discussions about the impact of the death of Frederick Barbarossa and the quarrel between Richard and Philip Augustus. But a good proportion of answers were able to aim their arguments directly at the question and many chose to arrange their material by analysing the successful and less successful outcomes in turn. Such responses largely concluded that the success outweighed the failure in the long term results. There was some strong knowledge displayed, particularly about the extent of Saladin's power and the outcome of the Crusade as it affected him.

The Renaissance from c.1400-c.1550

Question 4

One or two less strong answers dismissed the Roman Renaissance as achieving little, since it was brought to an abrupt end by the Sack of Rome in 1527 and had little time for the part played by the Papacy in patronage. They then went on to the Renaissance in Florence, about which they were better informed and could often give a great deal of detail. Some of this verged on description of artistic endeavours with little assessment of their role in the development of the Renaissance. This could be a problem even with better answers, which struggled to pick out a few relevant examples to show how the Renaissance advanced, but did, at least, realise this was what they were meant to do. There were some impressive responses with excellent detailed material directly aimed at the question and able to distinguish between the roles of Rome, Florence and Venice in the Renaissance.

Question 5

Some of the weaker responses did not have sufficient knowledge about Savonarola to sustain their attempts at this question. They argued that his preaching led to a lessening of artistic activities, but rarely gave examples, dismissing him as a very temporary contributor to the evolution of the Renaissance. Better answers put his activities in context and showed that his views often reflected rather than shaped attitudes to the Renaissance which were developing in Florence. Other answers pointed out that the economic decline of Florence had already begun and that the war with Pisa proved equally disastrous. These responses were also able to explain the part played by the Medici as patrons of the Renaissance and most concluded that their role was the crucial one.

Question 6

This question was not very popular and most of the answers showed a lack of focus on the terms of the question. Some seemed to fasten on the reference to classical influences and proceeded to explain the influence of Greece and Rome on the Renaissance in all its aspects, without confining themselves to social and political thought. There were some responses which considered the impact of Plato, Aristotle and Cicero and one or two which showed that Christian ideas had an equal impact on social and political thought with references to Erasmus and More, but these were exceptions. Machiavelli was a surprising omission in most answers.

Exploration and Discovery c.1445-c.1545

Question 7

There was a tendency in some less strong answers to disregard Henry the Navigator or to consider his role negligible. Some responses described his activities but did not focus on those which promoted voyages of exploration and discovery. There was rarely much assessment of what he achieved, but some better answers did weigh up the importance of his initiation of voyages and his aid to cartography and other technical advances, as opposed to that of those who carried on the work. There was some discussion of the context in Portugal which made the voyages desirable. There was also some description of the adventures of Diaz and da Gama, which did not reach the higher mark levels.

Question 8

There was generally sound knowledge of the motivation behind Spanish voyages of discovery and good answers were able to show how the reasons changed over time, arguing that the factors inspiring Columbus and Pizarro respectively were different. What was less well discussed was the pursuit of spices, with explanation about why spices were such an attractive commodity often being neglected. Some answers included the desire for spices in a raft of economic considerations. The alternative motives were generally cited as religious with Isabella particularly mentioned in this context. There were some answers which included detail about technical advances, but could not integrate this into consideration of motives, since it was more often an enabling rather than a motivating factor.

Question 9

Most answers were able to explain quite fully the gains which Portugal made from an overseas empire with references to the period as the only time when Portugal became a leading European power, along with the financial and economic advantages. The opening up of the routes to India and the East Indies were seen as crucial assets. The alternative view was less fluently put forward and assessed and in some answers barely covered, with conclusions asserting that the statement in the question was accurate. The problems which the small Portuguese population faced in maintaining and defending such a large empire were referred to by some answers and the disputes with Spain and later other rivals, despite the Treaty of Tordesillas, were also mentioned.

Spain 1469–1556

Question 10

This was a popular question and those who were able to focus on ‘consolidate her rule’ often produced a strong analysis. Most were able to comment on the role of Ferdinand, particularly his military contribution, whilst other answers focused on the importance of their marriage and the possibility of producing an heir. The role of Ferdinand was usually balanced against other factors, particularly Isabella and how she was able to establish a strong government. Weaker answers drifted away from the focus and wrote about her whole reign and often used the same material, and even the same argument, to answer Question 11.

Question 11

The strongest answers identified the problems that Ferdinand and Isabella faced and then assessed how far they were able to solve them. Most were able to discuss a good range of issues, most notably royal power, law and order, the power of the nobility and religious issues. Most concluded that they were largely successful, although some argued that the problems were shelved rather than solved and that this was reflected in the unrest of the early years of Charles’ rule.

Question 12

This was the least popular of the questions in this section. Those who did attempt the question were able to describe or identify the financial problems, but few were able to focus on the issue of ‘how serious’ and did not establish a criteria against which to judge serious. Most answers were able to mention the early bankruptcy faced by Charles’ son and suggested that this showed the problems were serious, whilst others wrote about taxation issues, although often quite generally.

Charles V: International Relations and the Holy Roman Empire 1519–59

Question 13

There were insufficient answers to this question to be able to comment.

Question 14

There were some answers to this question, but unfortunately most focused on the reasons for the spread of Lutheranism rather than considering the extent to which it had spread by 1555. By looking at the reasons for its spread many also did not look at the end of the period but confined their response to the 1520s and 1530s, which further limited the level achieved. It is important that candidates give particular attention to dates in the question and focus their answer around that if they want to reach the higher levels.

Question 15

A number of responses to this question did show some good knowledge of Charles’ relations with the Ottomans and were able to produce a balanced argument. Contrasts between the Mediterranean and events in the Empire were often considered. The strongest answers considered his struggles against the Ottomans in the context of his overall foreign policy and aims and often concluded that maintaining the status quo should be seen as an achievement and therefore it would be wrong to suggest he achieved very little.

Philip II, Spain and the Netherlands, 1556–1609

Question 16

There were insufficient answers to this question to be able to comment.

Question 17

The responses to this question often showed a good knowledge of Philip’s foreign policy. Responses approached this in a number of ways, usually either country by country and reaching a judgement on each, or by looking at different periods of his rule. If the latter approach was

taken, many concluded that it was the later period that was a failure, with the Armada and events in France, whilst earlier success in Portugal and against the Turks were contrasted with these setbacks. However, some also noted that he was unable to follow up his success against the Turks, but that any judgement should be set against his aims.

Question 18

The question required a strong focus on the reasons for a truce in 1609, but many answers went back almost to the start of the unrest and therefore failed to score highly. The stronger answers considered the problems faced by the end of the period, particularly financial and military and argued that in reality there was little option available. This was balanced against the strength of the Dutch rebels, although answers that scribed success to William of Orange were not credited highly.

F962/02 European and World History Period Studies – Modern 1795-2003

Napoleon, France and Europe 1795–1815

Question 1

Most candidates covered aims and delivery as well as outcomes; some covered methods too. There was a fair amount of description. A few responses strayed beyond 1804. The better and best responses were clear on aims, often linking these to the French Revolution's liberty, equality and fraternity. They covered legal, social, economic, educational, religious and political areas. The Constitution and the place of the aristocracy usually featured. Some good responses also considered how far these aims of reform were genuine and how far linked to Napoleon's own personal and political ambitions.

Question 2

Some answers included much, too much, about foreign policy and military campaigns. Where good links were made to the tenor of the Question, this was acceptable but often too little was then said about domestic policy areas. Better responses covered some range: the Constitutions, the Emperorship, the value of property, the appeal to the aristocracy and middle classes, educational reforms, economic policies, internal order, the force of the law (Civil Code etc), the relationship with the Church and the Papacy. The best responses also assessed the use of police, spies and informers, press controls, the growingly dictatorial nature of Napoleon's rule. This enabled a balanced appraisal of the likely nature of his control and indeed popularity.

Question 3

A small number of candidates embraced internal opposition but the majority focused on external opposition, answers were usually sound, some were overly descriptive, the better ones more analytical and evaluative. Common themes were: British power, at sea, through her economy, her ability to overcome the Continental System and her role in Portugal and especially Spain, with good analysis of the 'Spanish Ulcer.' Russia featured well and the changing political-diplomatic landscape after 1812 and success of the final Coalition were assessed, at times in contrast with earlier failed coalitions. There was some good analysis of military tactics, strategy, the use of resources, over-stretch, over-ambition, the belief in invulnerability and the longer-term corrosive effects of the Continental System. Chronology worked less well here. A few answers went beyond on to Waterloo. In addition, some made effective use of the consequences of military setbacks within France was seen.

Monarchy, Republic and Empire: France 1814–70

Question 4

This was answered well with some highly developed answers. Some were very descriptive; quite often there were lists of factors. At times, the social and economic problem (harvests, trade, unemployment, links to fiscal weaknesses) were rather neglected or submerged too much within other factors. Better responses distinguished between long and short term causes. Factors included the rise of anticlericalism and republicanism, mistakes made by Charles and problems he created, Chamber politics, ministerial changes, growing and articulated opposition, very short term economic crisis, the St Cloud Ordinances. Charles' personal mistakes in policy areas and in failing to build up good support and culpability were deemed important.

Question 5

This was handled well enough by those candidates who attempted it, though only a few strong answers were seen. Some were able to give adequate reasons why Louis Napoleon was able to move from being President to Emperor thanks to a combination of his personality, political skills

and the errors and indeed divisions of his opponents; he benefited from opposition to the Second Republic and had a wide support base. His name counted for much, the more so among those seeking stability, law and order, prosperity and a sense of France regaining pre-eminence.

Question 6

The main issue and indeed problem here was the definition of 'Liberal' and most candidates struggled with this or else ignored it. Some wrote excessively or wholly about foreign policy or else discussed banks, the state of the economy, rebuilding of parts of Paris. A few were able to engage with some of the issues here: the idea of a liberalising phase; constitutional and political changes, greater freedoms, including for the press; the release of political prisoners; the sense of a benevolent Emperor. A very few did allude to how far Napoleon III retained powers and controls and was wary of too many liberal reforms.

The USA in the 19th Century: Westward Expansion and Civil War 1803–c.1890

Question 7

Most candidates could list factors and develop these, often with strong knowledge. Properly developed analysis and evaluation were less in evidence. But there were some well-rounded, well-articulated and well-linked responses with strong evaluative comments. 'Push' and 'pull' appeared often. The Louisiana Purchase was usually well covered and linked to subsequent territorial acquisitions and gains, in turn a part of the great westward expansion. The role of the federal government, Manifest Destiny (linked to the sense of 'new nationalism' and indeed the 'Second Awakening'), trade and new routes and opportunities, the Gold Rush, the effects of the Civil War, developments in transport (above all railroads, new trading companies, willingness to take on and defeat Native Americans, spirited and acquisitive individuals as explorers or indeed as Presidents, often featured to varying degrees.

Question 8

Some good responses were read and candidates had strong topic knowledge as well as awareness of issues. There was good insight about the tribal divisions and tensions across the period and how these undermined Native American unity; at times good examples of how these were exploited were adduced. Wider contextual factors were assessed well: westward expansion, land hunger, the impact of Manifest Destiny, the cattle trails and buffalo hunting, the actions of the Federal government and the impact of the army, the growth of forts and new settlements and towns. In some responses there was perhaps understandable overlap with elements of answers to Q7.

Question 9

The problem here was a ready tendency to write comparatively about the North as well as the South, about Lincoln as well as Davis. Consequently, responses were imbalanced, often with too much about the North. Those candidates who did focus on the terms of the Question were able to adduce some good material and make some solid points. They engaged with such factors as political and military leadership (primarily Davis and Lee; Jackson was mentioned at times), the nature of the Southern cabinet government, military strategy and tactics, resources, transport, grade, financial power, the effects of blockade and the failures of diplomacy as well as the very diverse, disparate nature of a Confederacy wedded to States' rights.

Peace and War: International Relations c.1890–1941

Question 10

A popular question but surprisingly few candidates were confident about what imperialism was and what role it played in the outbreak of the First World War. Some chose to largely ignore it and gallop through the familiar list of German aggression and assassination in the Balkans while usually concluding that the Kaiser had a lot to answer for. Even when they mentioned Weltpolitik or the naval race with Britain they often failed to link this back to imperialism. There were a few excellent essays that balanced discussion of imperial ambitions with other factors and some

effectively argued that while important as a longer term cause for tensions it played a secondary role in the outbreak of conflict in 1914.

Question 11

Some very good answers pointed out that it was the potential of US involvement with their superior manpower poring over the Atlantic rather than their role in any particular battle that tipped the balance. It also pushed Germany into trying to win by a knock out blow before the Allied advantage became overwhelming. However too many essays became lists of factors with little attempt to evaluate their relative importance or indeed how they interacted with each other.

Question 12

The least popular of the set and generally poorly answered. Few candidates knew enough about the Nazi - Soviet Pact to know why it might have encouraged Hitler to invade Poland and decided to fall back on their trusty argument that Appeasement was to blame for the outbreak of war. Again many essays became a list of factors with little attempt to choose between them.

From Autocracy to Communism: Russia 1894–1941

Question 13

This question did not have an end date so while the majority of answers stopped in 1914 it was possible to take it up to the abdication of Nicholas II in 1917. The better answers were able to give a balanced view of how the 1905 revolution affected the Tsar's power and were even able to argue that many of his problems (especially his personality) predated 1905. Weaker essays either saw his downfall as inevitable without arguing why or alternatively as he had survived one revolution he had nothing to fear.

Question 14

A narrow time period from 1921 to 1924 made this an unpopular question. Better answers spoke of the Terror at the end of the Civil War and the ruthless policy of War Communism and Trotsky's onslaught against the Kronstadt uprising. This was balanced against Lenin's introduction of the NEP and the ban on factions.

Question 15

Many candidates were well prepared for an essay about Stalin's rise to power and wrote effective essays. The weaknesses among Stalin's opponents (especially Trotsky) were better known than their divisions but overall this led to many competent and some excellent essays. A few candidates wandered into Stalin's use of terror in the 1930s, perhaps because of last year's question, but this was rare.

