

History A

Advanced GCE A2 H506

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H106

Examiners' Reports

January 2011

HX06/R/11J

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

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the Examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this report.

© OCR 2011

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

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

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE History A (H506)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE History A (H106)

EXAMINERS' REPORTS

Content	Page
Chief Examiner's Report	1
F961/01, F961/02 and F962/01, F962/02	2
F963 and F964 AS History Enquiries	22
F966/01 and F966/02 Historical Themes	28

Chief Examiner's Report

The overall quality of candidates' work this session was very mixed. All AS Period Studies' units saw an increase in their mean mark compared with previous sessions, which was a most creditable performance. Much of the advice contained in previous Principal Examiner's reports appears to have been implemented and the consequent improvement was most pleasing. In contrast none of the AS Enquiry units improved upon the mean mark of last summer although F963/01 and F964/02 did see better quality answers than in January 2010. There was a similar variable picture at A2. The mean marks in each unit fell below those attained in June 2010, and that of F966/01 below the mean mark scored in January 2010. As always there was some exceptionally good work in all units, although fewer candidates scored Level 1A marks compared with 2010. This was no doubt a reflection of the candidate profile since a large number of entrants was repeating one or more units. However in many cases the quality of work suggests that candidates were seeking to improve on high marks attained in previous sessions in order to reach their university matriculation targets.

UNIT	Maximum Mark	Jan 2009 Mean Mark	June 2009 Mean Mark	Jan 2010 Mean Mark	June 2010 Mean Mark	Jan 2011 Mean Mark
F961/01	100	57	58.4	58.3	59.7	59.9
F961/02	100	53.1	57.6	59.7	59.2	62.9
F962/01	100	49.5	55.2	61	60.1	63.4
F962/02	100	58.1	56.9	59.9	61.2	62.9
F963/01	100	49.8	55.1	53.5	60.6	58
F963/02	100	51.5	60.1	58.1	58.7	54.8
F964/01	100	49.4	59.7	60.9	63	53
F964/02	100	53.3	60.7	57.8	61.5	59.1
F965	80	-	-	53.3	57.4	55.4
F966/01	120	-	-	70.5	75	66.6
F966/02	120	-	-	66.6	75.4	69.5

A weakness common to all but the best candidates was the failure to answer the question set and to remain focused on the key elements. Sometimes this was due to candidates not reading the question or source material carefully enough; sometimes candidates wrote about the topic rather than the question; and sometimes, most notably in the Themes papers, candidates produced a rehearsed answer to a slightly different question. Candidates really do need to think before they write, to plan their answer carefully and, once they have started writing, to stop periodically to check that they are still answering the question.

Some skills acquired at AS level are also used in A2 studies and, if such skills are lacking at AS, they are likely to remain a weakness in candidates' work at A2. Thus evaluating evidence, reaching judgements based on relevant and accurate examples, balancing the quality and length of answers where two essays or responses are required, and ensuring that arguments contain analysis and synthesis rather than description and assertion, are features that appear in each of the reports below. So too are comments on the quality of English. AO1a requires examiners to assess how well a candidate has communicated his/her knowledge and understanding in respect of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It would therefore seem appropriate to remind Centres of the importance of candidates producing work that is legible, well organised and written in formal English.

F961/01, F961/02 and F962/01, F962/02

General Comments

It is very pleasing to be able to report that the overall standard of candidate responses was encouraging, with many very good answers that were well focused on the question throughout and reached a balanced judgement that followed from an argument that had been pursued throughout the essay. There was clear evidence of not only an improvement in the analytical ability of many candidates, but also the level of supporting material. In many responses there were a wide range examples used to support the arguments and the key word was that many candidates were using the material to answer the question and not simply describing events with no link to the actual question set. It was also noticeable that the quality of conclusions has improved and even some average responses were taken to the next level by a well-developed conclusion that reached a conclusion. A significant number of candidates, even at the lower ranges, are making a determined attempt to answer the actual question set, even if the quality of analysis is not of the highest level. There were fewer examples of candidates simply writing about the topic and not focusing on the question. Many candidates are now producing plans that are helping them to focus on the question and are also writing ATQ (Answer the question) at the top of their plan and the responses show that this is being done.

There were very few questions that did not discriminate successfully between candidates, although there were some topics where it was noticeable that candidates struggled with their second question for whatever reason. This was reflected in the disparity of marks between the two essays. It is important that centres ensure all Key Issues are given equal weight if their candidates are to be in a position to do themselves justice. Previous reports have made it clear that there is no pattern to the questions being asked and therefore it should be expected that two or even three questions come from either the early or later part of the Study Topic. This certainly seemed to cause some difficulties for candidates who had studied the Crusades or Germany 1919-63, but this pattern of questions was not new and had been used for other Study Topics in the past. However, two questions will not be set from the same Key Issue there may be questions that draw on more than one Key Issue, but that is the nature of the subject. Centres would also be well advised to remember that the content guidance is indicative and is not a list of all that needs to be taught, Centres need to cover the material that is needed to give their candidates a good understanding of each of the Key Issues.

Although it would be wrong to suggest that there is only way to tackle a question, many candidates did ensure that their opening sentence of each paragraph was clearly focused on the actual question and that their final sentence of each paragraph linked their material back to the question. This seemed to help many of the more average responses reach Level III for AO1b and is an approach that could be suggested for others. This was certainly more successful than the approach where candidates tried to argue in turn that the specific issue with which they were dealing at the time was the main issue and frequently asserted that if it was not the main issue an as yet undiscussed one must be. This type of analysis often proved invalid. Candidates fared far better where they analysed several individual motives and then, in comparison, were better able to argue the main motive. Substituting factors for motives would give a very good general comment about the analytical limitations of candidates, but again it at least shows that they were attempting to address the task before them and often this took them into Level III. As a result of this approach it would be fair to say the default for the papers was Level III, with some analysis being achieved and a reasonable grasp of the requisite knowledge. This is a rise from the Level III/IV boundary that has been the picture in the past.

However, at the lower end the same problems do persist. There were a number who struggled with the second question, not because of time, but because they had simply not prepared the other topics from which they had to choose a second question and were expecting or hoping for

something else. In many instances, the first answer was in Level III but they were pulled down considerably by their second response. There were also the candidates who genuinely struggled with both questions and showed very little understanding of the demands of the question and also had very little knowledge, not just about the question, but even the topic. There were also the usual historical errors which do little to convince an examiner that the candidate really knows what they are writing about. Once again the number who thought hyperinflation was in 1929 was very large, but we also saw the wrong Prime Ministers and the wrong World Wars quoted on a number of occasions. It is not unreasonable to expect that candidates have a good chronological grasp of the Study Topic; after all they have spent a year studying this. It is also very likely that factual errors will lead to analytical confusion and candidates drawing the wrong conclusions.

Candidates who are hoping to score at the higher end of the mark range should pay particular attention to key words and phrases in the question and ensure that they focus their answer on them. When candidates are asked about effective the examiner does not want an answer that focuses on successful, there may be points made that do link to the actual question, but a focus on the question set will score more heavily. The same is true when candidates are asked about 'how' successful, candidates should address the issue of 'how' and not simply argue he or she was or was not successful, it is very unlikely that the answer will be so clear cut. However, it was pleasing to see that many more candidates appeared familiar with the command word 'assess' and there was a much more determined effort to weigh up the relative importance of factors and reach a judgement, rather than simply produce a list of factors and this helped to move many into Level II.

The mark scheme worked well and allowed examiners to discriminate clearly between this list approach and those who were attempting to make judgements, with a clear boundary between Levels II and III. This was also evident at the boundary between Levels III and IV, where argument, which was reasonably well-supported took answers into Level III. At the same time, examiners were also able to reward candidates whose argument was weaker, but who displayed a very good level of relevant supporting material. As a result there were many scripts where the Levels awarded were different, acknowledging the different strengths of the responses.

It is also encouraging to note that there were fewer comments about the decline in the quality of English. Most candidates did acknowledge that this was a formal examination and tried to write in extended prose. There are still some who use abbreviations and this should be discouraged, whilst others do need to avoid 'would of' instead of would have. There has also been a growing tendency for candidates to speculate and this should be discouraged. It was also encouraging to see fewer answers that simply described the views of historians and made no attempt to link their views to the question or to the actual argument being pursued by the candidate. Historiography is not a requirement at AS and for weaker candidates who might simply adopt the descriptive approach it is probably best avoided; after all it is not the view of the historians that the examiner wants to know, but the view of the candidate and why they think that.

As in the past, it would be helpful if Centres could encourage candidates in the following two areas. Firstly, if candidates are typing their responses, please could they use a sensible sized font and double space their answers as this does leave space for examiner comments and makes the scripts easier to read. Secondly, candidates do need to leave about half a dozen lines between essays so that examiners can record marks and summative comments.

F961/01

- 1 Candidates tended to focus on the strengths and weaknesses of Edward's rule and debated whether using the Godwins was a strength or a weakness. Some tended to use the events at the end of the reign, and to use the succession crisis as an example of the weakness of his government. There were very few answers that considered, at least in any depth, the Norman links and the extent to which they strengthened or weakened Edward. Most candidates argued that Edward was largely ineffectual but tried to account for this

with his upbringing and the political situation. There was relatively little on administration, taxation or Edward as a military leader. Many weaker candidates tended to address a shortened question and focus on how effective was Edward the Confessor rather than on government.

- 2 Most candidates were able to set up a debate between the relative importance of Edward's responsibility and that of other challengers. Most answers were able to write about Edward's actions and failures, notably to produce a son. The claims of Harold Godwinson and William were also debated and compared by better candidates with reference to the role of the Witan and Edward's intentions. Many referred to the king's possible wish for Edmund and then his son Edgar to be king. There was also discussion of Hadrada's claim and its impact, though a large minority ignored him, and focused only on Harold and William. Many concluded that Edward was primarily responsible but that the other candidates' ambition was also an important factor. Many were aware of the disputable evidence for both William's and Harold Godwinson's claims, though on this as on other issues, such as Edward's failure to produce an heir, candidates were often too dogmatic, stating as fact evidence which is clearly disputable – an example being those who stated unequivocally that Edward did not produce an heir because he was homosexual. On a topic notable for its clearly contradictory primary sources this was particularly unfortunate.
- 3 Many candidates focused on the methods and tactics used by William. There was debate of how effective they were in the stronger answers and many concluded that the opposition persisted for much of the reign. A few weaker candidates focused on why William won at Hastings with a lengthy description of the battle, and many were vague about specific rebellions. Most managed to mention the Harrying of the North, but a surprising number made no mention of castles. There were very few candidates who were able to name specific opposition leaders, referring vaguely to rebellions, and these candidates were notably weak on their knowledge of the difficulties the King faced from some Normans as well as Saxons. The patterns of failure therefore tended to be either a focus on Hastings, which usually gave an impression that this was all the candidate felt confident about, or a generalised approach. There was no evidence of candidates misunderstanding the question or not seeing how it should be approached.
- 4 There were several patterns of failure in the answers to this question. Many candidates started in 1471 missing the evidence on Warwick and the Readeption, and the opportunity to assess the second period by comparison with the first. Others wrote about both periods but of rule and did not link the first period to the period after 1470. Some sadly deleted a whole side when they realised that they had written about the first period of rule and didn't try to link it in, proving only their inability to link and evaluate material. Better candidates did link and drew comparisons between the two periods. Some omitted Clarence's trial and execution, which could have provided a useful point of discussion. Most discussed the family feud between the 3 brothers and most blamed Edward for leaving Richard so powerful that he could threaten the succession in 1483. Some compared the years of domestic peace with the chaos of 1460-61. A second pattern of failure was to neglect to focus on the nobility, and to try to assess, or at least describe, how strong Edward was in the second period. A significant number of candidates attempted this question with hardly any, or even no, mention of specific nobles by name.
- 5 Some candidates did not refer to Bosworth at all, and some talked of nothing else. Most were aware of Richard's narrow power base. Many expanded on the manner of his usurpation and its impact on noble support. Some erroneously thought that the princes were killed before the seizure of power, and some asserted he had killed them. Better answers drew comparisons between the two armies at Bosworth though many erroneously thought that Henry's force was much larger than Richard's. Few linked the neutrality of the Earl of Northumberland to Richard's promotion of the Earl of Lincoln and the enforced power share in the north. Many muddled the Stanleys' actions at Bosworth. There was

little sympathy for Richard's death, with many seeing him as merely impetuous and few effectively linking his decision to charge to his realization that his nobles were not going to support him. In short answers to this essay were characterised by an awareness of the overall problem but a lack of really convincing detail. Some weaker candidates just discussed the reasons for his unpopularity – a common pattern of failure for the weaker, or less-prepared.

