

History A

Advanced GCE A2 H506

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H106

Report on the Units

June 2009

HX06/MS/R/09J

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses 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 syllabus 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 2009

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

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

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE History (H506)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE History (H106)

REPORT ON THE UNITS

Unit/Content	Page
Chief Examiner Report	1
Principal Examiner's Report F961 and F962	2
F961 British History Period studies	5
F962 European and World History Period Studies	16
F963 British History Enquiries and F964 European and World History Enquiries	26
Grade Thresholds	68

Chief Examiner Report

How pleasing it is to write that, after a rather disappointing set of results in the January 2009 assessment, Centres have taken on board the advice proffered in the Principal Examiners' Reports and given out in various Inset meetings. The quality of candidates' work was much improved in terms of knowledge, understanding and skills. Though few candidates attained Level IA, many candidates satisfied the AO objectives for Levels IB and II. As a result more than 20 per cent of AS candidates gained an A grade and 94 per cent achieved E or higher grades. It is also worth highlighting two key features in the present AS reports. Firstly, that most Period Studies' candidates need to acquire a stronger grasp of factual knowledge, both in depth and accuracy. Secondly, that Centres should avoid teaching the Enquiries unit to a formula; candidates need to respond to the sources and questions set and not give a pre-determined 'stock' answer. If these suggestions are put into practice, there is every prospect that standards will continue to rise.

UNIT	Number of Candidates	Mean Mark	Maximum Mark
961/01	4210	58	100
961/02	4813	57	100
962/01	1121	54	100
962/02	4898	57	100
963/01	2483	55	100
963/02	3808	60	100
964/01	1744	59	100
964/02	7330	60	100

The size of candidature – in excess of 15,000 - demonstrates that there has been considerable continuity between Centres who entered for the Legacy papers and those embarking on the new Specification. Of course, several changes have taken place in the AS Levels, some of which were noted in the January report, and it is now appropriate to remind Centres of the key changes that will take place at A2 Level. Firstly, Coursework has been divided into two components, Investigations and Interpretations, both of which will be internally assessed and available for submission in January and May. Secondly, the number of options in the Themes paper has been reduced, the content of most topics has been revised, the length of the assessment increased to 2 hours and the Insert table of developments and events will no longer be available for candidates to use during the exam. These new arrangements come into operation in January 2010.

Principal Examiner's Report F961 and F962

General Comments

The number of candidates who entered the first major session of this examination was very similar to those who were previously entered for the Legacy Units 2583-6. This makes comparisons with the Legacy paper possible, particularly as the nature and type of questions set remained the same. Centres could look back at previous Principal Examiner reports for specific advice on what is understood and expected by the various command words used. Examiners also commented that the examination was appropriate for the ability range of the candidates. However, it must be remembered that in the new unit candidates did two questions on the same topic area, whereas on the old legacy paper, although they did two essays, one was British and one was European. The number of candidates for each component was very similar, although Unit F962/01 did attract significantly fewer entries than the other components, which saw little discrepancy between entries. It was noticeable that new Key Issues and Topics attracted fewer answers than the traditional topics that had been present on the Legacy paper and there are particular topics where comments about the need to ensure equal coverage of all Key Issues has been highlighted in the Question Specific comments to ensure that candidates have a choice of questions. At this point, it is also worth stressing that questions will be set that test more than one Key Issue and that there is no intention of allowing a pattern to develop when setting questions; for example centres should not be surprised to see that no question was set on Pitt, but two on Peel. This does not mean that Pitt is not seen as important or that Peel is seen as very important, but simply that we are determined to avoid question spotting. This also means that all three questions **could** be drawn from the first half of the Key Issues or the last half, again emphasising the importance of teaching all of the Study Topic.

It would be a great help to examiners if Centres could instruct candidates to start each answer on a new page, thus leaving sufficient room for comments about each Assessment objective to be made after the answer and not squeezed into a line.

Comments from examiners about the standard of work seen suggests that there was a slight decline in the quality of answers seen and that this was particularly noticeable at the top end of the range where there fewer answers in the top bands. It is till too early to say whether this was the result of candidates having to do two questions and most did appear to cope with little disparity between the first and second essay. In fact, there were a number of occasions where it appeared that because candidates had not left themselves half the time to write a second answer they produced a response that was more focused on the demands of the question and therefore achieved a higher mark. However, most centres appeared to have advised their candidates well on the use of time and most appeared to spend equal time on each question and there were few who failed to complete a second answer. However, it was noticeable that there were an increased number of rubric infringements with candidates answering all three questions from their area of study and it would certainly benefit candidates if they were reminded of the rubric on a regular basis before the examination. Although examiners mark all three questions and award the best two marks, candidates are disadvantaging themselves by spreading their time more thinly on questions.

One of the most significant changes for the new specification was the introduction of the new mark scheme. The new mark scheme required examiners to make two separate assessments, in broad terms this meant that one mark was awarded for relevant factual knowledge and one for the quality of analysis. Examiners were under clear instruction that they did not have to give the same level for each assessment objective being tested and this was clearly seen in practice. Where there was a different level awarded the most common difference was one band, but two or more was not uncommon. Many examiners commented that candidates tended to score more heavily on AO1b and, perhaps as expected, there was bunching of marks in the middle bands,

but with very few very weak answers. The introduction of the new mark scheme was commented upon favourably by many examiners as it did allow candidates to be rewarded for the precise skills that they had demonstrated and also those candidates who were able to display a good factual knowledge without necessarily having high analytical skills were also rewarded. Centres should also pay attention to the word 'judgement', in many ways this is similar to 'evaluation' of factors on the legacy specification, however on the legacy mark scheme evaluation became tied up with the ranking and prioritising of factors, which was not always appropriate for every question. However, the word judgement is, and at the very top levels candidates will be making judgements in every paragraph about importance or success etc. Those candidates who limit their judgement to a well developed conclusion are likely to be awarded Level II for AO1b, whilst those who explain reasons without making supported judgements will be awarded Level III. Given this, many candidates could enhance their performance by a good, full conclusion which focuses on the demands of the question.

It was noticeable that the level of factual knowledge of many candidates was disappointing and this was reflected in the large number of candidates who scored higher marks on AO1b. There were many candidates who were broadly aware of the knowledge required for their chosen topic but did not know the evidence in detail and this also had an impact on the level achieved on AO1b as they were unable to discuss issues at higher levels and show a detailed understanding of the issues involved. There were a significant number of essays that contained little more than assertive or unsupported comments and centres do need to ensure that candidates support ideas with precise and relevant details. Centres would be well advised to pay attention to the advice given at the INSET meetings on Raising Standards and Teaching Approaches last year when strategies to improve factual knowledge, such as timelines, card sorting exercises and graphs were discussed and examples provided.

As expected, the higher level answers addressed the questions asked and made judgements or evaluative comments throughout and supported their ideas with relevant and accurate factual material; this is certainly a requirement of A grade answers. It was however disappointing to see a large number of 'tutored' or 'pre-learnt' answers from centres being reproduced, even if the wording of the question set was slightly different and it would be a great pity if this practise was encouraged by the new examination. In many instances candidates who adopted this approach did not adapt their material to the demands of the question and did not achieve the levels they could have done, whereas it was refreshing to see candidates adopt a personal response and this frequently resulted in high levels being achieved. Although there were still a number of candidates who produced the classic Band III 'list' approach of explained factors this appeared to be rather less in evidence and many candidates appeared more willing to attempt to make judgements and assess the relative importance of factors. There were still instances of 'bolt on' analysis, where candidates simply assert that a factor was or was not important at the end of a paragraph without explaining why they think this in the rest of the answer; this approach will not allow candidates to access the higher levels in AO1b. In many instances, candidates could improve their performance by producing a good introduction which outlined the criteria they were going to use to assess issues such as success or failure and then sticking to it throughout the essay.

There is still a tendency for some candidates to think that an awareness of schools of thought or historiography constitutes an argument and questions where this approach was particularly noticeable are mentioned in the Question Specific part of the report. In many cases we were simply told 'X says that, y says that', but not what the candidate thought, yet that is what we want to know. Candidates need to know that the above approach is descriptive and will therefore achieve only the lower levels. Descriptions of schools of thought are rarely more than implicitly relevant or helpful. However, genuine application of historiographical knowledge is always valuable, but it is **not** a requirement of AS and candidates can still achieve full marks without using it. Some candidates similarly have started to make use of counterfactual history and attempt to speculate. Given the lack of time to develop these ideas, this tends to result in little more than an assertion of possibilities, which again will gain little credit.

Although candidates should be encouraged to plan their essays there were a number who took this to extremes and produced plans that were virtually as long as their essay and obviously took a significant amount of time. It might be suggested that candidates should spend about five minutes planning each answer and that their plan should be a list of ideas that they intend to develop during the essay and not a list of facts about the topic that they feel they must use, regardless of the question. Candidates should also be encouraged to focus on the key words and phrases in the question and there were many who did not do this. This affected their ability to show that they really understood the demands of the question. Once again, centres would be well advised practising this skill during the course of the year and encouraging candidates to underline or highlight the key words on the exam question.

Examiners did comment on the quality of written English and the legibility of some scripts. It would be fair to say that the standard of English was variable and centres do need to remind candidates that this is a formal examination and therefore formal writing styles are expected, and abbreviations should not be used. Literacy was an issue for some with the continued misuse of the apostrophe, 'economical' for economic, no grasp of the concept of paragraphs and poor spelling of names and terminology that are key to the topics they have studied. Legibility was a bigger problem than usual and again centres and candidates should be reminded of the instructions on the front of the question paper about the need to write in black ink. It is also important that handwriting is sufficiently large enough for examiners to be able to read and centres do need to take greater responsibility for the legibility of their candidates and apply for the use of a word processor where required.

It would also be greatly appreciated if candidates who did use a Word Processor used a font of size 12 and had one and half or double line spacing so that examiners have sufficient room to make their annotations. It was also noticed that many candidates wrote more than eight sides and again it would be appreciated if centres used 12 page answer booklets as this would do away with the need for treasury tags as often extra pages are inserted in the wrong place.

F961 British History Period studies

F961/01

From Anglo-Saxon England to Norman England 1035-1087

1. This was quite popular, but many candidates were unclear as to the term 'importance.' Some candidates took this to mean either 'significance' or 'prominence' and at times this resulted in some of the evidence presented being tangential. However, it was noticeable that many candidates did know a great deal about the Godwin family, although some answers focused almost exclusively on the first part of the period and wrote little about events after 1051. Many candidates were aware that Godwin had become powerful because of his relationship with Cnut, but there were fewer who were aware that his large number of sons also increased his importance. Most were able to comment about his importance in securing the succession for Edward, but often went on to argue that this influence was sustained throughout the period. The marriage of Edward to Edith was usually considered and better answers also assessed the significance of the Godwin possession of Wessex, however there was little reference to the significance of Winchester. Many were able to argue that Edward's power was undermined by the Godwin family. The promotion of Godwin's sons was considered as was the brief exile of the family and their swift return to a dominant position, but the significance of these events could often have been further developed.

Weaker answers simply tried to relate the well-known episodes of the period to the question, rather than focusing on the precise demands of the question.

2. This was a popular question which attracted a wide range of responses. Weaker answers tended to focus on the relative strength of each claim to the throne in 1066, but many of these answers were very general and tended to focus on the topic rather than the actual question set. This usually involved a survey of the relative claims of Harold, William, Harald Hardrada and Edgar the Aethling. There was also a tendency for many answers to adopt a shopping list approach and simply list Edward's faults. These answers largely focused on the lack of a male heir, not nominating a successor or nominating too many successors. In many instances, better answers focused on Anglo-Saxon affairs rather than simply the claims per se. Candidates frequently considered Edward's failure to consummate his marriage, the apparent confusion surrounding Edward's arrangements for the succession. There were very few answers that dealt with Edward's decision to bring Edward Ironside's son, Edward, together with his family, back to England from Hungary. This was a significant omission since it may have represented a compromise between the Godwin family and Edward to avoid the possibility of the throne falling into the hands of Duke William of Normandy.

Some answers gave too much attention to the Battle of Hastings, with a description of the course of the battle and William's role in it. However, the nature of the question did allow many candidates to rank the relative importance of the different factors.

3. There were a significant number of answers to this question, although there were very few candidates who were able to produce high level answers. Many responses were little more than a list of the revolts either by location, time or place. There were often some very simplistic conclusions based around the fact that because William survived the rebellions they could not have been very serious. Candidates need to be aware that just because William handled the revolts effectively it did not mean that they were not serious. It was also noticeable that many answers contained either serious factual errors on dates or those involved in the rebellions or failed to deal with many of the rebellions and focused

almost exclusively on the Exeter rising and the 'Harrying of the North.' Better answers avoided a chronological approach and adopted a more thematic approach and considered issues such as the power of William, the weakness of the opposition, the lack of co-ordination between rebel groups and William's tactics. Some candidates argued that William was fortunate in that much of the Anglo-Saxon aristocracy had been wiped out at Hastings and that this seriously undermined attempts at rebellion. Many candidates would have benefited from giving greater consideration to the threat posed by Edgar after Hastings and also the 1075 rebellion, which was frequently ignored or treated in a superficial manner and seen as insignificant.

Lancastrians, Yorkists and Tudors 1450-1509

4. Many candidates found this question challenging, often struggling to address the factors and as a result produced answers that were largely narrative. There were a handful of candidates who wrote about the whole period in the question, ie they wrote about Edward IV's first reign and this took them away from factors such as the weakness of Henry VI as a political and military leader, the pernicious influence of faction in the 1450s, the role of Margaret of Anjou and the ambition of Richard of York; the key factors which would help to form a strong answer. There were also a number of candidates who focused excessively on the period before 1450 and recounted in detail the events of the minority at the expense of the real focus. There were also answers that restricted their answers to the 'weakness of Henry VI', but better answers discussed this alongside other factors before reaching a judgement. Some also argued that Henry chose to marry Margaret and that a stronger personality might have handled York and Warwick more effectively. It was also noticeable that there were a number of answers that were generalised with little precise supporting detail.
5. There were a number of candidates who got confused between the two reigns and this resulted in some very confused attempts at analysis, whereas stronger answers compared the two reigns effectively. The better answers to this question adopted a thematic approach considering issues such as Edward's relationship with the nobility, foreign policy and finance and ensured that there were cogent references to both the 1460s and 1470s in each paragraph. Some candidates wrote less well about the financial aspects, for example there were statements asserting the finance through the Chamber was better than through the Exchequer without explaining why this should be so. In dealing with the nobility, Warwick and Clarence tended to dominate answers, although better answers often made reference to the use of Richard of Gloucester, Buckingham and Hastings to control troublesome areas. The question of the Woodville marriage attracted considerable attention, but the difficulty of the succession in 1483 less so. Although an equal balance between the periods was not essential, it was vital that candidates did not simply dismiss one of the periods of rule and most were able to give roughly equal treatment to the reigns. There were very few candidates who disagreed with the statement.
6. Although many candidates saw this as the easiest of the three questions in this section, there were a significant number of very limited answers. There were many who allowed their answer to become simple narrative accounts of the Pretenders and did not link their knowledge of events to the key issue of 'how effective.' Even in the analytical answers, it was very noticeable that many candidates were unable to progress beyond an analysis of the Simnel and Warbeck challenge, whereas the best answers considered a wider range of issues and focused on 'how effective.' There was also some confusion over the term 'Pretender' and many seemed to see it in a very narrow manner and did not widen it to include any claimant to the throne. Most candidates understood the role of Margaret of Burgundy, Henry was given credit for his diplomatic efforts to make Warbeck persona non grata in France, Burgundy and Scotland, although it was surprising how few candidates explicitly realised that this indicated Warbeck was not in England very much and so it was difficult for Henry to deal effectively with the revolt by laying his hands on him.

Henry VIII to Mary I, 1509-1558

7. This was a popular question and there were a large number of very effective answers. These tended to establish the aims in the opening paragraph in order to go on and assess the success, however only the very best answers were able to show that aims did vary through the period and considered how far Henry was able to meet the changes. Some argued that Henry was more successful in the period up to 1520 and that this was then followed by gradual failure, culminating in the divorce crisis of 1529. However, it was noticeable that in a significant number of answers, particularly those that adopted a chronological approach, candidates had much less to say about the period after 1520 and focused heavily on the Field of the Cloth of Gold and The Treaty of London. Many answers did not handle the question of Henry's divorce from Catherine and its impact on foreign policy effectively. Some were able to relate it to relations with Charles V, but weaker answers simply used it to explain the fall of Wolsey. Most candidates showed a good understanding of Wolsey's role in foreign affairs. His realisation of the limits of English resources was often contrasted to Henry's lack of interest in financial affairs and his belligerence, particularly in the early years. Where candidates did consider the latter years they frequently became bogged down in narratives of Pavia, the sack of Rome and the Peace of Cambrai without linking the material to the question.

8. There were some good answers to this question as candidates were able to effectively compare the rule of Northumberland and Somerset. Most candidates agreed that Northumberland was more successful, but failed to focus on the key issue of 'to what extent.' There was a great deal for candidates to write about – religious change, social unrest, economic and fiscal problems, war against France and Scotland- and it was therefore surprising that there were a significant number of candidates who lacked precise factual knowledge and relied on sweeping generalisations and assertions. Answers that adopted a thematic approach tended to be more successful than those that dealt with Somerset and then Northumberland. There were a number of candidates who, having decided that Northumberland was more effective, wrote almost exclusively on him and virtually ignored Somerset. In weaker answers there was also much confusion, particularly over events of 1549 with some appearing to believe that because Northumberland crushed Kett's rebellion he was in power. There were a minority of candidates who wrote solely about religious affairs, possibly having been taught the Church and State topic, and this meant that a limited range of issues were considered and that the top bands could not be accessed.

9. This question was less popular than the other two in this section and there were a significant number of weak answers. As with question 8, there were a number of candidates who considered only religious issues and this again limited their level of achievement. There other answers that adopted a largely historiographical approach, but instead of using this to answer the question simply described the views of historians on Mary. As with the Legacy Specification, historiography is not a requirement of AS, it will gain credit when it is used effectively to answer the question, but will not when candidates simply describe a range of historian's views (and this was made very clear at the examiner standardisation meeting). Some candidates appeared to struggle to identify the problems that Mary faced apart from religion once the Lady Jane Grey and Wyatt affairs were over. It was disappointing that little attention was given to the social problems of disease and harvests and few explored the financial difficulties she faced or the reaction of Parliament to some of her policies.

Church and State 1529-1589

10. This was a popular question and attracted a wide range of responses. At the higher levels candidates engaged with a wide range of issues and were able to support their argument with detailed examples and statistical evidence. However, weaker answers often relied on sweeping generalisations or believed that isolated examples, usually associated with Wolsey, were sufficient to show that the church was in desperate need of reform. At the lower end there were also a significant number of candidates who turned the essay into one on reasons for the divorce and ignored the focus of the question. As with question 9, there were a large number of answers that were historiographically based and this was acceptable if candidates used this to answer the question, but there were a significant number who simply described what Dickens, Elton, Haigh and Scarisbrick thought in separate paragraphs and then wrote a conclusion, leaving the examiner with little idea of the candidate's understanding and view. Some answers argued that because there was popular support there was nothing wrong with the church, but did not explain this, whilst others wrote excessively on the 1530s and argued that because there were problems then there must have been problems before, but these approaches were not convincing.
11. There were a significant number of disappointing answers to this question as candidates wrote in sweeping generalisations and were unable to support their ideas with reference to specific events or individuals. Many answers focused exclusively on the 1530s and the Dissolution of the Monasteries and this allowed weaker candidates to simply list the expected role of monasteries or to write about the Pilgrimage of Grace and consider it in terms of religious, political and economic motives. Better answers considered a much wider range of evidence and looked at opposition from More and Fisher, monks and the Aragonese faction to the King's supremacy. Nearly all answers focused solely on the 1530s and there was however little consideration of reformers who were disappointed by the Act of Six Articles and the downfall of Cromwell or opposition which might have surfaced in opposition to the more Catholic policies of the 1540s.
12. This question produced an interesting range of responses. There were a significant number of candidates who were able to write at length on Elizabeth's views in 1559, but ignored other factors or were uncomfortable in dealing with Elizabeth's views and wrote largely about other factors. Better answers considered both and were able to link Elizabeth's views to the actual settlement that emerged in 1559, although some were not able to make the links between her views and the settlement. There were other candidates who knew very little about the Settlement and tried to argue back from events later in her reign with some trying to argue her hostility to Puritans by describing the suspension of Grindal.

England under Elizabeth I, 1558-1603

13. At the lower end candidates either described the problems that Elizabeth faced without assessing their seriousness or indulged in speculation about the seriousness without factual support for their ideas. There were also some candidates who went well beyond 1558 in consideration of the problems. Many chose to emphasise the seriousness of the problems created by the make-up of the Privy Council in 1558 and by addressing this first and at length gave the impression that this was the most serious issue despite being unable to supply any supporting evidence to substantiate it. There were a number of candidates who mishandled the loss of Calais and suggested that it meant that England was under imminent threat of invasion, even suggesting 'All invasions came through Calais.' There were other answers which did not see religion as a problem and argued that England was willing to embrace Protestantism and was simply waiting for Elizabeth to come to the throne.

14. This was not a particularly popular question but a wide range of levels was seen. At the lower end candidates tended to either describe the methods used by Elizabeth to manage parliament or become embroiled in a description of the historiography surrounding Elizabeth and her parliaments, which frequently resulted in detailed descriptions of Neale and the Puritan choir. There were also some candidates who were confused between the terms Parliament, Government and Council. However, at the top level candidates were able to discuss the issues and many argued that Elizabeth was able to obtain supply, was successful in calming parliament over issues such as Monopolies and discussed her use of the royal prerogative and whether this suggested she was successful in managing Parliament. There were some answers which also considered the scale of the legislation that was passed and used this to argue that her management must have been successful.
15. There were a number of candidates who wrote about the whole period, reading 1558 for 1588 even if they had answered question 13. However, there were a significant number of candidates who produced some wide-ranging and well-focused analytical answers. There was a wide range of issue available for candidates to consider and it was not expected that all were dealt with in detail. It was surprising that a number did not deal with the issue of the Armadas, although some did link this to the financial problems faced. Many were able to discuss the problem of rebellion, both within England and Ireland and usually argued that the government was very effective in dealing with the problem in England, shown by the small numbers despite the economic problems, but were less successful in tackling the problem in Ireland. There was usually consideration given to Elizabeth's relationship with parliament and this provided a variety of responses, some arguing that she was not effective in dealing with opposition to Monopolies and others pointing to the Golden speech. Some better answers also gave consideration to the success of government legislation in tackling the social and economic issues created by the poor harvests of the 1590s. The question gave candidates the opportunity to make links between factors and this often done successfully, allowing candidates to access high levels on AO1b. There were some candidates who adopted a historiographical approach and this was successful where they avoided simply describing the views of historians such as Haigh.

The Early Stuarts and the Origins of the Civil War 1603-42

16. This was quite a popular question, but there were a significant number of candidates who simply described the problems rather than addressing how serious the problem was. At the lower end candidates did struggle to cover the whole period and often focused on events at the start of the reign, focusing almost exclusively on the Millenary Petition, the Hampton Court Conference and the Gunpowder Plot. However, better answers were able to consider later events and included discussion about the Book of Sports, foreign policy and marriage. The discriminating factor in many answers was the quality of the analysis and those that did not simply assert that the problems were or were not serious. At the very top level there were candidates who argued that the religious problems under James were nothing like as serious as they would become under Charles and that James was able to manage both the Puritan and Catholic challenges effectively.
17. This was quite a popular question and produced a number of well argued and focused questions. Candidates were usually able to weigh up the role of James against other factors such as his inheritance from Elizabeth and the role of Parliament in creating the difficulties. Many were able to draw their examples from across the whole reign, although there were a number who were unable to discuss the failure of the Great Contract. Many argued that James inherited a difficult situation because of war and inflation, however they often went on to argue that James made the situation worse by his extravagance and his upholding of Divine Right, which made a solution difficult.
18. There were a wide range of answers to this question, with many arguing that because it ultimately failed it must have been a failure. However, better answers took a wider view

and considered that until the problem with Scotland there was much evidence of success, despite the lack of popularity with some. There were some who argued convincingly that many were pleased to see the stability that the period brought to England. Many candidates spent much time discussing financial expedients and whether they were successful. Better answers were able to argue that some of the expedients, notably Ship Money, were initially successful, but that returns declined over time. At the top level, candidates did argue that there was little to suggest that if Charles had not introduced the Prayer Book to Scotland that personal rule would have come to an end and therefore it could be considered successful until then. However, at the lower end there were many who simply described what Charles did, rather than establishing criteria against which to measure success.