Democracy and Dictatorship: Italy 1896–1943

Question 16

This attracted a large number of candidates but answers would have been stronger with more specific knowledge of the period 1896 to 1915. There was a lot of analysis of the post-unification problems of Italy which described the differences between North and South. There was a tendency to overstate regional differences and there could have been more focus on the problems caused not only by rural poverty but by rapid industrial expansion. Better answered balanced the different problems and distinguished between them. Generally political difficulties were treated less well than longer term issues.

Question 17

There were some strong responses which balanced the different factors which might explain Mussolini's rise to power. Some found it difficult to distinguish between 'social' elements and economic problems. Many seemed to regard disappointment with the peace treaties as a 'social' factor; but there some developed explanations of the impact of rural and industrial unrest. While it is not necessary to give lengthy descriptions of the process of Mussolini's accession to office in

1922, many answers did not deal with specific events as much as the general situation of Italy after 1918, making answers unfocused.

Question 18

There were some good assessments of policy but some seemed to focus on success and failure, perhaps because they had written about this previously and neglected to mention propaganda. Others seized upon this term and wrote substantial sections on the nature of Fascist propaganda which were not well related to the question. The level of knowledge was often competent, but as is so often the case, many answers did not mention the Corporate State which was significant omission. Most engaged with social and economic policies though often these elements were not given equal weight, with much of the economic policy being confined to the 1920s.

The Rise of China 1911–90

Question 19

Many answers were stronger on the period between 1911 and 1919 than on the later period. Some resorted to accounts of problems – for example, warlords, Japan, Yuan and Communists which sometimes showed impressive knowledge, rather than linking these directly to 'unrest'. Better answers dealt with the continuing unrest after the suppression of the Communists in 1928 but there was a tendency to offer a list of problems rather than assessing, that is weighing the relative importance of the reasons for unrest.

Question 20

Again the period was not always covered sufficiently with surprisingly little attention being given to the period after 1945. Many answers offered another list of problems faced by the Nationalists, but better answers did offer a more balanced analysis. The Communists were not utterly defeated but they were severely weakened and Jiang (Chiang) did establish a more modern state even with the threat of Japan. Though there was some impressive analysis which did weigh successes against threats there was more narrative writing here than in other topics.

Question 21

Better answers defined the domestic aims and considered what the CCP needed to do given the situation China was in when they took over in 1949 and also in terms of their ideology and the adaptation of Marxism by Mao. Thus the policies were tested against aims. Weaker answers started with an account of elements of Communist Policy and then tried to comment on their success or failure. More developed responses saw a distinction between the political, social and economic elements and also between the early policies and the more experimental economic and social developments after 1958. Some recognised that class warfare and the eradication of landlordism and bourgeois elements was an aim, but others tended to ignore the high levels of violence and repression in favour of descriptions of reforms and economic developments. There were some interesting analyses of the Great Leap Forward which went beyond 'success' or describing its consequences and considered it in terms of Mao's aims for China.

Democracy and Dictatorship in Germany 1919–63

Question 22

Stronger answers were able to weigh up the importance of the legacy of Versailles against other factors in Hitler's rise to power, whilst weaker answers often either ignored Versailles or simply listed the terms and suggested that Hitler said he would overturn them which won him support. Many argued that it was only a minor issue and that if it had been crucial would have won him support earlier, whilst others suggested that it became important given the economic problems caused by the Crash and Depression. Most were more confident writing about other factors, such as the weakness of Weimar, the Depression or political intrigue and were therefore able to consider a range of issues and, in a number of cases, link them back to Versailles. However,

there were some answers which spent too long dealing with events from the 1920s and did not link them to Hitler's rise to power.

Question 23

Although most were able to write about Nazi social policies, often in considerable detail, candidates found it much harder to assess the success of these policies and in many instances it was simply assumed that they were successful because that is what was implemented or because of terror or propaganda. However, stronger answers were able to produce a balanced answer and considered issues such as Nazi policy towards women and the Church, whilst most suggested that the policy towards the youth was not always successful as some joined alternative groups. In most answers a good range was considered, with attention also given to policies towards minorities, such as the Jews, or to workers.

Question 24

This was the least popular of the questions in this section, but there were a number of strong answers which weighed up the importance of the named factor against others. There was some sound knowledge about currency reform and how it brought about an escalation in tensions between East and West and this was often contrasted with longer term ideological developments and the shallowness of the unity that had been present during the War. Candidates also considered issues such as Russian and American aims, with discussion of the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Aid, as well as the blockade.

The Cold War in Europe from 1945 to the 1990s

Question 25

Most responses were able to consider a range of reasons for the development of the Cold War, but 'Soviet consolidation of power in Eastern Europe' was less well handled than other factors. Most responses looked at wartime divisions and agreements and argued that tensions were highly likely, others looked at US policy in Europe, whilst some did consider Soviet consolidation of power and US reaction to it, noting that often the US failed to understand Soviet concerns about stability and the fear of invasion. Some answers went beyond 1948 and therefore produced material that was not relevant to the question.

Question 26

This was not a popular question and not enough answers were seen to be able to comment.

Question 27

Answers to this question did not always focus on consequences and instead wrote about the causes of the collapse, whilst others wrote about the consequences for the Soviet Union, rather than the states of Eastern Europe as the question demanded. Knowledge of the consequences was often quite general and often candidates seemed unable to refer to specific states and results.

Crisis in the Middle East 1948–2003

Question 28

There were only a few answers to this question, but most were able to consider a range of reasons for the creation of Israel and were able to write quite knowledgeably about the Jewish lobby in America and this was often contrasted with the legacy of the Second World War and the role of Britain. In dealing with the later point many answers showed a good understanding of British attitudes since the First World War and were therefore able to place developments in context.

Question 29

This was the least popular of the three questions in this section, but those who attempted it were usually aware of Sadat's policies and were able to write about the Yom Kippur War and the attempts at peace that followed, allowing them to reach a balanced conclusion.

Question 30

Most were able to consider a range of reasons for foreign involvement and showed a good awareness of the number of countries, as well as the UN, that were involved in the war. Responses considered issues such as the supply of oil and concerns, particularly from the West about a rise in costs, whilst this contrasted with the concerns of states in the region about the potential export of the Iranian revolution and its threat to stability in the region. In light of these issues many were able to explain why a range of powers became involved and supplied weapons etc to the belligerents.

F963 /01 British History Enquiries – Medieval and Early Modern 1066-1660

General Comments:

This is the final full session of this unit and responses reflected both the positive and, sadly, the negative features from past years. On the positive side responses saw candidates largely engaged with the sources for both answers, attempting to use, rather than just describe, the content in order to answer the question. In part (a) questions the comparison of content was generally good, with similarities and differences developed fairly effectively. In part (b) answers, sources were nearly always grouped at the beginning of the answer and the groupings generally made good sense or were, at least, justified by the later comments. It is worth commenting here that many sources are susceptible to alternative interpretations or indeed can be used for both arguments. There are no definitive groupings and as long as an effective case is developed, a candidate's choice of where to put a source will be seen as valid. However, it is also worth noting that there are occasions when a source is clearly for one argument and not the other. Source C for question 2, describing the religious situation in England in early 1559, is not easily explained as suggesting that Catholics rather than Protestants were the more influential in determining the Elizabethan Settlement. As a result of effective grouping, most responses at the very least attempted to produce a two- or three-way argument and very few merely regaled the reader with a large amount of factual information of variable quality. The vast majority of responses to each question also attempted to reach a judgement, although the quality and nature of that judgement varied considerably. In terms of source evaluation there were some very good examples of one source being used to evaluate the content or provenance of another and likewise good examples of candidates using their own knowledge to test the sources. It has to be admitted, however, that such examples were in the minority. There were very few examples of the wrong sources being compared for part (a).

On the less positive side, many responses still group the sources initially (often quite correctly) but then use each source discretely rather than genuinely cross-referencing them and using the content of one source to support or challenge another. As a result, sources are not really evaluated, and such answers tend to produce a judgement that is topic-based rather than related to the sources. In part (a) the question specifically asks for a comparison "as evidence for arguments against the 1559 Supremacy Bill" or "as evidence for William's methods of government". Thus a judgement that merely sums up the problem with no reference to the sources does not meet the needs of the question. An overview of what each source contains likewise is insufficient. There needs to be a clear statement as to how valuable the sources are in helping answer the question, and why. A comment that "both are valuable" can be valid if the reasons for this, drawn from content and provenance, is produced. Similarly, if the opinion expressed is that "Source A is more useful than Source B" there must be a reason for this. In part (b) a similar approach to the judgement is required. The question stem asks the candidate to "assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that..." and so the judgement must involve an assessment of the utility of the sources for that particular question. Thus a conclusion to question 2(b) that "Protestants had the greater influence on the Elizabethan Church Settlement because many of the changes introduced by Mary I had been reversed, Holy Communion was defined in Protestant terms, priests were allowed to marry and images were banned from churches" but which lacked any reference to the five sources would not meet the needs of the question.

Using the provenance of the sources and evaluating the sources' utility or reliability, remain a challenge for many candidates. In many cases it remains a 'bolt-on' activity in the penultimate paragraph so any analysis of the provenance is not linked to the content. Thus points made on the validity of remarks by Count Feria or Charles I are not used to temper earlier comments

about what the writers have actually said. Frequently evaluation was based solely on who the author was and when she or he wrote/said what was in the source. This was very stock or formulaic in approach and amounted to little more than the view that the writer “is a royalist, is a catholic, is of Norman birth” and that therefore such an opinion is to be expected. There are also many examples of generic evaluation using the word ‘biased’ as if this explains everything. With regard to material written at a later date than the events being described, there are frequent comments about how important matters will have been forgotten or incorrectly recalled, when something like the brutality described in Source C in question 1 would have been very hard to forget, even if it might have been exaggerated for effect. No credit was given when it was suggested that a set of sources would have been improved by the addition of a different perspective (e.g. someone outside government in question 3 or a modern historian in almost any question). Cross-reference between sources can lead to effective judgements. For example, in Question 1, Source B is clear that Elizabeth, as a woman, cannot be Head of the Church. Source E later in the same year states that “The Queen refuses to be called *head* of the Church of England but accepts the title of governor”. There is clearly a link here that, in the context of part (b) should be explored. The focused use of own knowledge to question the statements being made would have been much more effective and certainly earned much higher marks. For example, in Question 2 (b) a detailed knowledge and understanding of the terms of the Elizabethan Church Settlement would allow candidates to identify where each of the five sources were correct in their hopes, fears or conclusions and where they were (for whatever reason) incorrect. In Question 3 (b), Source A, by John Pym, suggests that he and Parliament have no desire to weaken the King’s authority, merely remove a clear threat to the well-being of the Realm. Own knowledge of Pym’s views, Strafford’s rule and actions in Ireland, the known favour that Charles I had shown Strafford and the wider context of the post-Personal Rule situation in England would allow the veracity of Pym’s statements to be, at least, questioned. In general, the use of own knowledge varied considerably. This is primarily a paper where the sources need to drive the responses but the stem for every part (b) question specifically states “Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation” so some degree of pertinent and accurate own knowledge is expected.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question 1: The Normans in England 1066-1100

Part a:

Most answers were able to make a direct comparison of the Sources but not all of them focused on the terms of the question. Hence some were general comparisons, not looking specifically at the issue of government. Weaker answers were not able to do more than make a basic comparison of content, showing how William governed with the help of both English and Norman lords. Stronger answers used the context to explain the contrasting treatment of the English Earls in the Sources and often were aware of the close relationship between William of Poitiers and the king. The differing dates of the Sources were also used evaluatively by better answers. Additionally, some candidates showed a real awareness of the two authors and were able to use this knowledge to develop further their evaluation of the content of the Sources and their reliability.

Part b:

Better responses saw that the Sources were often ambivalent about William’s hostility, while weaker answers tended to stress either his hostility or his leniency. Good responses suggested that he was not inherently hostile, as this was not in his interests, but that English rebellion persisted and provoked him into retaliation which was designed to be a deterrent. Parts of Sources B, C and D were used to support this argument. Stronger answers used Source A, the end of Source B and the opening of Source E to show a lack of hostility and Sources B, C and

the beginning of D to illustrate hostility. The replacement of English administrators with Normans in Sources A, B and C was seen by better answers as a sensible measure rather than a sign of outright hostility. Linked to this idea, very few commented on the reference in Source A to William bringing ‘capable castellans’ over to command some of the new castles. He did this because he could trust them and references in Sources B, C and D, as well as own knowledge, would confirm that the English were not so trustworthy. Source D allowed responses to indicate another motive from William, using an English army to fight English enemies in a divide and rule approach, while Source E led to suggestions that it was the Norman advisers of William, rather than William himself, who were hostile. The provenance was not always fully exploited in these responses beyond rather formulaic comments on a monk in York naturally sympathising with the fate of the city and an English chronicler defending Hereward. Contextual knowledge was often strong. The Harrying, or Harrowing, of the North figured in most answers and William’s treatment of other rebels such as in Exeter was mentioned. The replacement of English landowners was also cited.

Question 2: Mid Tudor Crisis 1536-69

Part a:

Most responses focused on the issue in the question and were able to make sound comparisons of the arguments. Points of similarity were easily found but differences were more elusive. Better answers fastened on the argument in Source B that the queen could not be Supreme Head of the Church, which was absent from Source A. They then explained the difference in that Source A was written by a layman and Source B by a churchman and so they had different priorities. The background to the Sources was generally well-known and answers were able to explain the circumstances in which the speeches were made. Weaker answers simply omitted to mention provenance or context.