- 6 Most answers linked the aims of his foreign policy to achieving security and since Henry VII was not overthrown he was successful. However, better candidates realised the limitations on his options. There were few candidates who developed recognition for the Tudors as a positive rather than just seeing Henry trying to eliminate pretenders. Most looked at economic aims and trade, and gave Henry credit, and most saw limitations, especially citing the Brittany question. Generally the answers were competently answered, and even modest candidates were able to gain some credit by commenting on relations with different countries in turn and being aware of what Henry was trying to do.
- 7 This was a popular question and it was pleasing to see a considerable number of very good responses. These candidates considered a wide range of issues and were able to analyse, rather than simply describe the changes and assess the significance of the changes, either by comparing them with what had gone before or by considering whether the changes were permanent or temporary. There was less description of the Elton debate and where candidates did refer to his theses the comments were often evaluative. The depth of supporting knowledge was often of a high level, with references to Wales and Durham occurring, which has not been the case in the past. Similarly, there was better discussion of the role of Parliament, although discussion of the Privy Council was sometimes confused. There were very few answers where candidates were unsure of areas to consider and when changes to the government of the Church were discussed they were usually related to the question.
- 8 This topic also witnessed a considerable improvement in the quality of answers seen. In the past, many have been either very general or narrow in the range of issues considered, but this time answers were usually wide ranging. Better answers identified the problems that each government faced in the introduction and then proceeded to evaluate their relative success in managing each problem. There were few answers that adopted a chronological approach and candidates often compared the success of Somerset and Northumberland, making interim judgements about their handling of government, finance and the economy, foreign policy and social unrest. Most argued that Northumberland was more successful, although some did argue that the failure of Northumberland to alter the succession was little better than Somerset's ability to maintain power. However, this was often balanced against Northumberland's greater economic success and his more realistic foreign policy.
- 9 This was the weakest of the answers in this section. Candidates were able to identify a range of problems that Mary faced, although the range was often narrow in scope, but they struggled to assess how serious the challenge was. There were a significant number who could write in only general terms about the economic problems and many either dismissed them in a few sentences or frequently interchanged the term with finance. Where candidates were able to assess the greatest challenge many argued that it was rebellion as it threatened her very position on the throne. Although religion is not part of the specification some candidates argued that returning England to Catholicism would have been perceived by Mary to have been her greatest challenge and this was credited, but candidates who did not discuss religious issues were not penalised. Knowledge of the economic issues was limited and candidates do need to ensure they have a good factual knowledge of all parts of the specification.

- 10 The weaker candidates tended to describe opposition; a legitimate approach if this was accompanied with an evaluation of its nature and extent, but many did not progress beyond description. The best answers assessed directly the seriousness of opposition from individuals, from parliament and from the Pilgrimage of Grace by examining its impact and extent. However, the range was often limited and it was surprising that the largest rebellion faced by a Tudor monarch often received scant treatment given the numbers involved and the potential threat they presented at the end of 1536. The symbolic nature of More and Fisher's opposition could have been developed and candidates could have suggested that opposition from such respected figures was serious and might have a wider impact. Some did suggest that government measures were successful and that the Treason Act was useful in controlling potential opposition, so although there might have been private grumbling it did not become serious.
- 11 Some of the best answers began by distinguishing between moderate and radical puritans and then discussing the nature and extent of support for each group. The majority of candidates, however, were unable to move beyond generalities spiced with references to the Elizabethan Settlement, the Puritan Choir, Archbishop Grindal and the Prophecyings. Many focused too heavily on the issue of the Puritan choir or Elizabeth's councillors but were unable to link their material to how much support, focusing more on how serious was the threat. There were also some who drifted into detailed discussions of the Settlement and the influences at play in 1558-1559.
- 12 The better candidates realized that the catholic challenge – actual and perceived – varied over time. There were moments of crisis, as in 1568-72 and the mid 1580s, and periods of relative calm, as in the 1560s. They also noticed that the challenge was particularly acute when domestic and foreign threats interacted (1568-72 & 1583-88). Weaker candidates were inclined to present a mix of description and explanation that focused on the highlights – Mary Stuart, the Papal Bull, the Plots, the missionary priests and the Armada. Some candidates found it very difficult to cover the whole period, but often this was because they took a chronological approach and spent too long on the early years and therefore did not allow themselves sufficient time to look at Mary Stuart of the Armada, which were often dismissed in a few sentences.
- 13 Questions on faction have often presented a serious challenge to candidates and it was therefore encouraging to see the number who were clear about the concept and could use precise examples to support their argument. Although many did focus heavily on the Essex/Cecil struggle, most were able to consider a range of factional struggles and link their material back to the actual question of how successfully Elizabeth was able to control it. There was some discussion of her relative success in the 1590s, but most concluded that she was successful, that it did not hinder policy and that Elizabeth was in control. It was also encouraging to see that most candidates had a sound grasp of court and government and were able to successfully distinguish between different elements of Elizabethan government, even if it was at a basic level.
- 14 This question drew a significant number of descriptive answers where explanation or analysis was limited. Many adopted a chronological approach and described the issues surrounding each of the marriage suitors with some analysis of why Elizabeth refused to marry attempting to explain the clashes with MPs and ministers wanting assurance of their careers. However, candidates who were able to identify issues such as the fear of a catholic successor or foreign interference after Mary's involvement in Habsburg wars were usually able to produce a more focused and analytical response. Many candidates did not know a sufficient range of examples to produce a convincing argument and were often restricted to comments about Mary Stuart or Philip II of Spain's attempts to court her in the early years of her reign.

- 15 Although this was a popular question, it was not answered effectively. Many candidates did not have a full understanding of the Crown's finances, the difference between Ordinary and Extraordinary Revenues and the fiscal and administrative weaknesses of the antiquated revenue system. There were a significant number of answers that lacked the range of knowledge about her finances to effectively answer the question and there were others who simply described the problems she faced, rather than focusing on how effectively she handled them. Some were able to compare the position at the start and end of her reign and use that as the basis for an argument, but there were a number who wanted to write about how serious the financial problems were or more generally about the problems she faced. There were a significant number who wrote about economic problems in general and did not see the difference between finance and economy and this did have an impact on their final mark.
- 16 The best answers were able to place the dispute provoked by the Palatinate Crisis within a context of controversy over James's preference for friendly relations with Spain and his plan for a Spanish Marriage Alliance. In focusing on the Thirty Years War better answers were aware of the disputes it provoked over subsidies and the nature of fighting the war. However, many struggled to focus on 'most serious' and simply explained why the Thirty Years war and other events were or were not serious. Despite this, it was pleasing to see that many candidates were able to cover a range of events, but there was a heavily weighted focus on the Spanish marriage and very little coverage of the early years, despite disagreements over peace with Spain in 1604. The worst dwelt in generalities without specific reference to the 1621 and 1624 parliaments and the journey to Madrid. Some candidates seemed unsure as to when James dies and therefore the answers continued into Charles' reign.
- 17 There were a wide range of responses to this question. At the lower end some were unsure what 'Thorough' was focused more on explaining why Charles embarked on Personal Rule, whilst other answers were narrow in the range of issues covered. There was a great deal that candidates could cover and most were aware of the financial element, although some were unaware of the initial success of Ship Money. There was little coverage of Ireland in many answers and the work of Strafford received little attention. However, at the higher levels candidates were able to consider the question of 'effective' and many argued that it appeared effective in the short term and whilst Charles pursued a peaceful foreign policy, but others argued that once he tried to have a uniform religious policy it was not effective and the resentment at earlier measures soon came to the surface.
- 18 Disappointingly, there were very answers that focused sharply on the outbreak of civil war. The majority discussed the long-term causes of the war, inevitably finding themselves explaining Charles's responsibility for the political crisis of 1640 rather than the outbreak of war, being left with insufficient time to analyze the key issues of 1640-42. There were many that did not get much beyond the reasons for Personal Rule and others who were unaware that war was very unlikely in 1640. However, those who did focus on the period 1640-2 often produced well balanced and analytical answers that showed a detailed knowledge of a range of issues and events. Many answers accepted that Charles was to blame and there were only a few who considered Parliament's or, interestingly, Pym's responsibility. When there were attempts to consider Parliament's responsibility it was often in a short paragraph and a balanced approach was not achieved in many cases. Candidates should try and achieve a balanced discussion even if they then concluded that Charles was more to blame than Parliament, rather than taking it for granted.

F961/02

- 1 There were a large number of very good answers that were able to compare the importance of Pitt's handling of the radical challenge with a wide range of other factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Most candidates could write about, indeed describe, features of Pitt's measures (often mixing legislation with his shrewd use of newspapers) and some were good on such other factors as the role of the monarchy and loyalism. However, there were some answers that said little about the nature and scope of the radical challenge; but better answers picked up not just examples but its extent and contextual factors, particularly the economic situation, as well as internal divisions and organisational problems, linking these to Pitt's measures. Some weaker answers wrote about the likes of Wilkes or went on into the Liverpool repressive era. Most argued that the radical challenge was weak and that was the most important factor in its defeat, whilst others suggested that Pitt's measures were not successful, either because they were hardly used or because radicalism re-emerged more strongly under Liverpool.
- 2 There were some very good answers to this question and it was pleasing to see the depth of knowledge that was displayed in many instances. Candidates were able to consider a wide range of issues and the supporting details from the work of Robinson, Huskisson and Peel was very impressive. It was also pleasing to see the number who were able to refer to specific legislation that was passed before the period, such as the Truck Act, to show that there was more continuity than is usually acknowledged. It was also encouraging to see the issues of religious and political reform receiving good coverage and arguments that responses here were often pragmatic. Most attempted to define and explain 'liberal' in the introduction and then related the measures back to this. There were a few wrote about 1815-22 to show that was illiberal and did not give sufficient time to look at the later period. The best answers were aware of the debate over liberal values, but avoided a description of the historiographical debate and contextualised against 1815-22.
- 3 Although this was the least popular of the three questions on this study topic, there were still a considerable number of answers. Although it proved difficult for some, there were still a considerable number of good answers. Some responses were very vague, particularly when dealing with the named factor and simply made sweeping comments about popular discontent, or made reference to the Chartists and their unrest. There were also a number who wrote, sometimes at length, about the content of the Great Reform Act itself and therefore did not spend sufficient time considering the reasons for its passage. A few responses were able to place the act in context and linked in middle and upper class fears and needs as well as the machinations of the parties. However, many seemed unaware of the actual chronology of events and were confused about who were the monarchs and Prime Ministers and this resulted in some confused attempts at analysis.
- 4 This was the most popular and also the most successful of the questions on this study topic. Most candidates had a very good knowledge of the reforms and were at least able to describe them, though some strayed into foreign policy and some were very selective of reforms they considered. Better answers often linked the reforms to their aims, taking a more thematic approach and this often resulted in some good interim judgements about the success of a particular aspect of Gladstonian Liberalism. Candidates were than usually able to relate the contents of the reforms to outcomes, usually electoral and political (class issues). Most were able to write in some depth about military and civil service reforms, attacks on privilege, Ireland and temperance. However, there were times when discussions of issues such as education, temperance and union legislation could have been more balanced and simplistic judgements avoided. Not all answers were sharp enough on 'successful' and as with any question, it is very important that candidates do pick up on key words and phrases in the title if they want to reach the higher levels.