F961/02

From Pitt to Peel 1783-1846

1. This was a very popular question and inevitably drew a wide range of responses. Most candidates did have a good knowledge of events, although there were some who drew evidence from Pitt's period in office or who simply described what Liverpool did in response to the radical challenge. Weaker answers described the unrest or failed to link the material to the question of 'how serious.' Some answers spent too long explaining the reasons for the radical threat. It was particularly noticeable that there were few candidates who were able to adopt a thematic approach and analyse the seriousness in terms of content, scale, geographical and social appeal. The best answers did consider seriousness and tried to contextualise as well as measure radicals' weaknesses against government measures and strengths. Some answers looked at each in turn; better ones linked the two and led from examples into discussion, rather than splitting the two. Better answers were able to distinguish between the political and economically motivated unrest and make a distinction between the seriousness each presented.
2. The most noticeable feature of answers to this question was the failure of candidates to go beyond 1841. Contrasts with 1841-6 were needed. There were also many who did not understand what 'reconstruct' meant and did not focus on the Tory party. Instead some got too immersed in his time as prime Minister and lost focus on the issue of leadership and reconstruction. Candidates could have made more of the leadership skills of Peel and there were many answers that ignored areas such as Bonham, party organisation, registers, electoral appeal and methods. Better answers did consider the 1841 election and results and were able to use this to show how limited in success the attempts to broaden the appeal of the party had been. The very best answers did probe the idea of reconstruction and some nobly tried to assess whether he was in fact founding the future Conservative party or ending the old for good.
3. This was a very popular question that was often answered well. The best answers focused on economic and financial issues such as free trade, budgets, fiscal measures via taxation, improvements in banking, businessmen's needs and industrial development and some tried to link these to the issues of poverty and prosperity. However, few were able to address Peel's role in stimulating mid-Victorian prosperity. Very few dealt with the issues of railways and their significance, but many got lost in Premiership, considering events in Ireland and social issues such as mines and factories without linking them to the demands of the question. The repeal of the Corn Laws was often tackled not from an economic perspective but from the party political angle. Some candidates drifted into answers about the reasons for repeal and there were some who confused Pittite economic and financial measures being delivered by Peel, most noticeably over issues such as National Debt, the Consolidated Fund and Sinking Fund. It was a topic where candidates had plenty of knowledge, but did need to ensure they focused on the question set and did not answer a past question.

Liberals and Conservatives 1846-1895

4. Although there were some good answers to this question, there were also a number of very weak attempts. There were some candidates who simply described the reforms and often the focus was on a very small number of reforms and it appeared in some cases that candidates had not covered the 'Great reforming ministry.' Many candidates found it difficult to link the material at their disposal to the idea of 'limited' and seemed unsure as to what was required. Often candidates listed or described the acts, some did not consider Ireland, which was important in this question, and spent too much time on the Licensing and Public Health acts at the expense of covering more important area. The Secret Ballot Act was rarely discussed. Better answers were able to link the acts to aims and outcomes,

trying to assess Gladstonian Liberalism and seeing contradictions between reforms and a desire to deliver efficient, yet cheap, government. The best answers made links to social groups and electoral-political appeal, but few did this. Some simply wrote that the measure were unpopular and resulted in defeat in 1874. Candidates did need to address the rank order of importance in the Acts and think about the context and the goals of Gladstone's government.

5. Although this appeared a straightforward question, many responses were little more than broad generalisations as candidates struggled to write about other 'potential leaders.' Having adopted this approach many then proceeded to list the reasons why Disraeli was not the ideal choice. In many answers the 1867 Reform Act was seen as the key turning point in bringing him to the leadership as this allowed him to win over his party. The chronological understanding of some candidates was noticeably poor and this impacted on their ability to make relevant analytical points. There were some candidates who focused on his time as Prime Minister and others spent too long writing about the impact of 1846. There was some knowledge of Derby and occasionally there was mention of Bentinck and Disraeli's rivalry with Gladstone. Very few answers considered the importance of the 1850s and others did not fully explain the significance of 1867-8 or the issues of balance between Disraeli's skills and trust in him and few pointed out that the suspicions surrounding him continued into the 1870s. Candidates could have made more of Disraeli's skills and sense of opportunism. This was clearly a problematic question for many who were expecting something else on Disraeli.
6. The better answers did try and address the issue of 'Tory democracy' and even considered contemporary and later views of it, but there were many who simply saw it as Disraelian conservatism. There were also some candidates who simply wrote what they knew about his policies and hoped that this answered the question. Many answers agreed that it was the most important feature, although opportunism also featured and some saw the eye for the main electoral and personal career advantage as being a typical Disraelian approach. There were other answers that argued foreign and imperial policies were at the centre of Disraelian ideas, but were often unable to support this other by brief reference to his speeches. Most were able to make some links to his social ideas and reforms, but this often led to a listing of social legislation after 1874-5 and fewer picked up the roles of Cross and Sclater-Booth in this. Better answers did try to address the issue of importance and prioritise the issues, but there were too many who simply wrote all they knew about his premiership without addressing the question directly.

Foreign and Imperial Policies 1856-1914

7. This was a straightforward question and was generally handled well, although not always as crisply as it might have been. There were a number of list-like answers, but many candidates were able to take the opportunity to link trade with strategic reasons and develop the idea fully. However, weaker candidates struggled to cover a range of reasons. Candidates were usually able to write in some depth about the Suez Canal and Egypt, occasionally the Sudan and also South Africa. However, less was written about the political and popular or jingoistic dimensions, although some did bring in the issue of electoral appeal. There was some coverage of humanitarian and missionary issues, in weaker answers this and descriptions of the role of 'men on the spot' could dominate at the expense of other issues. Candidates could have made more about the rivalries and the 'Scramble' itself. There were some answers that adopted a geographical approach, but occasionally this blurred the issue of motives.
8. This was not a popular question and those candidates who did try to tackle it often produced weak or poorly focused and generalised answers. There were very few candidates who knew sufficient about the Anglo-Japanese alliance and the reasons behind

it and few were able to comment about the desire to cover Far Eastern interests so as to focus nearer home. There were few candidates who were able to discuss whether 'splendid isolation' was really isolation and this did impede the quality of the answers. Many were unable to compare the situation after 1902 with the situation before and simply got into a consideration of Anglo German relations and the development of ententes, although these were often referred to as alliances. There were few who were able to address the issue of change and as a result marks were frequently very low.

9. This was a straightforward question, but many failed to focus on the key issue and wanted to simply write about why war broke out. There was also a tendency for some essays to become little more shopping lists of reasons, with little attempt to address the relative importance of factors. There were also a number of candidates who spent too long dealing with British domestic issues at the expense of other factors. It would be fair to say that the issue of Belgium was probably the least well explained factor. In dealing with Belgium, the best answers looked at the 1839 Treaty and linked this to the Liberal Cabinet and the splits and the use made by the government of the morality issue; this was then linked to Anglo-German relations and the tensions there. Candidates were able to write effectively about military plans, the threat from Germany and concerns about a German occupied Belgium, Britain's relations with France and the naval and military talks that had taken place. The very best answers considered the role of Grey and the Foreign Office and were able to cite Eyre Coote's Memorandum and contextualised well.

Domestic Issues 1918-1951

10. This was a popular question and saw a wide range of responses. Many candidates did not write enough about World War One and the Labour party and all too frequently answers focused on the decline of the Liberal party, the fall of Lloyd George and vaguely about Britain's post war problems. Within the political context of a revived Conservative party and declining Liberal party it was important that Labour's actual growth was given attention. However, there were some better answers which looked at the issues of 1917-18, the benefit for the Labour party of its wartime roles, the Constitution and the issue of Clause IV, moderate socialism, the roles of Henderson and MacDonald, and some were able to link these issues to party organisation, trade unions and funds and electoral appeal. Many candidates explained the importance of the changes in the franchise, but were unable to link it to the actual electoral outcomes. At the top level there candidates who saw Labour as the beneficiaries of the shift in progressivism. There were however some answers that spent too long discussing the first Labour government or that did not mention any Labour politicians by name. Many weaker answers suggested that candidates were anticipating a question on the fall of Lloyd George or the Liberal decline and appeared to reproduce a pre-learnt answer that did not focus on the demands of the question.
11. The question gave candidates the opportunity to consider the whole period and there was plenty of material available, but it was noticeable that many answers focused almost exclusively on the period to 1929 and were unaware of Conservative dominance of the National Governments. Nearly all candidates were able to write about the Carlton Club debate and there were also a large number who unnecessarily wrote about the negotiations in America for a loan. It was pleasing that many could write clearly about Baldwin's misjudgement over calling an election over protection. Most referred to the General Strike, often at excessive length, suggesting that they were hoping for a question on the topic. There was some consideration of the weakness of the other parties and some better answers gave consideration to the measures of Neville Chamberlain at the Ministry of Health. There were few answers that ventured beyond 1931, except for a cursory mention of the Abdication Crisis. Many answers simply asserted that dominance of Baldwin and failed to consider the issue of a 'new' Conservatism, although some did consider Baldwin's character and use his stable and trustworthy approach to explain dominance. Some better answers also looked at Baldwin's skilful use of radio, cinema and

the newsreel, his middle ground appeal and the cultivation of this image to unite the party. However, not enough was said about electoral fortunes and actual results or about the pressure put on the Liberals.

12. Although this was the best answered of the three questions in the section, there were still a significant number of answers that were very generalised. Better answers considered a wide range of issues and did not focus just on the economic crisis of 1931, although there were some that even ignored it! Comparisons with the first Labour government were acceptable if they were made relevant, but there were a number of answers that ascribed events from the First Labour government to this period. Many candidates were able to balance success against failure and looked at the foreign as well as domestic record. In many answers more could have been made of the growing economic-financial crisis that MacDonald faced. There were very answers that said much about MacDonald himself, his skills or his errors, Snowden was rarely mentioned and more could have been made of the interactions of economic and political circumstances, particularly as it was a minority government. There was usually some consideration of Cabinet divisions over cuts and an ability to distinguish Keynesian from orthodox economics. Consideration of MacDonald's resignation and the formation of a National Government was mixed and there were even some candidates who argued that MacDonald continued as a Labour Prime Minister.

Foreign and Imperial Policies 1945-1990

13. Many candidates found this a relatively straightforward question, but there were a number who simply listed the reasons without providing any effective evaluation and others who either wrote in sweeping generalisations or ended their answer with the Suez Crisis. The impact of the Second World War was frequently the weakest of the reasons examined, and in some answers it was ignored, though most answers had some idea of the economic and financial impact. India and the USA featured prominently in many answers, but precise supporting detail was sometimes absent. There was some consideration in most answers of nationalism, unrest within the Empire and movements for independence, but these were unevenly covered and in many instances not enough was known about Decolonisation as a process and response. Better answers did make links to Suez and then the 'winds of change' speech of 1960, although some did confuse this with Churchill's Iron Curtain speech of 1946. In some of the higher level answers candidates were able to detail some of the economic and strategic problems associated with post-War Britain and comment on the roles of Labour and Conservative governments in the process of retreat and change.
14. This was a popular question, but there were a significant number of answers that focused on 'why' rather than 'to what extent', which meant that the upper levels of the mark bands were difficult to achieve. It was also noticeable that a significant number of candidates did not draw their examples from across the whole period with many stopping in the 1960s before making some comment about developments under Thatcher. Better answers did try and assess the great power signs and status, contrasting the need for American help with the special relationship within the Cold War, NATO, the retreat from east of Suez through nuclear weaponry and support of the USA during the Falklands crisis. In many answers the Suez crisis was seen as pivotal and a sign of the end of great power status. Many answers focused excessively on British entry into the EEC and would have been happier if that had been the focus of the question.
15. There were a large number of candidates who fell into the trap of writing solely about the Falklands or, if they did consider other factors, dealt with them very poorly. However, strong answers on Thatcher and Europe, with reference to CAP, SEA, enlargement, sovereignty, her apparent ambivalence and the pressures on her from within the party were seen. Candidates also considered Thatcher's role during the ending of the Cold War, with suitable examples, whilst others looked at her style. There were a number of weaker answers that simply unloaded all the information they had on foreign policy with little

regard for the actual question set and some that appeared very muddled about what actually happened during the period.

Post War Britain 1951-1994

16. The focus of the question caused candidates more problems than other factors. There were very few who could go beyond the Keeler affair and many were only able to describe this or write in generalised terms. However, those who did know something about the incidents were able to link them to the image of a tired government, a resurgent Labour party and the prevailing economic problems. The latter factor was often dealt with very well by candidates. There were a number who were also able to write intelligently about Conservative leadership, but more could have been made of Macmillan's style of premiership and how far it had lost direction by 1962-3. Those who argued that a Labour victory was inevitable should remember that the actual result was very close; it is all too easy to over-credit Wilson and Labour. Most candidates were able to consider a range of factors, but to achieve the higher levels clear evaluation of the relative importance and links between factors were necessary.
17. This was a straightforward question and there were a significant number of good answers, but there were also a substantial number that lacked factual detail and wrote sweeping generalisations, ignoring events such as the Three Day Week and the Miner's Strike. Better answers were able to elaborate on issues such as developments over Trade Unions, economic and financial policies, switches and U turns, the failure to follow through initial ideas, entry into the EEC and sometimes Ireland. The economic issues and their linkages to the Trade Union power and strikes in 1973-4 were often done well. However, at times the thrust of the question as to levels of success was missed by many and some also made claims linking Heath's early ideas to those of Thatcher and there were answers that focused on comparing the two. There were very few answers that considered his leadership style and its effects.
18. This tended to be poorly answered with very few answers focusing specifically on the elections and many writing almost exclusively about the impact of the Falkland's War. If any specific election was mentioned it was usually 1979 and this often resulted in a disproportionate amount of time being spent on it. There were many answers that considered her policies and there was evidence of good knowledge of monetarism, the sale of council houses, economic strategies and their impact. Her battles with the Unions was also considered, but as with other factors this was not well linked to electoral victories and more could have been made of the effectiveness of Union legislation and the Miner's Strike. Many answers commented on her strong leadership and some mentioned the divisions that developed within the party. Those who did deal with Labour weaknesses pointed more to the leadership of Callaghan than Foot and Kinnock and it was surprising that more was not made of the nature of socialism and the Militant tendency and the electoral messages put across by Labour and their problems with organisation and spending power at elections. However, the most noticeable weakness was an inability to link material to the election results and simply assert that these developments resulted in electoral victories and with some answers you were left wondering whether the candidates knew the dates of the elections.

F962 European and World History Period Studies

F962/01

The number of candidates entered for this option was much smaller than the three other options for the Period Studies. As a result many of the comments about individual questions are limited and this is made worse by the fact that entries were particularly concentrated around the Crusades and Spain.

The Crusades and the Crusader States 1095-1192

1. The question required candidates to focus on the reasons why Pope Urban called for a crusade and did not require lengthy comments about the motives of those who responded to his call. Those who focused on the latter did not score well as much of the material employed was tangential to the question requirements. It appeared that many reproduced model answers on the motives for Crusades regardless of the question asked, bringing in issues such as millenarian sentiment as an explanation for events in 1095! Better answers tended to start from the defeat at Manzikert in 1075, which led to the need to defend Christendom by 1095. There were few candidates who were able to fully develop the possible political motives of Urban as he attempted to reassert papal authority and possibly reunite the Christian church. Many candidates focused on economic motives, but this seems more appropriate in explaining the motives of those taking part. At the top end there was some evidence that candidates had a good knowledge of Urban's speech at Clermont and were able to use details from that to argue. There was a tendency for some candidates to produce a list-like answer, rather than assess the relative importance of factors.
2. This was the least popular of the questions on the Crusades and also attracted a large number of weak answers. Although candidates were aware that they needed to discuss the reasons for the failure of the Second crusade they were less able to focus on the idea of 'no clear aim' and were more confident when writing about factors such as increased Muslim unity. There was some knowledge deployed of events at Damascus, but there were a significant number of candidates who seemed unaware of the reasons for the launching of the Second Crusade, which could have been used to argue that there was a clear aim, but that it became less clear as the Crusade progressed. Weaker answers tended to describe the reasons for failure, rather than assessing them. There were some candidates who argued that Louis' perceived lack of military prowess was because he was a second son!
3. This was a challenging question, particularly for less able candidates who were happier to explain why the Crusade failed, rather than assess whether it was a failure. As a consequence there were a number of answers that contained relevant factual material which was not well linked to the actual question set. There were a number of candidates who started by focusing on the question, but then, either because they ran out of relevant material or simply because they lost focus drifted into an explanation for the failure of the Crusade. Candidates did need to read the question carefully and ensure that they kept to the focus. Those who did succeed often argued that it failed to achieve its ultimate goal of freeing Jerusalem from Muslim control, but that other significant gains, particularly on the coast, were made that would allow the Crusader states to survive.

The Renaissance from c1400-c1550

4. There were a number of answers to this question, but most found it difficult to distinguish between the papacy and the Church and ran the two together; this approach was not

penalised. More importantly, many answers did not have the precise factual detail on the role of the Church in the development of the Renaissance and resorted to sweeping generalisations. However, there were some better answers that did examine the role of the church in patronising artists. The opportunity to examine the links between lay and church patronage – gifts to the church by individuals and guilds was ignored. Candidates were much happier writing about other factors that were important, but it was vital that the Church was given sufficient coverage.

5. There were a number of solid answers to this question, although in some instance evidence of precise examples to support the argument was somewhat lacking. However, in the higher bands candidates were able to balance the role of the Medicis against other factors to produce competent answers. In these answers there was often detailed knowledge of the Medici family, but frequently other factors such as guilds and other prominent families was less-well dealt with. Some answers focused on why the Medicis provided patronage, which resulted in providing slightly off-focus answers.
6. There were very few answers to this question and those that were produced seemed rather weak. This is a new topic within the Study option and the lack of candidates tackling this question may reflect this and the emphasis placed upon it within Schemes of Work. However, those that did tackle it showed a good focus on the given issue, with many candidates able to support their argument with detailed references. However, there was a general failure to recognise that the Northern Renaissance had its own independent roots and problems of chronology in the failure to recognise that Van Eyck for instance pre dated many of his more famous Italian counterparts. Though art was often dealt with at length, distinctions between Italian and northern humanism were rarely made.

Exploration and Discovery c1445-1545

7. This was a straightforward question and produced the highest number of answers in this section. The question allowed candidates the opportunity to display their knowledge and most were able to seize the opportunity. Most agreed with the proposition that economic factors were pre-eminent and were able to explain why, but also remembered to balance this against other factors. Weaker candidates tended to write about the topic rather than answer the question directly, but even here the level of knowledge was usually sound, although some seemed unclear as to what constituted an economic issue. However, there were some instances where candidates would have benefited from a clearer geographical knowledge as this would have aided their understanding of certain points.
8. As with question 7, this was a straightforward question and allowed even weak candidates to show what they knew. Unfortunately for many this was simply a description of the reasons for the acquisition of an Empire, rather than an analysis. It was only the relatively stronger answers that were able to assess the reasons, but weaker candidates with some knowledge were able to do themselves justice. At the lower levels there was certainly evidence of candidates reproducing model answers and this also allowed them to perform credibly by producing a list of reasons. There were also some candidates who were confused between Spain and Portugal.
9. This question was undertaken by the fewest number of candidates. There were a significant number of candidates who drifted into the problems the Spanish brought to the Americans, discussing diseases and the destruction of their traditions. Some answers got into the issues of religion, and the difficulties of conversion, the relationship between the clergy and the conquistadors etc. It appeared that many candidates did not read the question carefully, got into it and wandered away from the focus. In considering the benefits, many answers were confined to the obvious gains of gold and silver.

Spain 1469-1556

10. This was one of the most popular questions on the paper and saw a wide range of responses. It was pleasing that many candidates were able to distinguish between the importance of religion for Ferdinand and Isabella, stressing the greater importance religion played in the latter's policies. However, weaker answers were often simplistic over this issue and suggested that religion was the sole motivating factor for Isabella and that Ferdinand had no religious motivation. Although many were able to consider a range of issues, there were some answers that were very limited and did not discuss policies that went outside religious motivation and this prevented them reaching the higher levels. Stronger answers considered a wide range of issues and were willing to balance the issue of religion against other factors, even in areas such as the Inquisition and church reform.
11. Although this question attracted a significant number of responses, the level of attainment was generally much lower than on question 10. There were a significant number of candidates who lacked the depth of factual knowledge needed to write in sufficient detail and the result was a number of short or superficial and generalised answers. Many candidates struggled once they had considered the Granada War and finished up writing at length on overseas exploration. It was particularly noticeable that many candidates did not have the depth of knowledge on events in Italy and there was certainly little awareness of the nature of cooperation between the two countries' forces, with the Aragonese fighting in Granada and Castilians in Italy. There was also a distinct lack of knowledge of military and naval history displayed in the answers.
12. This question drew a very wide range of responses, but there were a significant number of candidates who restricted their answers to the early years of Charles I's reign. However, better answers did try to survey the whole period and drew a contrast between the callow Burgundian youth and the mature, naturalised Castilian. Many candidates argued that he was largely successful, although this was set against his financial failings, which tended to play a significant role in many answers. There were some answers that blamed him for all Philip's failings, particularly the bankruptcies, which did seem rather harsh! Candidates who did not have a good chronological understanding of the topic did find this question difficult and it is a clear example of where candidates do need a clear framework if they are to make sense of large amount of material. This was particularly noticeable when candidates did not have a clear understanding of when the rebellions occurred and their attempts at analysis were severely hampered.

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

13. There were very few answers to this question and those that were seen often dealt in generalisations, particularly when dealing with the named factor of 'a reaction against abuses.' Candidates' understanding of Luther's ideas was, at times, underdeveloped and would have benefited from a reading of some extracts from key sources of his writing.
14. This was a more popular question and was handled quite well even by quite modest candidates. Most were able to at least describe the contribution of the Princes, and most knew at least Frederick and one or two other princes by name. There was tendency to simplify the question to a comparison of the two factors of princely power and the absence of Charles from the Empire. However, stronger answers dealt with a much wider range of issues and were able to do justice to the question with the evaluation of a wide spread of actors, although issues such as the grass roots appeal of Lutheranism, its spread in the cities as well as the countryside and the widespread use of the printing press were not always developed.
15. Answers to this question tended to be disappointing; in many instances answers were very narrow and saw the issues only from the perspective of Charles. There was very little

consideration of other aspects such as the divided policies, the problems of the Ottomans and their relationship with the North Africans. Most candidates had a lack of awareness of a general threat to the Western Mediterranean beyond the territories of Charles V, and a limited understanding of military and naval power and its potential, with the result that some candidates reached some very confusing conclusions. There were also some questionable factual comments about Charles' alliance with Persia and an assertion that Charles V was not interested in his brother's problem of Hungary.

Philip II, Spain and the Netherlands, 1556-1609

16. There were a significant number of answers to this question and it drew a wide range of answers. Better candidates were able to show empathy towards Philip's religious aims and his attitude to religion. Some were able to consider a wide range of issues, although there was a weakness in dealing with clerical taxation. Candidates were usually able to deal with the issue of reform and better answers showed some understanding of the problems of rituals and orthodoxy in rural areas. There was also some considerable knowledge displayed about diocesan and educational reform and the success of the measures. However, there were some who struggled to disentangle a genuine approach to his faith with his poor relationship with the Pope. There were a number of candidates who ignored the domestic focus and went on to discuss relations with England and France. Weaker answers also tended to rely on generalisations and comments became little more than assertions.
17. Most candidates were able to tackle this question in an effective manner. Candidates were able to identify a list of reasons for the rebellion and weigh up the relative importance of the factors. However, some candidates found it difficult to evaluate the importance of Philip in the outbreak and were more confident in dealing with other factors. Many saw Philip in two-dimensional terms: a foreigner and religiously rigid. The depth of his interest in the Netherlands was often underestimated, and reduced to pride and a refusal to rule over heretics. There was little on his responsibility for the instructions to Alva, or discussion about whether Alva's attitudes were his fault. As a consequence a lot of answers were quite good, but few reached the very top.
18. There were a number of good answers to this question and it was pleasing to see the numbers who were able to take an over-arching approach and consider his posthumous reputation and impact. Candidates were usually able to see his contribution throughout the period and many argued that his early achievements were often limited, but did stress his ability maintain unity among the provinces and his ability to obtain foreign support which was important at crucial points. Most candidates were able to do justice to his contribution before weighing it up against other factors.

