

# History

Advanced GCE A2 7835

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS 3835

## Report on the Units

---

**June 2006**

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A-level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

The mark schemes are published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

The reports on the Examinations provide information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Mark schemes and Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers.

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

© OCR 2006

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annersley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622  
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## REPORT ON THE UNITS

<b>Units</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
*	Chief Examiner's Report	1
*	Grade Thresholds & Outcomes	11
2580 - 2582	Document Studies (AS)	14
2583 – 2584	Period Studies: English History (AS)	36
2585 – 2586	Period Studies: European & World History (AS)	54
2587 – 2589	Historical Investigations (A2)	68
2590 – 2591	Themes in History (A2)	85
2592 - 2593	Independent Investigations (A2)	99
	Frampton Prize Winners	112



## Chief Examiner's Report

### General Comments

This Report should be read by every teacher of the *specification* in conjunction with the Mark Schemes. All centres are encouraged to discuss the various issues raised in this Report within their History Department and with their candidates. The sections on individual Units comment only on questions to which there were a sufficient number of answers on which to base general conclusions, but it is always helpful to read sections on other topics and options not taught because issues relevant to teaching are made throughout.

The overall quality of the candidates was satisfactory and many scripts were very sound. Some were excellent and revealed a considerable degree of historical understanding, knowledge and judgement. OCR's AS Level course has been successful in encouraging a larger number of candidates to study History beyond GCSE over the past five years. Naturally, there are fewer very weak scripts at A2. Most candidates who found A Level History too testing drop the subject after the AS stage. This is one major reason why the GCE A Level 'pass' rate has increased. Before Curriculum 2000, there was not a preliminary stage to 'remove' weaker candidates. They continued until they failed at the end of their course or dropped out without any recognition for any achievement.

There have been suggestions that A Level standards are declining and that the proportion of candidates who are awarded the higher grades, especially Grade A, has increased unjustifiably. A comparison of year-on-year results proves that there has been no 'drift' in OCR's History assessment. Grade A makes high demands on candidates in terms of the complex skills required in History. At the other end of the spectrum, it is not easier to gain Grade E. When making their judgements about grade boundaries, the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) and OCR insist that senior examiners must consult an archive of past scripts and examples of cross-board scripts from comparability exercises.

### **OCR's GCE History specification**

has proved in its first five years to be the course that

**universities rate**

**the best of the five available;**

**the best preparation for AEA History;**

**the best preparation for undergraduate History study.**

The *Specification* is a clear guide to centres and candidates to what should be taught and studied. The options and topics are structured around Key Issues and associated Content, except in the thematic Units 2590-2591 where only Content is indicated because of the synoptic nature of the work. As previous Reports have noted, the *Specification* is a contract between OCR, centres and candidates. They know what to study and the awarding body makes the appropriate assessment demands. This is fairer to candidates than the previous type of syllabus when examination papers were often a lucky dip. A syllabus that states baldly 'European history from 1789 to 1939' is less helpful to candidates, teachers and awarding bodies than one that spells out what is expected. Questions are usually based on one Key Issue but might range across two as long as they are not unduly difficult. Candidates can use whatever relevant knowledge and understanding they have to answer questions, either from other Key Issues or from other Study Topics.

There were very few complaints from centres about questions, 4 in AS and 2 in A2, and all about different questions. This compared with 13 and 8 in 2005 and 35 and 27 in the first full year of the new assessment in 2002. Each complaint is always taken seriously. An isolated complaint is not necessarily invalid and, if nothing else, may feed positively into future question-setting. If a complaint is received sufficiently early, it is considered by senior examiners before marking begins. If justified, mark schemes are amended. Examiners are asked if a later complaint seemed justified on the basis of candidates' responses. Each complaint is considered at the Award when grade boundaries are decided. Among other criteria used to decide these grade boundaries is the perceived difficulty of a question paper.