- 5 In the past, when questions have been on this issue answers have tended to be rather general and lacking in specific supporting detail and this was still the pattern this time. Where candidates did engage with knowledge, they focused very much on 1846 and 1867, but unfortunately some went well beyond 1867-68 into 1872 or 1874. Candidates were often aware of a range of reasons for Disraeli's emergence as Conservative leader and better answers focused on issues such as skills, luck, contingencies, the Derby factor, the place of the Whigs/Liberals, emergent policy ideas, pragmatism and opportunism. There were a large number of factors that could have been considered and it was not expected that all of these would be covered even to achieve a top level answer. However, when considering factors such as his skills precise supporting detail was often absent, most notably his oratory. However, there were some better answers that did see he was not trusted for much of the time and argued that his emergence of leader was because there was no-one else.
- 6 The best answers did focus on 1879-80, mixing foreign and imperial policies and disasters with domestic issues. Many candidates were able to consider a wide range of domestic issues and this included economic failings, which were often linked to the depression, a government without energy, which was linked to the absence of social reform in the last years of the ministry, Disraeli's tiredness and ill-health which inhibited his campaign, Gladstone's energy and resurgence, Liberal organisational strengths, Conservative weaknesses and picking up on electoral appeal and shifts of support. But some candidates simply wrote about the 1874-80 ministry or became diverted into excessive descriptive coverage of foreign policy areas. The greatest weakness in answering this question was an inability to consider the impact of Gladstone's foreign policy attacks, knowledge was often very general or even absent. This was a good example of a question that needed to be read with care otherwise it was easy to drift into a discussion of Disraeli's foreign policy and its failings, rather than Gladstone's attacks on it.
- 7 There were many good and solid answers; candidates displayed a great depth of factual knowledge and were able to support their ideas with precise examples. However, sometimes candidates spent too long on the economy and trade, providing such a wide range of examples that the depth of knowledge almost got in the way of the argument. Candidates were usually able to cover a wide range of factors and most considered the issues of balance of power and strategic needs. These two factors also provided candidates with a great opportunity to make links between factors and many seized the opportunity to show just how intertwined foreign policy was. There were fewer answers perhaps unsurprisingly, that discussed religious, cultural and the civilising mission factors as there was so much that candidates could have written about. Most had a range, though some did not get near 1902 or focused rather too much on the end of the period. Some picked up on the rising threat of Germany but made too much of this, given that it was only really a feature from around 1896-98.
- 8 There was overlap with the above Question in a good number of responses – the same factors being listed and assessed and often the same material used. However, provided candidates addressed the actual question and focused on British concerns in the Balkans and Mediterranean they were not penalised. Some understood British concerns and linked such to the Russian and the Ottoman Empires, but there were others who could write only in very general terms. Stronger answers considered Britain's strategic and military needs and these were related to trade and power in the region. Candidates were usually able to see the importance of the area in terms of protecting the Empire, be it in Africa or India and the associated trade routes. Many also explained the fear of Russia and the challenge its expansion would create to the concept of the balance of power. As often with responses to this question area, most only went as far as 1878 or just after; few wrote about the 1890s, and the changing perspectives and issues by then. However, it was also pleasing to see a number of candidates writing accurately about the Mediterranean Agreements.

- 9 This was a popular question, but some turned it into a question on why the two countries went to war or answered a recent and similar question. Better candidates got the focus correct and were able to consider a wide range of issues. Most were able to write about colonial rivalries and the Moroccan crises, but in some answers this was almost to the exclusion of other issues. The question of the Ententes and Anglo-French proximity in talks and sharing of resources and planning was present in many answers and usually well explained. German perceptions and British fears, particularly the role of the Foreign Office (and Grey) were often considered. This was often linked into the question of the naval race, although some seemed unaware that Britain had triumphed in this area before 1914. References to Belgium were in order, though excessive space was not needed on that issue. Candidates did not struggle to explain a range of reasons, but often this was little more than a list and there was little or no attempt to evaluate the relative importance of factors. However, some better answers did note that relations were not always in decline and that there were periods when a rapprochement appeared possible and then used the failure to evaluate the relative importance of factors.
- 10 This was a very popular question. However, many candidates tended to write about the events or else generalise about causes. There were few answers that focused well on mine owners, though those who did produced well-developed answers, involving other factors – the government, the TUC, general economic-industrial conditions were favoured. Even then, some good answers fell away because they went on into the events of the Strike or the aftermath. A significant number argued that the causes were the result of long term economic problems, largely due to the post war problems or the structure of the industry and that therefore the mine owners could not be blamed, whilst others attributed much of the blame to the government, the return to the Gold Standard, preparations for a strike and Baldwin's breaking off negotiations following the Daily Mail incident. There was some confusion between the relative roles of the mine workers and the TUC.
- 11 This area has often proved difficult for candidates in the past and it was pleasing therefore to see an increasing number who considered a wide range of government measures. As a result some good answers were read, replete with knowledge and, importantly, economic and fiscal understanding. Many considered issues such as the coming off the Gold Standard, tariffs, 'cheap money', help for Depressed areas, Old and New Industries and areas, affluence set against poverty, the military factor in decreasing unemployment as the economy was geared more towards defence needs. Many argued that if government action helped, it was inadvertent, through coming off the gold standard or cheap money. There were some answers that gave undue weight to the impact of measures such as the Special Areas Act, but more were willing to see the recovery as the result of factors outside government control. However, there were still a number of weak answers that were not focused on the question; candidates writing about foreign policy or the Abdication crisis. Other weak answers focused on causes of Depression; occasionally rehearsing Labour 1929-31 and the formation of the National Government.
- 12 This question produced a significant number of very disappointing answers as candidates seemed unable to focus on the precise demands of the question. There were a number who confused development after the Second World War with measures taken in the 1920s, whilst many simply wanted to write about the Labour government's reforms with only a brief link to the question. There was far too much focus on the actual outcome of the measures and as a result candidates did not score well. Where there was analysis it was often too brief. However, there were some decent answers and these did try to assess a range of causes. Many placed the reforms in context of the failings of the 1930s or Labour ideology and their first opportunity as a majority government to put these views into place, whilst a large number made at least some reference to Beveridge and the five 'giants'. There was some mention of Labour's plans of 1945 and this was occasionally linked to the General Election. There were very few answers that were able to make evaluative comments and, even where there was analysis, many simply listed the reasons.

- 13 In many instances, questions such as this result in a chronological approach with little attempt to adopt a more thematic approach; attempts at comparison are often left to the very end. It was therefore pleasing to see that a significant number of answers did identify themes, such as the relationship with the US or Empire and were therefore able to make their comparison explicit, rather than implicit. Much was made of the effects of the retreat from Empire, Decolonisation, the onset of the Cold War, USA-USSR relations, ties with the USA and the interest in Europe. Less assured answers tended to describe too much or wrote very generalised comments and often treated the governments in a rather sequential manner. At the lower end, as one would expect, the range was also narrow and often only parts of the period were covered.
- 14 This was a popular question and a wide range of responses was seen. There were some good and knowledgeable answers, though, at times, the economic dimension took over rather too much, creating imbalance. At times candidates did not link their considerable knowledge to the actual demands of the question and simply explained the reasons behind the economic problems. Many, however were able to consider a range of factors, even if most concluded that economic factors were the most important. Other factors that were discussed included the end of Empire, the USA factor, defence interests and strategic concerns; occasionally there was mention of European ideals amongst some Conservative politicians. At the lower ends candidates were not able to distinguish between the different governments and Prime Ministers were incorrectly ascribed to times in office. Once again the importance of a sound chronological understanding needs to be stressed.
- 15 If any question reflected the overall improvement in candidate's ability it was probably this one. At the start of the new specification answers on Thatcher's foreign policy usually covered a very narrow range of issues, with some not going beyond the Falkland crisis of 1982. However, this question produced many answers that considered a good range of issues ranging from Rhodesia to the Cold War, to Europe and relations with the US. Although a number were not able to go beyond listing success and failure, there were others that made interim judgements about success, particularly over Europe, before reaching an overall judgement. At lower levels there were issues of balance of knowledge: some answers focused very heavily on 1982 too much. Another issue that also received undue attention was the USA relationship and attendant factors; as a result, at times the Cold War dimension was relegated or neglected. The development of European relations and involvement in the EEC/EU featured, at times with good knowledge of the SEA. What mattered was the creation of reference points in aims and ideas by which to measure the success or otherwise of her policy. This is particularly important in a question such as this where this a great deal that could be covered. Organisation by aims and ideas was not always done, so turning answers into descriptions or, on occasions, generalisations.
- 16 This was a very popular question and there were a significant number of very good answers. Some answers tended to write a great deal about Conservative policies and performances from 1955 or 1957, even 1951, which did not seem relevant to a question on 1964. If these factors were so important it would be fair to assume that the Conservatives would have lost an earlier election! Some wanted to answer a previous question on the role of the scandals and again spent a disproportionate amount of time on them. Better answers did focus on Wilson's appeal, linked to electoral success, but this was often the weakest element of the answer. Candidates also compared organisational features as well as electoral issues to explain the outcome. In many answers, however, a wide range of factors were considered and these usually included Conservative economic strategy, the loss of direction, the scandals, Macmillan's faltering leadership, the new PM (Home) and social development and changes that seemed to make the Conservative party appear out of touch.

- 17 This question produced many good answers, but perhaps the biggest discriminator was whether candidates could link specific issues to particular election victories. At the lower end, candidates made more generalised points and some seemed unaware of the particular elections or specifically mentioned only two of the three. Sometimes answers got into Thatcher's policies per se rather than the hub of the question, writing more generally about her policies and then suggesting that because they were successful she won the election. Better answers made links and looked at common or different causal stands across the three elections, though 1979 and 1983 were better known than 1987. In considering Conservative strengths issues such as Thatcher's appeal, her ability to convey and make change, her general impact, the Falklands War factor, the sale of council houses, the reduction in trade union power were key features; so, too, at times, the thrust of her fiscal strategy. However, some argued that it was Labour weakness that was the key. When this approach was adopted candidates often used the Winter of Discontent, Labour leadership, manifestos and policies to support their argument, suggesting that these were more important because some government measure were unpopular and therefore the only reason she was elected was because Labour was unelectable.
- 18 This was the least popular question in this study topic. However, there were some good answers but others were generalised or thin or lacking in real understanding. Range of coverage was important and often candidates wrote too much was said about the first few years, so producing a very unbalanced answer. Candidates who scored well usually looked at a good range of issues including, the problems of Ulster, religion and politics, attempts to find solutions, Direct Rule, terrorism in the North and on the mainland. Very occasionally, reference was made to bi-partisan politics and the common ground approaches of different governments as well as issues of just how well the nature of the 'Irish problem' was understood in Westminster and Whitehall.

F962/01

- 1 This was a very popular question and attracted a significant number of high level responses. Many candidates were able to consider a range of motives and support their ideas with precise examples from either events or individuals. There were some whose comments on religion was rather generalised and did not go further than the defence of the Christian church or the remission of sins. Better answers were able to refer to the motives of specific examples or made reference to the work that has been done on Charters as evidence that religion was the main motive. Although there were very answers that completely disagreed with the statement, most were able to weigh up religion against other motives. In considering other issues candidates were able to write about economic benefits or political gain. Once again this was often illustrated by reference to specific individuals. There were very answers that seemed to think that motives could be mixed, assuming that individuals were motivated by religion or land. At the lower end, some candidates did drift away from the motives of the Crusaders and wrote about the motives of the Pope.
- 2 This question was answered well, aided by the straightforward nature of the question. Most candidates were able to produce a list of reasons, even if they were less good at prioritising their importance. However, as with other questions, many candidates did make some attempt to reach a judgement and this often took them into Level II. Although it may be a subject that gets less coverage than the First Crusade, many candidates displayed a thorough knowledge of events and were able to support their ideas with specific examples. There were some candidates who either had not prepared this topic or were confused by the question and wrote about the Second or Third Crusade. However, the most common failing on this question was a lack of specific knowledge and answers that tended to be generalised or very sketchy in the detail deployed.

- 3 This was the least popular question in this section. Questions on the Crusader states are always less popular than those that deal with the actual crusades and this was no exception. When this is added to the relations between the states and the Muslims it is perhaps not surprising that the take up was less than for the other questions. Many candidates did struggle to link Muslim disunity to the relationship with Crusader states and very often answers drifted into reasons for the survival of the states, where Muslim disunity was one of a number of reasons. There were also a significant number of responses that focused on the relationship between Muslim disunity and the outcome of the Crusades. This was seen particularly when candidates wrote about the success of the First Crusade being due to Muslim disunity, not noting that this was before the Crusader states were established. However, there were few good answers which considered the role of Muslim disunity in allowing the states to survive and then showed how the growth of Jihad and greater unity led to their downfall.
- 4 Most candidates were able to balance rivalry against a range of other factors. Knowledge of rivalry was usually quite sound, although candidates do need to take care to ensure they do not drift from the dates in the question as there were a number who went into the sixteenth century when considering Rome and Venice. There were also some candidates who had learnt a package of evidence on the diversity of Renaissance art and artists as indicative of political rivalry and were determined to use it so their argument was skewed as they tried to make it fit the question. Candidates must also ensure that they focus on specifically Italian issues as stated in the question and do not write in more general terms. Weaker responses were rather general and candidates should be reminded that they do need to support their arguments with precise examples.
- 5 This question was generally well answered, but there were a few candidates who drifted away from architecture to art or sculpture which could not be credited. However, there were some good references to specific buildings and an awareness of other influences such as Gothic, Byzantine and Christian. A few candidates did try to make the question into 'exclusively' classical and this did distort their arguments and analysis. At the top level, candidates were able to weigh up how much was a rediscovery of the classical style and how much was new.
- 6 This question attracted a wide range of responses. At the top level there was some very impressive understanding of the roots of humanism and these answers were able to link their ideas to 'totally new.' However, there were other answers that ignored the concept of 'totally' and this limited their response and candidates should be reminded of the need to focus on key words in the question. At the lower end there were a number who simply described humanism and humanist thought and did not make any attempt to link their ideas back to the question and produced a purely descriptive response.
- 7 Candidates found this question straightforward and most were able to consider a range of factors, including technology. There was generally a good understanding of technology and the use to which it could be put and how this would have encouraged voyages. Many candidates were able to weigh up its importance against a range of other factors and reach a balanced conclusion, which allowed them to reach at least Level II. Candidates avoided simply saying that it created the discoveries.
- 8 Stronger candidates found no difficulty in considering a wide range of factors and reaching a balanced judgement about their relative importance. However, in some weaker answers candidates simply used the same material from the previous question and although this worked to a limited extent, it tended to lead to more generalised responses that lacked the specific references to the establishment of an overseas Empire.