Part b:

Answers showed an awareness of what was required, but not always an ability to put the Sources in credible groupings. Many argued that Sources A and B showed Catholic influences because the speakers were able to express their views, although good responses suggested that the argument about the Supreme Headship was influential as Source E indicated. Contextual knowledge was also used by better answers to show that, apart from the Headship, Catholic influence was minimal. These answers used the evidence from Sources D and E to show how that influence was translated into practice. Source C led to difficulties in some responses, as they felt the authorship of the Source meant that it must show Catholic influence and some fixed on the phrase ‘The Queen was so resolved to leave religion as her father left it’ to argue that the Source showed she rejected Protestantism. This was the result of not reading the Source fully. Better responses seized on the information about bishoprics left vacant to show how Protestants were able to be influential and some cross-referenced with the steer for Source D. Evaluation was variable, with Feria decried as a biased Catholic by some and praised as an informed observer by others. Sources D and E were more accurately used, with the mixed messages being given out by the Queen noted. Source D was often evaluated as being self-seeking since Jewel became a bishop later, without much reference to the text of the Source, but the agenda of the returning exiles was noted and contextual knowledge used to show they had been radicalised while in Europe. Knowledge about the nature of the eventual Settlement was also used soundly in the final judgements and some reference to how the Settlement bedded down was acceptable, as long as it did not turn into a lengthy account of the religious policy of the reign. Answers which tried to suggest that Catholic influences were stronger rarely made their points persuasively.

Question 3: The English Civil War and Interregnum 1637-60

Part a:

Too many responses to this question failed to see that the comparison focused on attitudes, and not on the issues. Hence those who identified the main issues between the two sides, but failed to mention their attitudes, could not reach higher mark levels. Those who did appreciate what they were being asked to do were sometimes led astray by the superficially polite language in Source E to suggest that Parliament was being conciliatory. They needed to use contextual knowledge to evaluate what Parliament was really saying. Responses suggested that both sides felt the issues needed to be resolved and were urgent, but the similarity ended there with attitudes to religion, the army and the raising of revenue being linked to redress of grievances, differing. The context of each Source was usually known and understood.

Part b:

Responses were mostly focused on the issue in the question and the alternative view was taken as being the king himself was preventing an agreement, with the proviso from some that Sources A, D and E indicated that his advisers were responsible for the rift. Grouping here was not always as nuanced as the Sources suggested. Thus Source D was taken as an expression of the desire of Parliament for power and the provocation of the attempted arrest not noted in some responses. Similarly, Source B was taken at face value to show Parliament being to blame, and Charles' obstinacy over bishops was not always picked up. A number of answers saw Source C as a crucial Source, since it showed that an MP could initially support the Parliamentary reform agenda, but then have doubts about the apparent desire from Parliament for power. This was often the decisive argument in answers which suggested that Parliament was to blame, citing this Source, the willingness of Charles to compromise in Source B, the accusations in Source D and the demands made in Source E. The defenders of Parliament relied on their apparent reasonableness in A as opposed to the wicked ambitions of Strafford, Charles' refusal to negotiate about bishops in Source B, the reforms accepted as necessary in Source C, and the moderate requests made in Source E. Provenance was quoted but analysis was often quite formulaic, since most of the Sources expressed the views to be expected from their authors, but contextual knowledge was used to support and challenge arguments to good effect. The situation in Scotland, the outrage released at the attempted arrest and the Nineteen Propositions as a last resort were all quoted to advance the views being propounded.

F963/02 British History Enquiries – Modern 1815-1945

General Comments:

This is the final full session of this unit and responses reflected both the positive and, sadly, the negative features from past years. On the positive side responses saw candidates largely engaged with the sources for both answers, attempting to use, rather than just describe, the content in order to answer the question. In part (a) questions the comparison of content was generally good, with similarities and differences developed fairly effectively. In part (b) answers, sources were nearly always grouped at the beginning of the answer and the groupings generally made good sense or were, at least, justified by the later comments. It is worth commenting here that many sources are susceptible to alternative interpretations or indeed can be used for both arguments. There are no definitive groupings and as long as an effective case is developed, a candidate's choice of where to put a source will be seen as valid. However, it is also worth noting that there are occasions when a source is clearly for one argument and not the other. Source D for question 2, Disraeli's comments on Gladstone's first Ministry, is not likely to be a ringing endorsement of his rival's achievements and so must be seen as supporting the interpretation. As a result of effective grouping, most responses at the very least attempted to produce a two- or three-way argument and very few merely regaled the reader with a large amount of factual information of variable quality. The vast majority of responses to each question also attempted to reach a judgement, although the quality and nature of that judgement varied considerably. In terms of source evaluation there were some very good examples of one source being used to evaluate the content or provenance of another and likewise good examples of candidates using their own knowledge to test the sources. It has to be admitted, however, that such examples were in the minority. There were very few examples of the wrong sources being compared for part (a).

On the less positive side, many responses still group the sources initially (often quite correctly) but then use each source discretely rather than genuinely cross-referencing them and using the content of one source to support or challenge another. As a result, sources are not really evaluated, and such answers tend to produce a judgement that is topic-based rather than related to the sources. In part (a) the question specifically asks for a comparison "as evidence for the attitudes to government involvement in education" or "attitudes to the Munich Agreement". Thus a judgement that merely sums up the problem with no reference to the sources does not meet the needs of the question. An overview of what each source contains likewise is insufficient. There needs to be a clear statement as to how valuable the sources are in helping answer the question, and why. A comment that "both are valuable" can be valid if the reasons for this, drawn from content and provenance, is produced. Similarly, if the opinion expressed is that "Source A is more useful than Source B" there must be a reason for this. In part (b) a similar approach to the judgement is required. The question stem asks the candidate to "assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that..." and so the judgement must involve an assessment of the utility of the sources for that particular question. Thus a conclusion to question 2(b) that "the achievements of Gladstone's first Ministry outweighed the limitations because of the number and wide range of acts that were passed" but which lacked any reference to the five sources would not meet the needs of the question.

Using the provenance of the sources and evaluating the sources' utility or reliability, remain a challenge for many candidates. In many cases it remains a 'bolt-on' activity in the penultimate paragraph so any analysis of the provenance is not linked to the content. Thus points made on the validity of remarks by Morley or Lord Halifax are not used to temper earlier comments about what the writers have actually said. Frequently evaluation was based solely on who the author was and when she or he wrote/said what was in the source. This was very stock or formulaic in

approach and amounted to little more than the view that the writer “is a nationalist, is an official, is a government minister” and that therefore such an opinion is to be expected. There are also many examples of generic evaluation using the word ‘biased’ as if this explains everything. With regard to material written at a later date than the events being described, there are frequent comments about how important matters will have been forgotten or incorrectly recalled, when the thoughts and feelings described in Source E in question 4 would have been very hard to forget, given the context of the time and subsequent events. No credit was given when it was suggested that a set of sources would have been improved by the addition of a different perspective (e.g. a member of Sinn Fein in question 3 or a modern historian in almost any question). Cross-reference between sources can lead to effective judgements. For example, in Question 2, Sources A and B comment on the first Ministry but from different perspectives and with different explanations of its relative successes. The analysis of these two sources would provide an interesting set of agreements and contrasts that could be explored. The focused use of own knowledge to question the statements being made would have been much more effective and certainly earned much higher marks. For example, in Question 4, Source A by Lord Halifax forcibly rejects rearmament and suggests that war is wholly unlikely. Knowledge however of his later attitudes towards Germany and the initial stance he took about approaching Italy in 1940 to see if acceptable peace terms could be negotiated could be used to show his inherent pacifism in the 1930s. In question 3(b) own knowledge of the Solemn League and Covenant and the Curragh Mutiny; the perceived difference in attitudes to gun-running adopted by the authorities towards the Irish Volunteers and the Ulster Volunteers; the Easter Rising and the British response etc. could all be used to support or challenge aspects of the sources. In general, the use of own knowledge varied considerably. This is primarily a paper where the sources need to drive the responses but the stem for every part (b) question specifically states “Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation” so some degree of pertinent and accurate own knowledge is expected.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question 1: The Condition of England 1815-1853

Part a:

Most candidates were able to identify the key similarities and differences between the two sources. Neither writer, although from different perspectives and for different reasons, wanted government involvement in education. Both felt that the cost would be unacceptable and that government control would be unwelcome. The differences are in part explained by the different starting points of the writers. For Cobbett (Source A) it is compulsory, national education with costs falling on the “industrious” to benefit the “slipshod and the idle” that he objects to, not the principle of popular education. Brougham is against expanding education beyond the voluntary and charitable undertakings already in existence, and sees the cost element from a governmental point of view. He also rejects any suggestion of basing decisions about popular education on a foreign example (i.e. Prussia). In terms of provenance, Brougham in Source B represents the government view of saving money and maintaining the current *laissez-faire* situation with education a matter for individuals to decide. Cobbett in Source A is a radical and as such reflects the radical view of hostility to the extension of the state’s powers and increased taxation, although he is unusual in having a rather jaundiced view of many of the lower orders. In terms of a judgement, the fact that they both share similar views was seen by many candidates to make them equally valuable as evidence.

Part b:

Most candidates found it fairly straightforward to group the sources to create alternative arguments. In general, Sources C, D and E were used for the interpretation, with Sources A and B being used to focus on other factors, primarily finance. In fact, there were a variety of other possibilities – personal freedom to choose, the prevalent attitude of laissez-faire, class fears about educating, and therefore empowering, the poor - but most responses focussed on religion as against the financial costs as the key limiting factors. Own knowledge of the different religious groups involved in education, and their mutual antipathies, was limited in many cases so, despite the prompts available in Source C, opportunities to use own knowledge to test the validity of Source D and to discuss other denominational approaches to education were lost. Likewise, the competition between Anglican and Nonconformist groups was rarely developed. Source E, by Engels, created some problems for some candidates who were unaware of who he was and of the Marxists' distaste for organised religion. Some candidates did develop the idea, starting with the reference in Source A, that governments could not be trusted with control of education and this point was echoed by Engels in Source E and, in part, by Brougham in Source B. Some candidates also interpreted Source C as evidence of government meddling and therefore linked it to Sources A and E and their concerns about 'the new and terrible control in the hands of government'. Evaluation of the sources and their provenance tended very much to the formulaic with only the better answers able to contextualise the sources effectively.

Question 2: The Age of Gladstone and Disraeli 1865-1886

Part a:

Most candidates appreciated that there were marked similarities and differences between the two sources. They agree that Irish reform was desirable and necessary and that this issue dominated his first Ministry. Source E is more positive on the need for reform but Source C agrees, albeit with the proviso of such reform being based on "English political justice". Finally, they agree that Irish educational and university policy was problematic. The major difference identified was over impact and consequences, with Source C seeing nothing but negatives and arguing that Gladstone had conceded too much to the Irish. Morley, in Source E, concedes that there were difficulties with the Irish University Bill but sees much that was good in the other reforms. In terms of provenance, the author of Source C, being anonymous, was sometimes discounted for that very reason whilst Morley was dismissed for being too much in favour of Gladstone. Own knowledge here allowed some candidates to evaluate which writer, if either, was the more accurate, but this was not an opportunity taken by many. As far as a judgement was concerned, many saw Morley (Source E) as being slightly fairer as he did reference a wider range of issues and had the benefit of hindsight. However, the fact that he was Gladstone's biographer often counted against him. The fact that the author of Source C did not have an obvious link for or against Gladstone convinced others of his greater reliability, especially as some aspects of Gladstone's Irish policy did garner some very negative contemporary opinion.

Part b:

The grouping for this answer was fairly consistent, with most candidates seeing Sources A, B and E as arguing for the interpretation (i.e. that achievements outweighed the limitations) and Sources C and D providing the basis for the counter-argument. This alternative view can also be found in parts of Sources A and B and, by inference, Source E. However, the subtleties of Sources A and B often went unnoticed, which led to less developed or incomplete analyses of content. Source B in particular highlighted achievements, but many candidates were unable to argue that it (or Source A) contained evidence both for and against the interpretation in the question. The common element to these sources was praise of Gladstone personally and what was achieved in the first years of the Ministry coupled with implicit criticism of other ministers or of an over-ambitious approach to the second half of the Ministry.

In terms of evaluation, the anonymity of the writers of Sources A and C did create some problems for candidates who were unsure whether to trust the content or not. Source D, on the other hand, was used with confidence, largely because Disraeli, it was assumed, would quite naturally argue against Gladstone, as his political enemy. It was therefore normally rejected as having much value. In Source E the phrase 'Protestant ascendancy' caused some confusion because candidates simply did not understand its meaning but Morley was almost equally distrusted as Gladstone's biographer and highly regarded as having a much broader overview than any of the contemporary writers. This was, however, a question where own knowledge was not in short supply and candidates wrote, sometimes at length, about the various pieces of legislation passed by the Ministry. What was often lacking was a focus to that own knowledge. Linking the knowledge to the different sources in such a way as to use that knowledge to test the views expressed by the writers (e.g. was Morley correct in his assessment of the Irish reforms? Were the pieces of legislation referred to in Source A unsuccessful?) would have produced more effective answers but this was done by relatively few.

Question 3: England and a New Century 1900-1924

Part a:

Candidates produced some good comparisons of Sources C and D, identifying several similarities and some key differences. The writers of both sources saw the Easter Rising as an error; both agree that it lacked support and was not an 'Irish rising' but a Sinn Fein one; both also agree that the nature of the response of Britain would be critical. A key difference is that Source C is responding to the Rising as it happened whilst Source D (only eleven days later) is already faced with the reality of the British response in terms of arrests and executions. Both agree that the leaders of the Rising 'will become saints' if the response is not measured and careful. The difference in timing also determines the difference in tone. Mary Flanagan, writing in her private journal, has a light tone, almost flippant. Faced with the harsh reality, John Dillon in parliament is angry both about the executions and the lack of consultation before they took place. Candidates' evaluations of the two sources were in part formulaic – Source C was a private journal so would be a genuine expression of her views; Source D was a speech, designed to win an argument and was therefore suspect. Some however did apply their own knowledge to judge that both were valid expressions of reactions to the Easter Rising. It was not initially well supported but the fifteen executions, as well as accusations of brutality by British soldiers, hardened opinion dramatically.