Although the six Units might seem to be disparate, there are links between them of which centres should be aware. It is worthwhile pointing out these links to candidates to help them make sense of their course. The skills needed to use primary sources (AS Document Studies) successfully are complemented by the skills needed in handling secondary material (A2 Historical Investigations). In turn, both of these feed positively into approaches needed for an effective A2 Individual Investigation. AS Period Studies in English and European/World History develop skills in historical explanation and extended writing – needed at a higher level in all A2 papers. Candidates learn how to apply knowledge that has been learned to answer different sorts of question, including analysis, assessment and comparison. The Units require a combination of knowledge and understanding. A2 Themes in History take this a step further because the topics cover an extended period of approximately a hundred years, considerably longer than the AS Period Studies topics. AS candidates study change and continuity, important historical concepts, and put more emphasis on them in the synoptic unit. Each of the A2 Units depends highly on candidates' ability to convey their ideas through examples of extended writing. They are prepared for this in the AS Period Studies.

Two pages are included at the end of this introductory section of the Report that centres might use with their candidates – these take forward the similar pages for candidates in the Summer 2004 Report pp.7-11 and the Summer 2005 Report pp.295-296. They include guidance about approaches to different Units but it is important that candidates understand that some requirements are common to all Units, such as relevance, argument and accurate knowledge. Perhaps these are the most important ingredients of a good answer. Examiners are encouraged to be aware of valid alternative approaches, including the very good 'maverick' answers.

Centres are encouraged to discuss the assessment criteria with their candidates. Relevance is probably the most important quality that examiners look for in any answer to a History question. Writing an effective answer depends on memory but not simply on mechanical recall. The most successful candidates can select from what has been learned to answer the particular question that is written. For example, 'How important was Gladstone in the creation of a successful Liberal party during the period 1846-68?' requires a different answer from 'Analyse the aims of Gladstonian Liberalism during the period 1846-68'. Much of the same knowledge will be needed, but it will be used in different ways.

Teachers are reminded that the way in which exam units are taken is a decision to be taken by each Centre. The full GCE *specification* can be taught modularly or linearly – see the *Specification* (2005 ed.) p.21. Most of our centres teach AS linearly, with their candidates sitting all three exams at the end of Year 12. Some centres have decided that taking all six exams at the end of Year 13 best suits their candidates and the needs of teaching and studying a liberal arts subject such as History. For further details, see *Teacher Support & Coursework Guidance* vol.1 (2<sup>nd</sup>. ed.) p.3.

Candidates should practise answering different sorts of questions. Common commands used, such as 'Assess the reasons ...', 'Compare ...' and 'How far ...?' require that answers adopt different approaches. A characteristic of the best answers is that they consider different explanations and explain which is/are the most/more convincing because questions are never

based on one universal reason or factor. Weaker candidates tend to deal only with one, or very few, aspects of a question. The dates that are sometimes given in questions are important. Candidates need to develop a strong sense of chronology.

The quality of the argument is paramount. The most successful answers link points in successive paragraphs either to show development or differences. Examples from candidates' knowledge should be used to support the argument. Less successful candidates sometimes relate the knowledge that they have learned without applying it to the question or the argument. Examiners do not ask for very considerable detail, but for sufficient historical knowledge to substantiate points that are made. Successful answers present a clear line of argument. When different points are explained, it is important to judge between them. Examiners are not looking for the one 'correct' answer in History, but it is important for candidates not to sit on the fence. The skills of supported argument cannot be applied suddenly in an examination, but can be developed throughout the course (for example, by taking part in regular classroom structured discussions).

There is sufficient time in all of the examinations, and sufficient space in the extended essay in Unit 2592, for candidates to explain their answers. However, time should not be wasted. One frequent misuse of time is in extended introductions. Candidates should be encouraged to come to the point quickly. They should be discouraged from setting the scene in a very general sense. Candidates might be able to allude to pertinent comparisons during the course of an answer, especially in a conclusion, but should be discouraged from doing so in introductions because too often it seems to tempt them to go off at a tangent.

Answers are given credit for appropriate quotations and references to the views of historians although historiography is not a required feature of AS Level answers. However, the quotations and references to historians should be linked to the argument because they only represent opinions. A quotation does not prove anything. Candidates sometimes learn mechanically a series of quotations that they are determined to use whatever the question. They can mention different historians without using their knowledge to support or contradict the claim.