- 9 This was the least popular of the questions in this section and some candidates were unable to go beyond a basic list of benefits such as trade, power, prestige and bullion. Some better answers attempted to address the issue of bullion and how well it was used by Spain with most concluding that it was a missed opportunity as it was not invested in Spanish industry. There were a few answers where candidates were able to display a wider range of material and knowledge, considering for example the impact on the Spanish church and how the conquest benefited the crown's relationship with the church.
- 10 This was a popular question which attracted a range of responses. The better answers were able to weigh up Isabella's contribution against other factors and many were able to make links between them. This was most noticeable in terms of her collaboration with Ferdinand which was often handled very well. Many were also able to compare the weaknesses of Joanna with the strengths of Isabella's leadership. However, there were a number of answers that were thin on specific detail and were unaware of events like the Battle of Toro. There were also a significant number of answers that went beyond 1479 and used material that would have been better deployed in Question 11, whilst some other answers lacked specific examples of, for instance, nobility who were won over.
- 11 This was the most popular question in this section and there were a wide range of responses, but many very good answers that focused on 'how successful', making interim judgements on a variety of issues, before reaching an overall conclusion about success. Many answers covered a wide range of material, although there were some where the range was very narrow. Although it is the quality of analysis that is important, candidates do need to cover a sufficient range of issues so that their conclusions are based on a wide enough selection to make their conclusions valid. Most candidates were able to identify and consider a range of problems; weaker answers tended to deal with problems one by one and did not see any pattern or links between them. It was encouraging that candidates avoided simple descriptions of the problems, again evidence of good preparation by centres and as a result a number of modest candidates were able to reach at least Level III for AO1b.
- 12 This was the least popular of the questions in this section. There was a distinct tendency for many answers to rely on sweeping generalisations as knowledge of his financial measures was very limited, often going little beyond debt. Candidates still have a tendency to conflate finance and the economy and this meant that they failed to focus on the actual demands of the question and did not score well. Where candidates were able to link economic issues back to finance credit was given, but this was not a frequent occurrence. Better answers frequently linked Charles' management back to the legacy of Ferdinand and Isabella and forward to Philip II's inheritance.
- 13 This was the least popular question in this section. Candidates who attempted this question frequently relied on generalisations and wrote about his relationship with the Princes without specific detail on how they limited his power in specific circumstances. Other factors, such as the constitutional context of Charles' position and his other responsibilities were less well covered.
- 14 This was a popular question and most candidates were able to produce at least a list of reasons for the spread of Lutheranism. Many were able to go beyond a simple list and make judgements about the relative importance of issues and thus access Level II for AO1b, but there were few answers that were able to make links between the factors. This was particularly noticeable in the treatment of Martin Luther, who was often considered as factor in himself, separate from his ideas and their appeal and the impact of his written works was considered without reference to the innovation of the printing press which made it possible to disseminate his works so quickly.

- 15 At the top level there were answers that showed an excellent knowledge of the Habsburg-Valois wars and were able to make a series of judgements about 'how successful' Charles was in the conflict. However, there were other answers that lacked a detailed knowledge of his relationship with France and answers often relied on one or two specific examples to try and sustain a case; usually a reference to Pavia and the Treaty of Madrid. Candidates do need a good working knowledge of all elements of the topic they are studying; it was worrying when a candidate confused Madrid for Milan. Once again this question also showed the problem of a poor chronological understanding as events were confused and this resulted in incorrect arguments being pursued.
- 16 Most answers were able to consider a reasonable range of issues and were able to analyse his domestic policies. However, in order to reach the very highest levels candidates do need to evaluate or make judgements about his success in each area under consideration and this did not always happen. This question demonstrated clearly the need for a strong conclusion that allowed an overall judgement to be reached and this was found only in the very strong answers.
- 17 There were very few answers to this question and those who did attempt to tackle it often lacked sufficient knowledge about France itself to deal appropriately with the question and this must always be an issue with foreign policy essays. The internal turmoil of France impinged greatly on Spanish perception and policy and there were very answers that saw this. Candidates also failed to address Philip's changing attitude in terms of his growing aggression. Candidates could, legitimately, have looked at possible turning points in terms of the relationship and this would have provided another avenue to approach the question.
- 18 This question was generally well answered. Candidates were able to stay within the parameters set out in the title and most could produce a list of reasons why Philip had problems, with better answers able to offer some judgement as to their relative importance. It was again apparent that average candidates who had been well-prepared were able to produce a structured and analytical response with some judgement, which often allowed them to reach Level II on AO1b. Most pleasing was the very detailed knowledge that some candidates were able to display. The problem of religion is complex and some did drift towards generalisation, but most answers were sound and showed a clear grasp of the key issues.

F962/02

- 1 Although this question was quite popular, candidates struggled with the idea of the reasons for his reforms. Some were unable to go beyond the named factor and simply argued or stated that every reform was designed to secure him in power, whilst others argued that his reforms were popular and this then made it difficult for them to, explain issues such as censorship, electoral manipulation and the use of secret police. Some candidates drifted beyond the Consulate or considered only a very narrow range of reforms and this also made it difficult for them to reach balanced and well supported judgements.
- 2 This was the most popular question in this section. However, there were a number of answers that did not go beyond broad generalisations about Napoleon's tactics or military skill and were unable to link these to any specific examples from battles. Too many essays attempted to answer the question with no or little reference to actual battles, or relied on brief references to a couple, often Austerlitz and one other. The same was true in the treatment of the weaknesses of his enemies, candidates asserted that the Coalitions were weak, but were unable to refer to specific coalitions or give precise details of the weakness, other than the problem of calendars. However, better answers did consider a range of issues and were able to reach judgements about the relative importance of the

factors. At the lower end, some candidates described Napoleon's early military campaigns and there were some who struggled to get into the nineteenth century, spending too long on the Italian or Egyptian campaigns.

- 3 This was the least popular question in this section. Many candidates struggled to consider a range of issues and to link them to specific countries, often drifting to countries that were not under his rule. This was seen in considering the impact of the Continental system on England and its economy. Specific examples were often lacking and some answers were simply reduced to stating that countryside was damaged by fighting or that a large number of inhabitants who were conscripted into Napoleon's armies were killed and therefore his rule had a serious impact. However, there were some who saw the different types of states that were established and were able to distinguish between those who were controlled directly and those that were controlled indirectly. There was a wide range of issues such as taxation, economy, conscription and administrative changes that could have been considered, but few were able to do address such a wide range.
- 4 Although this is not a particularly popular topic, the candidates whom did tackle this often showed a very detailed factual knowledge and there were even times when this depth of knowledge got in the way of the argument that was being pursued. The question did illustrate the need to ensure that the conclusion follows logically from the rest of the essay and this was not always the case. Some candidates argued, quite thoroughly and convincingly that the years from 1818 to 1824 had been a failure, but concluded that overall his reign had been a success. However, it was pleasing to see that some candidates were able to see his reign in more than domestic terms and that there was reference to Spain and the succession. Against this, candidates would have been advised to give more attention to the increasing influence of the ultras in the latter years.
- 5 As with the previous question, candidates displayed a very good level of relevant and detailed knowledge. It was pleasing that many were able to focus on the short term reasons for his downfall as in previous sessions questions on his fall have often focused on long term causes and seen only cursory treatment of the events of his later years. However, the named factor did cause a number of candidates some difficulty as they seemed unable to identify traits that might be considered under the heading of his character. Sometimes candidates wrote about his age or inability to be decisive, but were unable to link this to his character and his fall. Most candidates were able to consider a range of issues and offer some judgement as to their relative importance and therefore reach the higher levels.
- 6 This was the least popular of the questions on this topic. Many answers adopted a chronological approach and as a result some answers did not give sufficient time to the Franco-Prussian War, which it could be argued was his greatest failure. A number of answers adopted a list-like approach, with success and then failures. However, most argued that the 1850s were largely a period of success and the 1860s a period of failure. Although this argument is valid, the analysis was often undeveloped and superficial. There were very answers that were able to address the issue of 'how successful' and this lack of judgement confined many answers to Level III as the response was largely a list. There was little understanding of how Bismarck outsmarted the emperor and the quest for Luxembourg was usually omitted.
- 7 There were many good answers that often pointed out that the west had already been opened up prior to the railroad. However, these answers did not neglect the 'main factor' pointing out that the railways facilitated large scale permanent settlement. It was pleasing to see that in this session candidates were able to support their ideas with precise examples, be it of towns that developed through cattle ranching or numbers who were attracted westwards because of gold. In previous sessions candidates had relied on sweeping generalisations about many of these issues. Knowledge of government

legislation that encouraged the move west was usually impressive. This is such a big topic it was not surprising that there were a lot of omissions but most mentioned government acquisitions and mining as important 'other factors'. Most answers were analytical in their approach and it provided an ideal opportunity to link together factors, which many candidates seized upon with considerable effect.

- 8 Candidates often provided good analysis of a range of issues. However, less successful answers failed to link the factors discussed to the Civil war or took a more generalised approach eg a reference to Lincoln's power of oratory, but with no examples, such as the Gettysburg address. A considerable number chose to take a comparative approach of Lincoln and Burns, and while this did work to some extent; it imposed some limitations on the answer. Other candidates often slipped into a preprepared answer comparing Lincoln to Davis – which could work but again frequently led to a loss of focus. A surprising number omitted any discussion of the Emancipation Proclamation.
- 9 Most candidates agreed with the proposition but only the better ones were able to explain why it took four years for superior resources to make the difference. Too few candidates made the obvious point that the Confederacy was very large and actually had to be conquered. Many candidates struggled to organise their material in a logical and structured fashion and there was often drift from the demands of the question. Some candidates took a comparative approach and this worked well in many instances. Frequently candidates had a very good knowledge of Union resources, but they struggled to link this back to victory in the civil war. Most answers were analytical in their approach, but this was often only a list approach and judgement or evaluation was limited.
- 10 There were only a few answers on this. The approach of many suggested they had prepared an answer for why Germany was defeated but knew precious little about the war at sea. What was particularly surprising was that while many correctly stated that US involvement was a paramount factor in Germany's defeat, very few made the link with unrestricted submarine warfare! Many candidates interpreted it as assess the main factor against the other reasons for Germany's defeat, rather than focusing on different aspects of the war at sea, such as the blockade or the consequences of the unrestricted U boat campaign or the lack of naval encounters. However, most candidates showed some knowledge of the naval war and attempted to assess the role of the blockade in defeating Germany.
- 11 This proved to be a big problem for candidates. There were very few candidates who attempted to discuss anything but Versailles, apart from some brief references to self-determination in Central Europe. Although candidates were generally well versed in the various aims of the Big Three, only a few tried to assess to what degree those aims were reflected in the subsequent settlement. There was also a tendency to confuse the personal aims of Lloyd George with the self-interest of the British state, while many candidates paid scant attention to the national interests of the USA. Too many answers were the stock GCSE response which ran through the aims of Clemenceau, Lloyd George and Wilson in relation to Versailles. The better answers did bring in the other treaties and were able to discuss the principles of national self-determination and maintaining peace through the League of Nations. Weak answers stated that all the powers were selfish, failing to recognise that Clemenceau compromised. Other common omissions were the Middle Eastern mandates and Britain's success in eliminating both the German navy and empire.
- 12 This produced the best answers of this section. Candidates were aware of the need to identify a range of factors as well as Hitler's foreign policy and attempted to assess the relative significance of those factors. The main weakness was a tendency to simplify Appeasement and reduce it to no more than giving Hitler what he wanted; perhaps a legacy of GCSE. Most tended to agree with the proposition and the better ones harked

back to *Mein Kampf*. Chamberlain and appeasement were also blamed though not many blamed the weakness of the League of Nations – the League was omitted by many. What was striking, however, was candidates' poor chronology – a number placed Munich before the Rhineland, Chamberlain as Prime Minister before 1937, a discussion of Poland followed by reference to Manchuria. Perhaps the most surprising point to note was the absence of the Nazi-Soviet Pact by all except the better candidates.