Part b:

In general candidates grouped Sources A and B together, although for different reasons, in support of the interpretation that it was Irish reluctance to cooperate that prevented a solution from being found. However, elements of Sources C and D were also considered relevant to this argument. The alternative view, that the Irish were willing to cooperate, was identified in Source C, D and E. A third view, that it was the British response to the events of Easter 1916 that was a cause of problems was developed from Sources C and D. The reliability of Source A was largely assumed as it was a well-known public document, signed by thousands. Evidence to support the view that it was the Irish Unionists who were obstructive was usually provided by reference to their campaign against Home Rule but the development of the Ulster Volunteers and the impact of the Curragh Mutiny on Unionists also were used. Source B provided evidence for the nationalist opposition. Some candidates were able to show that gun running was not the exclusive preserve of the nationalists and that weapons were also obtained for the Unionists. Few commented that the authorities seemed more keen to seize nationalist rather than unionist weapons, but those who did linked that to the idea that Britain was not without fault in the failure to find a solution. Sources C, D and E were taken together to show examples of the Irish wishing to work with England (Source C) or actually doing so (Sources D and E). Source E was supported by reference to the ending of the civil war and Collins' involvement in that, but this was rare.

In terms of provenance and evaluation, in addition to Source A noted above, Source B was generally well handled. Being from *The Times*, some candidates treated its apparent support for the government with scepticism. Others argued more simplistically that it was a newspaper and therefore not to be trusted in general or that it was an English paper and was by definition 'biased' against the Irish nationalists. Some candidates leapt to the conclusion that Flanagan, in Source C, was a Unionist because she spoke out against the Rising and laughed over the idea of an Irish republic. This was in part because of a misreading of the tone of the piece, but it also ignored her references to the desire of many to work with England as 'anyone with any sense must see that it (independence) must come by England's consent'. This undermined any assessment of the provenance of Source C. Source D, as noted above, was regarded as suspect, again ignoring the fact that the executions were having just the effect that Dillon said. Finally, source E was linked quite easily to the question, but the strangeness of the leader of the IRA co-operating with the English was often commented upon (and not always understood or appreciated). In terms of a judgement, most candidates felt that there was blame on both sides and that the sources could be seen to support either interpretation quite effectively.

Question 4: Churchill 1920-1945

Part a:

Candidates were able to draw a comparison out of these two sources in terms of content. They identified that Churchill and Ismay agree that British defences are too weak, with particular reference to air defences so war over Czechoslovakia would have been hazardous. The main difference is that while Churchill found the Munich Agreement unendurable, Ismay was relieved because the 'explosion of war' had been avoided. Ismay thinks that this was a price worth paying but Churchill disagrees. In terms of provenance, candidates were aware that Source D (Churchill) was an immediate response by someone who had continually warned against the growing threat of Nazi Germany. They also understood that Source E was a judgement by someone looking back but very much aware of the contemporary situation in 1938. Comments that Ismay might have forgotten or confused some matters due to the passage of time were formulaic and unconvincing. More convincing were suggestions that, as a military planner, he would have been more aware of the situation than was Churchill, for all that he was fed information by insiders in the civil service. Thus most did see Source E as more useful but felt that Churchill did represent one point of view on Munich, albeit a minority one. Candidates who used their knowledge of wider attitudes outside Westminster towards peace, especially in regard to Chamberlain's triumphant return from Munich, were able to place the sources in a wider context and so give their judgement more conviction.

Part b:

Candidates generally grouped the sources with Sources A and B clearly opposing the interpretation that Churchill was right in his criticisms and Sources D and E broadly supporting the interpretation. Source C did create some difficulties for candidates but was seen as containing evidence for both arguments. Interestingly, some candidates argued that since World War II did happen and that Baldwin in Source B was so manifestly incorrect, all sources in some way supported the interpretation. Where this was well argued, the conclusion was hard to challenge. However, most candidates were more conventional and developed a two-way argument. Contextual knowledge was very important for evaluating the sources and thus reaching a judgement. The memories of the First World War were still very raw. The Depression made increasing military expenditure politically impossible, as Baldwin in Source B correctly points out. There was considerable pacifist feeling in Britain throughout the 1930s, manifested in the East Fulham by-election, support for the Peace Pledge Union and the celebrated debate in the Oxford Union that 'this House would not fight for King and Country'. Thus Shinwell was correct in Source C to show that Churchill, for all his skill in arguing, was very much going against the prevailing opinions both in parliament and in the country at large.

However, the fact that war did happen and Source E recognised the weaknesses in British defences, especially air defences, indicates that there was a valid case to be made for improved defences and a more determined search for allies. Thus Churchill's criticisms could be justified.

F964/01 European and World History Enquiries – Medieval and Early Modern 1073-1555

General Comments:

This is the final full session of this unit and responses reflected both the positive and, sadly, the negative features from past years. On the positive side responses saw candidates largely engaged with the sources for both answers, attempting to use, rather than just describe, the content in order to answer the question. In part (a) questions the comparison of content was generally good, with similarities and differences developed fairly effectively. In part (b) answers, sources were nearly always grouped at the beginning of the answer and the groupings generally made good sense or were, at least, justified by the later comments. It is worth commenting here that many sources are susceptible to alternative interpretations or indeed can be used for both arguments. There are no definitive groupings and as long as an effective case is developed, a candidate's choice of where to put a source will be seen as valid. However, it is also worth noting that there are occasions when a source is clearly for one argument and not the other. Source B for question 1, Robert the Monk's description of the Crusaders search for water, is not directly linked to the 'vigour' of the defence of Jerusalem and so must be seen as opposing the interpretation. As a result of effective grouping, most responses at the very least attempted to produce a two- or three-way argument and very few merely regaled the reader with a large amount of factual information of variable quality. The vast majority of responses to each question also attempted to reach a judgement, although the quality and nature of that judgement varied considerably. In terms of source evaluation there were some very good examples of one source being used to evaluate the content or provenance of another and likewise good examples of candidates using their own knowledge to test the sources. It has to be admitted, however, that such examples were in the minority. There were very few examples of the wrong sources being compared for part (a).

On the less positive side, many responses still group the sources initially (often quite correctly) but then use each source discretely rather than genuinely cross-referencing them and using the content of one source to support or challenge another. As a result, sources are not really evaluated, and such answers tend to produce a judgement that is topic-based rather than related to the sources. In part (a) the question specifically asks for a comparison "as evidence for the importance of religious inspiration for the Crusaders" or "attitudes towards the Edict of Worms". Thus a judgement that merely sums up the problem with no reference to the sources does not meet the needs of the question. An overview of what each source contains likewise is insufficient. There needs to be a clear statement as to how valuable the sources are in helping answer the question, and why. A comment that "both are valuable" can be valid if the reasons for this, drawn from content and provenance, is produced. Similarly, if the opinion expressed is that "Source A is more useful than Source B" there must be a reason for this. In part (b) a similar approach to the judgement is required. The question stem asks the candidate to "assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that..." and so the judgement must involve an assessment of the utility of the sources for that particular question. Thus a conclusion to question 2(b) that "weak papal policy was the reason that Lutheranism was able to strengthen because the Papacy was more concerned about maintaining its own power in the face of demands for a general Council" but which lacked any reference to the five sources would not meet the needs of the question.

Using the provenance of the sources and evaluating the sources' utility or reliability, remain a challenge for many candidates. In many cases it remains a 'bolt-on' activity in the penultimate paragraph so any analysis of the provenance is not linked to the content. Thus points made on the validity of remarks by Robert the Monk or the Venetian ambassador are not used to temper earlier comments about what the writers have actually said. Frequently evaluation was based

solely on who the author was and when she or he wrote/said what was in the source. This was very stock or formulaic in approach and amounted to little more than the view that the writer “is a monk, is a papal official, is a Protestant Elector” and that therefore such an opinion is to be expected. There are also many examples of generic evaluation using the word ‘biased’ as if this explains everything. No credit was given when it was suggested that a set of sources would have been improved by the addition of a different perspective (e.g. a Saracen chronicler in question 1 or a modern historian in almost any question). Cross-reference between sources can lead to effective judgements. For example, in Question 2, Sources A and B comment on the papal failures but from very different perspectives. The analysis of these two sources, with the application of some own knowledge, would provide an interesting set of agreements and contrasts that could be explored. The focused use of own knowledge to question the statements being made would have been much more effective and certainly earned much higher marks. For example, in Question 1b, knowledge about the provision of wood by Genoese merchants, the earlier experiences at the siege of Antioch or the form that the final assault on Jerusalem took could be used to support or challenge statements made in the sources and so validate their comments. In general, the use of own knowledge varied considerably. This is primarily a paper where the sources need to drive the responses but the stem for every part (b) question specifically states “Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation” so some degree of pertinent and accurate own knowledge is expected.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question 1: The First Crusade and the Crusader States 1073-1130.

Part a:

Most candidates were able to identify similarities between the sources with the main point being the belief that divine intervention would bring success. Preparations for the conflict involved fasting, prayer and alms-giving (Source E) and a procession, reconciliation and offerings in Source C. A common point was also the role of churchmen - the clergy in Source C and bishops and priests in Source E. Differences were less easy for many candidates and this was achieved largely by identifying points made by one source but not the other – the mockery of the Saracens in Source C as opposed to the speed with which the Saracens fled the walls in Source E; the initial failed assault in Source E suggested a weakening of will as opposed to the fact that ‘we pressed on with the siege by day and night’ in Source C. The differences were often explained by provenance. The writer of Source E was a layman whilst Raymond of Aguilers was a priest and so their perspectives were slightly different. Candidates often felt that Source E was more militaristic than religious while Source C was interpreted to be more focussed on the religious elements because that was Raymond’s calling. Evaluation varied considerably. Although candidates knew much about each writer some of the comments were very formulaic – Source E was sometimes held to be less reliable as the writer was anonymous but for others his military experiences made him the more useful source. Conversely, the fact that religion was the driving force behind the Crusades was enough for many candidates to see Source C as the better evidence for the views of Crusaders about the role of religious inspiration in these events. For others, his role as a chaplain meant that his views were to be expected and were thus less valuable.

Part b:

Most candidates felt that the supporting argument for the interpretation, that the vigour of the defence was the main obstacle to the capture of Jerusalem was most clearly expressed in Source D, with supporting evidence to be found in Sources A, C and E. The alternative argument – that there were other factors – was usually extracted from Sources A, B, C and E although some candidates felt that this should be considered in terms of lack of resources (Sources A and D) and the appalling conditions (Source B). Source E was singled out by some

as evidence that, in fact, the defence was scarcely vigorous at all as ‘no sooner had he ascended, than the defenders fled from the walls’. The validity of these arguments was best tested by the use of own knowledge and many candidates had considerable knowledge of events, some indeed to the extent that the contextual material overwhelmed the work on the sources. Candidates were able to write about the defences of Jerusalem; the relative sizes of the two forces; the ‘scorched earth’ policy adopted by the Saracens that poisoned water supplies and removed tress that might have been used to create siege engines. There was also understanding of the divisions within the Crusader forces (hinted at in Source C with the reference to reconciliation) and how the arrival of wood from Genoese merchants allowed for the building of siege towers and ladders leading to the final, successful assaults on the city. Evaluation of the sources was often stock, with those who had been present at the siege deemed more useful, but in fact all five writers were well-informed. There were valid comments about the purpose of some of the sources, not just to inform readers about what had happened but also to inspire them to consider becoming involved in future crusades. Judgements varied and there was no clearly preferred answer, but as long as the evidence and sources were used critically, this was of course not an issue.

Question 2: The German Reformation 1517-1555.

Part a:

Candidates found the identification of similarities and differences in content relatively straightforward but a significant minority, somewhat inexplicably, focussed on one or other of the two parts of Source E rather than considering the content and authorship of the two separate resolutions. Both clearly were concerned with the enforcement of the Edict of Worms and the concession gained at the first Diet of Speyer in 1526. Both sources also referred to the request for a General Council of the Church, although some candidates wrote as if this was the desire of all of the German princes. The similarity in provenance was also noted in that the Imperial Free Cities were the authors of Source D and were associated with the Minority resolution from Source E. What was often made less explicit was the fact that the authors of Source D were only the cities whilst in Source E there were two contradictory resolutions by different groups of authors. In respect of the concession from 1526 it is clear that the Minority resolution in Source E agreed with Source D and desired to continue the concession but the Majority of the princes wanted to see the removal of that concession and the rigorous enforcement of the Edict of Worms. The difference in attitudes was explained by reference to own knowledge and in particular to the changing international situation as it affected the Emperor Charles V and his relationship with France, the Ottoman Empire and the Papacy. In general, Source E was deemed to be the more useful as it was from a later, thus having a broader perspective and because it represented a wider range of attitudes to the Edict of Worms.

Part b:

Candidates found it relatively straightforward to group sources, with the exception of Source E for reasons noted above in the comments on part (a). Sources A, B, D and part of Source E were usually grouped to support the interpretation that it was weak papal policy that allowed Lutheranism to spread. The counter-argument, that it was other factors, was advanced through reference to Sources B, C, D and part of E. However, a significant number of candidates preferred to argue that it was either the fault of the princes (especially the Electors of Saxony – Sources B, C and E) or of Emperor Charles V (Source B and inferred from the last sentence of C), thus creating a three-way argument. Some candidates also argued that references in Source A (Adrian VI’s intentions in terms of reform), Source B (the Curia’s outspoken comments) and the calling of Second Diet of Speyer indicated a more forceful policy, although this was not especially convincing. Own knowledge of the terms of the Edict and the historical context in Germany during the 1520s was used relatively effectively. This was particularly true in respect of Charles V whose commitments elsewhere were used to explain the first Diet of Speyer and the concession made by his brother, Ferdinand. Similarly, changed circumstances (including the

end of the war against France and the sack of Rome) were used to explain why the second Diet was called. Much was known also about the Electors of Saxony although not all appreciated that Frederick the Wise had died in 1525 and that it was his successor leading the Lutherans at the second Diet. Many commented on the continued demands for a General Council of the Church, which was mentioned in Sources B, D and E. Candidates knew that this did not happen until the Council of Trent in 1545 but few realised why there was resistance from the Papacy because popes feared a diminution of their powers should a Council meet. Most candidates trusted Sources A, D and E, the latter two because they were formal declarations and the first because it seemed unlikely that a Pope would be so critical of the Papacy if it was not so. The views on Sources B and C were mixed. As both were reports it was felt by many, somewhat formulaically, that they would be accurate statements whilst others saw their catholic origins as likely to affect their views. Few commented on the general reliability of Venetian ambassadorial reports. Judgements varied and the role of the princes, especially Saxony, figured as largely as did papal weakness or Imperial failings.