F962/02

Napoleon, France and Europe 1795-1815

1. This was the least popular of the questions in this section and attracted a significant number of weak answers as candidates were unable to focus on the demands of the question. There were few candidates who were able to meet the challenge of comparing the periods before and after the set date. In general, answers focused on the period after 1804 and several candidates simply ignored the comparative aspect and focused solely on the period of the Empire, which had a significant impact on their performance. Many candidates seemed unprepared for this type of question. Many answers simply did not see the importance of the creation of the Empire as a potential turning point and instead turned their answer into a discussion of Napoleon's domestic policies.
2. Although many candidates knew a great deal about Napoleon's strengths and abilities as a general and military leader, they much less confident in dealing with the weaknesses of his enemies and were frequently reduced to sweeping generalisations. There were many who knew little detail about the coalitions and this had a significant impact on the quality of their answers. It was also noticeable that there were a large number of candidates whose knowledge of Napoleon's victories was very limited. Many better answers compared issues of organisation and leadership and tactics, however weaker candidates produced a lot of bolt on analysis which gained some reward, but was not well-enough developed to reach the higher levels.
3. There were some excellent answers to this question with candidates able to make links between the Continental System and Spain and Russia. This was better than answers that see these events as separate to Britain. However, weaker answers tended to focus on why Napoleon was defeated, appearing to produce a pre-learnt answer, and found it much harder to focus on Britain's role. It appeared as if they had a list of points and simply unloaded them rather than focus on the precise wording of the question. More able candidates were able to produce a coherent analytical answer that made explicit judgements between the various factors.

Monarchy, Republic and Empire: France 1814-1870

4. This was a relatively straightforward question but the quality of answers varied considerably. Many answers showed little understanding of the context and events were often described rather than considering whether the policy was a success or failure. Better answers started by considering aims and France's relationship with the Great Powers and then linking events back to the aims and their relationship. Better answers were able to explain why his policy was considered a failure even though in light of what was practical it could be considered a success and were also able to link the events to their reception at home. However, at the lower end there were candidates who covered only a small number of events and focused on description.
5. Many candidates struggled with this question and there were a number who were confused about the events and wrote about the wrong period. There were also a significant number who were unable to support their arguments with detailed factual knowledge. Key events were often missed out and there was much evidence of sweeping generalisations. Candidates would have benefited greatly from a clearer chronological understanding as it would have helped to ensure that conclusions made were based on a sound factual basis.
6. This question was handled quite well by many candidates. There were many who were able to identify key phases in his policies and were able to back this up with substantiated

analysis. There were many answers that focused on Paris, railways and banks, but did not discuss political changes or consider the increasing problems of the late 1860s.

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

7. There was a divide between candidates who knew the acquisitions in some detail but not the motives behind them and those who knew the various motives for westward expansion, but had little idea of the actual acquisition. Many answers took each purchase in turn and assessed them, but better answers made links throughout arguing that the US was looking to expand and also considered the idea of manifest destiny.
8. This question produced a wide range of answers. There were some who focused on just slavery, even though they referred to different aspects of the problem. Better answers saw slavery as the underlying cause in other factors that led to war – economic issues, states rights and Lincoln's election. Some candidates offered narratives of events from 1819, but these often petered out in 1860 and there were surprisingly few answers that considered the crucial crisis of 1861. This was crucial as the issue was the survival of the union as well as slavery. Some were aware of different possible explanations but offered rather general analyses. It is not uncommon for knowledge to peter out at the end of a study period, but it was crucial for this question.
9. Most answer agreed with the basic premise and argued convincingly that resources were primary. Better answers were able to argue that the Union would always win a war of attrition, but it took skilled leadership to recognise this and carry out a battle plan that utilised these resources. Some weaker answers simply described the weaknesses of the south rather than focusing on the demands of the question. However, better candidates seized the opportunity to make judgements, many made a distinction between the earlier part of the war where generalship may have been more important and the later stages of the war when attrition and the failure of the South to get foreign recognition made superior resources more important.

Peace and war: International Relations c1890-1941

10. There was a great deal of material that candidates could bring to bear to answer this question and it was not expected that all issues would be considered. The large amount of material available did make it difficult for weaker candidates to organise their material. There were a significant number of candidates who appeared to reproduce a pre-learnt answer on the cause of the war rather than focus on the precise demands of the question. Some candidates tried to start in 1870 and this simply increased the amount of material they tried to include, whereas other started much closer to 1914, but better answers tended to start somewhere between these dates. There were a significant number who did ascribe blame to Germany, but the quality of support varied considerably. Better candidates were able to compare the culpability of Germany usually with Russia, but sometimes Austria.
11. This question was often poorly done as most candidates knew very little about the disputes of the 1920s and often wrote about issues that involved the League in this period or focused on Manchuria and Abyssinia, which were not relevant and gained little credit. There was also much confusion about what the League actually did, with a number of candidates crediting the League for Locarno and Kellogg Briand. This was certainly a question where many would have benefited from a far better chronological understanding, a closer reading of the question and basic factual knowledge. There were very few who could write in detail about any event other than the Corfu crisis and comments about the Aaland Islands or other disputes were usually very generalised.

12. There was a considerable variety in the quality of answers seen. Some answers were very generalised and candidates wrote about the lack of money, whilst others were able to provide detailed supporting material. An understanding of British interests at this time was variable and candidates often strayed from the reasons for British appeasement to a judgement on its policy. There seems to be little understanding of the motives behind appeasement and answers tended to be one-sided.

From Autocracy to Communism: Russia 1894-1941

13. This was the least successful of the questions on Russia as many candidates were unsure as to what constituted 'social and economic.' As a result there were a significant number who wrote general histories of the period and included everything they knew, whilst others wrote predominantly about the 1905 Revolution, but were unable to distinguish between the social and economic and political issues. There were other answers that focused on the need to maintain social order and avoid revolution and then drifted in to a consideration of political policies pursued in order to achieve this. However, at the higher levels there were some candidates who were able to discuss the work of Stolypin and Witte, but few had grasped the scale of industrial growth in Russia at this time.
14. This was the most popular of the questions on Russia and there were a number of very good answers. Many candidates were able to make links between factors and evaluate their relative importance in a successful manner. Most were able to explain why the Provisional Government was weak, although comments about the war were often generalised. There was usually a good understanding of the Bolshevik party and the relative roles of Lenin and Trotsky and these were frequently linked to the weakness of the Provisional Government. However, it was noticeable that the understanding of the significance of the Kornilov affair was less competently handled and there were some answers that were weak on events of October. At the lower end there were some very weak answers characterised by sweeping generalisations that did not go beyond GCSE standard and casts doubts on the strategy of repeating topics that have been covered before.
15. Perhaps the nature of the question lent itself to a descriptive approach, but there were certainly a significant number who described Stalin's economic policies and then perhaps added bolt on comments about success and failure at the end of the paragraph. There was some unevenness between coverage of collectivisation and industrialisation. Many dwelt, perhaps excessively, on the social cost of his policies, and did not give enough attention to the successes and made little comment about Russia's ability to withstand Germany in the Great Patriotic War. Better answers often weighed up success and failure against the aims. However, there were a significant number of answers that were lacking in precise support material and were unaware of production or output figures which could have been used to help clinch points.

Democracy and Dictatorship: Italy 1896-1943

16. At the top end there were some excellent answers. However, there were a large number that did not go beyond a general survey of Italian problems since 1870 or which focused on the issue of unification. There was a great deal written about the problems themselves, rather than how the governments solved them. However, at the top end candidates were able to link themes together and see that political weakness and a poor economy led to constant problems. Perhaps this question is a clear example that centres do need to ensure that they study all aspects of a study topic equally and do not just regard Italy 1896-1922 as an introduction to the rise of Mussolini.
17. This question attracted a wide variety of answers. There were a number who, surprisingly, wrote very little about Mussolini, so eager were they to show the failings of Liberal Italy,

and, as a result, consideration of the squads, propaganda, the speeches and the March on Rome were almost completely ignored. Other candidates also struggled with balancing economic factors against other issues and sometimes ignored the issue or devoted too much time to it. However, stronger answers explained both the long and short term reasons for the Mussolini's success and often concluded that the role of individuals was crucial. This allowed some to go on and examine the importance of the role of the King in some depth. Better answers also saw that a poor economy led to a rise in socialism and that the reaction to this led to fascism and then contrasted this with other factors. Candidates do need to read the question carefully as there were a significant number who brought in material from much later in the period and this did not receive credit.

18. This was a popular question, but we saw the usual problems with Mussolini foreign policy essays: answers that focused on the 1920s, answers that ignored the 1920s and some that stopped in 1935 – it is important that candidates cover the whole period. Foreign policy essays also tend to encourage a narrative approach and this question was no exception. Candidates would be well advised to consider Mussolini's success in establishing a European reputation and there were very answers that considered his relationship with Hitler. There were very few candidates who considered the final years, especially 1940, yet this could have provided a good basis for an overall assessment of the impact and success of foreign policy as a whole. Certainly centres do need to advise candidates not to spend too much time telling the story of individual events such as Corfu or Abyssinia.

The Rise of China 1911-1990

19. Many candidates struggled with this question and the best that many could do was to outline the events in a narrative form rather than assess. There was a lack of awareness that the Nationalists had more or less established authority before the Japanese invasion. Even better answers often embedded reasons in a narrative framework.
20. Although this question produced some better answers than question 20, there were still a significant number who adopted a descriptive approach. Most candidates condemned the Great Leap Forward as an unmitigated disaster. Candidates were often able to supply lots of details about backyard furnaces and the deaths of sparrows, which seemed to have gripped their imagination, but there were few candidates who could analyse the results.
21. The better answers to this question discussed Mao's aims before going on to weigh up how far he achieved them. However, weaker answers simply outlined the policies with little reference to the question.

Democracy and Dictatorship in Germany 1919-1963

22. This continues to be a popular topic and attracts a wide range of answers. It is a large topic and some candidates did struggle to manage the material at their disposal, however they do need to avoid writing sweeping generalisations. As with all questions planning does help, but perhaps where there is so much material available a plan becomes essential to ensure that vital issues are covered. There were also a large number who produced descriptive accounts of Weimar and a significant number who focused nearly all their attention on the period pre 1930. There were many answers that simply described the weaknesses and focused heavily on issues such as Versailles and the resultant right wing distrust of the Republic, but very often candidates failed to tie in their points to the actual wording of the question. There were answers that displayed a good knowledge of election results and were able to analyse who voted for Hitler and why. Most surprisingly there were a number of candidates who failed to consider the Depression or who knew very little about Hitler. At the top end, candidates were able to achieve a balance between Weimar weakness and other factors.

23. Economic questions are often a difficult area for many candidates, but this year there were a number of good answers which ranged across the whole period in a balanced fashion and supported their ideas with good and relevant details. Better answers usually established the criteria against which to judge success in the opening paragraph before evaluating success. However, as usual, there were many candidates who ignored the war years and confined their answers to 1933-9. There were also other areas that do need attention: Albert Speer was rarely mentioned, many confused the New Plan with the Four Year Plan and were confused over Mefo Bills.
24. There were a limited number of answers, despite the very straightforward nature of the question. This was also the weakest answered of the questions on Germany and answers tended to be generalised or narrow in focus with very little knowledge of the 1950s. There were few candidates who progressed beyond a list-like approach. Candidates were usually able to write about the state of the world economy, the impact of the Korean War and Cold War and western aid, but were very limited in their knowledge of Erhard and labour relations. Once again, with a new topic area and with a question set on the central topic it does not appear to bode well for the future and centres should ensure that they cover the whole topic equally.

The Cold War in Europe from 1945 to the 1990s

25. This question produced a significant number of list answers with comments such as 'this was another reason for the progress of the Cold war as it showed the growing tensions between the powers.' Many answers addressed the topic rather than focusing on the question and analysis of both sides was often limited or superficial, particularly when dealing with ideological differences or spheres of influence. However, there were some stronger answers that were able to consider both sides when examining the deepening divisions during the Second World War, but even here there was still a tendency for some of the analysis to be simply bolt on with little real understanding of the causal reasons for the conflict.
26. Many candidates found this a difficult question and there were a significant number who were unable to write about anything other than the Blockade and the Wall. Candidates often struggled to go beyond a description of events which showed tension, with the result that many ended up scoring higher marks for AO1a than AO1b. There were other answers that drifted away from the main focus and use the essay to write generally about the development of the Cold War. However, there were some better answers where candidates did focus on the reasons and were able to produce sustained analysis.
27. This was probably the most successful of the questions on the Cold War, with most candidates able to argue and provide evidence for the view that Gorbachev's role was pivotal. Most were able to at least outline the economic weaknesses which provided the backdrop for the reforms, although weaker answers were somewhat general in their treatment. However, there was a tendency for candidates to focus on Gorbachev rather than Eastern Europe and there was often lengthy reference to glasnost and perestroika, with only a hint of their relevance to Eastern Europe. Very few candidates gave any credit to Reagan and it was often the lack of balance that was the main problem with answers.

Crisis in the Middle East 1948-2003

There were very few answers to this topic and therefore generalisations are more difficult.

28. There were very few candidates with a sufficiently broad range of knowledge and answers tended to focus almost exclusively on Egypt.
29. Although this question did attract some better answers, the focus was still quite narrow with most candidates seeing it purely in terms of Egypt and Israel and neglecting the wider perspective.
30. Candidates found this question challenging and often turned it into a recital of different explanations rather than looking specifically at Saddam.

F963 British History Enquiries and F964 European and World History Enquiries

General Comments

15,365 candidates sat the Enquiries papers with most sitting the 'modern' versions (02). By far the most popular was F964/02 (Modern European and World) with over half the candidature, (7330) which performed a little better than on the equivalent legacy paper. F963/02 had 3808 entrants who, overall, were the most impressive. In comparison the earlier history versions impressed less, perhaps surprisingly given that these had always been the stronger papers on the legacy specification. F963/01 (the earlier British History Paper) saw 2483 candidates, whilst F964 01 saw 1744. The latter especially seemed to attract weaker responses.

Given that this was a new specification with a revised and disaggregated mark scheme which stressed some aspects more than in the old specification (judgement and context for example), **examiners were pleased at the overall standard achieved**. As in January even where candidates struggled it was clear that they were trying to do the right thing. The standard was similar to the large summer entries for the legacy papers with only the variants noted above. Examiners were pleased to note some passionate engagement with the issues at stake, particularly on the German Reformation, the French Revolution, the Condition of England and Churchill. The quality of many was noteworthy given that this is only AS, taken by all in Year 12. It is important to remember this given that much of what follows will point to areas of weakness. These areas are for Centres to focus on, in most cases yet again, in their next round of teaching. Yet the impression of overwhelming weakness given by an extensive enumeration of failings can give a false impression of impossible demands. This is far from the case. Almost all candidates managed to achieve something worthy of credit, most managed at least partially to sustain their answers and a quarter of the candidature were of A grade quality.

Most candidates ranged between 30-70 marks, mainly achieving levels II, III and IV. Some were in the lower 70s but many found it difficult to get into the higher 70s and lower 80s. It was rare to see a mark in the 90s and only a few managed the higher 90s. The 01 version (the earlier periods) saw some of these very high marks but, as noted above, overall they did slightly less well than their more modern, 02, equivalents. On a more positive note, candidates at most levels were trying to do the right thing, especially at the bottom end (30s and 40s) and at the top. The former simply didn't know how to make the sources work within the framework they knew they needed to work towards. More disappointing were those in the middle and potentially top ends who preferred to argue their points purely by source reference and well used stand-alone knowledge. They were convinced by their command of the topic, failing to realise that they needed to go further and question the sources, using their own knowledge to do this. **Own knowledge must be subservient to the Sources on this paper.**

All the topics had **new elements** as the period of coverage has been extended and in some cases it was this that was examined. If one considers the traditional topics in relation to the **entirely new ones** (Gladstone and Disraeli, Churchill, Dictatorship and Democracy and the US and the Cold War in Asia) we are pleased to say that there was no difference in outcome. Centres who have taught new topics and new areas can rest assured that they have done so appropriately with no disadvantage to their candidates. Indeed some of the passionate engagement noted above came from those studying new topics.

We hope that the **new mark scheme**, although more time consuming to mark for all, will have helped centres to focus on particular skills and address particular candidate weakness but there is a danger for both teacher and examiner. For teacher and candidate the disaggregation of

skills can lead to a failure to produce 'joined up' history. Candidates lose sight of the question, so concerned are they to 'tick off' the assessment targets. If they are given confidence in source skills and know their way around their topic they should be able to demonstrate these without resort to check lists for issues that may not even be there. For the examiner it can lead to seven ways of being mean and to avoid this all examiners were instructed to award the top of a level where more than one mark was available. There are various lessons to be learnt from the first year's application of the scheme. For teachers the rightful emphasis on the importance of AO2a (source evaluation) is leading to too much emphasis on stock and formulaic evaluation (see below). Evaluation *must* be linked to the key issue in the question and it must include relevant analysis and evaluation of source *content* as well as the nature of the source. Much of what was seen this summer was 'stand alone' provenance that was not compared or integrated into a consideration of the content in relation to the question. The provision of more time in which to answer led to some candidates expanding these comments at much greater length than there was anything worth saying. The evaluation of provenance is a backdrop for critical and reflective use of the content itself. As examiners we have also learnt from its application and we will look at clarifying this, hopefully before the next session, to **make some revisions to the wording of the scheme** to ensure transparency to teachers and candidates. **No change will be made to the levels or the allocation of marks at this stage and our advice and intentions remain unchanged.** Centres will be informed if any changes are made. Meanwhile we would like to emphasise, as we did in the January Report, the **key elements of the assessment targets. Teachers are strongly advised to adopt this in their own marking.** It is a useful means of assessing candidate progress during a course. The weighting of marks is a clue to the relative importance of skills. The focus should be on AO2a and b.; AO1a and b have fewer marks attached. It is worth considering how we reward candidates:-

Qa – The Comparison (three of the four assessment targets)

AO1a – demonstrating an accurate understanding of concepts and context (there are only 6/30 marks here). Knowledge for its own sake is not rewarded

AO1b – comparing content and, by analysis, arriving at a substantiated judgement (8/30). No judgement is LIII or below and sequencing is Level IV or below.

AO2a – an evaluation of the two sources by linking their provenance, comparatively to the content. If this is uneven then LIII or below is appropriate. A sequenced approach or 'stock' evaluation is LIV, or below. Most of the marks are awarded here (16/30).

Qb – Assessing an Interpretation (all assessment targets)

AO1a - relevant knowledge that is used to extend, verify, refute or qualify the contribution of the Sources to the interpretation or view. It should largely be used to assess content and provenance. The mark allocation is low (10/70)

AO1b – explaining, analysing and judging the sources in relation to the question. The key is developed explanation and analysis of content incorporating knowledge. This is also where we reward substantiated judgement. By Level IV there is description of the sources with little if any judgement. Again the weighting is low (12/70).

AO2a – an evaluation of the sources as a set, a group or individually in relation to the question. How much weight should be given to a source or group of sources.

Evaluation is rewarded in L1A, L1B (all sources) and LII (most). If the sources are merely referred to illustratively then LIII and below is appropriate. Most marks are awarded here (28/70)

AO2b – This is about synthesis – bringing together all the other skills to provide an effective answer to the question. It is also where we reward a balanced discussion as between sources and evaluative own knowledge. It too has a high weighting (20/70).

We would also like to draw teachers' attention to the document on the OCR website (**Thinking about the Enquiry Assessment Targets in F963 and F964** – available within the Teachers' Guide) which was used as the basis for training our examiners and which discusses the above points in further detail. It provides the framework for a useful skills audit for teaching and delivery in the classroom. There is also a **compilation of previous reports** highlighting common errors and suggesting advice for tackling this in the classroom.

One major issue which emerged this session and to which Centres need to pay heed has been alluded to above – the prevalence amongst weaker, middling and even some abler candidates of a **formulaic and mechanical approach to source evaluation**. It had a considerable impact on lowering the middle range of marks and in depressing the results from those Centres that appeared to have encouraged this approach. In part this is because of a wider and commendable awareness of the need to evaluate sources as evidence (AO2a). Yet many candidates seemed to view the examination as 'going through the motions' of a mechanical process. Our Reports have categorised problems and this too may appear as a list of things to do but Centres and candidates lose sight of the need to engage with the historical process, using and carefully evaluating written and in some cases visual material. Several Centres provided rigid plans or mnemonics of bewildering variety. This can be fine as a mental checklist to see if *some* of the qualities are relevant but not if they are absent. Many candidates following this approach ploughed on regardless, discussing non-existent qualities in increasing desperation. Some arsenals of evaluative terms were clearly not understood - consistency, authenticity, typicality etc. They are applied indiscriminately and without any exemplification from source content. On typicality for example we received comments to the effect that 'this is typical of the author' (without any explanation or further comment); 'the author is consistent with what he says right through to the end of the source' (!). Whilst formulas can rescue the weak, especially in relation to the comparison in Q(a), it invariably depresses the more able. Such scaffolding is useful at the beginning of an Enquiry Unit Course to introduce and expand on GCSE skills (the audit) but hopefully candidates develop by dispensing with it, absorbing the skills as a natural historical reflex to be applied flexibly to whatever is provided. Some Centres appear to have taught the content within a rigid 'schools of historical thought' scheme (Marxist, revisionist, post revisionist, contingency etc) which inhibited the responses of even the most able, producing sterile lines of argument and some very 'stock' judgements. We cannot emphasise enough that historiography plays no part in these Units. **We want to read the responses of candidates to questions about the sources put in front of them.** Other Centres, in response to Q(b), simply rewrote the attributions and provenance for each source without any link to the question or attempt to assess the source. Many candidates relax into this approach and consider it sufficient. Another Centre used the phrase 'against the accepted historical consensus' to assess evidence. This merely led to a disengagement from the sources and the demonstration of some very tangential yet considerable own knowledge. All these are examples of unhelpful 'techniques' that in effect raise barriers between candidates and the material we expect them to assess.

Such mechanical ways obstruct and must make boring the study of sources. We want candidates to engage meaningfully with the content and interpretative thrust of a source. The **best teaching practice** is to use sources as the basis of each issue or piece of indicative content taught. In practice this means studying a source (or two or five) according to classroom progress and asking candidates some leading questions – are they similar or different?; why

might this be the case?; what issues are dealt with?; what is the purpose of the author?; to whom is it addressed?; does the form affect the message?; is the tone notable?; is the date significant?; what is the context? Allow them to provide the answers and build their experience in handling material in both a common sense and historical way. Enable them to use their own knowledge to explain what might be significant or set as a research task to find out. Please make them explain clearly and concisely the historical issues at stake and why they have asserted something. For example some had clearly picked up the idea of an author being in a position to know, (which not infrequently came across as the author having 'good' or 'bad' access). This is then stated without any explanation. Effective teaching here is about enabling candidates to make those connections. It is not about facilitating stock assertions but about linking questions specifically to the history and explaining the process in those terms, not in the half understood abstract. That is why using sources in the classroom, discussing them, possibly with only a few questions in mind initially, to build experience, are so important. Evaluation that is formulaic de-links itself from the history and the content of the source. It may prompt them to ask a question but it discourages an explained response and answer. It also disconnects from the key issue in the question. All too frequently it comes between them and the essence of history – putting together material from the past to answer questions.

Another general cause for concern is **conceptual and historical understanding**. In some cases this is surprisingly good (religion in the earlier periods for example) but on **politics, representative institutions (in Britain's case Parliament) and government** it is weak. If the question focus is here then candidates sometimes struggle to make sense of the sources. They frequently lack an understanding of how government works and its basic function in particular periods; perhaps more so on the 19th and 20th centuries. This may be because teachers take for granted pupil understanding of periods closer to our own. Centres would be well advised to underpin their teaching with an appreciation of political and constitutional terms. Examples of where candidates came unstuck this summer are legion. On F963 02, Q3 on 'New Century' saw a confusion between PM and Chief Whip, between an Act and a Bill and between Home Rule and Partition whilst on Q4 on Churchill the position of Military Secretary was assumed to be a typist and a censure motion was clearly not understood. On Q1, the Condition of England, many thought an MP was a member of the government, whilst on Q2, Gladstone and Disraeli, the role of PM and Minister was confused (there were comments that Disraeli was not interested in social reform because he left it to a minister to introduce the Bill). On F964 02, Q2 on Italy, saw candidates struggling to make sense of 'constitutional government' or on Q5 (Asian Cold War) the role of the CIA. On earlier periods F963 01, Q1 saw some confusion over Papal pretensions and rights and over legatine authority, whilst on Q2 (Mid Tudor Crises) some didn't know the difference between an Act and a Proclamation. On Q3 Cromwell was almost uniformly referred to as the Lord Protectorate and few could distinguish between Protectorate and Commonwealth or had any understanding of Cromwell's Parliaments. On F964 01, Q1 (Crusades) saw a lack of understanding over Councils, letters and sermons. On Q2 (German Reformation) some were confused over the status of Imperial Cities and were less aware than they should have been on the various types of authority – ecclesiastical, imperial, princely and urban. Such uncertainty led to serious misinterpretation.

The time allowance has increased to one and a half hours and this has enabled candidates to spend more time thinking, planning and organising. This is invariably better than mere length. We think this is about right, provided candidates know **how to spend the extra time**. Certainly few were unfinished. Of particular importance is to spend time **reading with care**. Too often sources were taken at face value and one wondered whether the content of the sources had been properly read. Only by careful reading can clausal qualifications, sub- text, inference and nuance be detected. The other problem is that extra time has led some to describe and offload tangential knowledge with the general lack of focus this inevitably leads to. Candidates are also prone to spend too long on the comparison in Q(a), when more time could have been profitably used in thinking through grouping and considering the relative value of such groups. There were often examples of **time wasting** with very long introductions, often background based, with grandiose statements of what they intended to do – 'I am now going to be comparing Source A

with Source B', or copying the question out and parroting it repeatedly to highlight the illusion that they were answering the question in anything other than a fairly superficial way.