- 13 Candidates generally had a good knowledge of the subject although they did not always address the question of the degree of seriousness of the problems Nicholas II faced. Many simply described the problems and seemed to assume that because they were problems they were inevitably serious. Some weaker ones were inclined to confuse 1905 and 1917, with the Tsar away at the front and some believed that Russia had enjoyed an economic boom in the 1880s, an exaggeration, to say the least. There were still a significant number of answers that relied on sweeping generalisations about the conditions of the peasantry, the starving masses in the cities, the weakness of the autocracy and the personal failings of the Tsar. There were also a considerable number of answers that ignored the Russo-Japanese war and the 1905 revolution when they could have been used to considerable effect.
- 14 This topic was well known and most candidates identified a range of factors and attempted to assess them. In some cases, however, too much detail was provided on events before 1914, leaving little time to examine the role of the war and its links to those problems. Most candidates agreed with the proposition and the better ones also discussed long term factors. What was missing from most, however, were the actual events of February/March 1917. Few seemed to understand that Nicholas was brought down by his generals who felt by removing him they were avoiding a revolution. There were a significant number of answers that showed a considerable depth of knowledge of events from the outbreak of the War, but often these candidates were unable to link them to the downfall of the Tsar and the answer appeared to be an assessment of the problems caused by the war, rather than the actual question set.
- 15 Candidates displayed good knowledge and attempted to evaluate a range of factors. It was also pleasing to see an improvement in the depth of knowledge deployed by many on this question. In the past, many candidates have relied upon generalisations, particularly when talking about the weaknesses of White command, but this time specific commanders were named. The same was true in the discussion of control of interior lines of communication as candidates were able to consider a variety of ways the use made of the rail network helped and give specific details about the areas controlled by the different forces. Trotsky was quite rightly credited with a key role, although there was an inclination to underestimate the part played by Lenin. Some answers were able to consider the role of the Cheka and the use made of intimidation to ensure victory or at least control. There were some good contrasts made between what the Reds and Whites represented and some used this to help explain why Red forces were victorious.
- 16 This was the least popular of the questions on Italy and many of those who attempted it were often reduced to sweeping generalisations. As with the question the seriousness of problems facing Russia, many answers seemed to assume that because it was a problem it must be serious and there tended to be descriptions of the problems rather than analysis or evaluation. As with any topic, it is vital that candidates have a detailed factual knowledge, but also a secure chronological grasp and both of these were noticeable for their absence in many answers. Many answers focused on the period from 1870, or in some instances 1861 and this resulted in answers which, at best gave background or general comments about the issues. Some candidates also struggled with the concept of social unrest and seemed unsure what should be covered under this heading.

- 17 This was a very popular question which produced a wide range of responses. The problem for a number of candidates appeared to be knowing where to stop. The best answers displayed a very thorough knowledge and were able to link this to the key issue in the question and assess the impact appropriately. However, weaker responses often just described the impact. Many candidates were able to make good links between the social and economic consequences of war and the political ones, the best answers also commented on the continuity of problems from pre-war situations and pointed out that the war merely exacerbated existing problems. Some missed the long-term effects of the war on the growth of Fascism, whilst others mentioned this but were unable to link it to the question. Once again it was pleasing to see that there was often good supporting evidence in terms of facts and figures. In terms of points of contention, two issues should be raised. Firstly, the 'great victory' of 1918 against Austrian forces was overdone, it was after all against the corpse of the Austro-Hungarian victory, although Italy did require any victory after Caporetto. Secondly, the election of 1919, a crucial point in Italy's decline into anarchy was rarely clearly understood.
- 18 The most popular of the 3 questions on Italy. There were some good answers to this question with many candidates pointing out Mussolini's success as a propagandist but failure in terms of actual achievement. Virtually all the candidates included social and economic issues and were able to reflect on the view in the question in order to score well. This is because some form of argument was nearly always included and was rewarded appropriately. Naturally there were some factual errors or confusion especially in economic matters. However, some candidates struggled to know what to leave out and found the topic rather too large to handle well. It was however pleasing to see the balanced approach that characterised many responses. Candidates considered the apparent success of a policy, before looking at the limitations and reaching a considered judgement, often linked back to the idea that many of the policies were little more than propaganda triumphs.
- 19 There were a number of well argued and well supported answers to this question. Most candidates were able to analyse a range of problems, but struggled to weigh up their relative importance. Candidates were able to argue that rivalry between the warlords created instability and there was no one source of power to succeed the Manchu dynasty, at least in the short term. Some answers linked this to the problem of a power vacuum, which was only partially solved in the 1920s by the Nationalists. Candidates considered a range of issues including the limited support for Sun Yat-sen, the emergence of the CCP and the Guomindang.
- 20 There were a number of strong answers to this question as candidates were able to compare the strengths of the Communists with the weaknesses of the Nationalists and usually this approach ensured that the answer was analytical and allowed many to reach a sustained or supported judgement. Most candidates were able to examine a range of issues ranging from support and alienation of various groups in Chinese society, to the role of Mao and his promises of land reform and the conduct of communist soldiers. Often the issue of land reform was contrasted with the Nationalists management of the economy and their attitude towards the peasantry and it was argued that the masses could see little to be gained by supporting the Nationalists. Some answers considered the situation during and after the war and argued that this also aided the Communists.
- 21 A number of candidates produced some very well supported and analytical answers to this question. The detail of supporting knowledge was often excellent, showing a depth of detail about the output from both industry and agriculture that was impressive. However, there were a number of answers that either relied upon sweeping generalisations or went beyond the dates in the question and wrote about more recent economic developments within China, which was outside the scope of the question. Most candidates were able to

produce balanced answers that weighed up the relative successes and failures of the polices and then reach an overall conclusion, with many arguing that the success of the Five Year Plans was much greater than the Great Leap Forward.

- 22 Although this was a very popular question, the quality of the answers was variable. Many candidates had obviously prepared for a Nazi rise to power question and still focused on that aspect rather than their ability to stay in power. As a consequence there were a significant number of candidates who spent a considerable amount of their time writing about the 1920s, which was usually peripheral to the actual question. Once again there were a very large number who wrote about the hyperinflation of 1929. When candidates did write about the Nazis staying in power a significant number of the answers were descriptive of what they did and they were unable to link the material to support. It was also noticeable that much of the knowledge was generalised and did not go beyond what one might expect from the average GCSE candidate. There were also a large number of answers that did not get beyond 1934, focusing on the Enabling Act and the Night of the Long Knives and this can be contrasted with the poor treatment of the war period and the early foreign policy success. The named factor also presented some candidates with problems as they were able to describe policies, particularly Mefo bills, but again were unable to link this to support for the regime. However, there were some candidates who were able to make links between the economic policies and the use of propaganda or between terror and propaganda and this often allowed them to access the higher levels.
- 23 The level of responses to this question and also to question 24 suggests that many candidates had expected there to be two questions on Nazi Germany and were less happy in writing on the emergence of a democratic Western Germany. Candidates should be reminded of the need to cover the whole of the specification in sufficient depth to allow them to write confidently about all aspects and not focus on just part of the specification. Many candidates were reasonably secure in writing about the Conferences and the establishment of the zones and there was some knowledge of the currency zones, but after that knowledge was rather patchy, some ascribing the construction of the Berlin Wall to this period and other ignoring the airlift. There were other answers that drifted from the focus of the question and considered who was to blame and therefore did not deploy their command of the topic effectively.
- 24 The quality of the answers varied considerably. At the higher level there were some very good questions that weighed up the role of Adenauer and balanced it against other factors such as the role of the US through Marshall Aid, or other reasons for the economic miracle. However, there were some answers that credited everything to Adenauer and made no real attempt to produce a balanced answer, as even within paragraphs on the economy it was only Adenauer who was given the credit. Answers that focus on only the named factor cannot go beyond Level III for AO1b. Knowledge of the topic also varied greatly, some resorting to simple generalisations, whilst others showed considerable knowledge of a wide range of issues, including economic statistics and foreign relations. Some candidates do need to ensure that they focus on the precise demands of the question and do not drift into answer that deals with his fall.
- 25 Many answers showed a good knowledge of the motives of the USSR and the Western Allies, with particular attention to the question of Germany. Most candidates sought to evaluate the various factors and identify the most significant. However, Britain's particular role was either ignored or misunderstood. Attlee was dismissed as a poor substitute for Churchill and Bevin not mentioned. If Molotov is to be believed, they were more confrontational than the Americans at Potsdam and it was they who initiated the military alliances that led to NATO. Some candidates spent an excessive amount of time on the long term causes of the Cold War, with most of the answer focused on the legacy of the Russian Civil War, even if there was some passing reference to ideological differences.

Candidates were rather hesitant in their knowledge of the problems faced during the war between the allies and more could have been made of that. Perhaps, most worryingly, was either the confusion or lack of knowledge about the change of leadership in Britain and the US and the consequences for relations. There were some answers where a poor chronological knowledge was an issue as candidates were unsure where to end and events such as the Berlin Wall was used to explain the origins.

- 26 This was of course a wide-ranging focus, and better responses tended to take an overview early on, and then deal with the few specific relevant events to discuss. However, many answers were not as good as they might have been. Although some had a good knowledge of events concerning Berlin, the reasons why it seemed so important to both sides were less well understood and there was also confusion between the events, revealing once again the need for a good chronological base. There was a tendency to pay too little attention to 1989 compared to earlier crises and Uncle Joe continues to get credit for building the Wall. Very few candidates latched onto the symbolism or 'microcosm scenario' that Berlin offered.
- 27 In some cases the candidates showed good knowledge and sought to evaluate a range of factors, with particular attention to the role of Gorbachev. However, some gave undue credit to the crises of 1956 and 1968 for undermining Soviet control. This seems difficult to justify, given that both ended in failure, with the former especially violent. Likewise, there was a tendency to overrate the success of Solidarity prior to Gorbachev taking over. Some answers misunderstood the question and instead discussed Hungary 1956 and Prague 1968. There were a significant number of weak answers where a confused or even absence, of chronology was a major problem and resulted in some confused attempts at explanation. At this level, knowledge of events in the satellite states was at best patchy.
- 28 The candidates who attempted this question were usually able to explain a range of reasons, although attempts at evaluation of the relative importance of the factors were less successful. Most candidates had a sound knowledge of events and were able to support their ideas with precise examples that were wide ranging in their coverage.
- 29 This was a not a popular question and those who did tackle it needed to establish criteria against which to judge success; this could have been in terms of his aims, outcomes or the historical context. Knowledge was also lacking in specific details and it resulted in sweeping generalisations or assertions.
- 30 As with the previous question, candidates who attempted this question did not have sufficient depth of factual knowledge to support their attempts at argument. As a result, many answers were very generalised and often did not go beyond assertion.

F963 and F964 AS History Enquiries

General Comments

The total entry for the Enquiry Units was 4354 with a breakdown on the British History Units of 672 on the earlier period (F963 01) and 1020 on the later (F963 02), and on the European and World History Units of 346 on the earlier period (F964 01) and 2316 on the later (F964 02).

This session saw a mixture of candidates some, possibly most, entering for the first time after a term's study. Some approached the sources with confidence, using historical terminology and knowledge with ease. At both the middle and lower end there was evidence that candidates had, conceptually, not got much beyond GCSE. Their failure to integrate content and evaluation was particularly noticeable and they tended to proceed sequentially and descriptively. The skills required by Enquiry papers take a little time to mature, noticeably in the handling of concepts, evaluating sources, either individually or in groups and in integrating knowledge into this process.

Most candidates ranged between 39-75 marks, mainly achieving levels II, III, and IV. Most found it difficult to get into the 80s and it was rare to see a mark in the 90s. The answers on F964 01 did less well than their more modern, 02, and British 01 and 02 equivalents but the candidature here was a small one. Topics which were part of the specification but which, by virtue of their recent inclusion, had not featured before also saw some uncertain responses by candidates, especially Q2, the German Cities in the 1530s, and (Q1) Tolpuddle and the Trade Unions 1824-1844.