F964/02 European and World History Enquiries – Modern 1774-1975

General Comments:

This is the final full session of this unit and responses reflected both the positive and, sadly, the negative features from past years. On the positive side responses saw candidates largely engaged with the sources for both answers, attempting to use, rather than just describe, the content in order to answer the question. In part (a) questions the comparison of content was generally good, with similarities and differences developed fairly effectively. In part (b) answers, sources were nearly always grouped at the beginning of the answer and the groupings generally made good sense or were, at least, justified by the later comments. It is worth commenting here that many sources are susceptible to alternative interpretations or indeed can be used for both arguments. There are no definitive groupings and as long as an effective case is developed, a candidate's choice of where to put a source will be seen as valid. However, it is also worth noting that there are occasions when a source is clearly for one argument and not the other. Source B for question 4, describing the establishment of the first Nazi concentration camp, is not easily explained as part of a programme of persuasion rather than force. As a result of effective grouping, most responses at the very least attempted to produce a two- or three-way argument and very few merely regaled the reader with a large amount of factual information of variable quality. The vast majority of responses to each question also attempted to reach a judgement, although the quality and nature of that judgement varied considerably. In terms of source evaluation there were some very good examples of one source being used to evaluate the content or provenance of another and likewise good examples of candidates using their own knowledge to test the sources. It has to be admitted, however, that such examples were in the minority. There were very few examples of the wrong sources being compared for part (a).

On the less positive side, many responses still group the sources initially (often quite correctly) but then use each source discretely rather than genuinely cross-referencing them and using the content of one source to support or challenge another. As a result, sources are not really evaluated, and such answers tend to produce a judgement that is topic-based rather than related to the sources. In part (a) the question specifically asks for a comparison “as evidence for the problems facing the Legislative Assembly” or “for how great a problem opposition was for the Nazis”. Thus a judgement that merely sums up the problem with no reference to the sources does not meet the needs of the question. An overview of what each source contains likewise is insufficient. There needs to be a clear statement as to how valuable the sources are in helping answer the question, and why. A comment that “both are valuable” can be valid if the reasons for this, drawn from content and provenance, is produced. Similarly, if the opinion expressed is that “Source A is more useful than Source B” there must be a reason for this. In part (b) a similar approach to the judgement is required. The question stem asks the candidate to “assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that...” and so the judgement must involve an assessment of the utility of the sources for that particular question. Thus a conclusion to question 4(b) that “the Nazis relied more on force than persuasion because of the use of the Gestapo, the SS and the destruction of opposition through imprisonment in concentration camps” but which lacked any reference to the five sources would not meet the needs of the question.

Using the provenance of the sources and evaluating the sources' utility or reliability, remain a challenge for many candidates. In many cases it remains a 'bolt-on' activity in the penultimate paragraph so any analysis of the provenance is not linked to the content. Thus points made on the validity of remarks by Goebbels or King Louis XVI are not used to temper earlier comments about what the writers have actually said. Frequently evaluation was based solely on who the author was and when she or he wrote/said what was in the source. This was very stock or

formulaic in approach and amounted to little more than the view that the writer “is a royalist, is an official, is a former president” and that therefore such an opinion is to be expected. There are also many examples of generic evaluation using the word ‘biased’ as if this explains everything. With regard to material written at a later date than the events being described, there are frequent comments about how important matters will have been forgotten or incorrectly recalled, when something like the brutality described in Source E in question 2 would have been very hard to forget. No credit was given when it was suggested that a set of sources would have been improved by the addition of a different perspective (e.g. a sans-culotte in question 1 or a modern historian in almost any question). Cross-reference between sources can lead to effective judgements. For example, in Question 4, Source A suggests that persuasion is going to be the Nazis main tool for winning over the German people. Source B (six days later) indicates the opening of the first concentration camp and the nature of the intended inmates. There is clearly some degree of contradiction here that could be explored. The focused use of own knowledge to question the statements being made would have been much more effective and certainly earned much higher marks. For example, in Question 1, Source E from Louis XVI suggests that the King is wholeheartedly behind the new Legislative Assembly. Knowledge however of the Queen’s attitudes (Source D) and the Flight to Varennes could be used to question the sincerity of Louis’s motives. In question 5 (b) own knowledge of what the Tet Offensive did achieve but also of how successful the USA was in the longer-term at defeating the Viet Cong could have been used to support and question statements in Sources C, D and E. In general, the use of own knowledge varied considerably. This is primarily a paper where the sources need to drive the responses but the stem for every part (b) question specifically states “Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation” so some degree of pertinent and accurate own knowledge is expected.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question 1: The Origins and Course of the French Revolution 1774-95.

Part a:

Responses to this question were generally good. Most candidates were able to find similarities and differences, with the majority of these offering a comparison of “inexperienced” in Source B and the suggestions of division in Source C. Other popular comparisons were “work evil” with “gain money and jobs”, and those relating to the position of the King (“kept as a prisoner” with “denounced the King”). The phrase “unfavourable circumstances” in Source B was used in a variety of comparisons with evidence from Source C. Contextually, the king’s flight to Varennes was developed, and some students were able to link “voted to exclude themselves” with Robespierre’s Self Denying Ordinance. Problems arose for those who weren’t clear on the differences between the Constitutional and Legislative Assemblies or, indeed, the Constitutional Assembly and the Constitution. Some took Source C to be an observation on what was happening outside the Assembly rather than the divisions within. Comment on provenance generally centred around Royalist/right-wing authorship, and there was a general consensus that the views expressed in both sources were influenced by sympathy for the King. Most recognised they were from right-wing nobles commenting with the benefit of hindsight.

Part b:

In general, candidates engaged well with the requirements of the question. Most were correct in the grouping of the sources with the commonest grouping being based on Sources B, C and D arguing for the interpretation that the Legislative Assembly had little chance of success and sources A and E arguing against it. However, some candidates did attempt to group Source E as supporting the proposition on the basis of its unreliability, given the evidence in Source D, and that the King was been held against his will as indicated in Source B. Some candidates found Source D more difficult to handle and few recognised the significance of Lafayette as

Source D's author. However, those who did grasp Source D used it in both arguments. They utilised references to the threat from the émigrés to argue for the instability of the Constitution and but also took the hesitation of the queen (& king) to argue there was hope. The best knew something in regard to La Fayette and his changing fortunes and attitudes. Source E also was used differently by different candidates. Many took this at face value seeing it as hope for the Constitution whilst others just dismissed it on the grounds that the king was totally untrustworthy. The best responses were much more cautious seeing positive signs in the content but also presenting the position that the king found himself in, and his actions, as important evaluative points.

In terms of provenance and evaluation, the reliability of most sources was challenged because of authorship. Madame Julienne (Source A) was seen as unreliable as she was related to a Constituent Assembly member with few recognising that, as she was a member of the Third Estate, she will have shared many of their hopes & aspirations, and as such was a credible witness. Very few trusted anything Louis XVI (Source E) said. The authors of Sources B and C were given some credit for writing with hindsight but were also deemed unreliable because of the regularly deployed accusations of forgetfulness and incipient senility. The opposition of Lafayette (Source D) to the King was assumed and therefore was considered to have influenced his views. What was rarely done was to apply own knowledge of the historical context to any of these sources to see whether what they were saying could be supported or objectively challenged by what actually happened at the time.

Question 2: The Unification of Italy 1815-70.

Part a:

The quality of responses to this question was very good. Candidates engaged with the contrasting nature of the hostility in Sources B and E, although a few candidates did misread the nature of Source E's violence, reading the Austrians as the ones who were 'often cruel in their treatment'. Virtually all candidates acknowledged that both sources provided evidence of hostility to the Austrians. A popular comparison was "appoint magistrates and administrators who know nothing about this country" with "occupied our country by force". The better answers commented on the degree of hostility suggested by these two quotations. Some candidates were able successfully to match up references to the young and to women in both sources. Although the general tone of Source B was one of mild hostility, some candidates did suggest that the reference to 'rebels' might be indicative of a stronger dislike for Austria.

In terms of provenance there was a general view that both sources were 'biased', which was a somewhat stock response. However, most recognised de Capitani (Source B) was having to be rather careful about what he said since his job depended on the Austrians and he was writing to Metternich. Candidates tended to do less well in evaluating Shinglewood Taylor (Source E) whom they often criticised, rather unconvincingly, for not being Italian or for writing in 1920 when his memory was likely to have been playing tricks. Even those who struggled with evaluating the provenance tended to note the significance of the contrasting dates more effectively and there was often impressive knowledge of periods of revolutionary activity to contextualise the sources and to evaluate and develop points made.

Part b:

The majority of the candidates engaged effectively with the requirements of the question though some did find their counter argument more difficult to identify, with some candidates reading the question more as whether the Austrians did, or didn't, use repressive measures rather than whether they relied solely on these. Grouping was usually effective with Sources A, B and E generally grouped to support the use of repression in opposition to Source C. However, Source D was used in both groupings (usually on an either/or basis rather than using it for both interpretations). Source A's evidence tended to be grouped together as repression but very few

developed the content of this source in detail. Source B was considered by some to suggest that the Austrians were more irritating than repressive, whilst others latched onto the “fortress garrisoned by (Austrian) people” to support the view that there was Austrian military repression. A small number suggested a sub-grouping in favour of the proposition by distinguishing between political and military repression.

Comments on provenance mostly suggested that sources B, D and E were ‘biased’ due to the nature of authorship whilst most felt A was reliable as it was a statement of policy. Sources C and D provided some problems for candidates. Some candidates thought that Source C, with all the mention of armies, had to be about Austrian aggression without fully grasping the point that the Duke of Tuscany was refuting the suggestion that he was under pressure ‘to join my forces with those of Austria’ or that ‘Austria offer(ed) their troops to suppress revolution there’. Radetsky in Source D was, in fact, expressing his opinion that Austria had been too lenient (‘it is high time to stop giving favours’) and needed now to ‘let the country feel the power of Austria’.

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

Part a:

In general, this question was well done, with most responses identifying both similarities and differences. However, there were more candidates here than with other questions who sequenced the sources in their answers, often leaving the comparisons implicit. The word “violent” was latched on to as the basis for many comparisons, and the North versus South aspect was frequently exploited in both terms of content and provenance. Other popular comparisons centred around states’ rights, the threat to the Union (“can the Union endure”, “splitting in two”) and the zealotry of the abolition societies, although some did remark on Buchanan’s acknowledgement that “fanaticism” existed on both sides. The best responses were those who could write meaningfully in regard to Douglas and Buchanan and their respective roles in events at the time. Generally, Douglas (Source D) was handled better than Buchanan (Source E) though the best were aware of Buchanan’s background and how his knowing the outcome of the Civil War might colour his view. The provenance was often handled effectively with a significant proportion picking up on the timing of D though many did base their provenance comments more on the steer than on the sources or attributions themselves. In terms of context, there was broad agreement with references to wider issues such as popular sovereignty, Douglas’s election campaign, and Buchanan’s portrayal as a ‘doughface’. The use of these contextual elements to evaluate the reliability of each source added significantly to the better responses.

Part b:

Many candidates showed a good understanding of the issues involved in States’ rights and other sources of tension, with most seeing slavery as the main alternative interpretation. However, some candidates found grouping the sources a challenge, mostly because they couldn’t see a clear space between States’ rights, slavery & sectionalism. Despite this, many of them made a good case out for their individual choices. Sources A and B were generally used to support the proposition, although a small but significant number of candidates clearly did not understand the term ‘Federal’ and this led them to group this source for the opposing argument. Many candidates also linked Source D to this side of the argument, although it was used equally to support the view that slavery was the paramount cause of sectional tension. Source C caused the most problems for candidates, although those who felt that the ambition of politicians was also a key cause of tension made good use of this source, linking it to Calhoun in Source B and deploying own knowledge to flesh out this argument. Others took “little local jealousies” in Source C to be a euphemism for either slavery or sectionalism and dealt with it in this context, to greater or lesser effect.

In terms of provenance, comments on Source B suggested that candidates knew a significant amount about Calhoun and deployed this knowledge to greater or lesser effect to question the reliability of his comments. Sources A and C were largely regarded as reliable, the former as it was a private family letter and because of its objective tone; the latter (despite its fulsome tone) because it was from a Southern senator who nonetheless criticises Calhoun fairly forcibly. Enough was known about Douglas (Source D) and Buchanan (Source E) to allow those with a firm grasp on context to comment meaningfully on both sources.

Question 4: Dictatorship and Democracy in Germany 1933-63.

Part a:

On the whole effective comparisons were in evidence, with many identifying the key difference which was that Source A did not appear to regard opposition as a problem (or at least one it was that could be solved in time and peacefully) whilst Source B clearly did see an internal threat that needed to be managed immediately. Most candidates understood the difference in tone of the two sources, and generally considered this to be significant (for example, “no need for the power of the bayonet” versus “concentration camps”). Most commented on the nature and extent of opposition, with some better answers stating that because Source B was more precise in identifying who its opposition was, it was therefore a more reliable as evidence. Some also commented that just because 48% of the electorate voted against the Nazis, this did not necessarily mean that it was active opposition. A small but significant number misread the reference to “terrorising” in Source A and incorrectly suggested that opposition was to be dealt with harshly. There were examples also where candidates focused more on opposition rather than on opposition in 1933 with a number of candidates criticizing the sources for not providing information on later opposition such as the White Rose group or the Edelweiss Pirates.