Spelling was generally reasonable, **grammar** less so, with **punctuation** very mixed. The last two are important given that clarity of thinking and communication are crucial to success. On the whole examiners were impressed given that this is AS and that few other subjects require candidates to argue a case through extended prose. This is a very high level skill, increasingly unsupported elsewhere in the curriculum, and the surprise is that candidates are as good as they are. We would however stress the need for **paragraphs** as a key to organisation. In some cases examiners were treated to some very long blocks of text which became just a stream of consciousness.

More of a problem was **illegibility and very small handwriting**. If a candidate is known for this then they or their Centre should make arrangements to word process or seek the assistance of a scribe. However this should be done in Font 12 and be double spaced. It also requires an effective scribe, preferably a historian. There were several cases where the one used had no sense of history and transcribed nonsense, when it was reasonably clear what was meant if the attached original with poor handwriting was consulted (Disraeli's Artisans Dwelling Act was rendered as Atkinson's Military Act). A minority of candidates were also prone to the use of slang, some rather too colloquial if not downright sleazy (did liberty have to be referred to as St Just's bitch?). History has its conventions, which should be adhered to.

There were **very few rubric infringements** – they usually occurred on Q(a) in the form of comparing the **wrong sources** or, a recent trend perhaps encouraged by more time, **all five sources**. If this happened a candidate could not go higher than a Level VI. An irritating trend was to compare the right sources but to label them as A and B regardless of whether it was supposed to be C and E. It seemed a perverse form of laziness. **It should also be noted that we may not always set five sources**. We will sometimes **set only four** and these will be slightly longer than in the five versions, the reason being a more extended argument is being tested in one or more of the four sources. Candidates should not always expect to see five and if in doubt they should **refer to the rubric at the heading of the topic** which will state whether there are four or five sources to be considered. This year we only set four sources on the French revolution. Also if a **visual source is used with four other sources** it will not always fit on the double page spread and candidates need to watch for instructions to that effect. We thought we had been clear on Q1 (The Condition of England) on F963 02 by a capitalised and emboldened instruction to turn over for Source E, but some missed it under the pressure of an examination. **Teachers need to warn candidates to watch for these departures from the norm.**

The following is our customary list of weaknesses seen in the two questions. For those new to the specification these are the areas where marks are usually lost whilst for those with more experience it should act as a timely reminder that the minefield of the examination is far from cleared and candidates continue to repeat the mistakes of their predecessors.

Sub Question (a) – The Comparison

Of the two questions this was the better handled. Candidates spent more time on it and if they could resist the temptation of lengthy and thus more sequenced comment their answers were more careful and effective. For those who avoided sequencing it was customary to score in Levels II and III. Level I was rarer as few managed a sustained, focused and effective comparison throughout. There was usually some unevenness or lack of completeness, often missing some obvious but very important aspect of the comparison. It was fortunately rare for Levels V and below to be awarded. It is worth stressing that we require a point by point comparison as evidence for a given issue. The following should be noted by Centres:-

- The requirement to demonstrate an understanding of **context and concept** (AO1a) has led to the practice of some introductions that can often veer too much towards the general introduction, often of only tangential worth. The context is often of great importance, as with the rarely noted occasion of two Diets in Q2 on the German Reformation. **Use of knowledge can best be used to explain these** and often need only be a sub clause in a sentence that then uses it to evaluate the evidence, in this case the more fevered atmosphere in German Cities hosting an event to which the great and the good would travel.
- **Sequencing** seemed more prevalent amongst middling candidates this June with the result of more Level IVs. At its worst this became paraphrase. Perhaps this is the result of the need to explain but we are looking for explained comparison, not explanation for its own sake. Weaker candidates interwove references without clear source identification and no attempt at analysis. This always proves very difficult to follow any line of argument that might emerge (especially in Q(b)). There was some evidence that candidates had been told to rank sources in order of merit, the most useful first, the least second. Again in both questions this led to unintentional sequencing and the inability to cross reference so vital to success in both questions.
- **Explanation** is often lacking leading to unsubstantiated assertion. It can render comparison ineffective. They need to go that bit further. For example on F964/02, Q3 on the American Civil War, many were able to remark that in Source A there was a reference to slavery whilst in Source B there was not. A difference had been identified but not explained or developed as a valid comparative point. Far better was to say that Seward wanted to relate the Compromise of 1850 to the issue of Slavery to raise emotion in a Senatorial contest whilst Clay didn't because his purpose at that stage of the debate was precisely to avoid inflaming passion by keeping the issues abstract and constitutional. This is what we mean by developed and explained comparison.
- **Provenance** has tended to take centre stage given the mark emphasis in the new scheme (see above on the increase in formulaic responses) but unlike content is **much more rarely compared**. Candidates who quite successfully compare content seem unable to compare provenance (spelt very variously). They sequenced their comments in a discrete fashion, often at the end. The ability to link this to content in relation to the question marked out the best answers but only a small minority managed it. If only they would compare audience or purpose or the significance of the dates using context they would be in business. Some still fail to use the introductions and attributions at all. This also led to either poor judgement or a lack of it altogether. It is usually the compared provenance that enables a judgement to be made. There are still those who compare content and evaluate using their own knowledge but make little or no comment on provenance or worth of what is said. Given the formulaic approach of many much of what was said on provenance was 'stock'. This is what happens when a candidate loses contact with the sources. It is not helpful or illuminating in Q2 on F963 01 to describe and dismiss as 'biased' a Protestant's reference to the 'cruel proclamation' which ordered the burning alive of 7 of his co-religionists. It would have been better to point to whether such attitudes were typical or to put such persecution into context, either religiously or in terms of the forms of punishment. Candidates need to integrate and synthesise their comments on provenance. The practice of flooding their answers with provenance criteria irrespective of relevance or helpfulness to the question set is to be deplored. It leads to matters like tone and emotion being spotted in odd and inappropriate places. Bias is still beloved of weaker candidates, applied without explanation as to its nature.
- **Reliability** is oft invoked and is usually the accompaniment of bias. Candidates would do well to ask themselves reliable for what? Better candidates moved on to ask whether the author was in a position to make an informed judgement. Others dwelt amidst wooliness claiming that the author, if recounting at a later date, 'might have forgotten' (often in relation to a very precise account) or be 'clouded by time' (this in relation to diary entries that were later published – another example of the need to read carefully). In other respects the fact that a source was contemporary was often felt to be enough. On Q4 in F964 02 for example Ulbricht was often trusted as he would know what was going on and

would reflect 'genuine' opinion. Equally there were some candidates who would not trust any source. Specific qualification of the evidence was surprisingly rare, particularly in relation to the question and comparatively between the two sources. Candidates would be better advised to consider **utility**, as this is closer to which of the two sources may be the better evidence. It was very easy to lose sight of why we require a comparison of provenance – to assess the relative merits of the sources as evidence for a particular event or issue.

- It is obvious from the above that we require a **judgement** on these relative merits. Too often this is entirely lacking. More usually it is tagged onto the end and has rarely been earned by relevant provenance and content comparison. Candidates would be well advised to incorporate their judgement as they go along rather to pluck some assertion out of the air at the end.
- **Comparison by Juxtaposition** would appear to be on the increase. Dissimilar points are supposedly compared. This is not the comparison of like by like and does not constitute comparison. There was also a tendency for content to be mismatched in the attempt to compare. So, for example, the espionage and spies in Q4 on F964 02, mentioned in Source C was not always matched with 'spies' as mentioned in Source A but rather with something else less appropriate.

Sub Question (b) – Assessing an Interpretation

This tended to be the weaker of the two questions given that it is a more extended exercise which makes more demands on candidates. Only some candidates were able to access Levels II and above, largely because they were unable to evaluate in relation to their grouping or question. They could frequently comment on the limitations of each individual source in a discrete manner but failed to link this via cross referenced comparison to the other sources and the question itself. This confined most to Levels III and IV. If the sources were sequenced this made it even more difficult to focus on assessing the thrust of interpretation and they could not get beyond Level IV. **The most successful candidates** were those who didn't see it as an extension of what they had done in (a). They constructed paragraphs according to views/interpretations and maintained a chosen grouping, incorporating telling points to exemplify a case and built into this a consideration of limitation across the grouping (of circumstance and context, of authorship and audience, of utility in relation to the question) with focused and fluent answers. **Far too many group, then list the sources in isolation** (with little or no cross referencing) with some very discrete provenance purely internal to the source and often rather stock. Centres should consult the subject specific mark schemes for the sort of approach to encourage candidates to take as many of the sources contain points either directly or via provenance that can counter the view suggested in the question. Evaluation and provenance can tie this into a judgement as to how far the sources support the given interpretation. This paper and this question in particular offers candidates a taste of what real history is all about – the use of contemporary sources, cross referenced, evaluated, considered and assessed, to support an historical interpretation.

The following were **the main areas of weakness**.

- **Sequencing** remains a formidable obstacle to an assessment of an interpretation using the sources. Candidates have clearly benefited from past advice to group the sources according to the stance they take on the key issue, although few do this by looking at all the sources in terms of two or three different views which enables them to see that some may be able to bear different interpretations. However having done the hard work of identifying stances in their first or second paragraph a very large number of candidates then proceed to examine the sources sequentially and discretely. Anything they say about provenance is thus in isolation of the key issue and question and cannot be rewarded beyond a Level III or IV. Even when considering a group, say of A and C, the tendency is to deal separately with A and C instead of picking common or

complementary issues from both and comparing their respective provenance in relation to the value they would give their views.

- **Spurious grouping** would appear to be on the increase. Candidates will block together the most unlikely of sources either mistakenly through misinterpretation and misreading of the evidence in front of them or because they have been told to do so and grasp at any pairing, however unpromising. Examiners have been told to check for random groupings.
- **'Bolt on' Provenance** has replaced 'bolt on' knowledge, again perhaps because of the high weighting accorded to it in the new mark scheme (AO2a). Level IV candidates will first sequence the sources for content (often descriptively) and then do the same for provenance. It is much better to explain and analyse each content point supporting a particular view and assess its provenance. If they first sequence content and then provenance it also hits them in AO2b, also highly weighted, where we reward a synthesis of all the skills in relation to the question. AO2b requires an integrated answer which clearly this approach prevents. Again the analysis of provenance is often discrete, the limitations of a source discussed in isolation. It begs the question of what they think they are doing which in effect amounts to little more than a listed description and commentary on five sources with the occasional stab in the general direction of the question. Provenance has to be related to content and the question and conditioned by knowledge. Then it becomes evaluation. We want joined up history and although the mark scheme rewards particular skills this is best achieved through integrated analysis and evaluation, very much the preserve of AO2b.
- **Referencing** remains all too common. This too will prevent access to Levels II and above. Many candidates are very good at using the sources in this way. They think this is how to use evidence and although it is a necessary step to exemplify from the sources an interpretative point many fail to proceed to the next step of questioning its value. Essentially they produce a good answer to the question based on their own knowledge, using the sources to a greater or lesser extent as illustration ('as source D says'). They think they have done well because they assume they have answered the question but this is to misunderstand source based history. They have missed the point. The question asks them to assess **how far the sources support** the interpretation that...! If they have simply been referenced they cannot have been used for anything more than illustration or at best their content. Content may have been used but it has not been evaluated in a historically meaningful way. Have they compared their groupings using evaluated provenance? Are A, B and D of less value than C and E?
- **Stock Evaluation** seems to be on the increase (see general comments), the product of an overly formulaic approach. It deals in generalisations and shifts the focus from a specific evaluation of the content in relation to the attribution and provenance towards a mantra that becomes progressively divorced from what is actually there. It seems to partner the 'bolt on' approach to provenance noted above. Other than in the hands of the strongest of candidates, terms such as 'completeness', 'typicality' and 'utility' are frequently meaningless. Candidates should deal with the questions noted in the general comments section, the answers to which will inform and focus their answers in much more effective way.
- Candidates all too often **ignore the steers, introductions and attributions** which contain a wealth of clues to aid evaluation and analysis. Dates, authorship, context, format and useful background information all hide therein and are ignored at their peril.
- **The correct use of own knowledge** remains difficult for candidates to get right. In some cases it remains a 'bolt on' although much less so than in the past. More candidates try to integrate it but do so by alternating a paragraph on a source with a paragraph of knowledge that may or may not be linked. Many use only a little knowledge, sometimes not much more than a throw away sentence or two interspersed through their answer. We would like to emphasise again that **knowledge is best used to establish context, to explain a point and especially to aid an evaluation of provenance where it can be used to confirm, extend, qualify or verify a particular point.** Above all it needs to be **integrated with the sources.** These should dictate the discussion and knowledge

should serve the sources. It is rewarded in AO1a and, if used in relation to the sources, in AO2b where an effective balance is sought. If there is a notable or serious imbalance of knowledge to sources then it will be difficult for a candidate to score more than a Level IV on AO2b.

- **Misreading the Question** is, perhaps surprisingly, a very common error on both questions. In (a) it is because candidates stop reading at 'compare Sources A and D as evidence', missing 'as evidence for... the attitudes of Londoners to religious change' (F963/01, Q2) or the attitudes of German townspeople (F964/01, Q2). Thus they compare the sources in general and lose focus. On Q(b) it tends to be more the case of not understanding what the question is getting at. They find it difficult to cross reference and analyse with the question in mind. Their reading of the sources seems to pull them in a different direction or they find it difficult to spot various views and points that can be used to substantiate this. Often it is the case of finding an organised way through the question such as focusing on the types of authority on the German reformation question or the type of motive in the German Dictatorship and Democracy question. Some try to address this by a relentless repetition of the terms of the question, followed by a mixed response to the sources which sometimes uses appropriate points but all too frequently lapses into a mix of general comment and description. Others grasp the point but then reference the sources. The best group, evaluate, explain and argue with a clear conclusion and judgement which is developed throughout the answer. This year most misreading seemed to occur on F964/02, Q4(a) on German Dictatorship and Democracy. Instead of comparing the possible aims of the western powers many candidates focused on why the DDR built the Berlin Wall, the subject of Q(b).
- **Dealing with Modern Historians** is frequently fraught with problems, usually of the stock variety. The key is to assess their slant – is it balanced or opinionated? Does it take an overly partial line (F963/02, Q2(b), Vincent in Source E, who has little time for Disraeli or Q4(b) Source E, Thompson, who has a very low opinion of Churchill)? Does it provide a ready structure upon which to hang an answer (F963/01, Q1(b) Source E on the Normans)? We use modern historians to provide a real steer. Candidates tend to the stock and waste their time when they say that, because it is a historian, it has the benefit of hindsight is objective and so forth. These sources are there to aid organisation and/or to set up an aunt sally. Candidates who were able to pick up on the spin in Vincent and Thompson used it to propel themselves to Level IA or IB. Most reverted to very stock comment indeed.
- **Comment on the Sources as a Set** can be evidence of a Level I because candidates who pick up what some sources have in common (hindsight, political or religious stance, date) can use this to clinch an argument or reach a sustained conclusion. It enables them to go beyond the merely discrete focus on an individual source. All too frequently however it is the final trap for the stock and unwary. Those who follow a formula will have a standard paragraph ready on what the examiners should have included if they had had the opportunity to lay before the eager candidate the full panoply of the Vatican Archives or the PRO. It is depressing and irritating to read in an answer on Disraelian social reform, 1874-80, that the sources are incomplete without something on Gladstone and the Liberals. Unless candidates can spot telling provenance points relating to the sources as a set they should avoid the tactic which offers the examiner the view that the sources provided are unhelpful but another, completely different set would have enabled them to produce a good answer. Instead they should do as much as they can with the sources that are given.
- Candidates do **need to pursue another line or lines of argument**. The sources are there to help them in this as they will either take different lines or contain within themselves alternatives. Although we give hints in the introductions candidates do need to spot this for themselves. The Question will contain one particular view but we expect candidates to work out for themselves other points of view. Some candidates only bother with an alternative or counter argument in their conclusion, as a last minute thought. Teasing out different views needs practice in the classroom.

- **Providing a Judgement** is a requirement and is best done throughout the essay rather than a sudden final assertion in the conclusion. Far too many conclude with something along the lines of 'two sources oppose the view but three agree so I would agree with the view in the question'. This is analysis by number and assertion and misses the point that it is how far the candidate agrees that the sources and own knowledge suggest a particular view to be more valid than any other that is at issue.

Comments on Individual Questions

F963 01

2483 candidates took this paper. A large number answered on the Civil War with only a few tackling the Normans. The Mid Tudor Crises were also popular but less so than in the past. Overall the standard was disappointing, candidates exhibiting all the problems cited above. Some struggled with finding an organisational way through the Mid Tudor question, more were let down by lack of knowledge on Cromwell and the Protectorate but there were some high end scripts seen and most acquitted themselves reasonably within some of the less effective frameworks noted above (sequenced lists, discrete and basic provenance, distinct knowledge etc). One letter of complaint was received on Q3 on the English Civil War and Interregnum to the effect that a question whose focus was on Cromwell's aims as Lord Protector was too narrow in its suggestion that a Godly Society was his priority. Candidates were happy to interpret this in terms of Cromwell's religion and it appeared not to be a problem.

1. The Normans in England 1066-1100

(a). Responses were very mixed here. The main issue was that candidates did not focus clearly on the question of 'Papal relations with the Church in England'. Candidates struggled with whether they were discussing papal relations with William, with Lanfranc or the English Church, failing to see that elements of all three were germane to the question. The significance of the dates was missed by weaker candidates, so the provenance was merely different Popes, but little knowledge was then applied as context to inform the comparison of content. To make sense of this it was necessary to have a grasp of the very different relationship that existed between Alexander and William on the one hand (cooperative, with the Pallium supporting the invasion in return for the expectation that William would oversee reform of the Church, in harness with Lanfranc) and Gregory and William on the other. Thus Source A was misinterpreted as confrontational and thus similar to B. A surprisingly large number of candidates were unable to locate Gregory's letter in the wider context of the Investiture Contest. Amongst those who did, a wide range of alternative names for the Anti- Pope was proposed. Better answers were able to make the distinction between relationships with the King and those with Lanfranc. There was speculation about whether the King had prevented Lanfranc visiting the Pope, and Source B seemed not to have been well understood or used effectively. Few were able to spot that even Alexander in A is careful to set limits – decisions must be in accordance with Church Law; they must be just. Obvious points – the differing audience (King and Archbishop), were missed and few made a judgement (both effective as evidence of a changing relationship).

(b) Some answers focused on whether the relationship was harmonious, and did not address the question of either help or obstruction for reform. This question did have two distinct issues to address and weaker candidates found it a step too far to consider both, finding it difficult to control. Too many wrote just about Lanfranc and William and made no mention of whether it obstructed reform or not or they wrote about William and how well he reformed the Church without any link to Lanfranc. Sequential coverage of the sources was very common. As in Q(a) a misinterpretation of Source A led to claims that it contradicted the assertion in the question and obstructed Church reform. The other source that caused problems for many candidates was D, Orderic Vitalis. Few seemed to understand him or place him as a source. He was decidedly of the opinion that William helped reform but many candidates thought this meant the provenance to be dubious. He was subjected to a real, and unwarranted, pummelling by some and dismissed as a 'lickspittle'. Criticism of Orderic as a source would have been better directed at his decidedly monastic perspective on reform and the inferences on William's priority for firm and authoritative church government. Wider knowledge and context was not well understood or much in evidence. A number of candidates asserted that the pre-conquest church was riddled with corruption which no Anglo-Saxonist would accept.

2. Mid-Tudor Crises 1536-1569

(a) There were some excellent answers to this question, which focused on the detail of similarities and differences, but it was rare to find answers which linked fully to the question on the 'attitudes of the *people of London* concerning *religious change*'. Too many saw the reference to religious change and entirely missed the word attitudes, so much of their response was poorly directed at the question. The majority spotted that the Sources referred to different reigns yet the same year, but there were some very weak answers, where candidates thought Mary was still on the throne at Christmas, despite the introduction of Source D pointing out the change of monarch. Good use was made of the provenance of C by better candidates, who saw that there was fear as a result of the imposition of heresy laws, leading to Protestant congregations hiding from the authorities. They suggested that the author might have a purpose in reassuring his audience that there was widespread support for Protestants among Londoners, and this might be unreliable or exaggerated - occasionally the Source was compared to Foxe's Book of Martyrs, with the suggestion it may have been propaganda. Opportunities to assess its typicality were rarely seen despite its 'underground' status. The fact that the Source was a private letter, therefore uncensored, they saw as giving it reliability. 'Fear' was therefore mentioned as the main attitude of Londoners by most candidates, with only the best balancing this with 'bravery' and 'defiance' against the 'cruel' authorities, 'hatred' of the Bishop of London, and 'compassion' for those facing death. Few made the point that sympathy with their plight might not necessarily denote support for Protestantism. The best answers compared these attitudes to the 'sense of freedom', 'irreverence', even 'violence' in Source D. They saw that both Sources were opposed to Catholic change, but in D in support of Protestant change after Elizabeth's actions in hinting at Protestantism by asking the Bishop not to elevate the host. Some diverted too much into this incident (of more relevance to Q(b)) which is less helpful on the attitudes of Londoners and hardly any picked up on the incident in St. Augustine's or the type of person making up the 'mob' (led by a mechanic and a cobbler) or noted the significance of the date – Christmas Day, and the possibility that their antics in the Church might have been drink-fuelled.

Most realised that Londoners were 'confused' and saw that Elizabeth was unclear in the signals she gave to religious change, as she prevented attacks on Mary and Pole but refused to accept transubstantiation. Some used good knowledge of Elizabeth's religious upbringing and the foreign situation when addressing the provenance of D. Most took at face value the comment that Elizabeth 'often promised to continue the Catholic religion', but some candidates of all ability levels did question this and suggested reasons why this may have been unreliable. Most felt Il Schifanoja was a more neutral observer writing a report, but few spotted the audience of his letter - Philip II's court - or linked this to the tone 'the blessed Queen Mary' inferring the foreign pressures on Elizabeth in December 1558. Few candidates mentioned that Philip had offered his hand in marriage to Elizabeth to explain her ambiguity on religion. More importantly they failed to look at his reliability in relation to the attitudes of Londoners. He might pick on such incidents in an untypical manner because his purpose is political.

There were sometimes less convincing inferences and 'stock' comments on limitations of the Sources, for example:

*'The Italian ambassador does observe and evaluate the situation from all its different angles. He does indeed do this **as the Source illustrates**. It begins to mention that whilst Elizabeth intended to continue the Catholic religion, she chose not to 'elevate the host' during mass. This suggests she might be leaning towards Protestantism. However, he then goes on to inform the ambassador that the Queen did not agree with the actions of certain individuals, which included uttering rude jokes about Queen Mary and Cardinal Pole; **this would suggest Catholic leanings**. In short, the content informs us that some people in London were confused as to whether England was a Protestant country or a Catholic country at this time. When we couple this with the context, one can see that this information is somewhat useful/reliable as evidence for the attitudes of people in London concerning religious change. **However, as with Source C***

it does not give us the opinions of people from other parts of London. In this sense it is not completely useful.'

The best responses questioned whether the attitudes shown were actually a response to religious change or merely dislike of Mary and compassion for ordinary people suffering a painful death. The limitations of the Sources in not giving evidence of Catholic attitudes of Londoners were occasionally pointed out. Tangential knowledge was used: -

*'By Mary being able to ascend the throne after the nine-day rule of Lady Jane Grey, it **proves that** the people perhaps favoured Catholicism too. Yet Sources C and D prove that Mary's extreme religious policy caused distress - 'brought more hatred'(C) and 'uttering rude jokes' (D).'*

(b) Answers to this question were very mixed. Some centres had clearly drilled candidates on religion to assess beliefs, practices and lay impact and the sources were used to illustrate this framework. They thus missed all the points about how all monarchs wanted conformity/uniformity. Others just discussed doctrine but had little to say beyond this. Weaker candidates fell back on sequencing, either by source or by reign (much the same thing in this case). This made it difficult to grasp an overview of continuity or not over the period as a whole. Better candidates traced issues across the Sources and reigns, such as 'uniformity', 'doctrine', including scripture, methods such as 'preaching, teaching and censorship' and 'enforcement/punishment'. Grouping was either by these issues, or by monarchs - Edward with Elizabeth for similarity, sometimes Edward with Mary for personal and narrow doctrine versus Elizabeth for relative leniency and breadth of belief/practice; Mary and Elizabeth for punishments, although some felt these were similar and missed the obvious difference in harshness (burnings versus heavy fines and arrest). Not many realised in Source B that Mary was trying to be conciliatory whilst many took the comment in Source D about Elizabeth promising to retain Catholicism at face value. The provenance of the Sources received some good attention and was integrated well by some - especially the timing at beginnings (B and D) and ends of reigns(A and C) - for similar cautions in policy at the start and for contrast of Edward and Mary in desperation to enforce uniformity at the end. Limitations of the Sources often repeated the comments on C and D in Q a) but also added the limitation of A as merely the memo of a young king not necessarily implemented, for example:

'It is difficult to tell the actual religious policies from Source A as Northumberland was ruling during Edward's minority.'