There has been a continuing debate in the media and within awarding bodies about the standards of written English. QCA has reminded awarding bodies of the need for clear policies in the assessment of written English. It is often claimed, especially in the media, that standards have declined and continue to decline. However, research into GCSE scripts by Cambridge Assessment (the parent body of OCR) contradicts this. The report 'Variations in Aspects of Writing between 1980 and 2004' concludes that punctuation, grammar and vocabulary improved during the 1990s after a fall in the previous decade. This should not lead to complacency. Examiners continue to note poorly written scripts. However, the pattern is of differences between centres, not general decline over a period of time. Most centres are to be congratulated because their candidates write effectively; this includes some candidates whose grasp of history is limited. On the other hand, there are centres in which there is wide evidence of inaccuracy, even among candidates whose historical understanding is sound. The differences in standards cannot be attributed to types of centres. OCR's centres represent the entire cohort of schools and colleges who prepare candidates for A Level. The most likely explanation for the different standards is probably the degree of importance that centres give to written English. This should not be represented to candidates in terms of a mechanical task that is needed for success in examinations but as a fundamental skill that is necessary in most fields of employment and in social communication. It is a skill that must be developed over years of practice; it cannot be concentrated into a brief revision period.

A common rubric appears on all of the History examination papers. 'You should write in continuous prose and are reminded of the need for clear and accurate writing, including structure of argument, grammar, punctuation and spelling.' Examinations do not require a polished style and examiners are sympathetic to the careless errors that are induced by examinations. However, it is not unreasonable to expect that major names are spelled correctly,

that basic punctuation rules are followed, and that answers are structured into simple paragraphs that represent a succession of points. Abbreviations should be avoided. Candidates might be encouraged to study and discuss books or articles to understand what makes some more appropriate for A Level studies than others. Most candidates produce their Independent Investigations (Unit 2592) on a word-processor, but they need to be warned against over-reliance on spell-checks.

Handwriting can pose problems. QCA regulations are clear that responsibility rests with each candidate to make him/herself clear. Examiners are not required to guess what a candidate is trying to say. In some cases, an illegible script is awarded 0. Examiners take considerable trouble to decipher scripts that are difficult to read; some scripts are read by three or four different people. OCR history examiners go well beyond what they are required to do. The number of scripts that presented considerable problems of legibility grows every year. Teachers must identify their candidates who might be at risk and make special arrangements – either permission for use of an amanuensis or a word-processor.

Centres are advised to note pp.140-141 in the *Specification*. These refer to the Key Skills that can be developed during a course of study. All the Key Skills required by QCA can be developed in this *Specification* and communication, working with others, improving own learning and problem-solving can be developed at a high level. Candidates should be made aware of these Key Skills in spite of their frequent preoccupation with the immediate demands of the next lesson, assignment or examination. It helps them put the study of History into perspective.

Many OCR documents are also available on OCR's website: [www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk) For all materials produced for AS/A2 History, see the section of the website devoted to the syllabus: [http://www.ocr.org.uk/qualifications/AS\\_ALevelGCEHistory.html](http://www.ocr.org.uk/qualifications/AS_ALevelGCEHistory.html) Here can be found, among other documents, all Notices to Centres about 3835/7835 History, the annual Board-set questions for Units 2592-2593, the two volumes of the Teacher Support Notes. When the Resources Lists are updated every year, these too are placed here for teachers to download.



### Up-dated Resources Lists

The 6<sup>th</sup> edition will go live on OCR's website in during autumn 2006

[http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/Data/Publication/Teacher%20Support%20%26%20Course%20work%20Guidance/AS\\_A\\_Level29092.pdf](http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/Data/Publication/Teacher%20Support%20%26%20Course%20work%20Guidance/AS_A_Level29092.pdf)

### Become an Examiner

Entries keep going up and more centres join OCR each year so the Board is always keen to receive applications from teachers to act as examiners. Examiners and the National Assessment Agency (NAA) highlight the professional experience to be gained from being an examiner, and the benefits and insight it can bring into the classroom.

Teachers who become examiners say that the experience they have gained has improved their teaching as well as their assessment skills. You can read some of their stories on the NAA website <http://www.examinerrecruitment.org/>

If you are interested in examining History for OCR:

- New examiners are given training.
- New examiners are given a smaller allocation of scripts to mark.
- All examiners work under the guidance of an experienced Team Leader who is willing to give continuing advice during the examining period.