With regard to evaluating the reliability of the sources, a significant number of candidates merely dismissed both sources on the grounds that both were Nazi propaganda without considering the context and in particular the fact that the question specifically referred to 1933. Better responses did comment on Goebbels purpose in making the speech in Source A or effectively used the factual information in Source B to test the comments and tone of Source A. In terms of context, the Enabling Act was discussed, and for the most part was well used as part of an evaluation of both sources. Gleichschaltung was also often mentioned to support references to “whole people” and “whole nation”.

Part b:

In the responses to this question, whether the Nazis relied upon persuasion rather than force to win support, groupings varied and effective arguments were developed for both alternatives. Censorship was, for some candidates, a ‘stand-alone’ third alternative whilst some argued it should be grouped with propaganda and others with force, depending on their use of Sources C, D and E. This is, of course, entirely valid. Many sources are susceptible to alternative interpretations and as long as an effective case is developed, there are no definitive groupings. Unsurprisingly, B was firmly in the ‘force’ grouping for nearly every response, and Source A was generally used to support the ‘persuasion’ argument. A few did suggest there was a sinister undercurrent to Source A, mainly based on knowledge of the provenance and the proximity of the Enabling Act. Source C was usually successfully grouped with persuasion, although the odd candidate, less successfully, saw veiled force in the tone of the piece or made reference to the seizure of left-wing printing presses during Gleichschaltung. The use of Source D, on the other hand, varied between those who deduced ‘force’ due to the actions of the Gestapo and those who said ‘persuasion’ on account of the outcome of the action being that only censored and approved material would be available. Source E likewise saw a split between those who said ‘persuasion’ being the main thrust of the piece and those who saw veiled threats in “it goes without saying” and who made reference to the Editors’ Law and what had happened to other publishers who did not push the Party line enthusiastically.

Evaluation of provenance was often formulaic as all five sources emanated from the Nazis. Thus comments on propaganda and the fact that the sources could not be trusted were common. However, better responses used their own knowledge to support or challenge what the sources said and did so effectively. Book burnings were real, and not just in Düsseldorf; the Editors' Law and the Enabling Act did provide the Nazi party with the tools to control the population; concentration camps were used and in more places than Dachau. On the other hand, propaganda through the whole range of media was deployed by Goebbels and his ministry. There was considerable scope to develop arguments linking the sources and own knowledge without resorting to formulaic comments on the nature of any Nazi source.

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

Part a:

Most candidates adopted a before and after Tet approach, understanding that the two sources represented the planning for and the outcome of the Offensive. There were some very good responses, with candidates comparing the objectives in Source A with the situation on the ground in Source D and accounting for similarities and differences through historical context. There were also some measured judgements taking into account the timing of the sources. The most popular comparison was based on references to "the countryside". Some candidates were drawn to a comparison of "enemy's brain" and "nerve centres". Comparisons based around difference tended to revolve around the objectives versus what was actually achieved. Many candidates were able to contextualise the Offensive, often describing the effect on US troops who are not referred to in the sources. However, when it came to the evaluation of the sources and their provenance, some candidates took the sources very much at face value, deciding that Source A would naturally be more useful because it was explaining the key objectives, and dismissing Source D as evidence. These responses largely failed to draw inferences from the comments of the writers of Source D and rather expected that the two sources would directly confirm or challenge each other. Largely the provenance of the sources was discussed in the context of propaganda but better responses recognised the objectivity of Source D where it reported on the Offensive's shortcomings.

Part b:

This question was generally answered well with candidates engaging with the question. In many cases a limited amount of own knowledge was used quite effectively to aid analysis and evaluation. Groupings varied, although Sources A and C were mostly used to support the proposition. The other three sources were used to support both arguments and there were a number of examples of candidates interrogating the sources for evidence to support both arguments. However, a few candidates separated Source A from the others on the grounds that it covered the 'well planned' section of the question only. Source B caused the most division amongst candidates, particularly with regard to provenance. Some with lesser knowledge asserted that an American journalist would be biased against the North Vietnamese, whilst others suggested that a journalist had the duty to report the 'facts'. Those who knew who Cronkite was, how the broadcast came about and linked it with the growth of the protest movement, showing the impact it had in turning the US public against the war, produced the most effective answers. Source C caused relatively few problems, and candidates were split over Source E, seeing both agreement and disagreement. The best responses were those who put the sources into the context though there were those who dismissed anything Johnson said out of hand. Others knew about Johnson's decision not to stand for re-election and some made the inference that this was a consequence of the success of the Offensive.

F965 Historical Interpretations and Investigations

General Comments:

There was some very impressive analysis of both interpretations and sources and responses demonstrated considerable understanding of some complex historical issues. However, the component continued to show some divergence between centres who understood its requirements and those who were less aware the explicit demands of the mark scheme for evaluation of both the passages in the Interpretations questions and the sources in the Investigations. Thus results were often polarised between centres that recognised the demands of the tasks and marked realistically and centres that were generally over generous to analyses of the passages without knowledge being applied to test them, or essays which referenced sources without offering sustained evaluation of the evidence.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Strengths and weaknesses of Interpretations

Fewer answers this year merely referenced parts of the passages in an essay which considered different aspects of the topic in the question or tried to use isolated sentences of the passages coupled with their own knowledge to construct arguments about the issue in the question. However, this approach was still favoured by some candidates and did not result in a full analysis of the passages, which led to supported evaluation of the identified interpretation in order to make a judgement about the issue. Many candidates still seemed reluctant to look at what each passage was saying about the issue and to assess it by using other evidence. The best results were achieved by candidates who focused on analysing the passages thoroughly, and who researched detailed and relevant knowledge to apply to the passages to confirm or challenge their interpretations. There were some very impressive answers which went beyond basic and general knowledge, and showed that candidates had researched the issues enough to offer detailed knowledge in support of judgements about the passages.

For higher-level marks the quality of analysis and knowledge does have to be of a very good or excellent standard. Candidates have time to consider the passages carefully and to undertake detailed research. High marks should not have been given for knowledge which was quite limited and generalised. Sometimes, too, detailed knowledge was used to expand on points made in the passages, rather than to evaluate their view as a whole. This 'gobbet' like approach lost sight of the question and treated the passages as 'stand alone' pieces of writing whose content needed to be amplified and explained regardless of the question. This approach should not have been over rewarded. High marks were not appropriate, too, for answers where the passages were understood well and there was cross-reference between them but there was little application of knowledge. The questions clearly required the use of contextual knowledge, and the mark scheme reserves higher marks for answers in which knowledge supports critical analysis. A minority of answers treated the passages as primary sources and commented on their origin and possible purpose as a result of research done on the authors. This had little value and often resulted in simplistic and speculative comment. Some answers had a lot of knowledge but only offered a limited explanation of the passage, sometimes little more than a brief summary, ignoring the majority of the text. However, the passages should have been closely analysed. An examination of their whole argument and content as related to the issue in the question was required. Too often, candidates did not go beyond a single sentence about each passage before writing what amounted to an essay on the topic, loosely linked to the views in the texts.

There was a tendency for some centres to offer realistic marks in the lower and middle ranges but to submit inflated marks to uneven or indifferently supported work because it was better expressed or fuller than some of the weaker answers. In these cases, annotation did not always notice when the passages were not understood properly in relation to the question.

However, despite these problems, many centres did recognise the variations in quality of argument and of supporting material; and there were some very strong answers which showed a good understanding in the centre of what was required. Centres did not stint in marginal annotation, but sometimes the final comments did not relate sufficiently to the often perceptive and helpful comments in the margin.

Strengths and weaknesses of Investigations

A minority of answers neglected to use any sources at all, though included a bibliography. Most answers were evidence based, and referenced a range of sources, predominantly secondary. Some encouraged candidates to construct their own source-based exercise by selecting a range of sources, and then writing a commentary on them during the answer. This sometimes resulted in weak or simplistic work. Also some candidates chose weak sources and then criticised them for their uselessness and irrelevance. This raises the point that it candidates should not choose obviously weak sources merely in order to point out their inadequacies. However most candidates engaged with a range of well-chosen historical evidence and did try to assess it. The quality of evaluation varied quite considerably. Weaker answers juxtaposed sources, hoping that it would prove their point if a series of historians said broadly the same. However it is important for evidence to be evaluated by examining arguments closely and on the basis of a sound explanation of views, rather than simple comparison of short extracts. The reliance on short sentences, or even phrases, taken out of context, which were then 'evaluated' by applying knowledge, was often not a very convincing approach. Sometimes a historian was evaluated by using material from his or her own book – this is really explanation not assessment. There remained quite a bit of undeveloped or generic evaluation based on the origin of the secondary source. Some candidates even questioned a historian's views because he had or she had not been present or because secondary evidence may be biased by its very nature. Better answers tested evidence with knowledge, and this was particularly effective when secondary interpretations were tested by the use of primary evidence. In both Interpretations and Investigations it is ineffective to test the views identified simply by limited reference to another authority or to a 'school of history'. Simply to say 'This view is confirmed by other Intentionalist historians' or 'Elton has disproved this view' without further explanation and a demonstration of evidence used, is to offer only superficial judgement.

Some work did show wide reading and an awareness of a range of views, including the work of some recent historians. Historiographical discussion often seems restricted, though. Certain controversies are now so outdated that it hardly seems worthwhile to resurrect their debates. And they are beginning to disappear from textbooks. Some candidates also imported certain broad historical views or tendencies into topics which really have not attracted that sort of debate. 'Whig historians' and 'Marxists' and 'Structuralists' and 'Intentionalists' have not examined and offered views on all historical topics. Candidates should be discouraged for making reference to schools or types of history unless there is a meaningful and identified controversy about particular issues by named historians who can legitimately be associated with a school. While 'Structuralists' are certainly identifiable in the historiography of the Nazi period, they are less obviously prominent in the discussions about the Henrician Reformation or Lord Liverpool. Even where there have been schools of History, it is important to go to the actual arguments and evidence they used.

It would be unfair to dwell on the problem. Though centre marking tended to be more generous in this component of F965, there was much well- researched work which showed a developed critical sense and sustained analysis, sometimes going beyond what might be expected at A level. Also many centres assessed the Investigations realistically and noted the quality as well as the mere appearance of evaluative comment.

As this is the last full year of this paper, it is appropriate to thank many centred for their support of the component and for the considerable hard work and commitment in preparing candidates and marking the final pieces. The detailed comments have been invaluable to moderators in explaining the basis of the centres' assessment and the obvious time and trouble taken with internal standardisation have helped to ensure that a common standard has been established. The unit has produced some very strong work during its lifetime and teachers have used it to promote an understanding of the nature of historical evidence which will have been invaluable to future study.

F966/01 Historical Themes – Medieval and Early Modern 1066-1715

General comments

No rubric infringements were seen. Most candidates did not seem to have difficulty completing 2 essays in the time available. There was little evidence of candidates being rushed. Most encouragingly, candidates attempted to answer the question and most tried to be analytical. However, some candidates followed an analytical opening paragraph with a descriptive first paragraph and some resorted to narrative with bolted on simple analysis.

Candidates find it difficult to demonstrate synthesis clearly, and miss opportunities for synoptic assessment in the conclusion. More justification of the overall judgement is quite often needed and it would be helpful for Candidates if they worked on their conclusions, using it as an opportunity to demonstrate synthesis across the whole period and to qualify or support their initial hypothesis. Turning point questions seem to produce difficulties for some who find it difficult to compare possible turning points thematically. As has been stressed in previous reports, the mark scheme used for these type of questions is exactly the same as for the other questions and therefore a similar approach is required. Some abbreviations have crept in, especially POG for Pilgrimage of Grace, and TP, at times, for turning point. Candidates should be reminded that this is a formal examination and therefore abbreviations should be avoided and answers should be in formal, not text English. A number of candidates have real problems with Roman numerals, especially IV and VI.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Theme: English Government and the Church 1066–1216

Question 1

The best responses kept the focus on the link between the Crown's continental possessions and changes in government. They discussed whether the reign of Henry I was a turning point and selected pertinent themes as their measures. The most common alternative was the reign of Henry II. The question did tempt some candidates simply to narrate the story of changes, making weaker or stronger analytical links to the impact of continental possessions. Weaker responses omitted the reigns of William I and William II maintaining that they had no continental possessions. Some did not understand what was meant by the impact of continental possessions, whilst some weak answers described changes in government with little reference to the actual wording of the question.

Question 2

This was the least popular question in this section. Some responses tended to be chronological and have little sense of structure, or answers became more of a story of quarrels. Some drifted into why relations were characterised by conflict and often spent a great deal of time narrating particular quarrels. More successful answers often started from interpreting what 'characterised by conflict' entailed, and answered thematically. Most candidates were able to cover the period.

Question 3

On the whole, this essay was better answered than question 2, and candidates could see how they could structure their essays and develop an argument. There was a mixture of excellent answers with good synthesis and synoptic judgement, putting the relationship between kings and archbishops into its wider context of growing political power and aspiration of both institutions, and on the other hand, chronological accounts that failed to develop an argument. The main pitfall here was separating power of the church from power of the papacy. Some did

not see that the Investiture Contest was part of the growing power of the Church or thought that the only relevant factor was the growing personal power of the papacy. A few responses turned the question round to a previous question on 'relations between kings and archbishops of Canterbury determined the power of the church'. It is important that candidates answer the actual question set and do not simply use an essay that they have done in the past and hope that it fits the one set in the examination session.

Theme: Rebellion and Disorder under the Tudors 1485–1603

Question 4

This was probably the most popular question on the paper and attracted a complete range of responses. Unfortunately, there were a number of weaker responses which ignored the exact wording of the question and simply went through the causes of unrest, rather than focusing on the two named and required by the question – comments on other causes were not rewarded. Candidates who started from connecting the different origins of faction, and synthesizing the contributory causes of rebellion produced the most successful essays. Separating political faction from dynastic causes, succession causes and advisor causes and then considering religious causes often resulted in a very compartmentalised response. Candidates must read the question carefully. Many wasted much time considering tax or socio/economic rebellions with no consideration as to whether they were linked in any way to faction or religion and, although the question specified Tudor England, some candidates included Irish rebellions. The most common approach was to look at frequency of, and amount of support for, political faction and religious change in causing rebellion but some went on to discuss the impact of different sorts of rebellion in terms of, for example, threat to the crown and /or geographical extent.