Weaker candidates were prone to misinterpretation, the identification of Mary as Protestant and Elizabeth as Catholic being an extreme case. More typical were statements to the effect that amendments to the words of administration in E indicated that Elizabeth had retained transubstantiation, whereas it was a deliberate fudge to enable those whose Catholic consciences were not to tender to think that it was. Source D produced confusion with a sizeable number thinking that the rioters were Catholics protestant at Elizabeth's Christmas walkout. Many asserted that in Source B Mary was banning the teaching of scripture, not noticing the important point about licensing.

The Unit only covers the period 1536-69, yet many mentioned evidence of Catholic persecution in the 1580s, for example:

'We do not know if there were further policies by Elizabeth advocating Protestantism later on - this is from early in her reign, suggesting that it is not giving us a full picture of how Protestant and therefore different to Mary's her religious policies were.'

Others wrote, often quite extensively about the period prior to 1552, to little effect. Many missed opportunities to use knowledge in evaluation:

A and E suggest a similar approach to doctrine by Edward and Elizabeth, who advocates the use of the 'Book of Common Prayer of 1552', which was written during Edward's reign. However, this Source is not complete, as we do not know how much the additional sentences added by Elizabeth changed its meaning and meant it was dissimilar from its use in Edward's reign'.

This is a clear case of failing to develop 'own knowledge' to evaluate a Source. A good answer dealing with this aspect and others was as follows:

'Source A indicates that the King was using his Council for a policy of new 'doctrine' and 'scripture' - this indicates that Edward's religious policy consisted of mainly forming new Christian practice. This is completely different from Source B, which indicates that Mary 'commands her subjects not to teach scripture without her permission. Though only a statement of intentions, we know that Mary did forbid the teaching of Scripture, and thus pursued an opposite line to her Protestant brother. Source A likewise only mirrors the king's 'agenda', which was often ignored by his Protectors. However, we do know that doctrine was passed, such as the 1552 Book of Common Prayer and the 42 Articles, bringing us to the reasonable conclusion that Edward used new doctrine as part of his religious policy. In Source E, Elizabeth followed a similar line, adding 'two sentences in the sacrament' to Cranmer's 1552 Prayer Book. However, this was only a small alteration to allow Catholics to use the book, but it was not the main thrust of Elizabeth's policy which concerns more the consequences of disobedience to the Queen. Thus we can see that Edward relied more on creating new doctrine than Elizabeth, who focused more on creating religious stability.

Sources A, C and E all indicate that the three monarchs all similarly made use of clerical enforcement of religion - Edward demands 'bishops to enforce discipline', Mary uses 'the Bishop of London in C to 'condemn heretics' and Elizabeth in E uses 'the ministers' who 'must use' the new Prayer Book with parishioners. Edward and Elizabeth also focus on religious teaching, while Mary in C used Bishops in a disciplinary way and in B censored or licensed teaching. We cannot even be sure that Edward did use clerical enforcements, as he is still requesting it at the end of his reign. Thus it is difficult to be sure that the monarchs followed a similar policy on clerical enforcements of religious practice.'

Few answers had this command of detailed knowledge or the ability to assess policies across the period.

This question did polarize candidates - middle ability candidates sometimes struggled to use both knowledge and Sources and there were many uneven answers which gave a summary of Sources followed by a weak or inaccurate narrative of events across the period.

3. The English Civil War and Interregnum 1637-60

Many candidates called Cromwell 'Lord Protectorate' throughout their answers rather than 'Lord Protector' (as was correctly used in the heading to the question). Quite baffling! One, with unconscious irony, called him Laud Protector. A wide range of ability was seen but overall it was felt by all examiners that most candidates' grasp of the Protectorate was decidedly shaky. Not many were able to contextualize and bring their own knowledge to bear upon evaluation. There was much confusion between Commonwealth and Protectorate.

(a) Candidates found this question challenging as the Sources were both critical of Cromwell's rule. The question asked for a comparison of these criticisms, so it was illogical to expect positive comments as well as negative. Most linked the ideas of deception, hypocrisy, religious attitudes (a façade or a tactic?), Major-Generals, inconsistency and ambition across the two Sources but most found only similarities. The best ones spotted differences of detail, such as the personal agenda regarding Vane. Some developed the date with meaningful comments about

the context of Charles II's reign and its implications. Lucy Hutchinson is well known and some Centres have good knowledge about both her religious beliefs and her husband's fate! Weaker answers suggested that the writers were trying to ingratiate themselves with Charles II, despite being told of their well known anti-monarchist credentials. Only a relative few suggested that with Cromwell dead, they could voice their feelings without repercussions. The religious issue was widely misunderstood, particularly the reference to 'true religion' being almost lost, interpreted by some as a sort of Stalinist anti-God campaign. Some candidates were led into a tangential evaluation of whether or not they accepted the criticism, and allowed some to introduce chunks of own knowledge in defence of Cromwell, which was rather a red herring. Most judged the 'criticisms' rather than the 'Sources as evidence'. The perceived need to find inadequacies in the sources led to evaluative problems – *'It is impossible to reach a judgment as the sources are one-sided'* – was a comment made by a number of candidates – yet as they are critics of Cromwell they are going to be one-sided.

(b) Most candidates, even at the most basic level, were able to group the Sources according to their view for or against the idea of a godly society, based on A, B and C versus D and E, but some did not seem to grasp the concept fully, let alone that it could mean different things to different people. Some considered it part of 'healing and settling' (Source B) but better answers saw this as one of three possible lines of argument *vis a vis* Cromwell's aims – a Godly Society, peace created by 'healing and settling' post Civil War or power and ambition. Many candidates merely discussed 'religion' alone, producing imbalanced answers. Many seemed not to realize that the Major Generals played a key part in 'godly reformation' – though others, by way of context used reference to the Barebones Parliament to back up the proposition. There were many who used tangential evidence of Charles I and the Civil War; others pursued 'religious toleration', Jews, Nayler et al at length yet made little mention of Cromwell and Catholics. As noted above most answers grouped A, B and C for the positive view, and D with E for the counter-argument and a negative view of 'personal ambition'. Many mentioned 'healing and settling' but the weaker ones obviously did not quite grasp what this meant, and others equated it with a 'godly society', assuming the terms were interchangeable. Some judged that 'stability' post the Civil Wars was the main aim rather than a 'godly society' and there were some excellent arguments for the case that Cromwell was aiming for personal power - they linked C with D / E on the Major-Generals as the heart of their case. Some also argued ably that Cromwell's aims may have changed over time, moving from a religious priority to one based purely on the maintenance of his own power, either through naked ambition or through conviction. A number of stronger answers argued carefully whether Cromwell's main aim was a godly society or simply a peaceful settlement after years of Civil war, some concluding that this is ambiguous and that it may not be possible, or helpful, to separate these objectives. The five sources provided a good cross-section of opinion, so that to say that other sources from a Royalist, a Leveller, a peasant and even in one case Mrs Cromwell (!) would improve the question is superfluous. Many candidates commented at length on how unreliable sources A, B and C were only to accept D and E at face value when they are blatantly suspect opinions. Few picked up D's reference to hypocrisy and used it to cast doubt on Cromwell's own estimation of his behaviour in B and C. The provenance of D and E was most often referred to, with less confidence in using the provenance of Source A and limited development of the point that 'Cromwell would say that wouldn't he?', in B and C. Source E was the least well understood and Source A the least used (few knew about the Committee of the Triers and could say much beyond what was in the source). The following were at least applying common sense to their evaluation of A:

'Source A contains an author, possibly drenched in religious fervour (a Puritan divine) who is thus convinced of Cromwell's emphasis upon the development of a godly society.'

'There can be considered a certain exaggeration in the numbers that supported Cromwell's religious reforms, 'thousands of people' is rather ambiguous and the hyperbole of the word 'grieved' as a result of the abolition of the Triers in 1660 remains unconvincing.'

There were many weak answers to this question which followed the pattern referred to in the general comments, which merely grouped to start and then described the content of the Sources sequentially.

F963 02

3808 candidates took this paper, the standard being higher than on any other of the three papers. Candidates seemed more engaged on Qs 1, 2 and 4 (Condition of England, Gladstone and Disraeli and particularly Churchill), but less so on Q3 (England in a New Century). More candidates reached Levels I, II and III, with fewer in LIV. With the exception of Q3 the conceptual and knowledge grasp was a little greater than elsewhere and candidates made more effective attempts at evaluation. Q3 proved the most popular with the other three sharing a roughly equal share of the candidature. One letter of complaint was made on Q3 on the grounds that the topic and chronology (Ireland 1912-14) was too narrow and the sources provided required candidates to extrapolate a different responsibility from three of the five sources. We did not accept the first point but thought that extrapolation might be overly challenging for weaker candidates and examiners were told to be lenient on those who struggled to assess the role of others in creating the Home Rule Crisis. Several letters were received pointing out that candidates may have missed the instruction to turn over the page for Source E on Q1 (Condition of England). Few in practice did so but examiners agreed that the only penalty to be exacted in this case was to bar Level IA to those who failed to mention and use it in their Q(b) answers.

1. The Condition of England 1815- 53

The standard of responses seen to this question was greatly improved from its legacy predecessor. Centres are to be congratulated on the engaged commitment that was seen in even middling answers. Perhaps the issue of the 1815-20 radicals is inherently interesting but one would like to believe that later ones share this. Certainly the contextual knowledge here was frequently impressive.

(a) Candidates successfully compared the content of Bamford and Buckingham in relation to the events at Peterloo, producing some very perceptive points and frequently using their own contextual knowledge to assess the validity of Buckingham's casualty figures, the consensus being that he got it wrong, possibly deliberately. Better candidates compared the different attitudes to the cavalry, the crowd and the unfolding events. The provenances of the sources were a little less well handled. Many failed to pick up on the steer in the introduction to Source C that Bamford was a *moderate* Radical and accused him of gross exaggeration. Others considered him on the side of the angels in comparison to Buckingham's establishment view. Better candidates spotted that Bamford was on tiptoe and, in the confusion of a very large mass meeting, may not have witnessed events with any great accuracy. Only the very able spotted the date and put two and two together to make the point that by then the radical 'view' of events in 1819 had been well and truly established. A few spotted the context of 1839, the first great Chartist Petition, and were able to comment that such a date was most auspicious for reinforcing the radical 'take' on 1819. There was more confusion over Buckingham who was dismissed as writing long after the event, failing to realise that he may have less of an axe to grind at such a distance. Indeed the dates misled many into stock comments on the unreliability of memory. Even fewer spotted that he was using family papers which may or may not have an insider's view. Nonetheless most realised that he took an establishment view and were able to make the basic comparison with Bamford. Some weaker answers wasted time describing the events rather than comparing attitudes towards them.

(b) Almost all candidates agreed with the thrust of the question that radical failure was down to effective government repression. They rightly pointed out that all the sources, to a greater or lesser extent, point to this (spies, agents provocateurs, troops, executions, use of the law,

ensorship etc.). The main fault for many was a failure to develop an alternative line of enquiry. Some did this through knowledge, mainly in reference to economic factors. Others, without any great success, tried to argue an alternative based on the government not being especially repressive (a fair point but not an appropriate engagement with this particular question). Weaker candidates simply agreed with the proposition of government repression and made no attempt to consider anything else or changed it into a question on why the government was repressive. Better candidates based their alternative around radical failings. They successfully used Source A, from a radical perspective, to argue that the March of the Blanketeers was singularly ill equipped; that their support was from amongst the poorest and even the weather was against such a physically arduous method of protest. Such a point was backed by the radical provenance of the source whilst D could be used from the stance of an opponent to stress that the radical leadership at Peterloo could not control the crowds and that some elements arguably got out of control, giving the authorities the excuse to act. Only an able few were able to point out that all but one of the sources (D) were from a radical perspective and might be expected to divert attention from their own failings to a repressive government. Some candidates strayed well beyond the period (to consider the Luddites before and the Chartists after) and moved into irrelevance.

Individual sources posed problems for some. Apart from some misunderstanding of Buckingham in D (particularly the phrase 'candidates for martyrdom') and the failure of quite a few to see that A and C came from the same person and book (contrary things were said about Bamford's provenance by those who sequenced and several thought he was merely trying to sell his autobiographical book), the Source that caused most trouble for some was Shelley in B. He was mistaken for Mary Shelley and as a poet dismissed as a hopeless romantic whose comments (assumed by some to be an actual poem) were not worth the paper they were written on. Many thought his account to be in a book, again exaggerated to sell copies and or poems. As a result few picked up that the radicals had shot themselves in the foot by Brandreth's killing of a man during the Pentrich Rising, or that the government were sufficiently worried by the size of the crowd to hem them in with 'cavalry'. None commented on the ambiguity of the 'shriek' at the moment of execution (horror or anger?). Source E encouraged weaker candidates to write out the attribution at length rather than to integrate the points into an argument on government repression. Nonetheless most commented intelligently on the provenance of Cruickshank with some using contextual knowledge about his activities to cast doubt on his portrayal of government success (that Cobbett's paper continued to print and circulate; that 'Manchester steel' had rebounded on the government etc).

2. The Age of Gladstone and Disraeli 1865-86

This too was done well by many candidates. As a new topic this was most encouraging and centres are to be congratulated on a successful delivery. Any weaknesses were because some of the candidates were weaker. They struggled more with Q(a) than Q(b).

(a) Most candidates compared the sources well by pointing to similarity on the issue of sanitary reform (although contemporary context on this was less well assured) and difference on the relative breadth of their approach to social reform. Better answers were able to relate this more directly to the question which asked for evidence for the ideas behind the reforms. They were able to note the wide claims by Disraeli on a wide range of issues in contrast to the narrow and more sanitary concerns about just housing in Cross. They noted Disraeli's claims that the health of the people should be a government's priority, making the historical connection between greatness and health which Cross does not. However, only the more able realised that Cross was more concerned to set limits to government action. Whilst many spotted the role of *laissez faire* here fewer were able to extrapolate it to the difference between Disraeli, who appears to contradict it and Cross, who is concerned to ensure social reform is achieved within its constraints, following an impeccable Gladstonian and Liberal principle. More difficulty was experienced with the provenance. Some struggled with the fact that Disraeli was not mentioned in D, yet the question asked about ideas behind his social reforms, failing to realise that he

would delegate to the Home Secretary a measure on housing. They tied themselves into knots as a result. Most were able to pick up on the audience in B given its well known context and could at least comment that Disraeli was electioneering in opposition. Better candidates knew of his precarious position as opposition leader and could read it as a post 1867 appeal to an artisan electorate doing what he did best, rhetoric. Some knew that it formed only a small part of the Manchester speech. More problematic, for most, was Cross, as they failed to see the context and restraints of government and that Cross was appealing to a propertied and wealthy Parliament which required a proper stress on economy, low taxes and laissez faire. Contextual knowledge on permissive legislation would have helped here but only a few were in possession of it. Cross is seeking the loophole of consensus on sanitary reform to justify doing anything at all. Some weaker candidates assumed he was an opponent of Disraeli and several argued he was part of the Liberal government. The ability compare audience and purpose was thus lost, as was the chance to make a judgement.

The following is the response of a candidate who scored at Level I throughout the three Levels, 28/30 in total:

'Sources B and D both address similar themes with regards to the Social Policy of Disraeli's Second Administration, namely the main motivation behind Disraeli's Social Policy, but also the extent to which the state shall be involved with such social policy.

With regards to the main theme of these two sources, it is clear that there are many similarities between the views of these two Conservative Ministers. Both Disraeli, in his speech at the Manchester Free Trade Hall, and Cross in Parliament, argue that sanitary legislation was introduced with the clear aim of improving the health of the British public. Despite this, there still appears to be a discrepancy in the content of these sources. Whilst Disraeli, in source B, makes extremely vague claims, focusing on many respects of social legislation rather than getting into the nitty-gritty of social legislation, Cross is far more focussed. This difference in context is arguably a result of the contrasting provenance of the two sources. Disraeli is making an appeal to the electorate in his 1872 speech, attempting to win votes with exciting promises of social reform, whereas Cross has to be far more careful in his speech. By 1875 the Conservatives were in power, and so Cross arguably feels more responsibility than Disraeli does in source B. Source B is indeed rather typical of Disraeli's vague promises of 'air, light and water' in the run-up to the 1874 elections, and because of this source D is arguably more useful as evidence of the ideas behind Disraeli's social reform.

With regards to the second theme, the extent to which the state is responsible for the health of the people, there is again a clear contrast in the content of the two sources. Disraeli, perhaps again attempting to curry favour with the electorate, makes it quite clear that his government would be focussed on social reform, if it came into power. However, this does not corroborate with source D, in which Cross is equally adamant 'it is not the duty of the government'. Cross' position at the time perhaps suggest why this difference in content has arisen. Cross is understandably worried about following an expensive programme of compulsory legislation, whereas Disraeli is not tied down by such concerns, for he is not yet in power in his 1872 speech. In this respect, it is clear that both sources are biased. Cross' response is typical of Conservative reserve on heavy spending, whilst Disraeli is making attractive promises with the aim of unseating the dominance of the Liberal Government.

In conclusion, therefore, it is clear that these sources show large differences in content with regard to the ideas behind Disraeli's social reform, that when considered in terms of provenance these differences become clear. Whilst Disraeli is in the rather attractive position as the leader of the opposition, free to make attractive promises, by 1875 Cross is the Home Secretary, and cannot follow expensive policy without regard to cost. Because of the bias of source B, in which Disraeli is seeking to win votes, Source D is arguably a more reliable and useful source which explains the concerns which leading Conservatives felt with regard to social reform, although it too suffers from some aforementioned limitations.'

(b) Some impressive answers were seen to this question which was again, in the main, supported by sound contextual knowledge. Indeed some candidates were determined to offload vast amounts of descriptive material on the domestic reforms, rarely using it to examine the

issue of careful planning on Disraeli's part, or extend or qualify the evidence provided by Cross and Disraeli. Most candidates could see evidence of careful planning in A and especially B and could equally see that these were from Disraeli himself. Both were in the public arena (Manchester and Parliament) and thus prone to rhetorical flourish and ambitious claim. In contrast candidates could equally point to C, D and E, Cross and Vincent who, from rather different perspectives, contemporary and historical, do not provide evidence of much careful planning on Disraeli's part. At this point performance became more varied as weaker candidates fell by the wayside in evaluation. Many struggled with Disraeli in A, failing to analyse the credibility of his stance on the working poor. Some thought he was in power, missing or not understanding the dates (Gladstone's First Ministry) and certainly not identifying the context of Bruce's Liberal Trade Union reforms on which Disraeli was seeking to capitalise. Few questioned his claims as to their wealth or saw in it a political motive to win over the customarily liberal new Model Unions whose legal status he appears to champion. They thus lost a chance to judge the nature of a carefully planned programme or to question whether it was just opportunistic rhetoric on Disraeli's part. In practice few made much of A and some failed to use it altogether. Nonetheless most were more secure on B although most took the conventional line on Disraeli's opportunism and thus failed to make full use of the Manchester Speech, overlooking the hints about what would later become 'national efficiency'. On Cross (C and D) many also failed to make as much as they could have done. In C they were confused by the different dates contained in the introduction (1874) and the attribution (1903), not knowing what to make of it. Better candidates realised that these were Cross' memoirs and by that date, with Disraeli long dead, Cross could well be laying claim to the domestic achievements of the government, minimising the role Disraeli played. On D, weaker candidates failed to see the distinction between a PM and a minister and again could not work out why Disraeli was not mentioned. They lost the chance to comment that this might be evidence that social reform was planned. A specific bill was behind introduced. Vincent in E came in for much stock evaluation as a modern historian. Most recognised the strong anti Disraeli steer he provides but could not contrast his comments on the absence of any move to a welfare state with the claims made by Disraeli in B on racial health and national greatness that appear to foreshadow Edwardian developments. Only a tiny minority were able to suggest that Vincent might, as an historian, be basing his comments on Bruce's memoirs, hence the more sceptical view of Disraeli's social reforms.

The following is another high level response, respectively Levels IA, IA, IB and IB, a total of 64/70:

'The first years of Disraeli's Second Administration produced a raft of social legislation which prompted one Union leader to comment that 'the Conservatives have done more for the working man in two years than the liberals have in fifty'. The Public Health Act, and Artisans Dwelling Act, both of 1875, are further examples which support the interpretation that Disraeli had a clear programme of planned social reform in the 1870's.

Despite this, many historians, including Vincent in source E, are dubious as to the extent to which Disraeli had a planned programme of social reform. Vincent argues that Disraeli was largely unconcerned with social legislation, a not atypical view which corroborates with source C, in which Richard Cross demonstrates his disappointment with Disraeli's lack of ideas. It must be considered, however, that Cross was never a great supporter of Disraeli within the Conservative party, and joined the cabinet with some reservations. This might perhaps suggest why he takes a rather insincere line on Disraeli's social policy. In this regard, perhaps, a source from Salisbury, or another cabinet member might add to the overall usefulness of these sources. However, despite the limitations of source C, it still provides strong evidence to refute the interpretation that Disraeli had a carefully planned programme of social reform.

Disraeli's own view, offered in source A, could also be seen to corroborate with Vincent's view. Disraeli, debating in the House of Commons, seems to take a rather naïve view of the circumstances of the British working class, arguing that 'they are a very wealthy class', which seems to implicitly suggest that they don't require any sanitary legislation to improve their conditions. Although this would superficially corroborate Vincent's view, the timing and provenance of the source clearly has influenced the content. Disraeli was well aware of the awful

conditions faced by many workers during the 1870's and this source is perhaps demonstrating Disraeli's opposition to Liberal policy. Disraeli was arguably the first politician to oppose the government on every issue as a political strategy and this attack on Gladstone's policy does not, therefore, give a fair representation of Disraeli's views of social reform. Moreover, 3 years from a General election is it highly unlikely that Disraeli would have a fully planned programme of social legislation, especially given the apparent strength of the Liberals at the time.

Source B perhaps offers a better insight into Disraeli's thinking on social reform, and indeed it would seem to suggest that Disraeli was carefully planning his social reform programme by 1872, refuting Vincent and supporting the interpretation. Disraeli argues that 'public attention ought to be concentrated on sanitary legislation', a point which could be seen to corroborate strongly with Cross in source D. Despite this, source B is severely limited in that it is extremely typical of Disraeli's promises. He specialised in vaguely attractive promises which boiled down to very little substance, and it must be considered that this extract, from Disraeli's Free Trade Hall speech is designed to win votes. In order to gain a better insight into Disraeli's view on social reform, perhaps a more private source, such as a Diary extract or a letter to Derby, would improve the usefulness of the sources as a set. Both A and B, however, are limited in their usefulness because Disraeli has a political agenda in play on both occasions.

Moreover, although source D could be seen to superficially support the interpretation, the source seems quite inconsistent for it argues that social reform should be limited, so as to prevent citizens becoming 'dependent'. In this respect this source corroborates with source C in supporting Vincent's view (from source E), for both suggest a lack of impetus from Disraeli. The usefulness of source D must, however, be called into question for it focuses only on the Artisans Dwelling Act, and does not provide an overall view of Disraeli's social reform. Cross seems to take a rather harsh view of Disraeli, failing to mention proposals such as the 1875 Sale of Food and Drugs Act (which is indeed alluded to in source B). In his defence, however, many of the proposals came from outside the cabinet. Indeed, the 1876 Merchant Shipping Act was pressed for largely by Samuel Plimsoll, an opposition backbencher. A liberal view, perhaps of their leader Hartington, might indeed be useful in assessing the extent to which the Conservative social reform of the 1870's was truly Disraeli's.

However, many historians have argued, amongst them, Robert Blake, that although Disraeli may not have planned every piece of social Reform down to the final clause, he did indeed have an overall plan for social legislation that he put into practice. This is mentioned in source E, although Cross takes a rather harder line in source C, arguing that Disraeli had to rely 'entirely' on his colleagues. Source B, although biased due to Disraeli's own view, could be seen to support this interpretation of an 'overall social philosophy', for it alludes to many different aspects of social reform, it does take a more favourable line than sources C and E. In this respect, a later source from Disraeli, from his premiership, might be useful in discussing the issue, as the lack of a post 1874 Disraeli view is a clear limitation.

In conclusion, therefore, these five sources would appear to offer significant evidence to refute the interpretation that Disraeli had a carefully planned programme of social reform in the 1870's. Sources E and C argue this in the strongest terms, whilst A could also be seen as evidence to suggest that Disraeli cared little for the working classes. Despite this, the sources, particularly B, do seem to suggest that whilst Disraeli may not have planned every piece of social legislation but he did indeed have a carefully planned overall view of social reform which he tried to implement. Unfortunately, this view is not sustainable with the evidence provided from these five sources. Although the set suffers from limitations, the overall impression of these five sources, despite individual limitations, strongly refutes the interpretation that Disraeli had a carefully planned programme of social reform.'