For details and an application form, please see:

[http://www.ocr.org.uk/examiners\\_and\\_moderators/recruitment.html](http://www.ocr.org.uk/examiners_and_moderators/recruitment.html)

Martin Jones, our Subject Officer, is moving in September 2006 to a challenging new post in University of Cambridge International Examinations, another branch of the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate. His teams of examiners are very grateful to him for his leadership. OCR's success in developing its Curriculum 2000 courses is due largely to his work and we all wish him well in the future.

The next two pages are included so that teachers can photocopy them and either post them as notices or circulate them among their students. They are intended as advice to candidates from the Chief Examiner and senior examiners.

**OCR HISTORY**

<b>AS LEVEL EXAMINERS LIKE</b>	<b>AS LEVEL EXAMINERS DISLIKE</b>
☺ AS DOCUMENT STUDIES: ANSWERS THAT GIVE REASONS WHY SOME SOURCES / PASSAGES ARE MORE RELIABLE AND USEFUL THAN OTHERS	⊗ DOCUMENT STUDIES: ANSWERS THAT ACCEPT SOURCES AT FACE VALUE
☺ AS DOCUMENT STUDIES: ANSWERS THAT COMPARE SOURCES	⊗ AS DOCUMENT STUDIES: ANSWERS THAT DO NOT LOOK AT SIMILARITIES OR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SOURCES
☺ AS DOCUMENT STUDIES: ANSWERS THAT LINK THE SOURCES / PASSAGES AND OWN KNOWLEDGE WHEN REQUIRED	⊗ AS DOCUMENT STUDIES: ANSWERS THAT DO NOT LINK THE SOURCES WITH OWN KNOWLEDGE WHEN REQUIRED
☺ AS PERIOD STUDIES: SHORT INTRODUCTIONS THAT GIVE A BRIEF OVERVIEW OR MENTION THE MOST IMPORTANT POINTS	⊗ AS PERIOD STUDIES: LONG INTRODUCTIONS THAT ARE SLOW TO COME TO THE POINT
☺ AS PERIOD STUDIES: RELEVANT ANSWERS	⊗ AS PERIOD STUDIES: ANSWERS THAT RAMBLE
☺ AS PERIOD STUDIES: ANSWERS THAT PAY ATTENTION TO THE DATES IN THE QUESTION	⊗ AS PERIOD STUDIES: ANSWERS THAT GO OUTSIDE THE DATES IN THE QUESTION.
☺ AS PERIOD STUDIES: ANSWERS THAT PAY ATTENTION TO KEY INSTRUCTIONS e.g. COMPARE, ASSESS, HOW FAR?	⊗ AS PERIOD STUDIES: ANSWERS THAT ONLY CONTAIN GENERAL ACCOUNTS
☺ AS PERIOD STUDIES: ANSWERS THAT ARE WELL ORGANISED AND LINK POINTS	⊗ AS PERIOD STUDIES: ANSWERS THAT ARE POORLY STRUCTURED
☺ AS PERIOD STUDIES: ANSWERS THAT SUPPORT THE ARGUMENT WITH ACCURATE KNOWLEDGE	⊗ AS PERIOD STUDIES: VAGUE ANSWERS
☺ ALL UNITS: ANSWERS THAT ARE WELL ORGANISED, WITH ACCURATE SPELLING, PUNCTUATION AND PARAGRAPHS	⊗ ALL UNITS: IN ALL UNITS, ANSWERS THAT ARE CARELESSLY WRITTEN