We would also like to apologise for the Crusades Question. There were mistakes in some of the sources and the thrust of Q1(b) on the military orders was inappropriate (see the remarks in 'comments on individual questions'). Candidates answering this question have been checked and, having done this, it is our opinion that candidates sitting this question performed in line with their ability equally to the other question on the paper. However **Centres should not use F964 01, Q1(b), in their teaching of this topic.**

At most levels candidates were trying to do the right thing, although it seemed that many, having grouped their sources, proceeded to discuss them sequentially, often in random order. There seemed an excess of description and referencing. More disappointing were those in the middle and top ends who preferred to argue their points by source reference and well used stand-alone own knowledge. They knew that they had to evaluate but preferred to do so in 'bolt-on' and discrete sections that did little or nothing to move the argument on in relation to the question. There was also much evidence of careless reading, both of the sources and the questions.

The new mark scheme is now in its second year and examiners have found it a more accessible assessment tool. It is to be hoped that teachers use it. Familiarity with its terms, skills and concepts will assist in delivering the skills we reward. Alas the errors which occur tend to be those that have always marred responses. We therefore make no apology for reiterating where candidates continue to lose marks.

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

It is worth remembering that the question asks the candidate to compare two sources '**as evidence**'. This means assess them in relation to each other, not extract information from them about the focus of the question. Equally, a *general* analysis is not what is required. There should be links to and focus on the key issue in the question. Candidates frequently ignore this and would be well advised to highlight it on the paper as an aide memoire. Many simply compare content and provenance (if they do compare both) regardless of the issue. For example Q4 (a)

on Germany in F964 02 asked about evidence for the popularity of the Nazis. The sources talked, amongst other things, of 'youth' and so many simply wrote about the Hitler Youth rather than about the extent and nature of popularity of the Nazis. Also the judgement reached should be about the Sources as evidence, not about the key issue. This example, from Q3 on F963/01, is of a typical general conclusion: *'therefore the criticisms of MPs were continuous and similar throughout the Commonwealth period'*. Such a statement does not judge which of the two Sources provides the better evidence on the issue and explain why.

In both questions the commonest mistake is in the use of phrases such as 'this shows us that', which is neither a comparative nor an analytical approach to the sources. Some candidates seem to think that to use the sources illustratively to support a view is what is required on the grounds that they are explaining the utility of the source, saying 'Source A is useful, it shows us that...' In Q(a) this leads them away from the comparative issues towards sequencing. In Q(b) it leads to a general answer in which the sources are used to illustrate 'knowledge' points rather than as the central body of material for evaluation.

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

- There are **no** marks for extraneous knowledge, only for bedding a source in its context. Credit is given for demonstrating a concise and clear understanding of the **context of an issue** (eg issues involved in the treatment of religious opponents; attitudes to the debate on the admission of Missouri to the Union; attitudes to state intervention to deal with poverty) and of any **concepts** involved, for example in the latter an understanding early 20th century attitudes to rights and responsibilities in relation to the economy and society. We are looking for a **light touch** here; say a sub clausal reference or at most one or two sentences.
- Many candidates simply focus on the topic, the parliamentary reform or the Knights Templar, instead of the **specific issue**, the views of Disraeli on the right to vote or the way in which the Knights Templar were founded.
- They refer to the sources to extract information for a general answer to the topic, rather than **comparing them as evidence** for a key issue. The consequence is a sequenced approach, a level 4.
- Many candidates, at some point in their answer, resort to randomly juxtaposing dissimilar points. They do not **compare like with like** or point out that one source may make a point which is absent from the other.
- Some are satisfied with **basic or undeveloped cross references**, often losing the question in the process.
- **Judgement** is often asserted at the end. It must arise from an evaluation of the quality of the content, either throughout or in a developed concluding paragraph. A failure to judge will confine a candidate to level III and below. Also **Judgement is all too frequently on the issue itself, rather than on the evidence for it** (see above).
- It is vital that candidates **identify the relevant issues** arising in the two sources and use these as their comparative focus. Failure to do so leads to description, paraphrase or at worst copying out what is there, word for word.

AO2a: Analyse and evaluate the two sources as evidence.

- This has the **higher mark weighting** and should focus the candidate on the sources as evidence.

- A **formulaic approach** often diverts the candidate from both the issue in the question (and the appropriate content) and the need to compare provenance, integrating it into an explanation of similarity and difference and arriving at developed judgement. We cannot emphasise enough the **damage** any formulaic approach does. Candidates desperately seek qualities on their 'list' that are simply not there or are of minor or tangential significance. For example a paragraph might be added on 'completeness' which turns into a wish list of sources that were not used in the comparison. Whole paragraphs are devoted to authenticity. Generic comments on reliability and utility are made without any reference to the content and nature of the specific sources supposedly under discussion. Although this is less frequent it continues to crop up in many guises.
- The key to an effective comparison of provenance is to **ask questions about the authors, their likely purpose, the different audiences and the respective tone**. For example, many candidates will devote whole sections of their answer here, and on Q(b), to reliability. This leads them to discrete comment. For historians all evidence can be used. Issues such as reliability are factored in and only then are conclusions drawn from it. It is a part of considering purpose, tone and audience. Simply to comment in isolation on reliability is not evaluation, only a relatively minor part of it. Many ignore or simply fail to use the introductions and attributions. These contain vital information to support the understanding of source content. For example in Q3 on the Civil War (F963 01) Source E was described in the introduction as 'a damning biography of Cromwell', yet it was often accepted at face value as reliable. Similarly in Q2 on the Mid Tudors there were clues on Catherine of Aragon and Katherine Parr which, if picked up, would assist candidates make linkages between religious change and faction.
- Most candidates **sequence their comments on provenance and deal with them separately**. They should seek to integrate them in a holistic approach. Having compared content they are quite happy to comment discretely on authorship, tone or purpose. Without effective comparison on this they find an informed judgement more difficult.
- Candidates will often take sources at **face value** eg Beatty commenting on the 'madness' of Churchill in making naval cuts or Cromwell recommending the English Bible as though this was fully commended by Henry.
- **Misinterpretation of the Sources** seems to be on the increase. Candidates need to read the material very carefully. It should ring bells in terms of their own understanding of the issue. Often this was simply carelessness. Our sources are fairly short but have been edited to contain real historical 'meat'. The language and points made need careful consideration and cross referencing which can only be achieved by attention to detail.
- There is much **assertion**. Candidates claim that something is useful or reliable, or biased without explanation, development or example. We are still faced with much 'stock' comment as a result. Stating that the author of a primary source 'has an agenda' so is unreliable, is as uninformative as asserting a modern historian to be reliable due to his research. A new variant on this is to argue that a source is limited because it only gives one point of view. For example on F964 02, Q3 on the US, Source A is limited because it provides a southern perspective but not a northern one; on Q4, on Germany, Source A is a Sopade report and limited because it doesn't give a Nazi point of view.

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

Most now know to attempt a grouping based on the assertion in the question but unfortunately they then still proceed sequentially, often in two halves. There is a discussion of each source, entirely discrete and often descriptive, and then a bolt –on section where the provenance of each is discussed, again discretely. No attempt is made to relate the provenance to a relative weighting of respective views. This divorces the material from the question and prevents candidates from integrating their points into the wider discussion of an interpretation. They fail to make the appropriate links. Candidates need to sustain their grouping by linking and cross referencing within it, establishing why two or three sources contribute to a particular interpretation or challenge it, and their relative merits as evidence. It is far better to integrate issues of provenance (authorship, purpose and audience) into this. It establishes the relative

weight to be given to the evidence of a group of sources. It is, perhaps, instinctive for candidates to proceed source by source, even within an established grouping, but they need to bear in mind the need to compare within and across their grouping at key points. This needs to be done both in terms of the issues and content discussed and on issues of provenance which may affect the relative weighting given to their points.

Candidates would be well advised –

- 1 To read the sources with care in relation to the question.
- 2 Plan using grouping; cross referencing those sources that can support two or more views. A structured argument is one of the keys to an effective answer.
- 3 Then assess the value of their grouping (evaluation) building in any relevant knowledge at this point. Content, provenance and knowledge will then enable an evaluation of the linked sources to occur. The grouping needs to be according to view for the sides of an argument rather than for undeveloped cross reference that loses sight of the question.
- 4 Thinking about their judgement and conclusion before starting to write and plan accordingly.

There were two key areas where candidates underperformed –

- 1 In using appropriate knowledge.
- 2 In applying the analytical and **evaluative** skills required to meet the requirements of the question effectively.

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

- It is worth remembering that there are **22 marks** for this.
- Some candidates simply wrote an **answer based on their knowledge** with the sources used for illustration or reference. Some implicitly referred to or quoted Source content to create a general narrative about the topic. Others knew that they needed to keep the focus on the sources, so dealt with this requirement by **bolting on their own knowledge**, either at the end, or scattered through the answer.
- In many cases candidates seemed to have little beyond a **general contextual underpinning**. They confined their comments to what was in front of them. This was either because it was as yet unconsolidated or because there were some sizeable gaps, as in the Condition of England or the German Reformation. In some cases it was simply inappropriate and led the candidate away from the focus of the question. It is important to realise what the **role of knowledge is in this question**. It is there as a means of evaluating the sources, extending, confirming or questioning what they say. It is **particularly important in evaluation**. Selection and use of the most appropriate evidence in evaluating the Sources *for the key issue* was the key to a high level mark for AO1a and AO1b. Many candidates used limited evidence within the date range of their questions, often preferring to drift irrelevantly outside it. Knowledge can only be credited if it informs the use of the sources. Thus for example it was necessary to know about Cromwell in Q2 on the Mid Tudors. Without this two of the sources could be misinterpreted. On Q3, the Civil Wars, candidates needed to spot and know about the two parliaments referred to – the Rump and Barebones (made obvious in the introductions).
- Many candidates missed key opportunities for **evaluating views within the Sources by use of knowledge**. This resulted in a lack of balance, where candidates rarely spotted the counter-arguments within the Sources. In the English Civil War option many failed to draw out religion as a reason for Cromwell's failure to work with the Commonwealth Parliaments, and in the German Reformation, where some struggled to relate Anabaptism and the catholicity of Speyer to the issue of whether the cities helped or hindered Lutheranism in the 1530s. On the Origins of the American Civil candidates preferred to

skew their answer towards the breakdown of compromise in the 1860s instead of assessing the Missouri Compromise over 40 years.

- Candidates need to **explain, develop, use and cross reference** the points for or against a particular interpretation in the sources. In so doing they will analyse the material to answer the question and arrive at a well thought through and argued judgement. Many manage to do this only through a discrete discussion of the content of an individual source. Often effective points are thus only made in isolation of the question and argument.
- Many answers **drifted out of focus on the key issue** in the question. The sharpness of focus was highly significant in marking out the best answers. For example on the 01 versions: William's *use* of the Church or *the relative importance of scripture and tradition* to Henry VIII's government, On the 02 versions: whether workers and their leaders were *responsible* for Trade Union weakness or how far *moral obligations* were the main reason for tackling Edwardian poverty, *how disastrous to his reputation* were Churchill's attitudes and policies in the 1920s or how *adequate* the Missouri Compromise was as a solution to the issue of slavery in the Territories. For each of these questions candidates would latch onto a preferred 'big' issue – William's power; Henry's alleged Protestantism; Trade Unionism and Chartism; the awfulness of poverty; Churchill as leader; the causes of the American Civil War. Too many candidates analyse the sources generally and are drawn away from the question or key issue.
- **The structure of the argument** was often seriously flawed. Many answers were of two halves – the first, attempting to analyse and use the Sources, but the second merely a resort to an essay style answer, with little or no further reference to the Sources. Some made no attempt to drive the answer using Sources, which became an essay with brief nods to the Sources by letter only, often in brackets.
- **Judgements and conclusions were often divorced from the sources.** Even candidates who had attempted a reasonable focus on the sources suddenly forgot that they were **assessing them as evidence** in their judgements. Instead they resorted to knowledge points **on the issue in general**. The answer would become topic based rather than what the sources have to say about a particular issue. Conclusions which make no reference to the sources are not answering the question '*assess how far the sources support...*'

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

- **Most marks** are given for this – **48**
- Candidates need to **spot the main thrust of argument or view in a source**. All too often they pick on a minor phrase and mistakenly make it central to their case or they allow knowledge to overwhelm it.
- As identified above lack of evaluation was the other key reason for underperformance. Candidates used to confine their discussions on provenance to Q(a). They now know this is crucial on Q(b) but their approach is to do so **discretely**, failing to link their discussions to the grouping and the key issue in the question. Having fallen down on analytical skills in AO1b they compound this by **failing to evaluate the source's relative contribution to the debate**. This confines them to Level 3 and below. They cannot access Levels 1 and 2 unless the source is given relative 'value' in its contribution to the question.
- By tackling the sources **sequentially and discretely** they inevitably move into Levels IV and below. It prevents them making the necessary links within and between sources, and with the question.
- Weaker candidates will often simply **describe the introductions and attributions**, as if this constitutes evaluation. It does not.
- At **Level 5 and below** there were those answers which blatantly copied out Source content sequentially with merely an uninformative, often repetitive, assertion.
- Many low level answers expressed **general comments about the topic** rather than focusing on the question itself or analysing the detail of the Sources. At the lower levels, several answers stated that the author 'had an agenda' without elaborating. At the highest

levels, there were some perceptive answers with impressive awareness of detail and the use of well chosen evidence in evaluation of provenance as well as content. Other able candidates lost marks for using Sources at face value and not considering their provenance, reliability or use.