Question 5

This was the least popular of the three questions in this section. Those who did it tended to have a good knowledge of Tyrone's rebellion and were able to analyse and evaluate its threat in relation to well-chosen criteria for what makes a rebellion threatening. While the best answers produced thematic, comparative evaluations using evidence from across the period and synthesising throughout the essay, less good responses dealt with rebellions individually, often asserting that Tyrone's was more, or less, threatening and lacking the necessary knowledge of Tyrone's rebellion to make the required comparisons. However, stronger answers were able to compare Tyrone with the dynastic unrest of Henry VII's reign that forced him into battle, and the threats to Mary Tudor from Northumberland/Lady Jane Grey and Wyatt.

Question 6

Although this question was quite popular, it attracted some of the weakest, as well as some of the best responses. At the lower end candidates often displayed little knowledge of local authorities and where there was some knowledge this was often descriptive in its nature. However, stronger answers displayed some impressive knowledge of the detail of local authorities. The best made the connection between local authority effectiveness and the ways in which the crown generated and encouraged local power and linked these to the ways in which specific rebellions were dealt with, or averted. However, some produced very descriptive essays, or essays based on generalisation about the powers of various local authorities and there was possibly too much attention to crown propaganda. Some made irrelevant reference to events in Ireland.

Theme: England's Changing Relations with Foreign Powers 1485–1603

Question 7

Most candidates went for a straightforward assessment of the list of factors, the better evaluating their significance as they went along. However, some were uncertain as to the named factor and wanted to discuss other reasons. Assured synthesis of the links between dynasty, succession, reputation, prosperity, national security and religion was well delivered by the best but supporting detail was not always strong, particularly on the reign of Elizabeth. It was

however encouraging to see a move away from the lengthy narrative answers which have often been characteristic of this topic.

Question 8

Although this was quite a popular question, it attracted some of the weakest responses as many struggled to adopt a thematic approach or to cover the whole period. Candidates tended to choose alternative turning points from the second half of the sixteenth century, typically 1558, 1560, 1572. This sometimes led to neglect of the earlier part of the period which limited some otherwise good responses and prevented synthesis or comparisons being made across the whole period. The best responses showed sufficiently deep knowledge of the significance of developments in France over the whole period to underpin their understanding of the question.

Question 9

Many candidates seemed to feel they had to decide definitively for Scotland or for Spain on this question which led to some convoluted argument or considerable omission to prove their chosen view. More successful answers looked at change over time, typically arguing that while Scotland was the greater threat for much of the time by second half of the sixteenth century it was Spain. There was some very convincing analysis integrating the discussion of relative threat throughout the period. Most were able to analyse and evaluate the Scottish threat in terms of the Auld Alliance. Some attempted to change the question into a turning point approach. Knowledge of the latter part of the period was often not strong, particularly from 1585 onwards and this impacted on how convincing the argument was. Some were also confused about Mary Queen of Scots and her links to France and the extent to which Spain would or would not be influenced by this.

Theme: The Catholic Reformation 1492–1610

Question 10

Many candidates tended to answer this question well. Most developed an effective argument and there tended to be good examples of synthesis. The question lent itself to synthesis – particularly comparison, and many candidates structured their essays effectively around different factors. However, the concept of typicality in terms of the sixteenth century papacy was a problem for some, leading to efforts to reconcile being an innovator with being overall typical or untypical. Those who defined at the outset the qualities of being typical tended to find the essay easier to handle. There were some very well informed scripts showing a good grasp of the relevant theology and a consideration of a wide range of popes.

Question 11

Some candidates found it difficult to confine their responses to secular rulers. The most common comparisons were with Philip II, Ferdinand and Isabella and Sigismund of Poland. The most effective essays were thematic with evaluative comparison within each theme and across the period. A number of candidates produced more descriptive answers with bolt on, sometimes asserted, comparison. Many essays were well structured and the best demonstrated a wide range of knowledge, effectively used. Most avoided including material relating to the church outside Europe.

Question 12

Candidates tended to disagree with the view, and some answers were quite unbalanced across the period, writing much more about one period than the other. Typical answers described difficulties on either side of 1564 without making the required comparison, preferring instead to adopt a descriptive approach and leaving comparison to the reader. Better answers thought about what made a difficulty more or less serious and used this to weigh up the two sides. The best identified the major continuities, organised the essay thematically and hit on the key changes accurately and with supporting evidence to produce a well-balanced conclusion. However, some candidates produced narrative accounts where it was very difficult to include synthesis.

Theme: The Development of the Nation State: France 1498–1610

Question 13

Knowledge and evaluation of the effectiveness of the reign of Henry IV was generally capably delivered. Much more variable was the quality of the comparison with earlier rulers, in particular weighing up their effectiveness in comparison to Henry IV. If a candidate started from what constituted effective rule in the context of the time comparisons tended to be better handled. Clearly the best compared and contrasted all kings from 1498-1610. Weaker answers adopted a chronological approach and /or omitted any but the most cursory mention of the kings between Henry II and Henry IV, thus failing to cover the period. Knowledge across the period was variable, with good detail on Francis I, Henry II and Henry IV showing the greatest depth, whilst Louis XII and the later Valois rulers were often treated in a superficial or generalised manner.

Question 14

Some candidates limited themselves by arguing exclusively for helped or hindered – but some really good responses successfully produced a balanced evaluation. The question seemed to tempt a few candidates to reel out all they knew about forces that helped/hindered the development of France rather than confining themselves to evaluation of the nobility's role. Most answers included evidence from across the period, although the role of the nobility during the Wars of Religion did tend to dominate.

Question 15

There was a tendency to stray from the focus of the question and analyse how religion in general destabilised the nation state of France. Other pitfalls were to neglect consideration of the Catholic Church as a stabiliser, thus producing an unbalanced answer, or to fail to consider 'consistently'. Few candidates displayed really comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the factors impinging on this question.

Theme: The Ascendancy of France 1610–1715

Question 16

There were some quite limited, descriptive answers, and even some more analytical ones, focused on the growth of French absolutism rather than limitations on royal authority. However, there were some really knowledgeable analyses, thematically handled and dealing well with change over time and leading to very good synoptic assessment. Those who adopted a thematic approach were more successful than those that looked at the reigns of the two monarchs.

Question 17

This question produced a marked mixture of responses, with some exceptionally strong answers seen which displayed a very impressive range of detailed knowledge, which was well used. However, in some instances the question was not well handled as candidates did not have enough in depth knowledge to answer effectively and relied on much generalisation. However, some candidates effectively identified the key factors that must be considered if the contribution to the growth of the economy is to be measured analytically. Responses that started from the factors, discussing comparisons, worked better than responses starting from the ministers. Most candidates focused on Richelieu and Colbert with a little on Mazarin.

Question 18

Many candidates struggled with this turning point question. They tended to run through a list of turning points explaining the significance of each rather than comparing and contrasting events to the Treaty of the Pyrenees, or they constructed a narrative of various turning points with comparison bolted on, often as assertion. However, some candidates displayed wide ranging knowledge and there were some interesting approaches, which went beyond pure foreign policy in discussing the factors which could be defined as creating a turning point, including economic factors which allowed France to build up her army in order to wage war effectively.

F966/02 Historical Themes – Modern 1789-1997 – Late

General Comments

Generally, the candidates for this summer's Historical Themes paper (Option B: Modern 1789-1997) performed at a level which was in line with that achieved by those in previous years. Most appeared to understand what the demands of the examination are and were aware of the assessment objectives. Many now seem to realise that to achieve marks in the higher Levels on the generic mark scheme there has to be a consistent focus on synthesising material, the formulation of well-structured arguments and the making of synoptic judgements. Subsequently there were many good to very good responses marked at Level II or above and relatively few that fell into the lowest Levels.

However, some examiners commented that they felt disappointed that some issues flagged up in reports in recent years had not been addressed. In particular these concerned the dumping of factual material, a lack of unpacking of questions (and, subsequently, weak focus) and signposting.

Assessment objective A01a continued to be misconstrued by some. A significant number of responses revealed a vast range of relevant and interesting factual material but it was not always used consistently to support arguments. Assessment objective A01a is not designed to test an ability to memorise; it is in place to get candidates to give careful consideration to the accurate deployment of historical evidence (however that might be defined). Thus, in a significant number of cases, answers consisted of an 'aerial bombardment' of scripts with information. This invariably resulted in drift from the exact demands of the questions. In such instances responses were considered to be 'on the topic' and did 'not address the question set'. Hence, it was not possible for such answers to reach higher than Level V even though they may have been quite lengthy and detailed.

In connection to the dumping of knowledge were the variable approaches seen to the unpacking of questions. With respect to question analysis, candidates are expected to: identify (and understand) the command stems; interpret and define key words; focus on the topic. Many did not do this and appeared to gloss over or misinterpret questions. For example, the command stem 'assess the reasons' should lead candidates to structuring arguments to reach a judgement about the relative importance of relevant factors. A more usual format witnessed was where factors were listed, described and loosely linked back to questions via asserted statements. Key terms and words such as social, economic (note, not economical), political, cultural, government, nationalism, strategy, tactics, aims, effectiveness and development were frequently loosely interpreted or completely misunderstood.

Signposting or merely stating the language of change and continuity has become more widespread. Unfortunately, candidates who use such terminology fail to expand and support the statements they make. For example, the assertion that Lenin was similar to Nicholas II with respect to the governance of Russia as they both adopted an authoritarian based ideology does not constitute synthesis. Equally, a nod to comparison at the end of a paragraph is unlikely to equate to sustained synthesis. Candidates need to think hard about how best to show patterns of change and continuity and synthesis; often, inappropriate criteria for measurement and/or comparison was witnessed which resulted at best in uneven, disjointed responses.

There was less of a feeling that past questions were being answered. However, overview type introductions were less prevalent, though the best answers did give an immediate comparison between the start and end of a period, so introducing the concept of change or continuity.

Similarly, quite often endings were too short, thereby negating attempts at balanced judgements; the more skilfully crafted responses did cross-evaluate issues over time before reaching a pointed judgement at the end.

Finally the correct use of historical language and the quality of essay writing in general has deteriorated. The inappropriate use of abbreviations continues to appear; some candidates persisted in using (for example) 'AA' for African Americans, 'NA' for 'Native Americans', 'PG' for 'Provisional Government' and govt. for government, all the way through (and there were many other examples seen by examiners). Candidates need to reflect on what an essay would be like if this approach was taken to an extreme. Such responses would become unreadable and, although candidates are not penalised for using abbreviations, they need to understand that by doing so they may not be providing evidence that they really understand the fundamentals of the topics being examined. This also applies to the correct use of spelling, punctuation and grammar. Also, too many essays now have no clear introduction which sets the scene and outlines the main line of argument to be taken. Candidates all too frequently jump straight into their answers; this gives the impression that they have not given due consideration to what questions demand and how answers might be framed around balanced argument.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Key Theme: The Challenge of German Nationalism 1789–1919

Question 1

Answers to this question were mainly characterised by blow-by-blow accounts of the achievements of leaders (mainly Metternich, Bismarck and Wilhelm II in that order). Such approaches invariably resulted in chronological surveys. Very few responses actually compared and contrasted Metternich with others, unless doing so at the very end. Knowledge used as evidence was usually of very good quality but analysis and evaluation were weakened by the lack of genuine synthesis. Hence, some answers suffered because of an overload of knowledge and a lack of discrimination when using factual material to support arguments. Bismarck was generally seen as the best manager of German nationalism (a concept not always well defined). Wilhelm II the worst, with the war of 1914-18 given as evidence for this claim. Metternich was seen as struggling to contain incipient German nationalism. Occasionally, Napoleon and Ebert were mentioned. Management was viewed as embracing such diverse areas as different social groups and different regions, cultural and literary manifestations of nationalism, the economy (above all growing industrialisation), Prussian ambitions, later social pressures, demands for colonialism, militarism, the drive towards unification and its consequences once achieved. However, no matter how in-depth and thematic some answers appeared to be this did not compensate for a lack of synthesis across the whole period if higher level marks were to be awarded.

Question 2

Some chronological, listing type answers were seen but, in the main, candidates adopted a more thematic route. This facilitated a focus on reasons for the growth in German nationalism (and not extent, which a fair few drifted towards discussing). Knowledge was often very full and used quite effectively. That said, as with answers to question one, there was frequently an 'all I know about' approach adopted by many. There were some very solid answers witnessed, but features included not as much stress on the issues of Kleindeutschland and Grossdeutschland as might have been expected. There was also a lack of appreciation of the debate over democratic as opposed to authoritarian governance and a tendency to argue for change rather than continuity after 1890. There was some attempt to distinguish between different types of nationalism (romantic, cultural, economic, social and political) but this approach was not always that 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 then were seen to be: to

oppose the French; unification; European military domination; colonial expansion. Some wrote about the aim of making Germany more unified still after 1870-1. Some spent much time on aims in the First World War or in 1919. However, 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 on the period that followed.

Question 3

This attracted a mix of chronologically-based answers and those that were much more thematic, the latter usually receiving greater rewards. Evidence tended to be used more selectively in answering this question. The biggest issue for candidates was with the concept of 'never united'. Quite often essays were divided chronologically into two sections; 1871-1919 and 1789-1870. If a thematic approach was adopted, it was usually still often based on the two periods. Rarely was there any significant attempt to compare and contrast the two periods together, closely and directly, resulting in a lack of even and complete synthesis across the whole period. Stronger candidates were able to assess political, cultural, linguistic, confessional and regional issues (with particularism often handled well) as well as those of an economic and social nature (classes, North-South differences). However, to emphasise, too often the answers created presented two blocks of time without the necessary close comparative analysis of the features within each.