3. England and a New Century 1900-24

Although some excellent responses were seen, of the 4 questions this saw the weakest responses. It would appear that for some Centres the indicative content on Ireland had not been studied to the disadvantage of their candidates. Plaintive references to the 'Cat and Mouse Act' and Emily Davison suggest they were expecting social issues.

(a) Without the different contexts, Carson's great speech launching Ulster's campaign of promised civil disobedience (the 'Solemn League and Covenant', provided in the introduction) and Redmond's later attempt to ensure Asquith's Liberal government stuck to its guns over Home Rule for all of Ireland, using their dependency on Irish Nationalist votes post the elections of 1910, candidates struggled to make much sense of the question. Better candidates kept a clear focus on the question, attitudes to Home Rule, and compared the views on its consequences, its suggested economic and cultural/national impact, over partition (where many assumed a difference that was not there – both Carson and Redmond opposed Partition and Ulster exclusion at this stage) and on religion (present in Redmond's case but, interestingly, not in Carson's and rarely picked up on). The more able contrasted the implied threats in both, in Carson's case civil disobedience and possibly armed resistance ('to stand against...threatened calamity...to defend our equal citizenship and...to use all necessary means to defeat this conspiracy'), in Redmond's a parliamentary threat to keep Asquith on the straight and narrow of a commitment to Home Rule. Many struggled with the provenance because their contextual knowledge was shaky and they failed to read the information provided carefully enough. Some assumed Carson was writing an article in the Times read only by the educated few and therefore of limited impact, missing the phrase 'reported in'. A few even alleged that the Times had 'doctored' the speech in some way. Some thought it a speech in Parliament and thus comparable to Redmond in C. Surprisingly few commented on differences in tone. Carson's speech in B is drenched in British patriotic rhetoric with appeals to King and Empire, whilst Redmond in C draws on images of nationalism and its associated 'rights', with appeals to former martyrs, 1886 and the great Parnell. Again only some were able to comment on the different dates and thus the changing context. In B, 1912, the original Home Rule Bill is the issue at stake; by 1913, in C, the suggestion of Ulster's exclusion has come to dominate political debate. There was much confusion over the amending of the Bill to accommodate Ulster through exclusion and when this happened. It was clear that for some the difference between Home Rule and Partition through exclusion was not understood. Some candidates had no idea of what Ulster was, assuming it to be a town somewhere in Ireland. Others referred to the Unionists as the 'Ulsters'.

(b) This too saw some weak and muddled responses. Better answers used the historian in Source E as the basis for an answer and used it, Bonar Law in A and the references by Healy in D to the PM's manoeuvrings over exclusion for Ulster, to make the case that the crisis arose and grew because of Asquith's mishandling of Home Rule. They then used A, B, C and D to construct the case against – that Asquith was the victim of the electoral situation post 1910 (dependency on Irish nationalist votes); that Bonar Law's Conservatives deliberately encouraged the crisis following their constitutional defeat in 1910-11 to the extent of condoning armed rebellion in Ulster ('no lengths of resistance to which Ulster will go in which I shall be ready to support them' in A); that Carson and Craig successfully organised Ulster civil disobedience with the potential for armed rebellion in the UVF (Source B) that would be difficult to thwart (and here own knowledge of Asquith and Seeley's handling of the Curragh Mutiny and Gun Running would have been pertinent); that the Irish Nationalists bore some responsibility for forcing a reluctant Asquith to embrace Home Rule (Source C) and then divided amongst themselves over exclusion (Source D). These Sources provide plenty of evidence for intransigent stances, reluctance on Asquith's opponents' side to compromise and the remorseless logic of the political situation. However many candidates, because Asquith was not mentioned by name, could not see how to use A and B to construct an argument against his role, failing to spot they were about Ulster Unionist and Conservative responsibility for the crisis. They same applied to C (often misinterpreted to read that Redmond opposed Home Rule when they possibly meant to say that

he opposed Home Rule with Ulster exclusion) and to a lesser extent D, which needed to be used to assess the responsibility for the crisis of a divided Irish nationalism. Only those with some background knowledge were able to make sense of the nationalist sources and to point to the absence of views from republican and revolutionary nationalism. Again better answers made much of Asquith's handling of exclusion to defuse the crisis, using E (which accuses him of unnecessary delay), C (which poses the problem of selling it to Redmond's nationalists) and especially D (which is evidence that he successfully leant on Redmond but also warns that it could lead to civil war in excluded Ulster and Nationalist split). Evaluation of provenance was weak given that the sources themselves were frequently misunderstood and poorly used. Better answers made much use of tone (brinkmanship in A-D) and of the use of public stance (newspapers and parliamentary speeches). They also picked up on the decidedly opinionated views of Jalland in E, which were not supported by any example other than Asquith's initial failure to incorporate exclusion on the suggestion of Lloyd George and Churchill. Few picked up on whether Bonar Law in A could carry his views with the rest of the Conservatives or spotted a continuing Conservative constitutional theme – that the Liberals lacked a mandate for major constitutional change ('we do not accept the right of the government to carry out such a revolution'), something tried earlier with the People's Budget and the Parliament Act, the constitutional background to the Home Rule crisis. Many candidates on Source A also seemed to think that Asquith was the Liberal Chief Whip referred to in the first sentence; others were confused by the term, assuming bullying of parliament or something even more sinister. The root of the problem for many was lack of context and a working own knowledge that would have allowed the sources to speak to them in a meaningful way. Responses were often sequenced and based on shaky narrative. A few diverted into post 1914 (the Easter Rising); some even back to the Famine of the 1840s.

4. Churchill 1920- 45

Although there was a wide variety of response, on the whole examiners were impressed with the engaged approach, which ranged from the dubious allegation that he was nothing more than an 'old git' to the view that he was both the greatest living Englishman and our greatest war leader. Centres are to be congratulated on their successful delivery of this new topic.

(a) Comparisons as to character were, in the main, successful. However for weaker candidates the temptation to ignore the precise area of comparison, Churchill's character, proved too much and they compared too generally in an unfocused manner. Those who did focus also often did so too generally, not getting much further than the petulant child in Brooke (C) and the inspiring leader able to distinguish the main features of a situation in Jacob (D). There was more to unwrap here, particularly if related to the provenance. Only the able were able to see the agreement – Brooke's reference to 'toys' is corroborated by Jacob's reference to Churchill's obsession with the new (radar, warships etc.). The latter also refers to any 'matters which attracted his passing attention', something that Brookes deplores when he is trying to obtain sound and practical decisions about the war in South East Asia. Jacobs also admits that Churchill could have some old fashioned ideas on warfare. Most candidates dealt with provenance separately but said largely sensible things about the dates (Brooke writing at the time, in the heat of the moment, without thought as to later publication; Jacob writing a more balanced but largely favourable account published soon after Churchill's death at a time when the consensus of opinion allowed little dissent from the hagiographic) and the circumstances. Brooke was well known but as expected Jacob was not. Several candidates missed the introductory comment, 'a leading soldier', or seemed to have little knowledge of the bureaucratic aspect of senior soldiering, assuming Jacob to be simply a secretary who would be in ignorant awe of the great man. His evidence was thus dismissed, the coup de grace being the alleged bias of the final lines – 'inspired us by his leadership'. A careful reading of what he had to say revealed a more careful and subtle balance with much inference as to weaknesses which Brooke openly, if tetchily referred to. For many, comments on provenance were very stock. Dates are meant to be unpacked, not merely used in a reflex manner (there was much primary= good evidence, secondary =bad stuff). Judgement also tended to be rare, even in middling

candidates and was similarly 'stock' in many cases. What follows is a candidate who reached Level II in all three assessment targets, a total of 23/30. The focus was more on comparing provenance than content but a judgement was arrived at :-

'Both sources C and D are extremely useful evidence for Churchill's character as a Wartime Prime Minister. Source C tells us an immediate factual account of Churchill's character whereas source D gives us details of Churchill's character which have been carefully written. Of the two however, source D would provide the better and more constructive evidence for Churchill's character while he was a Wartime Prime Minister

Both sources C and D provide evidence that show negative qualities in Churchill's character. Alan Brooke in source C explains he "had another row with him" and refers to the 19th August as "another poisonous day!" 19th August 1943 was soon after the British invasion of Sicily, in June, and the Allies were discussing where their next target should be. Churchill was known to be extremely temperamental, hence why Alan Brooke describes him as a "spoilt child". Churchill and Alan Brooke were known to have their differences; both were extremely stubborn and their relationship was a rollercoaster of admiration and loathing. Source D, although barely criticising Churchill as a Wartime Prime Minister, still mentions that "he [Churchill] had somewhat old fashioned ideas of warfare." What Jacob wrote certainly is evidence; Churchill definitely used traditional ideas of warfare as he always pushed for a victory and he was a great force for pushing action, such as the First Battle of El Alamein, and this quality was often viewed negatively with the view that Churchill was traditional. Nonetheless, source D is certainly useful for giving us a balanced account of Churchill's character. Source C also provides us with evidence as, from Alan Brooke's account, we understand Churchill was extremely temperamental.

However, of the two sources, it is only source D which provides us with positive evidence concerning Churchill's character. Jacob wrote "he [Churchill] possessed a solid base of experience" and "he inspired us by his leadership." Jacob wrote his memoirs in 1968 so it is of course long after the war had ended in 1945, nonetheless what he wrote is certainly factually reliable; we know that Churchill was an extremely charismatic character who aroused confidence in soldiers in the army and he had military experience from the 1900's where he trained in Sandhurst. Jacob's account, however, is likely to be biased. Although he gives a balanced account of Churchill's character, his account is centred on Churchill and his memoirs were published while Churchill was still alive. In this sense, Jacob most likely would not have wanted to offend Churchill or his leadership and as he has written an account, it has clearly been written with great care and a lot of time. Nonetheless it still provides us with factually correct evidence for Churchill's character. On the other hand, Alan Brooke wrote nothing positive about Churchill in his account. This could be due to his personal dislike of Churchill and due to the fact he was the only general who ever really stood up to Churchill so they often clashed personalities. However it is still likely to be reliable as it is a diary entry so a lot of what has been written was impulsive and rushed and we can tell this by the short-hand used and the rushed manner in which it is conveyed. Again, both sources provide necessary evidence for Churchill's character however Alan Brooke's account is extremely unbalanced, making Jacob's the best evidence for Churchill's character

Both sources C and D provide us with factually reliable and correct evidence for Churchill's personality. It is interesting since both points of view are written by men who worked in the army and yet they have such clashing views on Churchill's personality. Of course, this is due to the provenance of the sources. Alan Brooke wrote an impulsive diary entry, intended for personal use, whereas Jacob wrote an account intended for public reading thus having the motive to influence readers with the idea that Churchill was a great British statesman. Although both are reliable, Jacob's account in source D is the better evidence as although it's primary motive is to portray a great image of Churchill, it also gives us a balanced account, as he wrote that although Churchill had experience no one "could match", he did have 'somewhat old fashioned ideas of

warfare” which provides us with information which can positively and negatively contribute to Churchill’s character, thus making source D the better evidence’.

(b) Churchill as a ‘great war leader’ produced some very passionate accounts, both for and against, with some obviously able candidates getting quite carried away, not least from the sources upon which the discussion was supposed to be based. Some impressive answers were seen, one of which is reproduced below. Most managed to use the sources appropriately, the usual grouping was Sources A and D for his qualities as a great war leader, with B, C and E taking issue with this view at various dates and on various issues. Many weaker candidates however, and some middling ones, found Sources A and B surprisingly difficult to handle. ‘A’ was Churchill himself and was intended to provide evidence of his wartime rhetoric (the reiteration of ‘victory’) at a time of great national emergency. However many candidates missed the context and either couldn’t see how to use it, assuming war leadership to be matters strictly military, or dismissed it as nothing more than propaganda. Source B, Laidlaw Milne, was poorly handled, perhaps because candidates had never heard of him. We didn’t expect them to, hoping they would pick up on a leading Conservative critic, but it seems that few knew what a censure debate was. They also failed to understand the point that Milne was making – that Churchill should confine himself to general political matters and not seek to run the war himself by combining the offices of PM and Defence, an issue that clearly linked to the point that Brookes made in C but which Jacob countered in D. Both better and weaker answers diverted at this point into long and largely irrelevant pre-war digressions on Churchill’s misjudgements. Some candidates also struggled with the historian in E. They failed to pick up on Thompson’s contentious tone or even the irreverent title (‘Generalissimo Churchill’), preferring instead to comment on stock issues like hindsight (one even considered it unreliable ‘as 1974 was an unreliable year’). They accepted at face value his comments on the Desert War, the ‘honest and able’ Auchinleck and on Montgomery’s ‘comfortable HQ’. Indeed this was where some knowledge could usefully have been deployed, either of the North African War or that in South East Asia referred to by Brookes in C. Most preferred to offload general information on Churchill’s greatness or otherwise, often pre war, without a specific steer towards his role as ‘war leader’, his relationships with the Generals and his role in strategies. A sizeable number appeared to know little beyond what the sources told them. They also need to be careful about dates, chronologies and contexts. With the exception of D, which tends to make general points, all the sources are referring to the first half of the war when there was a real sense of crisis (Chamberlain’s fall and failure in Norway, the German attack on France and British encirclement for A; major defeats in the Far East etc. as the context for B). Surprisingly few made the issues raised by the sources the focus of their argument – Churchill’s over-personal involvement in decisions, his appointment and relationship with his generals, his approach to strategy and tactics (widely assumed to be interchangeable) and his role in maintaining morale. The following is a response that demonstrated some good levels of discrimination and was focused. It evaluated some of the sources in rather general terms (although comments on the historian were ‘stock’) and was rather evasive on making a judgement. It received Levels IB,II, II and IB, a total of 56/70 :-

‘Churchill’s ability as a great war leader has often caused much controversy among historians. Sources A and D do support the interpretation that Churchill was a great war leader. On the other hand, sources B, C and the majority of E do not support the statement. Overall however, the majority of sources oppose the statement and claim Churchill’s ability as a Wartime Prime Minister was somewhat overrated.

The sources agreeing with the statement are sources A and D. In source A, Churchill said Britain will “wage war against a monstrous tyranny” and their aim was “victory – victory at all costs”. This shows Churchill’s determination and highlights the charismatic ability he had to rouse confidence in those who heard his speech. Both determination and charisma are qualities which ensured Churchill as a great war leader. Similarly, source D corroborates source A as Jacob

wrote "we can only recall with gratitude the five years in which he inspired us by his leadership". This emphasises the idea that Churchill was an extremely inspiring war leader and emphasises the statement that Churchill was a great war leader. The provenance of the two sources must also be considered. Source A is a speech Churchill made to the House of Commons. As it was a speech, the language is extremely emotive and somewhat exaggerated, which enables Churchill to have a greater influence. The speech was not solely intended for the House of Commons and it was also an extremely public speech so Churchill also aimed to inspire the British public and enable public opinion to be more favourable towards him than it had been in the past, especially after he condemned appeasement in 1938 which greatly clashed with general public opinion. Additionally, he made his speech three days after he was appointed prime minister and in the early stages of the war so Churchill evidently was trying to show that as a newly elected Prime Minister, he would guide Britain to victory "against a monstrous tyranny". Source D was written by Jacob in the latter years of the war, in fact it was published thirteen years after the war had ended. Despite this, Jacob still wrote very favourably about Churchill and although his account was written with great care, as it was written after the war it insinuates that Jacob believed Churchill be an exceptionally sound leader throughout the war who possessed an "enquiring mind" and "a sound base of experience". Both sources suggest and highlight Churchill's positive ability as a war leader; his inspiration, influence, determination and ability to succeed and lead Britain to victory. Thus both sources A and D support the interpretation that Churchill was a great war leader.

On the other hand, sources B, C and E disregard the statement. Each source agrees the Churchill's behaviour towards his Generals was not amiable. Milne from source B wanted a "strong and independent defence minister" who allowed "his generals and admirals and our marshals [...] to do their work in their way". This is supported by Alan Brooke in source C when he wrote "he [Churchill] refused to accept that any general plan was necessary". Similarly, Thompson from source E wrote "Churchill was ignorant of all that the administration of armies entailed". Each source implies that Churchill actually had extremely limited military knowledge and each source highlights the idea that Churchill should not have overruled his generals when it came to tactics. This is factually correct: Churchill was famous for getting involved with matters of very little concern to him such as the General Strike of 1926, and again this is evident through Sources A, C and E. According to the sources, Churchill got carried away with his militaristic attitude and because he was so keen on action, would often assert his influence over his Generals and push them into Battles they had not yet prepared for. The only General who actually stood firm against Churchill's pressures was Alan Brooke and this is evident when Alan Brooke wrote "got nowhere with him and settled nothing!" Of course the reliability of the sources is questionable.

Milne from source B was a conservative MP making a speech during 1942. The fact that he is a Conservative MP poses questions concerning reliability. Once Churchill was out of power in 1929, he distanced himself from the Conservative party and after Churchill's negative stance on India and appeasement, he offended many Conservative MP's, evidently Milne, as he proceeded to continuously disagree with the majority. Milne made his speech in June 1942 just before the second battle of El Alamein so his only factual record of Churchill's progress in the war was the failure of the First Battle of El Alamein in October 1941. Additionally, Milne's speech has been written with time and care so he has clearly constructed his argument, designing to influence others on their opinion of Churchill. Source C is a diary entry written by Alan Brooke, one of Churchill's most significant Generals. Alan Brooke does not praise Churchill in any form and even proceeds to compare him to a "spoilt child". Alan Brooke and Churchill were known to have a roller-coaster relationship of admiration and loathing and certainly towards the latter stages of the war the loathing between the two became more evident.

Additionally, Montgomery's arrogance also led him to believe he needed no interference from Churchill. Both thought that Churchill paid very little attention to what his Generals wanted and often tried to overrule them with his own "purely opportunistic policy".

Alan Brooke wrote this source on the 19th August 1943 which was shortly after British victory in Sicily so Churchill was undoubtedly pushing for more victories which Alan Brooke, in his current focus on South East Asia, was trying to resist. Thompson the modern historian in Source E also

wrote Churchill was “completely naïve about tactics” and his shuffling of Generals contributed negatively to Churchill’s war leadership. Thompson is a modern historian so his account is likely to be reliable as he has hindsight and has gathered a great deal of information about Churchill as a war leader, and has made his own opinion based on this. Additionally his book was written in 1974 which was years after the war so the book has been carefully written with a great deal of time. The three sources all contribute to the idea that Churchill’s war leadership was flawed by the fact that he often believed he had greater knowledge than the military leaders themselves, which led to what have been seen as fundamental mistakes such as replacing General Auchinleck with Montgomery when it was in fact Auchinleck who won the “victory at El Alamein and North Africa”. Milne from source B even said Churchill should not have been appointed Prime Minister as he was already Minister of Defence implying Churchill had very little knowledge of effective leadership.

The sources provide a range of evidence for Churchill’s ability as a great war leader. Often the sources agreeing with the interpretation certainly fully support the comment. Churchill of course clearly thinks he’s extremely able and Jacob agrees that Churchill inspired confidence and guided Britain to victory. However, the majority of the sources disagree with the interpretation. Each one claims that Churchill should not have dictated to the Generals simply because he was the leader of Britain’.

F964 01

This paper was taken by 1744 candidates who, like their early British History colleagues, were also considered marginally weaker than their legacy equivalent, albeit a little less so. Q2 on the German Reformation was by far the more popular of the two questions, comprising approximately three quarters of the candidature. However the standard of understanding and knowledge on Q1 (on the First Crusade) was higher than in Q2, but in both cases some candidates were uncertain how best to use it in relation to the question asked. Indeed in Q2 there was a conspicuous amount of knowledge used irrelevantly, perhaps because candidates wanted to discuss Luther and the events of 1517-21, which was not the focus of the question. Consequently there were fewer who accessed Level I and more who found themselves in Levels III and IV, especially on the German Reformation. No complaints were received on this paper.

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

(a) Many answers got sucked into the motive of rallying support for the crusade rather than the Pope's attitudes towards Muslims, the real focus of the comparison. The best answers used the persuasive motive focusing on the demonisation of Muslims as religious polluters as well as provenance, to evaluate papal attitudes as being exaggerated for that very purpose. Few answers, rather surprisingly, said anything meaningful about the audience of Urban's letter in C, which was a pity, as there were obvious clues in the introduction and attribution. Many made an effective comparison of the tone and wording/language of the Sources, with good knowledge of the meaning of 'pagan' and barbarian' and the subtle differences of tone in their usage. The dates were picked up by most who used the idea of hindsight quite well, if in an underdeveloped manner. The better candidates pointed out that A represents the point where Urban launched the idea of the crusade, whereas C is more part of a follow-up campaign specific to a single region to persuade individuals to sign up to the venture. The Muslims would be used in both with the stress on them being 'pagans' in A and 'barbarians' in C. They also pointed out the slightly more religious appeal to motives in A, bearing in mind that Urban was addressing a Church Council, compared to the more secular appeal of Source C. The most obvious flaw in reasoning was to drift away from the focus of the question or to struggle unnecessarily to find lots of major differences rather than more subtle ones. Urban's message on Muslims is largely similar in each case. It was rare to find a judgement.

(b) As in part (a) the main error here was to divert into a question on the motives of the crusaders in going on Crusade rather than an assessment of the evidence for the nature of Urban's appeal. It appeared for many all too easy to allow this to happen. More successful candidates, and there were many of these on this question, assessed the social and material appeal (using Source B and a good part of E) in relation to the religious (using A, C, D and in part E) usually concluding that the latter had priority. The best pointed out that such issues, secular and religious, could not easily be separated and were skilful in demonstrating the links between them. Weaker candidates struggled to distinguish between social and material gain, with the dimensions of the former, perhaps most obviously seen in Source D, Urban's letter to an Italian city, in contrast to the more usual appeals to a warrior and peasant society, in particular less understood. It was the mark of the better candidate that they could categorise in this manner. Although most managed a reasonably successful grouping the tendency for many candidates was then to sequence, discussing each source individually. Only a few approached the question by looking at different aspects of the religious appeal (the armed pilgrimage, remission of sins, salvation, the linkage between religious and lay leaders) or at the social and material appeal (land, resources, overpopulation, internal dissent and 'civil' war, politics and social codes). Other, more subtle ways of approaching the sources were taken only by an able few – approaching the nature of appeal, for example, through audience. In A and B we have those gathered at the Council of Clermont itself, in C a follow up to the County of Flanders, in D a rather different audience in an Italian city and in E a modern historical account perhaps more likely to detect and stress social and material motives as underpinning the religious ones. This approach led naturally to an evaluation of the Sources where linkages could more easily be

seen. For example it was rare to see any point out that Duncalf in E may have based his observations on Robert the Monk's account in Source B and that given that both A and B are accounts of the same sermon it will depend on what weight one gives to any particular section of it. Some used the historian in E as their 'lead' source as it can be used in different ways. However in this Source(E) few picked up on the mention of Urban's desire to help Eastern Christians, seen also in the letter to Bologna in C, or could use their knowledge to assess whether much was made of this. The implication in Duncalf is that he downplayed it in favour of internal western factors but surprisingly few picked up on this. Some missed the subtleties in the sources through a failure to read closely. For example, Urban's comment to the faithful of Bologna – 'if any men go there not because they desire earthly profit...' could be taken as a thinly- disguised attempt by him to advertise the fact that gaining earthly profit was a distinct possibility.

2. The German Reformation 1517-1555

(a) Most candidates focused clearly on religious attitudes and beliefs, although some, by a rigid approach to structure diverted from this, particularly from those of 'townspeople'. Most discussed support for Lutheranism in Source A, Zwinglianism in E, seeing the difference in statements about Roman Catholics. The key to provenance here was the issue of typicality (see below). The provenance of A was almost always mentioned and seen as biased, with use of hyperbole and exaggerated language 'utterly destroyed', 'laughing stock' and 'cut each other to pieces'. Many realised the significance of the date as just prior to the Peasants' War and after the Knights' War. Others assumed it was during the War. Some then drifted into an essay on these events, ignoring the question on urban attitudes ('townspeople'). Better answers stated that tensions in the countryside were building up by 1524 and this might have affected the sense of panic in Source A. When content detail was compared, some useful insights were shown, such as disorder continuing in towns after the crushing of the Peasants' War. However many middling and weaker candidates neglected to compare attitudes to change, which were similar in that townspeople in both cities, neither especially typical generally or in the exceptional circumstances of a Diet, seemed to embrace change. The evaluation of this change over the intervening period provided a good means of evaluating the attitudes in the Sources. Some realised that attitudes would be untypical in the heightened tensions of a Diet when outsiders would enter the city. However many missed this obvious contextual similarity between the two sources, both hosting Diets. Weaker candidates clearly had no real understanding of what a Diet was, assuming that at Worms to be unique. Many missed the point that A mentions other Cities (as being Lutheran if under princely control) including Augsburg whereas E refers only to Augsburg. Some candidates mistakenly thought Ziani was German and discussed at length whether or not 'Ziani' was a German name. In fact he was, like Source E, Venetian, although knowledge of this was certainly not expected. None seemed to link to the context of a Diet to explain his presence as an 'outraged' observer. Some thought he was local to Nuremberg, calling it 'his city' to explain his resentment as the only Catholic left there! Few saw him as one of the observers at the Diet.