- **Evaluation** is best achieved as part of the grouping, either within it, in terms of establishing relative importance, or as part of the grouping (all Protestant or Nazi views; all pre or post war or whatever.). It should always be related to establishing its value in relation to the question.
- **Synthesis** is about **bringing together all the above skills**. In particular this is where we reward not so much the knowledge used per se but its integration and relative balance (unevenness and then imbalance).
- Many candidates seemed not to realise the need to group Sources for analysis according to their view to create an argument of two or more sides for the 'assess how far' element. Many seemed to think that, as the question began with 'use your own knowledge' they should begin 'essay style' instead of using the Sources to drive their answers to Q(b). Thus they will underachieve on AO2b by failing to achieve sufficient synthesis.
- There are still some candidates who persist in **adding a bolt on** – 'and from my own knowledge, I know that . . .' This undermines synthesis. Evidence is not linked or active in assessing 'how far *the Sources* support . . .'
- A surprising number of answers **failed to find more than one view** in the Sources. This was particularly true of William and the Church, Cromwell and the Commonwealth Parliaments, Disraeli and parliamentary reform, tackling poverty and US influence in the early part of the Korean War There were obvious internal clues which might have been used as a springboard for argument. The most successful answers made impressive use of all these clues and saw that some Sources might be used for more than one side to an argument.
- **Knowledge** needs to be selected for its relevance and pertinent use in integration into the argument and there were some excellent answers which did achieve this with clarity and control. Those in the middle range of the Mark Scheme were able to analyse the interpretation in the question, but less likely to balance it with an alternative view in judgement.
- Often some better answers **lost sight of the Sources in the final page or so**, meaning that the conclusion and judgement were limited, undermining synthesis.
- There were many examples of **weak or unclear English** and some inappropriate use of slang, or of terms that were anachronistic in their use – 'grassing up', 'dobbing in', and 'being ratted on'. Informal language is inappropriate in an examination.

F966/01 and F966/02 Historical Themes

General Comments

Nearly 300 candidates were entered for the Medieval and Early Modern paper and over 800 candidates for the Modern paper. There were no letters of complaint. As one might expect in a January session, the quality of scripts was varied although on balance quite sound. The majority of candidates understood that a synoptic or over-arching judgement was needed but there appeared to be fewer candidates this session who were able to achieve an argued synthesis and thus reach the higher levels. At the top end, as always, there were a few outstanding performances. Synthesis, usually in the form of cross-referencing, and analysis, sometimes in considerable detail, featured prominently in their essays, and their arguments were supported with accurate factual details relevant to the question set. Persistent, continuous comparison and contrast work extremely well when delivered.

At the middle and lower end of performances, candidates analysed and produced sound evaluative comparisons but often only at the very end of the essay, while some offered a bolt-on synthesis almost as an after-thought to a paragraph. Many still follow a chronological route to answering questions, inevitably leading to too much description and assertion, with limited explanation and little cross-evaluation or comparative analysis. Excessive knowledge was also a problem for some candidates who struggled to organise and adapt it relevantly. A common feature this session was for weaker candidates to list examples in a paragraph, sometimes at great length, rather than to select appropriate examples, evaluate comments, and demonstrate the linkages between paragraphs. At the bottom end, candidates frequently misunderstood the needs of the question or had insufficient relevant knowledge. Their answers were often thin, short or even totally irrelevant.

The key to an effective answer is to respond to the question set rather than to the topic in general. The command stem of questions should always be kept firmly in mind but once again some candidates resorted to writing a pre-packaged answer based on a previous and apparently similar question. Weaker responses therefore tended to ignore 'steadily worse' (Q3), 'greater danger' (Q8) and 'revival' (Q11) in Paper 1, and 'undermined' (Q1), 'hindered' (Q2 and 14), 'maintaining' (Q8) and 'advancing' (Q15) in Paper 2. Many candidates also described or asserted developments when the question commanded them to 'assess'. Such questions need different factors, propositions and reasons evaluated and compared to determine their relative importance. Some candidates failed to compare key factors when the question explicitly required a comparison. For instance, 'the most important cause' (Q4), 'most important means' (Q7), 'most important institution' (Q10) and 'most important contribution' (Q18) in Paper 1; and 'the most important reason' (Q4) and 'most important factor' (Q7, 15 and 16) in Paper 2. Several questions tested candidates' understanding of continuity and change over time. Sometimes this was done explicitly, as in Questions 2, 3, 5, 8 and 14 in Paper 1, and in Questions 5,10,12,16 and 18 in Paper 2. Sometimes the concept of 'turning-point' was central to the question, as in Questions 9 and 13 in Paper 2. Weaker candidates still list one factor or turning-point after another as not only indicative of change but of equal importance.

Overview introductions were less prevalent, though the best essays did give an immediate comparison between the start and end of a period, so introducing change or continuity at the outset. Some candidates began their essay by 'setting the scene' and, while this has merit if it is relevant to the question, it can often entail merely re-stating the question. Several candidates paraphrased the question in the first paragraph and then wrote about the new version rather than the question set. In general, candidates would benefit from giving a brief consideration of words that appear in essay titles in their introductions and to define any relevant historical terms or concepts.

The quality of English was variable and sometimes quite poor. Few candidates knew the difference between accession and ascension; effect and affect; thrown and throne; weather and whether. Some used slang and clichés, and drew attention to them by putting the offending terms in inverted commas. Abbreviations continued to be used and often became intrusive. Some candidates indicated their intention to abbreviate early on in the essay and then made free use of them in the body of the text. For example, 'HVIII', 'PoG', 'govt', 'E1', 'CRs', 'libs', '5YP', 'rev'. This practice should be avoided. Spelling and punctuation were generally acceptable but there were frequent grammatical errors usually from weaker candidates.

F966/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1066-1715
English Government and the Church 1066-1216

- 1 Several candidates focused on the impact that continental possessions had on the crown rather than on central government. Those who did assess the inter-play tended to examine developments that affected the management of royal justice, finance and administration, but only the better responses focused on 'weakened English central government'. They were aware that possession of lands overseas could at times strengthen central government but much depended on the competence of the monarch. Too many weaker answers gave extensive attention to the reign of King John or argued that the civil war under Stephen was entirely the result of the continental possessions of the English kings.
- 2 This was the least popular question and generally not well answered by the handful of candidates who attempted it. A notable lack of knowledge characterised their answers, and there was considerable confusion as to what constituted local and central government.
- 3 A popular question and usually well answered. Weaker essays gave too much attention to one or two archbishops, notably Beckett and Langton, and insufficient thought or space to the concept of 'steadily grew worse'. Some candidates argued that relationships did decline and based their evidence on a comparison of Lanfranc and Langton. Better essays recognised that some archbishops, such as William of Corbeil, Richard of Dover and Hubert Walter had good relations with their kings, and assessed the reasons. Most candidates adopted a chronological framework when a thematic approach would have produced a synoptic view of the question.

Rebellion and Disorder under the Tudors 1485-1603

- 4 This was a popular question and produced many strong answers. The best essays examined rebellions in which political factions played a major or minor role, and assessed their importance relative to other causes. They worked out what 'most important causes' meant, stated criteria for assessing these and then applied them. Most candidates considered political, religious, social and economic causes, and a good number were able to contrast English with Irish rebellions. A number of answers sought to show that many rebellions were caused by political factions and hoped this would deal with the question. This approach often resulted in lengthy accounts of rebellions interspersed with more or less relevant comments about their causes. Weak responses mistook 'political factions' for 'political factors' or failed to link factions to other causes. The Pilgrimage of Grace and Northern Earls' rebellions were most commonly examined but knowledge of the mid-Tudor rebellions was often quite weak.
- 5 Candidates did not answer this question particularly well. Many focused too much on particular rebellions either under Henry VII, Henry VIII or Elizabeth I, without considering the reasons for the marked decline after 1554. Many essays tended to describe various factors but not assess the relative importance of their explanation. Several candidates provided only one or two reasons, usually linked to changes in the Church, dynastic

stability or economic trends. Only the best essays contrasted the early period with developments in the Elizabethan era, and focused on thematic features to explain the variations in frequency.

- 6 A popular question that differentiated well and produced several excellent answers. Good responses focused on continuity and change, selected various strategies and illustrated their arguments with examples taken from specific rebellions. Weaker essays were often unsure what the question wanted, only dealt with one strategy such as buying time or negotiating with the rebels, and ignored Irish rebellions altogether or bolted them on to the main argument at the end of the essay. Some candidates wrote about reaction to rebellion or methods of ensuring civic peace. Others missed out the main point of the question, whether there were changes in strategy, focusing rather on why the differences occurred or what the strategies sought to achieve. There seemed to be a general understanding that strategy meant methods of dampening rebellion or preventing it from happening.

England's Changing Relations with Foreign Powers 1485-1603

- 7 This was a popular and generally well answered question. Most candidates agreed with the premise and illustrated their argument with a range of examples. Better responses examined alliances, trade treaties, the threat and use of war, spies and secret agents. Few essays, however, considered the role of ambassadors and diplomatic missions. Weaker essays usually failed to compare marriage with other means through which foreign policy was conducted or misunderstood what the question required. Opening paragraphs thus began: 'Marriage was the most important factor affecting...'; 'dynastic arrangements were the main spur to foreign affairs...'; 'the main aim of marriage alliances was...'. Another approach was to examine the fruits of the marriage alliances and others wanted to outline the motives of elements of Tudor foreign policy.
- 8 The most popular of this set and generally well answered. Most candidates compared Spain and France, though not always thematically and analytically. They concluded that initially France presented the greater danger but in Elizabeth's reign Spain posed a far greater danger. Weaker essays often took a chronological approach, which made synoptic judgements hard to sustain, frequently substituted 'greater threat' for 'greater danger to England's security', and examined Spain and France either in turn or in tandem. Candidates would have formulated decent answers more readily had they considered the terms of the question.
- 9 Neither popular nor well answered. Candidates generally lacked the factual details and range of economic trends to produce a coherent argument. Trade and commerce in particular were poorly treated, and knowledge of important developments in Edward's and Mary's reigns was often overlooked. Most essays knew something about the financial effects in Henry VII's and Henry VIII's reigns, and referred to some of the Elizabethan explorers. Several candidates reversed the point of the question, preferring to show how poor finances restricted foreign policy. Many discussed the importance of Antwerp in their accounts of the ups and downs of Anglo-Habsburg relations.

The Catholic Reformation 1492-1610

- 10 This question elicited several outstanding essays. Candidates usually compared the work of the Jesuits with that of other new orders, the inquisition and index, the Council of Trent and the Papacy. Their essays contained a wealth of detail, generally relevant to the question, though the best essays distinguished between the contributions of institutions and individuals, unless the latter illustrated the former. Most candidates argued that the Jesuits were vital to the development of the Catholic Church but better answers were also aware of their limitations, the hyperbole that often accompanied their achievements, and the role of the Papacy in their foundation, missionary activities and patronage. Moreover,

better responses assessed the period from 1492 to 1540 when several institutions, especially new and traditional orders, were in operation and Catholic reform movements in Spain and Italy functioned independently of the Jesuits. Weaker candidates produced lengthy accounts of the development and methods of the Society when the question was about the development of the Catholic Church. Some wrote about the way the Society infiltrated Protestant countries which was outside the scope of the question.

- 11 A danger facing candidates who tackled this question was the temptation to write a hagiographical account of Counter-Reformation popes, beginning with Paul III, before finishing with a comparison of earlier Renaissance popes. The focus of the question should have been on 'the revival of the Catholic Church', and the best essays linked the work of various popes directly to this concept. Some popes plainly did more than others. While some (eg Julius III and Clement VIII) continued the work of their predecessors; others (eg Pius V and Sixtus V) innovated and changed the pace of the Catholic Reformation. Most candidates agreed with the premise but better essays, while acknowledging Paul III's contributions, were more critical. It was often pointed out that Trent, the Roman inquisition and index, and the Jesuits owed their origin to his patronage and support. His motives may have been suspect but the impact of his work was unquestionable.
- 12 Few candidates attempted this question. Those who did produced either very good or quite poor responses. Most essays identified one or two reasons but the quality of explanation and assessment was often disappointing. Surprisingly few candidates considered the first generation of Catholic humanists, such as Erasmus. As a Catholic, he advocated reform but was opposed to the pace and direction that some reformers, especially Luther, appeared to be taking the Catholic Church in the 1520s.