Key Theme: The Changing Nature of Warfare 1792–1945

Question 4

Candidates still find discerning between strategy and tactics problematic; examiners acknowledged that divorcing strategy from tactics is challenging and took this into consideration when making their assessments. However, given the nature of the Key Theme and the longevity of the paper, it was expected that most would have understood the differences and connections between the two concepts. Examiners tend to adopt the view that 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, for example, trench warfare was commonly seen as a strategy; this may have been the case in, say, Virginia in 1864 but it certainly was not in 1914. Some candidates appeared to have pre-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, besides, were often not articulated clearly enough. Again, as with answers to questions on other Key Themes, many offered sequential narratives with limited comparisons. For many, not much changed before 1914 and, when it did, change was driven by technology. Overall, too many answers described events without thinking carefully about the concept of change and continuity.

Question 5

With this question the inclusion of the term 'organisation of armies' put a premium on how well responses should have been structured. Providing there was a fundamental grasp of the changing scale of warfare, candidates were able to score at least reasonable marks. Unfortunately, weaker candidates failed to compare the earlier and later wars effectively and missed obvious opportunities to focus on 'organisation'. This was especially true for World War One (for example, the Schlieffen Plan) and World War Two (for example, either the Western or Eastern fronts, or both). Command structures, corps, training and real warfare formations featured heavily in many answers. There were also some references to generalship, strategy and tactics, communications and weaponry. But even where such criteria was used in an

attempt to measure developments there was still a tendency to drift towards describing what happened rather than analysing the extent to which there was change or continuity.

Question 6

Several candidates took it for granted that superior weaponry won wars; quite a number cited the use of the Atomic bomb in 1945 as proof of this. Better answers recognised that the question asked about 'in battle' rather than 'in war', and so there were pertinent references to Balaclava, Koniggratz, Sedan and some of the World War battles. Arguments presented tended to focus on: when and where superior weapons proved invaluable; when and where of weaponry was of little use since troops were unfamiliar with it; where weaponry could be ineffectual due to the fact that it was experimental. Some responses were weakened by paying too much attention to the end of the period and, therefore, not showing even synthesis across the whole time span. Again, descriptive answers prevailed; a significant number of essays provided copious amounts of detail about firepower, the technical specifications of guns and artillery (including tanks), the effects of developing weaponry and links with industrialisation. Interestingly, few paid attention to aircraft deployment. The very best answers displayed range over time, place and the key words (superior weapons). Some candidates considered other factors linked to weaponry that may have contributed to success in battles: generalship, strategy and tactics, resources and economic growth. Such responses reined in pure description and narrative and instead used knowledge carefully to support well considered analytical arguments.

Key Theme: Britain and Ireland 1798–1921

Question 7

The majority of candidates focused on Constitutional Nationalism, though a few tried to write a comparison with Revolutionary Nationalism and quite a number used the latter as a vehicle to assess the changes that came after 1916. Synthesis was quite rare; more often listing of potential turning points, omitting comparison, was the norm. Those who did synthesise were able to assess and evaluate more carefully and reach more supported judgements. Quite often the named factor of the Home Rule Bill of 1886 was either over-developed or under-developed. A common feature was a focus on leaders in as much depth as key events or periods. Quite a number of candidates strayed into arguing that active participants in the Easter Rising (for example, De Valera) were Constitutional Nationalists and that the 1918 election victory was a victory for Constitutional Nationalism rather than a crushing defeat. Of the obvious leaders, Redmond was generally underplayed; Dillon was hardly mentioned, O'Connell, Parnell and Butt discussed at length. Some candidates ended up with a leader-by-leader approach, listing them and their actions (and contexts), somewhat limiting the degree of synthesis that could be achieved. Some responses wrote a rather standard response based on leadership, methods, strategy and tactics, support and appeal. The heavy emphasis placed on the role of leaders by some tended to distract from the implication of the question which was an assessment of the relative importance of events in the development of Constitutional Nationalism.

Question 8

Most candidates made a reasonable attempt at answering this question but often showing some lack of breadth and depth. Quite a deal was written about the immediate years before 1914 and about the effects of 1916-18. Some just focused on 1886 and after. Description of events was a feature of many responses, usually accompanied by limited analysis. The crisis years of 1912-14 were handled well enough by most but in isolation and without comparative evaluation. Religious changes usually figured although the rise of other social groups at the expense of the Protestant Ascendancy was not much considered. Other developments that would have been useful to explore such as Catholic middle class attitudes, corresponding responses from Protestant lower and middle classes, changes in local government and fluctuations in the attitudes and actions of

Westminster governments, were largely ignored. Probably the most concerning feature of many essays was the lack of coverage of the whole period: a number simply petered out after 1914.

Question 9

Some solid answers were read that displayed a good array of knowledge of economic developments over time. A few focused excessively on the Great Famine and the years after it when the Land Acts were passed; this was surprising as it is an issue that has been flagged up in previous reports on papers where questions on the Irish economy appeared. Some were able to evaluate a range of key issues such as: the prevalence of an undeveloped economy early on; regional similarities and differences (between North and South); agrarian and industrial change; degrees of poverty; wealth creation through trade (both within the British Isles and the Empire). All too often, though, such range was lacking. Often topic coverage spanned only from c.1845 to c.1903 or even before.

Key Theme: Russia and its Rulers 1855–1964

Question 10

Some candidates found this question problematic as they were unable to provide a clear picture of what they understood to be Russian society. Thus, there were a great many responses that identified a range of social, economic and political challenges but that did not show how they impacted on Russian society as a whole. Better responses did demonstrate how the peoples of Russia were affected by arguing that, for example, improvements in living and working conditions were achieved when there was greater political representation but worsened when leaders used more repressive tools to govern. Such answers were also characterised by balanced comment (that is, by stressing that some leaders did have a positive impact on solving problems). Candidates were usually able to identify a range of social problems with much written about different social groups (nearly always peasants and workers), housing provision, public health problems, hours of work, the new work discipline and education. Some well-informed answers also included material on religion. However, although many showed an ability to assimilate relevant material those who could apply it to analysing the effectiveness of policies of leaders were in a minority. This question perfectly illustrated how many candidates have been drilled to use the language of change and continuity but simply state it rather than develop it. To argue that, in this case, one leader was more effective than another required explanation and support (evidence) and not simply a statement of comparison.

Question 11

Some very good answers were seen to this question; the best offered a comparative evaluation of the role of different leaders and governments using a range of criteria. A significant number, though, simply listed rulers and described what they did. In addition, as ever, quite a number of essays included large sections on the economy and society when, of course, the focus of the question was on government. Those candidates who did better did try to assess political and governmental areas (namely, ideologies, political authority and power, structures, parties, representation and constitutions). Repression (force, propaganda and censorship in particular) as tools of government were heavily focused on. Reforms also reared their head but far too often answers failed to show how economic and social policies could be construed as part of the nature of government. A small number of candidates assessed the issue and relevance of national minorities. Some candidates appeared to answer a previous question about the role of wars in shaping developments in government. Others got into difficulty over the origins, role and demise of the Provisional Government. The latter, when it was discussed, tended to be summarily dismissed for being short-lived thus making an estimation of the true significance of Lenin and October Revolution very difficult. The consequent tendency was to try to argue that there was a high degree of continuity between Nicholas II's regime and Bolshevik rule as both were authoritarian in nature. The very best answers, however, saw October as ending a

liberalizing trend that had begun in 1905 (if not before, under Alexander II), and reached its apogee under the Provisional Government. Many candidates, however, simply dismissed the Duma period as a continuation of autocracy. This is another example of where more critical, thoughtful approach would have reaped benefits.

Question 12

There were many strong or very strong answers were witnessed to this question. These had well developed synthesis across the whole period and evaluation of a range of aims. However, there was often a drift away from the exact demands of the question resulting in comments that focused on methods used by leaders to rule. Those revealing a solid, comparative structure considered motivations for improvement (to catch up with the west, modernization, strengthening of world status) alongside the preservation of regime, and ideological imperatives. Most did assess a range of political, economic and social issues that leaders needed to address to strengthen their power. Areas and aspects that featured heavily were: living and working conditions of peasants and workers (health, housing, welfare, food, diet, nutrition working hours, pay levels, educational opportunities), political rights and freedoms, repressive controls, subsistence farming, famines and, in general, the extent of improvement in these areas over the period. Often material linked to these issues was used effectively to argue that power was strengthened by paying attention to how the issues could best be dealt with. Pleasingly, a good number of candidates considered the aims of rulers with respect to other social groups especially the aristocracy, middle classes, national minorities, youth and women.

Key Theme: Civil Rights in the USA 1865–1992

Question 13

The Black Panthers received variable treatment; some knew much about the origins, make-up, ideology and achievements of the group, others less so. No candidate wrote exclusively about them with a range of other factors adduced for purposes of comparison. However, many candidates listed factors without any attempt at showing the extent to which they were linked (or not). Where synthesis was apparent, it was usually confined to coverage of the role of Federal and State governments (the latter was a pleasing feature of a good number of answers). Quite a number of potentially good answers drifted too much into the positives, the help factors towards civil rights, often at the expense of the hinder factors. This made for imbalance and, at times, meant some candidates appeared to be answering a rather different question. In most cases, the question elicited a thematic approach with discussion of the role of the government – presidents and judiciary especially – and popular anti-civil rights movements (regional factors tended to be underplayed though). Some did deal with opposition and problems facing the advancement of civil rights but rather too briefly before moving on to extended assessments of how civil rights were gained and causes were furthered. Where opposition and resistance were dealt with, often there was reasonable coverage of the Ku Klux Klan and other white supremacist groups. That said, usually the focus was much more on Presidents, Congress and the Supreme Court. There was a tendency to follow a chronological approach in many (of the weaker) answers. The best responses did build thematically and were able to contrast opposition areas and issues, and discuss shifts towards more cooperation, help and improvement. Some pointed out, quite correctly, how far by 1992 there were still features of opposition and certainly discrimination.

Question 14

A great deal of relevant knowledge was evident in answers to this question though many focused exclusively on the twentieth century. Some (unfortunately, a minority) candidates were able to write successfully about the relevance of the Plains Wars, the Dawes Act (and related legislation) as well as socio-political trends. The American Indian Movement (AIM) usually received full treatment and assessment but all too often there was a ready tendency to list key

events and the actions of other groups which tended to blunt the quality of evaluation. Also, there was some confusion over what AIM was actually involved in. For many candidates the question was about 'turning points' rather than 'factors'; hence there was often discussion alternative turning-points to the 1960s and 1970s (the Nixon era) which typically included 1928, 1934 (and the New Deal era in general) and the 1950s. In general the period before 1924 was dealt with less effectively and in a more shallow fashion than the later years. Where a more factor based argument was adopted, the common themes used were either specific (for example, policy areas such as termination, leadership, recourse to pressure group activities, self-belief) or general (for example, political, legal, economic, social, educational issues). Either approach could have successfully led to a structure based on comparison and the analysis of links between factors which might have been rewarded with higher level marks. Unfortunately, many who adopted a factor based answer drifted towards describing what happened rather than evaluating the relative importance of the factors. Another feature of some essays was to provide an answer around the overarching of ideas of 'help or hinder'; this did not always serve the candidate well as it meant the exact demands of the question were not fully met. In all, this was a very popular choice but was often answered very mechanically with a rather ready dismissal of 1924 and 1934, approval of the 1970s and a few other notable occurrences thrown in. The best answers, inevitably, were those that offered a synopsis and synthesis of the whole period based on valid criteria.

Question 15

There were many well informed responses to this question although often with an over concentration on the twentieth century. It was rare to find much comment pre-1900 era. When it was evident was it tended to be on the Comstock Law of 1873, the position of women in employment, the family and household status, the absence of the vote, the notion of 'separate spheres'; all of these reference points could have been useful but in a number of cases they were discussed in a very woolly manner. Quite often coverage was limited purely to the twentieth century and to certain phases (1920s, 1960s and 1970s above all). Most answers did try a thematic approach and this, of course, worked better than one based on chronological blocks of time and description. Often dividing factors were set against unity factors; thus there was much discussion contextual issues, leadership, socio-economic influences, attitudes (including from federal authorities as well as employers), the effects of the World Wars, prohibition, the vote, employment, abortion, property rights and feminism. The material on these aspects was generally well handled and resulted in some very strong answers but, as alluded to earlier, many candidates struggled to provide a balanced coverage of the whole period. The very best answers identified different strands of gender equality and compared the different groups of women with regards to their aims, methods and how this affected unity. Most argued that women were much divided in support of the issue of equality and lots of knowledge was deployed to support arguments.

Key Theme: The Development of Democracy in Britain 1868–1997

Question 16

It was refreshing to witness some excellent answers to the questions set on this Theme in general. With respect to this question there was a substantial number of well-informed answers that covered the whole period using high level synthesis. Nearly all those answering the question showed a good level of knowledge and understanding about the changing nature of the franchise and how this affected the three main parties in different ways. Discussion of the named factor was, in the main, done with reference to the significance of other factors such as the economic and social context and the growth of the media. Most provided well planned, balanced essays with relatively few resorting to pure narrative and/or description.

Question 17

Of the three questions this was the least popular but those who did answer it revealed that they had a firm grasp of the main concept stated (electoral methods). Most were able to compare developments in 1872-1885 with those in other parts of the time span before arriving at a balanced judgement. Thus, there was much effective discussion of developments such as the Ballot Act of 1872, the Corrupt Practices Act of 1883 and the Third Reform Act of 1884 in comparison to the limitations of such developments including influence of the mass media, the role of local governments, local activism and the management of parties. Generally, answers were of a good quality and many were given marks at the higher Levels.

Question 18

On the whole candidates answered this question with a good amount of knowledge, understanding and skill. The very best offered a balanced evaluation of educational changes against other factors. Most included analysis of the motives, content and impact of key legislation (for example, Forster's Act of 1870, Balfour's Act of 1902 and Butler's Act of 1944) and other developments concerning curriculum change, the organisation of schools and educational ideologies. These developments were then usually compared with other factors related to the economy, the rise of the mass media, pressure group activity, party competition and the impact of wars. The majority of responses attempted synthesis across the whole period and were notable for avoiding generalised, woolly comment which has, in the past, been a characteristic of answers to similar questions on this topic.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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

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

© OCR 2016