Many Centres seemed to crave a mention of Luther at every opportunity so indulged themselves with discussions of what Luther had said about Friars and indulgences in 1517, explaining why Ziani was bitter, relevant provided it did not become too lengthy and thus diversionary. The mention of Catholic princes in Source A also led to the narration of irrelevant events concerning Frederick the Wise and the 'kidnapping' after the Diet of Worms.

The provenance of E was sometimes ignored, but many did suggest his report was more objective even though he was likely to be Catholic, an issue which some debated at great and irrelevant length, seeing that the main point of comparison was in the emotive tone of indignation of A in comparison to the more official style of E. The context of 1530 was less well known than that of 1524, although some were aware of the context of the Colloquy of Marburg, mentioned in the introduction, and almost all candidates discussed the difference in date. Again the trigger of

'Marburg' led to some over-lengthy digressions as to what happened there. Some weaker ones felt Ziani had deliberately left out Zwingli in Source A because he was biased. There were a few examples of very weak geographical knowledge from those who stated that Zwingli was only popular in Switzerland, which borders north-west Germany. Some concluded that the Venetian observer emphasised majority support for Zwingli in Augsburg only because he was a Zwinglian himself and biased. Many called his supporters 'Zwinglis' and the town was widely misspelt as 'Ausberg'.

(b) Candidates who organised the Sources had a variety of different groupings, seeing the different arguments possible from the same Source. However many struggled with finding an appropriate grouping and weaker candidates took 'authority' to mean only the Emperor and the Pope. Only the better answers defined *which authorities*, the organisational key to success in answering this question - in Source A and E the Princes, the Imperial Cities, Knights, Pope and Emperor meeting at the Diet but elsewhere (all the sources) acting in their individual ruling capacities. Some candidates, who lacked a firm grasp of the variety of authorities, including ecclesiastical, in the German States and Empire, became confused. More successful candidates were led in the direction of grouping Catholic and Protestant authorities, leading to much better structured answers. A was then grouped with D, for weakness of Catholic and Imperial control, whereas C was grouped with E for stronger Protestant Princely and Urban control, and B seen as evidence of the potential strength of reforming princes, but their lack of control of radicals leading to the Peasants' War. Indeed Source B caused the most problems as weaker candidates didn't know what to make of it (it was intended to show both the potential for princely control but also the possible threat to that control, especially if candidates recognised the provenance of Thomas Muntzer). Unfortunately this reference to the likelihood of war often opened the flood gates to Luther's overall message and its misinterpretation followed by irrelevant narrative of the part he played in the events of 1517-25. Many candidates seemed to feel that you could not answer a 'German Reformation' question unless Luther was at the heart of the answer. Others with large amounts of own knowledge were determined to offload long accounts of why Charles V was unable to exert control in the 1520s (and beyond). Other approaches were also followed successfully by many who grouped the sources around 'control' or lack of it, using A (Ziani on Nuremburg) and, depending on interpretation, D (Charles V) and B (Muntzer) to argue for lack of control and C (Philip of Hesse) and E (the Venetian observer) for control, with B and D for some support, although again this depended on interpretation. This approach simply addressed 'authority', regardless of whether that authority itself was catholic or reformist.

Many candidates took Source D at face value and began with it, to show the Emperor's power and control over the Holy Roman Empire. Better answers knew his weakness within the political structure of the Empire and could use the telling phrase in the source to underline this –'so far as is humanly possible', but the most common way to support a point about imperial weakness was to mention Charles's distraction in fighting the Turks and absence from Germany. This ignored his political weakness even had he been there. Many candidates did not understand Sources B and C, due to lack of contextual knowledge. Müntzer was not known to some candidates, but these were a small minority. Some wrongly talked about the town of Munster and drifted off into confused irrelevance on the Anabaptists. For example:

'Source B suggests that if the reformist prince Philip of Heese (sic) did not force reform then the Catholics would overthrow them. This suggests that Charles and the Pope had the upper hand in the argument. The authorities were able to control the situation at Muntzer where the city was taken over by reformists and a new head was appointed called King John, they practised polygamy and everyone was seen as equal. The Emperor took immediate action and starved the city until they were all massacred. This stopped the town from converting.'

There were some candidates who, in using Source C, made sweeping generalisations about German princes suggesting they were all Lutheran. Most knew who Philip of Hesse was, but some were less familiar with his activities in the 1520s. The rulers of Electoral Saxony were also

well known through Luther. This example shows good integration of Sources and knowledge, with effective referencing but no evaluation of the sources per se:

'Source A describes how some authorities, the Catholic princes in this case, were being disobeyed giving the view that the authorities were not able to control the reformation in 1524, when Charles was away fighting. Source C contradicts this, however, as Philip of Hesse seems to be ruling a fairly stable state. The difference here is that Philip of Hesse had converted to Lutheranism and fully supported it, so wasn't being disobeyed as were the Catholic princes at the Diet in Nuremberg. Source C describes how, after the Diet of Speyer in 1526, where Ferdinand, who was making peace negotiations in Charles's absence, decided the individual states could decide whether to enforce the Edict of Worms, Hesse took the stance not to enforce the Edict. This supported Lutherans and allowed him to make social reforms as stated in the Source, and therefore control the reformation in his area. So far this shows that in areas where Catholic princes ruled, they failed to control the reformation in towns, as they tried to restrict the movements altogether, whereas where it was embraced, the reformation could be controlled by secular Princes.'

At the lower end, there were candidates who constructed a narrative of events from 1521 to 1531 (including the Schmalkaldic league - in fact, many went on to 1555). Implicit Source content was woven seamlessly into the narrative without any explicit mention of the Sources at all, let alone their identifying letters. These answers read like a Period Study essay. If the sources were referred to then their limitations were often bolted on, and sometimes unhelpful such as:

'All together the sources do have some limitations as they seem to steer the reader into thinking the authorities had no control when there were reasons for this such as the threat of war'.

However at the top, there were some exceptionally good answers to this question, using impressive breadth and detail of knowledge. They used a range of 'authorities' to structure highly integrated and evaluative answers that proved a pleasure to read.

F964/02

7330 candidates took this paper, the largest Enquiry Unit, with the most questions (5) and, if anything, performed a little better than in the equivalent legacy papers. Better responses were to be found on the earlier questions (late 18th and 19th centuries, where most accessed Levels I-IV), weaker on the later ones (20th century, where Levels II-V were more common). Both 20th century topics were new, although half of one of these continued the old topic on Nazi Germany. Nonetheless 20th century responses did see many impressive answers, two of which are fully reproduced in the more specific comments on Questions 4 and 5 and which should act as guidance for what we are expecting, both generally and on these two new topics. Those centres which have taught these two new topics are to be congratulated. It is evident that any mistakes and misunderstandings were the personal fault of candidates. Although by far the most popular of the questions was Q4 on Dictatorship and Democracy in Germany, there was more of a balance between the questions than has been the case in the past and its dominance was much less than in previous years. Next in popularity were the Origins of the American Civil War, Q3. Qs.1 and 2 on the French Revolution and Italian Unification respectively produced some particularly impressive responses and clearly attract a largely able candidature. Perhaps a little surprisingly Q5, the USA and the Cold War in Asia, was the least popular done largely by a few large centres, although answered well by many. Only one letter of complaint was received – on Q3 (America), to the effect that the topic was an unnamed area (Southern aims and ambitions in the 1850s with a focus on the 1850 Compromise and Slave Power) and that candidates would be uncertain as to what was meant in the wording of the question by the use of the term

'unrestricted' and what we meant by 'southern interests'. Examiners were asked to report on this but found that no candidates had difficulties with southern interests, interpreting it appropriately widely according to the sources.

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

Some very impressive answers were seen on this topic. Certainly the new topic of the Terror engaged the interests of some candidates who wrote with a degree of passion on the topic.

(a) The main error here was to write about views on the Terror rather than the revolution as a whole. The contrasts in content were obvious to most and provenance was handled well, if a little basically by some. However many candidates were not prepared to compare the content in detail, shying away from making precise points on liberty, equality, justice and the nature of laws, on government and sovereignty, and on virtue. Many missed that in terms of views Robespierre was talking about aims, des Essarts about practical consequences. Weaker candidates struggled with the phrase 'contemporary views' making some convoluted attempts to decide what was or was not contemporary. Some saw D (des Essarts) as not contemporary on the grounds it was written after the Terror and were simply wrong as it was clear that he had lived through the revolution in its entirety. Some however saw it as meaning 'of today' rather than 'of the day', and very oddly saw D as being contemporary as it disapproved of bloodshed and executions whilst Robespierre in B was not as it was far more bloodthirsty! Provenance was usually dealt with separately. Candidates tended to conclude that des Essarts in D was the more effective and judicious in his points, ignoring the very hostile, emotive and vague points he makes albeit in a politically freer atmosphere but perhaps too many, spotting the context of a speech to the Convention by Robespierre in B, dismissed his evidence as ideological propaganda, failing to point out that he was much prone to this sort of lecture, making points that he genuinely and passionately believed in. Better answers made much of the contrast between the ideology in B and the comments on revolutionary justice in D. Some candidates, faced with never having heard of des Essarts, made too many assumptions – that as a lawyer he must have taken part in terror trials or that he was a member of the Committee of Public Safety.

(b) This too saw some very effective responses. However many candidates tended to change the terms of the question, so many in fact that in part they must have misread it. The key issue was an assessment of the reasoning behind the Terror with the suggestion that the main impulse was a need to defend France and its revolution from its enemies. It was expected that candidates would find evidence of this in A (the Law of Suspects), B (Robespierre's speech where reference is made to the need to fight the 'tyrants of Europe'), C (St Just) and, by implication, D. Another possibility was the personal ambition of Robespierre and his colleagues on the CPS (D's 'madness and ambition' and one reading of Robespierre and St Just in C and D, especially the attack on the aristocracy and the ruthless confiscation of property). The other option in the sources was a genuine belief in a Rousseau inspired revolutionary ideology for which there was much evidence in A, C and D. Surprisingly only a minority picked up on the latter. Most contented themselves with a brief comment on ambition. Others used their knowledge, often at excessive length, to discuss an economic motivation driven by financial necessity or discussed whether the Terror was created to assuage the Sans Culottes and the Jacobin Club. Most candidates preferred a grouping of A, B and C for an enemy induced Terror versus D for 'madness and ambition'. Many however saw the question as making a crucial distinction between internal and external enemies (it didn't) and proceeded to group the sources around this (A, C and D for internal enemies; B and C for external ones) arguing that either one or the other provided the main thrust behind the Terror, often with brief and belated comments on the ambition referred to in D as a third option. Whilst not overly compromising their responses this did serve to distort the focus of the question and may have contributed to most missing the ideological reasons in the sources. In some cases their knowledge distorted, especially for those who were determined to dwell on the origins of the terror in 1792 (and before!). Knowledge of the period 1793-4 was more skeletal, especially in relation to the war, although events in the Vendee were known (and often graphically described). Some had problems with using Source A,

not knowing how to treat a source which is just what it said it was. Stock attempts to assess its reliability were met with failure. It was there to suggest rigour and a harsh and wide definition of enemies (defence in time of war or a piece of revolutionary extremism to wage war on personal and class enemies?). Candidates needed own knowledge to assess who introduced it, why and its applicability and effectiveness in practice. Weaker candidates were confused by the reference to the Bastille in D and wrote randomly about France setting up large numbers of prisons with the ensuing problems of overcrowding. Many underused St, Just in C. Whilst picking up on his points about defending France from enemies they missed the connection with the revolution and the celebration of liberty. Confiscation for example seems to go beyond the needs of war to a redistribution of property whilst harsh measures were to be welcomed as part of a brave new world and state. There were obvious linkages here with A and B.

2. The Unification of Italy 1815-70

This too produced a large number of impressive and effective responses from many candidates.

(a) Most compared Cavour's views well but some found the term 'constitutional government' difficult and it was clear that they didn't really understand it. They turned the question into a general one on his aims and methods. Some middling candidates, who were unsure about constitutional government were able to use the words in the sources ('constitution', 'liberal' and 'government', linked with associated issues such as 'parties', 'factions' and 'revolutionary') to make sense of the question. However most happily discussed the similarities – that Cavour favoured liberal and constitutional forms (and could back this with contextual material on the Statuto); that he believed government should be based on popular support stemming from the ballot box rather than revolutionary action; but that he had a suspicion of parties and factions. Many did not pick up on the main difference – they spotted that in A he could appear dictatorial in contradiction to popular sovereignty but did not contrast this with the more subtle point in E that sees Cavour as merely acting as part of a government where the initiative appears to lie, if anything, with the King. Some misread the first sentence of A thinking that de la Rive was accusing Cavour of ceasing to be a liberal. There were more problems with the provenance given that there were only two years between the two sources and Cavour had died in-between. Many candidates took both at face value when in E it was clear that Cavour was playing to an audience (Piedmont's Senate, a constitutional body) and there was an element of hero-worship on the part of de la Rive in A. Nonetheless many concluded that A might be the better evidence given that there is implied criticism amidst the national admiration for Cavour's achievement. Weaker candidates commented that the date of A might imply a little more neutrality (for which there was not much evidence) or that as a 'friend' of Cavour he was biased and not to be relied upon at all. Some became obsessively concerned with the material on the 1848 revolutions and were unable to link this to Cavour's dislike of mobs and street action.

(b) This was much more successfully tackled than (a), with some excellent evaluations seen. Many candidates were able to appreciate for example that certain sources (C, the Piedmontese military report, D, Cavour's letter to Ricasoli and E, Cavour's speech) could be used in more than one way. Most candidates were familiar with the Piedmont v. Italy debate and were able to bring a sound contextual knowledge to underpin the sources. These were usually grouped according to those that appeared to support a Piedmontese view (B and C, with some ambivalence on the part of D and E) and those that supported an Italian priority (A and possibly D and E depending on one's reading of them). Most were able to use their knowledge of Plombieres to develop a discussion on B and C ('promises that ought to be kept'), which support an extended North Italian kingdom as Cavour's priority. Better candidates were also able to argue from the sources that Cavour's attitudes changed. In A for example there is the suggestion that Cavour's policy became 'more exclusively Italian', implying that he may not always have supported the unity of Italy and twinned with his ambiguous comments in E on Garibaldi and the South able candidates were able to make much of this. Weaker answers were undermined by an uncertain contextual grip and it would appear that in most Centres there were a few candidates who had experience of a previous question we had set on Piedmont's

economy. They were well primed to answer this retrospective question and wrote extensively and irrelevantly about Cavour's economic plans for both Italy and Piedmont, with much on railways and his English visit, where, according to one candidate, he had been impressed, as one would, by a bridge from London to Birmingham. For some source B caused problems given a variety of assumptions as to the Times' reporter. Many thought he was French and used him as typical of 'French' opinion. Others made stock comments on 'journalists and vague comments on stereotypical French and English views. There were also some very mixed interpretations of source C, both in respect of content and provenance – was the reference to 'an independent Kingdom of Italy' the same as 'northern Italy' and therefore which did Cavour prefer? Was the Chief of Staff a friend and supporter or did he twist his report? Some used it to stress Cavour's ambiguity on the issue of unification, others were simply confused.

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

This was a popular question with a very mixed set of responses. The crucial difference between the best scripts and the weaker was an uncertain contextual grasp and a lack of knowledge to develop and expand on many of the source references, especially in source E (Wilson's 1872 book).

(a) The key here was to match the content very precisely and many compared too generally to be able to pick up on specific points in Seward and Clay. The former seemed better known than the latter, a pity given that Clay was the author of the Compromise in question. Nonetheless the contrasts were identified well, although it would have helped if middling candidates had put this into a constitutional perspective (Seward in A argues for a constitutional breach denied by Clay in B) and then went on to discuss their views on how the Compromise affected the Union, and the issue of popular v. State sovereignty (and what that might mean in terms of such issues as settlement and slavery). Few identified differences like Seward's universal appeal to God in contrast to Clay's stress on the 'desires of men' and the 'onward march of a nation'. Surprisingly only abler candidates identified the similarity in the provenance – that both were Senators addressing that body in very high blown and oratorical tones and both considered themselves great patriots. Most were happy to assert typicality re northern and southern views, leading to some rather stock comments on purpose which often developed into comments on bias and thus unreliability or one of the two sources being a speech and therefore unreliable, missing the fact that they were both speeches. Better candidates, knowing Clay's context, were able to point to his authorship and to the fact that this was a compromise so would not be accepted by all in the South. They knew his origins in the upper part of the South and that this was his final and emotional farewell to a senate he believed must accept the compromise as the only possibility of keeping the Union on the road. They also spotted the differences in the date, the death of President Taylor, an opponent of the Compromise, having intervened between the two speeches with a new president, Fillmore, less hostile to it. Many assumed the speeches followed one from the other. Weaker candidates were confused as to whether Clay was a northerner or southerner and if the latter how typical his position was or they simply asserted that Clay was a typical southerner (he was not, being neither radical, aggressive nor particularly pro-slavery). There was, for many, much paraphrasing and sequencing on this question. Some struggled with Seward's hypothetical statement about South Carolina in A, thinking it a reference to the Nullification Crisis and that the State of South Carolina had actually and permanently left the Union.

(b) If candidates were able to avoid sequencing after grouping (a very common approach on this question) this question produced some very effective responses. It was an issue which, on the whole, candidates had plenty of knowledge on and the sources contained a variety of perspectives allowing for a range of points. Most grouped A, C and E (Seward, Lincoln and Wilson) to argue that Southern interests were unrestricted and unacceptable in the 1850s (Slave Power), using D (the southern newspaper) as the counterview that the opposite pertained and that the North had come to completely constrict the South, with much supporting knowledge on raids and the whole bleeding Kansas Nebraska issue. Source B (Clay's pro-compromise

speech) tended to be used as a more nuanced source, although some thought it supported a lack of restriction thus missing the key idea of 'compromise'. Some were able to pair it with source D to argue that the South were restricted, citing concessions like the ban on slave trading in Washington DC and the fact that California was declared a free state. Others saw Source E's reference to Lincoln as suggesting southern interests were limited, missing the focus on 'between 1850 and 1860'. Many middling candidates failed to use their own knowledge to assess the validity of the assertions made by Wilson in E as to the ramifications of Slave Power – the charge that southern influence 'shaped policies, made presidents, judges and Congressmen' could be explained with reference to Taylor (who opposed Compromise in 1850), Pierce and Buchanan and the Dred Scott judgement (not a simple case of southern judges out-voting northern ones). Indeed some candidates identified southern interests as 'slavery' and nothing else – as a result they could construct a sound response but without any sense of States' rights or economic inequalities. More surprisingly was a failure to evaluate such a partial view of the 1850s. For some Wilson was an 'accurate' historian with neutral powers of hindsight. Source C proved problematical for some, as they thought it taken from the Lincoln-Douglas debates of 1858 and evaluated accordingly, although much of what was said remained valid. More seriously here was a teleological bent that read back from Lincoln as 'the future president'. It indicated that some candidates do not consider what the source is *actually saying* when they assess provenance: the two elements need to be assessed together. Also on this topic there is a reflex response which analyses everything in terms of whether it is a typical northern or southern response. Most of the sources had more to them than just this and candidates run the risk of over simplistic evaluation if this is all that they do. As stated at the beginning some weak candidates were confused with the idea of being 'unrestricted'.

4. Dictatorship and Democracy in Germany 1933-63

This was the most popular question on the paper but did produce some disappointing responses from many candidates, largely because of a failure to read the sources closely and carefully (especially in relation to the push/pull factor and whether movement was west or east) but also because of an uncertain grasp of the strategic position of West Berlin, marooned in the centre of the DDR, and its particular history since 1945.

(a) The main problem here was that candidates simply wrote about why the Berlin Wall was built which is the part (b) question. They tended to ignore the issue of what two Communist sources thought were *western aims* towards the DDR. Both stressed that there was a western attempt to undermine the DDR through an aggressive policy of external and internal subversion. Many found it difficult to perceive the differences, failing to spot Ulbricht's fears in A that the west was 'sucking' on the DDR, a reference to the use of workers from the Communist Republic whilst Izvestia in C is more concerned at western penetration via spies and subversion. One has a specific DDR 'survival' agenda, the other more concerned with the Cold War in general. Many when it came to provenance were uncertain about C, despite its attribution as a Soviet newspaper (not always understood). There were comments that it was 'going to exaggerate to sell more copies'. They tried to stress difference when it is likely that the response of both was standard, if not specifically coordinated. Weaker candidates accepted at face value what they had to say about the West. Few failed to pick up on the more specific domestic audience in A or realised that both were post the building of the Wall. There was also a tendency for content to be mismatched in the attempt to compare. For example, the espionage and spies mentioned in C was not always matched with 'spies' as mentioned in A but rather with something else which was less appropriate. Comments on the dates were weak, even if valid – that A was more strident in tone as it was justifying the wall at the time of building but C was less so because of the time lag. Only a few were able to set the controversy in the context of Khrushchev's Berlin proposals and the failure of subsequent talks as the background of A. Many discussed firstly the reliability of the sources, then their unreliability, without any judgement as to which may be the more useful view. What follows is a response that scored Levels IA, IA and IB, 28/30. It is a clear and focused comparison on western motives and context:-

'Sources A and C give a largely similar view of the aims of the Western powers towards the DDR due to their Eastern authorship (A in the DDR and C in the Soviet Union), with emphasis on the Western aim of infiltrating DDR society, espionage, breaking down the communist system with Capitalism and stealing East German resources.

Whilst both are produced shortly after the erection of the Berlin Wall in August 1961, the exaggerated tone, especially of A, can be explained; both sources aim to justify the building of wall largely interpreted as 'inhumane' and thus want to emphasise the seemingly negative and detrimental aims of the western powers towards the DDR. Source A's tone is exaggerative and condescending with reference to the west as "counter-revolutionary vermin," a reference to their belief that the West wished to eradicate communism, This is also referred to in source C believing the West would 'provoke disturbances' to spread their 'fascist' ideology mentioned in A. Whilst the Western powers were vehemently anti-communist reflected in the Truman Doctrine of 1947, the claim that they were 'fascist' seems largely untrue. Both sources reliability is highly limited both by their motive in justifying the wall, but also due to their predominantly public audiences.

Whilst source C largely focuses on political 'subversive activity' and underground espionage, source A refers more directly to the immediate threats the Western 'aims' posed to the DDR, unsurprisingly as Ulbricht, the leader of the SED and in reality therefore the DDR leader would have been more concerned with domestic problems caused by competition with the FDR in the form of mass defections (3million had moved west since 1945-61) and the 'brain drain'. Source C was less concerned with this as the Soviets merely wanted to retain a communist buffer zone within the context of the Cold War. Therefore source A puts emphasis on the aim of the West being to "suck on our workers' and peasants' republic", making direct reference to the people themselves as Ulbricht is effectively justifying the Berlin Wall to the DDR citizens directly as the newspaper is a public document, which would have been widely distributed in the DDR. In contrast, source C remains less emotive and personal, although it also makes reference to the 'subversive activities' of the west in infiltrating the East, as mentioned in A.

Source A also differs from C in content, in reference to the West's aim to 'smother the younger seed'. Ulbricht makes reference to the West aiming to indoctrinate DDR youth, thus undermining a generation that had come to accept and resign themselves to the DDR, not mentioned in C. Ultimately, both A and C present similar views of the Western powers aims towards the DDR, although there are subtle differences. Both emphasise the Western aim of combating communism, not completely inaccurate considering the ongoing battle of Cold War ideology and Berlin's status as a showcase for both sides. Despite such a context and both sources Communist origin which makes both largely unreliable, both, in justifying to the public the building of the wall seek to exaggerate and even fabricate negative aims of the West, ignoring economic necessities as a reason for building the wall; defections had led to a reduced workforce and consequent 'brain drain'. Thus, whilst both these sources are limited in exploring the aims of the Western powers towards the DDR, Source A is more useful for historians studying Ulbricht's propaganda and public justification for the wall, and source C for Soviet Cold War propaganda.'