The Development of the Nation State: France 1498-1610

- 13 Knowledge of the function and importance of French *parlements* was surprisingly limited and usually confined to the Paris *parlement*. Most essays downplayed their significance before turning to other factors that limited the power of the monarchy. Foremost was the French nobility on which knowledge was generally good. In contrast the importance of royal finances, religious groups and provincial estates was not so strong.
- 14 A thematic approach to this question produced the best results. The main problems that were evaluated and tracked across the period in question for continuity and change were the powerful and ambitious nobles, the condition of royal finances, religious difficulties presented by Catholics and Protestants, and the competence of French kings and their administrations. Few candidates examined economic and social problems or the political difficulties presented by *parlements* and provincial estates. While the civil war was seen as a key factor in bringing about change, few candidates questioned whether it was a cause or a symptom of the monarchy's problems.
- 15 Few candidates tackled this question. Often there was no link made between religion and the development of the nation state and a surprisingly large number of essays showed little awareness of the differences between Lutheranism and Calvinism. Several candidates viewed 'religion' to mean Catholics and Huguenots and proceeded to assess how far each was detrimental to the unity of the state.

The Ascendancy of France 1610-1715

- 16 A popular question among the small number of centres who studied this topic. Most candidates saw the link between the Fronde and subsequent absolutist features of Louis XIV's reign and argued accordingly. Some downplayed its importance, either due to conviction or ignorance, before turning to other 'more important' factors. Others focused

too narrowly on the Fronde rather than the development of absolutism. The best essays evaluated the extent to which the French monarchy had become absolute before 1648 and compare its features with the later period. Many saw strong elements of continuity; most attributed later changes to the character and policies of Louis XIV.

- 17 Two candidates only.
- 18 The most popular question in this set. Most candidates were able to evaluate the work of Richelieu, though some ignored or glossed over his domestic achievements. While knowledge of the treaties of Westphalia and the Pyrenees negotiated by Mazarin was usually quite general and their importance in the development of France as a European power quite vague, most candidates devoted much time and space to praising the work of Colbert. Surprisingly few gave much consideration to Louvois and Le Tellier. The better essays gave some thought as to what constituted 'a European power' and compared the condition of France with its main rivals, especially England, the United Provinces and Spain. The role of Louis XIV figured prominently in these arguments which sensibly looked at the years after 1683 (the death of Colbert), including the early eighteenth century, to evaluate 'the rise of France'. Many concluded that from 1700 France was no longer rising and by 1715 there were many signs that it was in decline as a European power.

F966/02 Modern 1789-1997

The Challenge of German Nationalism 1789-1919

- 1 Most candidates had at least a reasonable grasp of the aims of German nationalism. The best answers focused on providing a balanced analysis of Prussia's role, comparing this with the importance of other factors such as war. Weaker responses often gave insufficient attention to Bismarck or the composition of the Reich but were generally much stronger on the Wilhelmine period.
- 2 This was the least popular of the three questions. Candidates seemed to have a rather sketchy knowledge and understanding of industrialisation. The latter was often lumped together with more general economic developments, such as the emergence of the Zollverein, without links to the question being made. However, most attempted to focus on the help/hinder angle with some sound comments relating to links with working class political activism in the later part of the period.
- 3 The best answers assessed the relative importance of German nationalism and pointed out that, by definition, a united Germany could not have existed without deeply entrenched national fervour. This was often linked to the notion of there being different types of nationalism that varied in influence. Other factors were discussed with some skill and included economic forces for change and the role of key individuals. Weaker answers usually wrote all they knew about the topic, focusing particularly on the early period.

The Changing Nature of Warfare 1792-1945

- 4 This question was well answered by many candidates. Most recognised that success in war depended on several factors and that a strong alliance was not necessarily one of them. Some candidates used a wide range of wars to illustrate their arguments, and most cited Austria-Hungary between 1914 and 1918 and Italy from 1940 to 1943 as examples of weaker allies who proved to be a liability. Weaker essays, however, provided a chronological run through of different wars, usually confined their knowledge to the Napoleonic, Crimean and World Wars, and saw little or no change in the role of alliances during the period. Any explanation as to why some countries were more successful than others was usually tagged on to the narrative of each war.

- 5 The most popular question in this set, and often well answered. The best essays displayed sound knowledge of a variety of battles across the period and focused on 'tactics' rather than 'strategy'. Nevertheless examiners took a lenient view of how candidates interpreted twentieth-century wars when the two concepts frequently coalesced. Weaker responses placed too much emphasis on Napoleon, very little on twentieth-century warfare, and usually adopted a chronological approach, which meant the 'unchanged' part of the question was not fully addressed.
- 6 Neither popular nor well answered. Few candidates effectively linked public opinion to the conduct of war. Most answers described why and how public opinion became more important and, although education, the popular press and democracy were often addressed, nationalism was strangely ignored. Answers were generally thin on concrete illustrations. There were also some rather strange notions of what constituted public opinion. A significant mistake that many made was to talk about developments in communications and then assume that this equated to an increase in the influence that the public had on the conduct of war. Also, some only considered how war shaped public opinion and the extent to which this had repercussions for governments in general.

Britain and Ireland 1798-1921

- 7 This was the least popular question. Candidates varied in their knowledge of cultural nationalism but some knew little beyond very basic information. Some were able to trace its influence throughout the period; most confined their argument to the last thirty years and to general comments on the Gaelic League; and a few weaker responses believed that the question was about 'constitutional nationalism' and so ignored 'cultural nationalism' altogether. Most arguments examined several factors but the better answers linked together different forms of nationalism, tried to assess their relative importance and focused on 'undermining the links with Britain'. Weaker essays re-wrote the question as a comparison between revolutionary and constitutional nationalism and described how links were undermined.
- 8 A popular question which discriminated very effectively. Better responses established criteria for 'maintaining a stable Union with Ireland' and compared Tory/Conservative with Whig/Liberal and, at the end of the period, Coalition governments. Where this was tackled thematically according to issues that might stabilise or destabilise the Union, for instance religion, land, trade, politics and Home Rule, the end result was usually very good. Weaker responses did not define success and tended to write a chronological account of first the Tory/Conservative governments' policies and then of Whig/Liberal governments, leaving any comparison and synoptic assessment until the conclusion. In these responses, consideration of 'stable Union' was very uneven.
- 9 The most popular question in this set which produced a range of responses. At best, essays analysed the effects of the 1886 Home Rule bill upon British attitudes before and after the period in question and then set them against the impact of other selected turning points. Catholic Emancipation, the Famine (sometimes covered excessively), Gladstone's land reforms, the emergence of revolutionary groups in the second half of the period, the Easter Rising and Civil War of 1919-21 were favoured developments. Weaker responses knew little about the impact of the first Home Rule bill or equated it with Irish independence and struggled to stay relevant to the concept of 'attitudes to the Union'. Their essays generally failed to argue and counter-argue as to the issues, importance, and impact of Home Rule, and instead focused on the concept of 'turning points'. Several essays were seriously imbalanced, either giving too much or too little attention to a discussion of 1886.

Russia and its Rulers 1855-1964

- 10 A popular question. Knowledge of the 1905 Revolution varied although most candidates had something to say about the October Manifesto, the Fundamental Laws and the Dumas. The focus of the essay should have been on changes in Russian governments during the period but many answers focused on policies and reforms. Weak essays offered only a limited assessment of the 1905 Revolution before turning to agricultural and industrial policies, without linking them to the nature of the governments responsible for directing them. Some essays confused the 1905 and 1917 revolutions and many candidates did not get beyond 1917 or 1924. Better essays compared the 1905 Revolution with other key events, notably the more liberal autocracy of Alexander II, the repressive autocracy of Alexander III, the liberal democracy in 1917, the veiled dictatorship under Lenin, totalitarianism under Stalin and the more liberal decentralised regime under Khrushchev. Their essays reflected core themes in government: autocracy; governmental machinery, institutions, personnel; decision-making capabilities; one party as against a multi-party system; repression and controls, linked to the defeat of opposition; the limited existence of representative bodies.
- 11 Most candidates agreed with the premise and there were several good answers. Better essays showed how Russia was ruled in various ways, tried to evaluate the extent of similarity or difference and were cognisant of both continuity and change. A comparison of the means and methods by which Russia was ruled lay at the heart of their answers. Common areas of assessment included: repression, terror, the removal of opponents, propaganda, controls; the use of reforms; ideas on decision-making; methods of rule via varying degrees of autocracy and dictatorship, occasional conciliation and gestures towards reformers. Similarity was much better addressed than difference. Weaker answers focused too much on economic and social policies, or with not enough of a link to 'ruled' to justify their inclusion. Some stressed the role of repression and terror at the expense of other methods. The difference between Capitalism and Communism as economic systems was rarely mentioned and knowledge of Lenin was at times very thin.
- 12 A popular question but not consistently well answered. How to measure 'successfully' was the key to a good essay. Most candidates wrote about Stalin's industrial and agricultural reforms, and some had excellent statistical data in support. Many also considered the social effects of his economic reforms. The better or best responses set out Stalin's policies, using selected statistics and details, and compared them with Alexander II, Witte, Stolypin, Lenin and Khrushchev – though Stolypin, Lenin and Khrushchev did not always get the coverage they might have warranted. Some candidates tended to list without much cross-referencing, though the best did the last and adjudged degrees of success and change. For some, not enough was made of the linkage of aims to outcomes in assessing success levels. Knowledge of economic change under the Tsars was often less convincing apart from references to the Emancipation Decree, Witte's 'Great Spurt' and the building of the Trans-Siberian railway, and many weaker answers also interpreted economic change under Stalin far too narrowly and often only wrote about the Five Year Plans in very vague terms.

Civil Rights in the USA 1865-1992

- 13 A very popular question and generally well answered. Good candidates referred to the main civil rights legislation of the presidency, Johnson's 'Great Society' and relations with Martin Luther King, Malcolm X and the Black Power movement. They also set these developments in the context of the 1970s and 1980s as well as with earlier periods. Weak answers knew more about the 1950s than the 1960s and often failed to respond to the concept of 'most important turning-point', preferring to narrate selected developments in African American history. Many listed turning points, often giving limited coverage to LBJ or their essays stopped in 1965 or 1968. There was a ready tendency to describe events

and features; and quite often answers followed chronological routes, so losing the chance to evaluate, compare and contrast.

- 14 Most candidates agreed with the premise but were also able to offer examples where presidents, Congress and Supreme Court judgements helped advance trade union and labour rights. The New Deal and support from Democratic presidents after 1945 were commonly cited. Many weaker essays sidelined the role of Federal governments in favour of other factors that hindered trade unions, notably internal divisions in the union movement, poor leadership, economic and social factors, which was not what the question was about. Others wanted to write more about the role of Federal governments and often produced chronological surveys, describing how presidents helped or hindered, but provided very little evaluation. Many lacked a strong argument and counter-argument focused on help or hinder. Period range was also an issue for many candidates. Surprisingly little was written about the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s; and often too much space was given to Reagan and the Air Traffic Controllers' strike of 1981.
- 15 This question elicited a wide variety of responses, and it is encouraging to see so many good essays on this new theme. Women's activism was generally understood (often as pressure group activities) and examples usually deployed, though the range was restricted in weaker essays. Individuals were quite well known but analysis and evaluation of roles and importance varied in quality. Most responses saw the need to discuss other factors but again, cross-evaluation levels were uneven. Such factors as economic and social changes, general attitudinal shifts and the role of the Federal government figured, and limits to women's activism were adduced as well in a good many answers – inner divisions, anti-feminism, and leadership tensions being common. Better essays were able to demonstrate the key role played by Federal governments, the World Wars, changing economic and social conditions, and more enlightened males. Weaker essays tended to generalise or describe; often these answers lacked the use of relevant knowledge to support argument areas. Quite often the focus was only on parts of the period, usually the late nineteenth century into early twentieth (temperance, the vote), then the Wars and the 1960s.

The Development of Democracy in Britain 1868-1997

- 16 Four candidates attempted this question. It was generally well answered with most showing a good level of knowledge and understanding and covering a fair degree of the period. The main factor in the question was assessed and other factors, such as the Trade Union movement and the media, considered.
- 17 Two candidates responded and offered some valid and well supported ideas.
- 18 Three essays of a fairly good standard – focused, argued and supported with relevant knowledge.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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

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

© OCR 2011