(b) Answers here were similarly disappointing in the main. This may have been because the assertion in the question as to motive, that it was done to stop DDR workers leaving in large numbers for the West, was explicit only in Source E, the modern historian. Candidates rarely spotted that it was also there, through inference, in Source A (Ulbricht) – 'sucking on our workers' and peasants' republic'. They seemed to have difficulty in spotting the alternatives or even accepting the thrust of the evidence in the other sources that the main reason was to prevent western subversion, there in A and C but also in B and D (and referred to as the official line in E). The third view, in B and by implication C, was disregarded by almost all – that it was built as part of a strategy to absorb West Berlin. As a result many candidates struggled with fitting the sources into an interpretative framework. They resorted to sequencing. Although the balance of the evidence in the five sources, if taken at face value, refuted the view not all judgements and conclusions were consistent with the evidence. That is, some claimed 'fleeing' was the main reason despite previously demonstrating that A, B, C, D or at least the majority of the sources indicated other reasons. Better answers explained that despite the apparent weight

of the sources against 'fleeing' the unreliability of A and C in particular meant that the case for 'fleeing' was stronger than the sources might indicate at face value.

Two sources in particular proved difficult for most candidates – B and D. Most had little idea how to use B (British Conservative MPs reporting Ulbricht's comments to Macmillan). They failed to see it as part of the pressure kept up on West Berlin by the East, with Ulbricht using the language of creeping absorption (on visas, flight paths and on proposed controls over Tempelhof). Instead it produced much misunderstanding. Many clearly did not appreciate the location of Tempelhof in West Berlin, despite the fact that it was bracketed as such in the source. Also, despite the date for 'B' being September, many argued that that the airport was still being used by easterners to flee west apparently ignorant of the fact that the wall was up and deliberately designed to stop people reaching Tempelhof. Neither did many use the introduction which clearly states that the passage reflects the 'intentions' of Ulbricht: instead, many seemed to think that the proposals in 'B' were being implemented. On the provenance of B it was often seen as reliable as it was a report and it was Ulbricht who would not lie to the British PM. Some even thought the wall would stop people flying out. Many interpreted it as about stopping fleeing as opposed to controlling ingress. Few were able to link this source to the Berlin Airlift and see the connections with what Ulbricht was saying. If they did comment on this it was assumed to be closely linked to the Wall and many of those who went down this route were convinced that Stalin was still in charge. The other problematical source was D, (Trenkner's memoirs). It was seen as evidence for almost anything (DDR economic weakness, reasons for fleeing the East, examples of Ulbricht's profiteers in A, reasons for not fleeing the East as it was cheap) but also created some difficulties for those who failed to appreciate the dates: some thought it showed that the Wall didn't work, whilst Trenkner was regularly accused of having a faulty memory or 'jazzing things up' to sell more books (but so too was Berghahn in E!). This was another case of the need to read carefully – Trenkner was going East to buy beer, books, records and hear subsidised Opera, the edifying products of a Communist People's culture. He was not there for food and consumer durables but he could easily be portrayed by the Eastern leadership as a parasite undermining their precarious economy. At the most extreme were the many candidates who confused East and West with some apparently of the view that the wall was built to stop Westerners fleeing to the DDR. This was most frequently made in assessing Source D, ignoring the point in D that explains the author returned to West Berlin. Better candidates recognised the economic dimension from the perspective of both East and West. Context about the economic miracle in the West was often sound.

Surprisingly many were reluctant to use Source E much given that it was the main source to use in arguing for the view in the question. In using it too many argued that the author offered two reasons for the Wall. Most recognised it was to check 'fleeing' to the West but if they also used the opening sentence, to argue that the wall was also to stop infiltration from the West, they did so without emphasising the point that this was the 'official' view of the DDR which the second sentence clearly explains the author dismisses. Also, in comments on the completeness of the sources or in their conclusion many argued that statistics on the number fleeing would be helpful ignoring the fact that 'E' provides just that. Better candidates used their knowledge about agricultural collectivisation and the dual economy operating in Berlin as well as information on people trying to cross the Wall and being shot as evidence of the real purpose of the Wall. Some candidates spoke of 'evidence coming to light after the collapse of the USSR' without indicating what this might be. Several wrote about the Stasi spying on their own people but used it to undermine the reliability of Source C in particular by claiming that the spying was not by the West. One had hoped that after studying this topic candidates would be secure on the difference between East and West, which was the FRG and which the DDR, and which side actually built the Wall, but this alas was not the case for a muddled minority.

What follows is an impressive answer that was awarded Levels IA, IA, IB and IA, a total of 65/70:-

'The building of the Berlin Wall in August 1961 was largely justified by claims of the Western infiltration of the GDR, both political in undermining the system and economic and social in the "leeching" of their goods mentioned by the communist sources (A, B and C). Yet these appear as public justifications, and whilst these remain factors, they are arguably less significant than that of the fleeing East Germans, which caused economic and social problems, as well as making the USSR and DDR look weaker during the Cold War, especially as the DDR was often looked upon as a showcase for the communist regime.

The strongest evidence for the statement comes from source E, referring to both the mass defections and the 'brain drain', but also come from the arguments and justifications of the East German government, thus suggesting these motivations were superficial. As a modern historian, although his book was published before the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, Berghan would have had access to numerous sources, such as source A, although many official DDR documents may have been kept back this increased access allowed the historian to disregard official and public documents such as the newspaper articles of source A and C as mere propaganda, the official reasons given for the building of the Wall. The official reason therefore was less significant given the primary propaganda purpose of these sources (A and C) due to their aim being to justify the Wall to communist citizens. This then suggests their listed aims to be propaganda leaving the more significant factor out, such as the prevention of those fleeing, which they would not want to admit to publically.

Source E's reference to the amount of defections supports the assertion in the question, indeed nearly 3 million had defected by the time of the building of the Wall. This is even more significant considering the DDR had a relatively small population of 17million. The mass defections and refugees caused a multitude of problems. Not only did the defections undermine the communist regime but also caused severe problems for the economy and agricultural sector. Whilst source E makes reference to the 'brain drain', in which white collar workers and professionals were lost to the FDR, seeking better prospects, it fails to mention the lack of consumer goods in the DDR and their inability to experiment with liberalism and decentralisation due to the unstable labour supply created by the fleeing of East Germans to the West. In addition, all of the sources fail to mention the agricultural crisis and consequent social unrest that had grown from fleeing East Germans; compulsory collectivisation first introduced in 1952 had led to reduced production, mass defection of farmers Westward, less food delivered to urban areas, social unrest and, a bitter memory, fear of a repeat of the 1953 uprising. The reintroduction or second wave in 1960-1 had created a similar effect. Whilst the communist sources fail to mention this, the Berlin Wall was much needed to stabilise the economy and agriculture, which had been seriously damaged by the fleeing of East Germans to West Germany.

Despite the agreement with the statement predominant in E, the majority of the other sources seem to disagree with the statement. Yet despite such evidence against the statement, the limitations of the majority of these sources largely discredit such evidence.

One such factor presented is the belief that the Western powers were aiming to eradicate communism and that therefore the wall was predominantly an 'anti-fascist protection wall'. This view is supported by the prevalent paranoia that was an undercurrent throughout the Cold War at the aggression of a perceived "capitalist monopoly". Whilst source A is largely unreliable considering Ulbricht, the leader of the SED, is publically justifying the building of the wall, choosing to ignore the DDR's domestic socio-economic problem and focus on the aggression of the West, this paranoid view links with evidence in source B. Source B, as a political report, is likely to be private and more reliable. It proposes that no Western citizens access the DDR without considerable difficulty, thus suggesting that they perceived there to be a very real threat from the Western powers.

Another possible factor behind the building of the Berlin Wall is the allegation of Western espionage and the undermining of the GDR's political system, suggested in sources A, B, C and E. Whilst source E challenges this factor, calling it merely a Government argument, the fact that the East German Government took such a line suggests it was still a factor, even if less important than the prevention of defections. Source A's exaggerated and emotive tone is due to its need to appeal to the public, but its reference to 'spies' is echoed in source C, and the fact that well placed British politicians are being told how difficult their entry would be in an official

meeting (source C) suggests that the Wall was definitely to prevent any easy Western penetration of the DDR, as well as DDR refugees fleeing West.

Sources A, B and D also make reference to the wall as a barrier to West Germans, who would enter the DDR predominantly to take advantage of cheap produce and resources, best explained by source D. Whilst source A is once again emotive on this issue, referring to those as "leeches and bugs on a healthy body," source D's agreement heightens the credibility of such evidence. Whilst the source's author was a West Berliner and therefore one might expect criticisms of the DDR, his explanation of goods being sometimes "just a quarter or a third" of their FRG price suggests substantial evidence for this 'leeching' really occurring. Despite this, the fact that the source is from an individual's memoirs suggests that the source may be atypical, heightened by the lack of basic consumer goods available in the DDR. They could be bought from state shops or on the thriving black market. Source B also links with this, once again providing evidence that the DDR did not want capitalists and Western 'enemies' entering the DDR. However, the fact that source B conveys details of a political meeting limits its reliability within the context of the Cold War. Why would Ulbricht, the leader of the SED and effectively a spokesperson for communism, tell British MPs of any domestic German problems behind the building of the Berlin Wall? He is more likely, as he does here, to raise relations between the two Berlins as a smokescreen for the real reasons for building the Wall..

Arguably, whilst the Berlin Wall was necessary for the East for a number of factors, predominantly it was to prevent the fleeing of refugees to the West. This had caused a complex set of socio-economic problems for the DDR, including an unstable labour force, increased criticisms of the regime and the undermining of communism. Arguably whilst the fear of espionage and the spread of Capitalism was a very real fear for the GDR, mentioned in A, B, C, and E, this had been prevalent since the end of the war and been solidified by the Truman Doctrine in 1947, but they only built a wall in 1961, over a decade later. Arguably, whilst the wall was in part a protective barrier against capitalism, this factor is exaggerated by the communist sources as a part of their propaganda. In reality the more pressing problems were domestic, caused by increasing defection levels in response to a tightening of State control, as Source E demonstrates so well statistically, thus proving that it was this factor that was the most important reason for the building of the Berlin Wall.'

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

The answers on this new topic were mixed but essentially sound.

(a) Most managed some reasonably effective content comparisons but were less impressive when discussing provenance and only rarely managed a considered judgement. Much depended on whether candidates identified Cronkite effectively and were precise in explaining his report as reflecting or shaping domestic opinion. It was also crucial to spot the difference in dates. The other weakness for many was an over general approach. They lost the focus on American domestic opinion. Most were able to see the agreement that TV had influenced domestic opinion at the time of the Tet offensive, but were less certain on the more nuanced differences – that D considers the media emphasis to be on Vietcong successes but Cronkite in B is more balanced and does not especially make this point. Here the opportunity to consider the respective dates was often lost. Less successfully handled by middling and weaker candidates were the differences. Much depended whether they spotted the balance in Cronkite's report. Although he describes the situation as one of 'stalemate' he also goes on to say that it might represent an act of desperation on the part of the North Vietnamese in an attritional war they could not win. Source D, the CIA Report, considers that domestic opinion is only fed the line of US defeat, clearly contradicting the evidence of the more balanced account given clearly by America's most famous news anchorman. Provenance and context were the keys here. Cronkite is producing a considered response in his broadcast at a time when shocking TV footage showed US forces coming under attack in their Saigon power bases. It does not tell us what the impact of the broadcast was, only the experienced reaction of an influential US broadcaster. Not

all candidates realised this and weaker answers dismissed his evidence as tabloid journalism, clearly lacking a sense of his role at the time and producing a knee-jerk response based upon modern perceptions of a certain type of journalism, clearly inappropriate here. However most could compare this with D and realise that this came later and was based on a compilation of views. Its accusation, that the media distorted the truth of the military situation thus boosting the domestic anti-war movement, although different to Cronkite, is not necessarily comparable given its wider remit to consider the general domestic attitude to Tet. Most concluded it was the better evidence given that it was a secret intelligence briefing at a later date when the wider domestic impact could be considered. It would also represent the military situation more accurately. However this led them to ignore the fact that Cronkite was also a heavyweight commentator, was balanced, and would not have lightly criticised his country at war. His was an immediate reaction; D was a later survey that could look at the precise impact on particular groups, especially the young. It could take account of some infamous later incidents, especially in Saigon. Surprisingly few candidates took the opportunity to use their contextual knowledge to allude to them. What follows is an engaged comparison which did not quite nail Cronkite as an example of the CIA Report's concern over the role of the US media. There are elements of description and it fails, arguably, to give sufficient weight to Cronkite, but it is aware of the contrast, demonstrated with close use of the internal content. Evaluation is also fair and there is some judgement. It was awarded Levels IB, IB, II, a total of 25/30 :-

'Sources B and D talk about how the Tet offensive has affected US domestic opinion on the war. Source B and D are both written by US citizens, B by a newsreader and D by a CIA official. Both of these sources seem to agree that the Tet offensive has had a negative effect on domestic opinion however with D, blaming this on US TV broadcasting and B on the fact that the US could not win the war, they differ in why public opinion has changed.

Source B written in 1968, after the Tet offensive had taken place, shows that this newsreader is making a conclusion from his own knowledge, he says how "(the) offensive has been forced by the communist realization that they could no longer win the war". This seems to suggest that America was perhaps likely to win in the long term however he goes on to say how it seems the enemy "can match us". This compares with source D because the CIA official says how "the media is not fixed on the success of US forces", but on "initial success by the Vietcong". He also says how the media are presenting the offensive as a "big American defeat like Dien Bien Dhu." The sources disagree in that source B believes the Tet Offensive was potentially a major Vietnamese victory in that the US is not as strong in Vietnam as the politicians like to say, whereas in source D it says how the media are making an American overall victory look like a defeat because of their coverage of only the initial Vietcong successes.

Both sources are reasonable evidence for the impact back home. Source B for example, written by a newsreader is likely to voice the opinion of the people back home, true it is his own opinion and so its likely to be full of his own beliefs, however he does bring up points that to an extent we know are true e.g. "Vietnam to end in a stalemate." The broadcast in February 1968 is very close to the offensive and so there might be problems of perspective here in contrast to D. The broadcast is going on what it only knows about Tet without the luxury of seeing what might happen down the line. He says how the enemy "can match us", however by the end of Tet we know the Vietcong failed and it was really an American military victory as D is concerned to point out. This source falls down because it cannot weigh up the impact of Tet on domestic opinion with the luxury of hindsight.

Source D, written by a CIA official, a few months after the Broadcast (source B) is very good evidence for Tet's impact on public opinion. It says how the media glorified Vietcong early success, persuading the public that maybe the US could not win the war. This comes across with more information about the impact on the public, how "anti-war protest is growing and "liberals and the young" have been effected. This we know as true with 1968 as a big year for anti-war protests. This source's evidence seems unbiased and based on fact. The Tet offensive was a major factor in changing public opinion and the source is good evidence for why opinion changed.

Source B unlike D is really quite limited in its opinion, written close to the offensive. Time has not allowed a proper balanced argument to come out. As evidence B does steer public opinion

towards the idea that the war could not be won, but disagrees with D's later view which blames the media for a failure of nerve and commitment. Whereas B says it's the fault of the leaders in America, and on the ground in Vietnam, for the overall defeat, both are good evidence for the impact on US domestic opinion because both echo the history of what we now know was true'.

(b) The key to an effective answer here was to distinguish between different types of turning point, particularly the impact on public opinion and military affairs. For example it was possible to argue for a change in attitudes to the war on the US domestic and governmental front using B, D and E but that militarily it changed little, using C and D (and possibly B). Conversely it could be argued that it was a military turning point using the intentions stated in Source A and the historical assessment of the impact of Tet in Source E. Those that could see the types of turning point available used the sources with subtlety and constructed effective arguments, although only the better ones were able to suggest that militarily there perhaps wasn't a turning point. Some considered the turning point from both the American (B, D and E) and North Vietnamese (A and C) perspectives, but not many adopted this useful approach to the question. Weaker candidates struggled with the idea of a turning point and certainly couldn't see that there could be several, given the different levels on which the war was waged. Other approaches were to use Sources A, B and E to support the view that Tet was a turning point in that it changed the US direction of the War and C and D to raise doubts and suggest the opposite (that it need not have caused a reassessment in Washington). There was a lack of own knowledge here to provide the context (from NLF guerrilla tactics to a broad offensive on the cities backed by a political rising in the South) and to confirm the shift in US public opinion (the decision not to grant Westmoreland more troops and Johnson's decision not to stand at the next Presidential election). Candidates were better at using knowledge of the extent of public outrage in the US in 1968 and could see that Tet could be seen as a turning point, either militarily, as it revealed the nature of the war, or that a misinterpretation by the media led to a crisis of confidence in public opinion which began moves towards de-escalation and peace talks.

Most candidates were able to handle sources B, D and E, although some struggled with Sources A and C. They did not know what to do with Source A, failing to see that it clearly intended a military turning point to occur as a result of launching the Offensive. This was partly because they lacked the context to see the change in Vietcong tactics clearly stated in front of them. With Source C it was because the information in the source, a North Vietnamese officer commenting on a feeling of loss and defeat after the Offensive was over, ran counter to what they would have expected. They failed to make the obvious provenance points here or to link it to the comments in the CIA Report in Source D that the Vietcong had suffered badly. It was certainly evidence that militarily Tet had failed from the North's viewpoint, albeit not necessarily typical of the political leadership's view. However weaker candidates were not able to use it in this manner.

What follows is a reasonable answer with some flaws, particularly the sequenced approach. Nonetheless it manages to rise above this through a dogged focus on the question and a determination to evaluate. The sources were handled discretely, although there were moments of linkage, evaluation and comparison which lifted the answer into the higher levels. The interpretation of D is controversial given the omission of its initial thrust which could and should have been linked to Source C, (which occurs only in the introduction), but there is evaluation of each source. There is context (which could be extended) and judgement throughout, (although not at the end). It was awarded Levels IB, IB, II, IB, a total of 58/70 :-

'The Tet offensive was undoubtedly a turning point in the war. Most of the sources A, B, D, and E agree with the fact that the Tet offensive was a turning point in the war for the Americans and could be for the N. Vietnamese. However source C and to some extent D disagrees with it being a turning point. This question could be interpreted as a turning point for either the US or the Vietnamese and through the sources you can see this was different.

Firstly source A agrees in theory that the Tet offensive should be a turning point in the war. Written before the actual attack the directive from the NVA officer in the North Vietnamese Army

shows that this offensive should change the fortunes of the war. It will create "utmost confusion", the opportunity to "liberate hamlets and villages", "district centres, provincial capitals in South Vietnam" as morale-boosting propaganda for the troops about to take part in it. However the officers who wrote this do believe that the Tet offensive should change the course of the war i.e. to liberate South Vietnam. Tet, for the North Vietnamese, was the biggest offensive that they ever undertook. The Vietnamese were optimistic that this could work because of the success they were having fighting the US and ARVN in the jungles. It says how "the masses should on go on strike"; evidently these officers believe that S. Vietnam is awaiting this offensive to that the people can show their true Red Colours. The big downside to this source is the fact that it is written before the offensive; this source only shows a belief that Tet will be a turning point in the war, not really evidence that it was. This source goes very far in the belief that Tet will be a turning point, but it does not go very far at all in reality because it had yet to happen and so from this source we cannot see any evidence that the Tet offensive was a turning point in the war. It is simply optimistic.

Source B also goes very far in agreeing that a turning point in the war was caused by the Tet offensive. It says how "Vietnam is to end in stalemate", as for "every means we have to escalate, the enemy can match us". These quotes indicate and lead public opinion about what the Tet offensive caused. Tet shattered the image of N. Vietnamese inferiority and uselessness, for many years American government propaganda had been telling the public of American success and how the best equipped army in the world could not lose to rabble soldiers. This source agrees that the Tet offensive showed the public that the Vietcong / NVA "could match" the US militarily and strike in S. Vietnamese heartlands with the capture of the US embassy and the airport etc. it showed that the North Vietnamese were not close to defeat and that the Americans were not invulnerable. As the battle of the La Dong Valley showed in 1965, even the best US forces could be defeated and the perceived US defeat during the Tet Offensive further underlined the belief that America could not win the war. This source gives no real evidence that Tet was a turning point in the war because this broadcast was too close to the event and so no valid judgement can be made from the source. However it does show that even weeks after the Offensive began people were starting to think that the US could not win and the NVA and Vietcong were much stronger than the US government alleged they were. Overall this source goes quite far in agreeing that it was a turning point. However because of the proximity to the actual event this source cannot really be used to assess if Tet changed the outcome of the war. However, it gives a good indication of what might happen because it correctly shows that the public and army Generals start to believe that the war might not end in complete US victory. Source D goes very far in agreeing that the 1968 Tet offensive was a turning point in the Vietnam War. Written by a CIA official in the summer of 1968 this source gives a good indication of the effect the Tet offensive had on the public. The Vietnam War was effectively stopped because of the massive growth in anti-war feeling back home. Before Tet, in 1968, there were no real anti-war protests but beliefs were out in the open after Tet. Mass rallies took place, e.g. in San Francisco in 1968, Washington in 1970 etc that had never taken place before. This source believes Tet was the main cause of this change in feeling. The source says how "opinion has turned against the war effort" and "images of Tet have won out and proved decisive, especially among the liberal groups and the young". These groups were the main driving force behind the anti-war movement. The 'images of Tet' and the information of US defeat gave these groups ammunition to stop agreeing with the war because it showed America might lose or might not win. As source B says "it can match us" (it being the NVA). In source D the CIA official believes that the Tet offensive was a turning point in the war because public opinion changed as no longer was there national support for the military. There was now a national anti-war feeling. This source goes far in agreeing with the question because it proves that Tet in 1968 started the anti-war feeling off. It agrees because it shows evidence that after the Tet offensive US public opinion changed and that such wars could not be won if public opinion was against you. This evidence is likely to be reliable because it's a CIA official and so he is likely to know the facts and it is a 'reflection' of the amount of input because months on from Tet this official can look back and see the damage caused, unlike in source B.

Source E also goes very far in agreeing that the Tet offensive was a turning point in the Vietnam War. It says how "it demonstrated that all the enormous firepower delivered on Vietnam by the US had not destroyed the NCF, its morale, popular support or its will to fight."; "It caused doubts among the American people". These quotes do show in this Historians sincere belief that Tet was a turning point in the Vietnam War. This source, along with Source B and D, shows the public that America could not destroy the North Vietnamese fighting spirit, morale or public support. This links with Source B's belief that Tet showed that American militarily might not defeat the Vietnamese as they had done against the Japanese in 1945 and the North Koreans in the 1950s, but that the North Vietnamese were actually winning – it also says how "doubts were growing among the US people". This, along with source D, shows that the vulnerability of the US forces shown had smashed the public view that the US couldn't easily win in Vietnam. It really shows that Tet was a turning point in the war because from 1968 onwards public and military opinion changed from we can win to we cannot. This source, written by a historian, means that this information is reliable. Written in 2003 it shows us that Zinn has had the luxury of time to make a balanced judgement. Further more, in agreeing with sources B and D, written at the time, it further strengthens the credibility that these three sources show. Overall the source goes very far in agreeing with the question that Tet was a turning point in the war and affected the USA badly.

Source C is the only source that has reservations about the fact it was a turning point in the war. Written by a North Vietnamese officer it gives a good insight into how the North Vietnamese Army and Vietcong were affected by the Tet offensive, how in reality Tet was a major defeat for the North Vietnamese losing 200,000+ men, material and supplies and losing the ability to really fight. As this source shows, (after Tet), (we) "didn't have enough men to fight a major battle", only to make "hit and run attacks", so "many men had been killed that morale was very low". As this source explains, unlike source A which believed that the North Vietnamese could gain a lot from Tet, in reality Tet was a turning point in the war for the North because after Tet they had really lost their combat ability but the US public believed the Tet offensive did show the North could match them. This source disagrees with all the other sources which show that Tet caused a turning point in the US. He believes it caused a North Vietnamese turning point. This source is also very reliable because it is primary information from someone who was there and comes from after the Offensive. It is a North Vietnamese officer who, without a strand of propaganda, tells us the facts as he sees them, that 20 years on we know are true, e.g. that the North Vietnamese suffered far worse than was publicly acknowledged. This officer is showing that the Tet offensive was not really a turning point because firstly the North Vietnamese lost and secondly they had not made a real impact, in his belief, on America. However in the last sentence of his source it says how they were told that the Americans felt as if they had lost, which we know is true because sources B, D and E support this view, two of them written by Americans.

Overall sources A, B, D and E agree with the view and C disagrees. It was a turning point in the war.'

Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE History (H506)
Advanced Subsidiary GCE History (H106)
June 2009 Examination Series

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
F961/01	Raw	100	69	60	52	44	36	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F961/02	Raw	100	70	61	52	44	36	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F962/01	Raw	100	66	58	50	42	35	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F962/02	Raw	100	69	61	53	46	39	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F963/01	Raw	100	65	58	51	44	37	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F963/02	Raw	100	70	62	54	46	39	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F964/01	Raw	100	66	59	52	45	38	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F964/02	Raw	100	70	63	56	49	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

Specification Aggregation Results

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

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

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

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
H106	20.1	42.8	66.6	83.6	93.5	100.0	10478

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:
http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums_results.html

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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

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

© OCR 2009