**OCR HISTORY**

<b>A2 LEVEL EXAMINERS LIKE</b>	<b>A2 LEVEL EXAMINERS DISLIKE</b>
☺ A2 HISTORICAL INVESTIGATIONS: ANSWERS THAT GROUP THE PASSAGES, LOOKING FOR AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT	⊗ A2 HISTORICAL INVESTIGATIONS: ANSWERS THAT CONTAIN MECHANICAL SUMMARIES OF THE PASSAGES IN TURN
☺ A2 HISTORICAL INVESTIGATIONS: ANSWERS THAT BALANCE THE USE OF THE PASSAGES AND YOUR OWN KNOWLEDGE	⊗ A2 HISTORICAL INVESTIGATIONS: ANSWERS THAT HARDLY USE THE PASSAGE OR WHICH CONTAIN VERY LITTLE OF YOUR OWN KNOWLEDGE
☺ A2 HISTORICAL INVESTIGATIONS: ESSAYS THAT EXAMINE DIFFERENT EXPLANATIONS AND COME TO A CONCLUSION	⊗ A2 HISTORICAL INVESTIGATIONS: GENERAL ESSAYS THAT DO NOT DISCUSS DIFFERENT EXPLANATIONS AND SIT ON THE FENCE
☺ A2 THEMES IN HISTORY: ANSWERS THAT COVER APPROXIMATELY 100 YEARS	⊗ A2 THEMES IN HISTORY: ANSWERS THAT ARE LIMITED IN PERIOD - MUCH LESS THAN A HUNDRED YEARS
☺ A2 THEMES IN HISTORY: ANSWERS THAT EXAMINE CHANGE AND CONTINUITY	⊗ A2 THEMES IN HISTORY: ANSWERS THAT DO NOT SHOW ANY CHANGE OR CONTINUITY
☺ A2 THEMES IN HISTORY: ANSWERS THAT ARE AWARE OF THE IMPORTANCE OF TURNING POINTS	⊗ A2 THEMES IN HISTORY: ANSWERS THAT DO NOT SHOW THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN IMPORTANT AND LESS IMPORTANT DEVELOPMENTS
☺ A2 INDIVIDUAL INVESTIGATIONS: ESSAYS THAT ARE BASED ON A PROBLEM	⊗ A2 INDIVIDUAL INVESTIGATIONS: ESSAYS THAT ARE GENERAL DESCRIPTIONS
☺ A2 INDIVIDUAL INVESTIGATIONS: ESSAYS WHERE PRIMARY AND / OR SECONDARY SOURCES HAVE BEEN USED THOUGHTFULLY	⊗ A2 INDIVIDUAL INVESTIGATIONS: ESSAYS THAT DO NOT SHOW EVIDENCE OF YOUR READING
☺ ALL UNITS: ANSWERS THAT ARE WELL ORGANISED, WITH ACCURATE SPELLING, PUNCTUATION AND PARAGRAPHS	⊗ ALL UNITS: ANSWERS THAT ARE CARELESSLY WRITTEN.

OCR History's E-Community could  
**HELP YOU IN YOUR CLASSROOM**

Our e-community currently has 229 members, but about three-quarters of our centres have still not joined.

Valuable exchanges have taken place and every message is archived so these can all still be read. The community unites classroom practitioners. Every message submitted is delivered to every other subscriber. Membership is free. To join or to obtain more information, go to: <http://community.ocr.org.uk/lists/listinfo/history-a>

The more teachers join, the better it will work so, over to you ...



**THE COMMUNITY IS BEING USED TO  
KEEP TEACHERS INFORMED  
ABOUT  
SPECIFICATION DEVELOPMENT.**

**So far, four updates have been sent round.**

### **INSET 2006-2007**

OCR's programme for GCE History next academic year was published in June 2006. As always, the History booklet was sent to every centre and placed on OCR's website. In response to suggestions from teachers, the main series of meetings for 2006-2007 will help colleagues to think about and develop more effective approaches to teaching exam units 2580-2591. In addition, the successful coursework half-day workshops of 2005-2006 will be repeated.

#### Feedback from the 2005-2006 series:

*"The opportunity to discuss with colleagues was very welcome."* [Head of History]

*"The quality of feedback on exam technique was excellent."* [Assistant Headteacher]

*"A very useful guide, plus good oversight into the course."* [Teach First Trainee]

*"The day clarified particular concerns I had."* [Curriculum Manager]

*"The course fitted the needs of the group – to the point."* [NQT]

*"Excellent advice that can easily be turned to practical method."* [VIth Form College Lecturer]

Three **Teacher Study Days** will be offered in 2006-2007: one on the Normans at the British Museum, one on Elizabeth I at the National Portrait Gallery and one looking both at Philip II and the Catholic Reformation at the Victoria & Albert Museum.

#### Feedback from 2005-2006 days:

*"Excellent and stimulating – introduced new perspectives and recharged batteries."* [Head of History]

*"Very useful for teaching preparation."* [Advanced Skills Teacher]

*"Good blend of providing exam-based information and issues for direct student benefit with subject information and issues the teacher's benefit."* [Deputy Headteacher]

*"Just to say how very valuable and enjoyable the day was – if only all INSET could be so stimulating with such a mixture of exam technique, academic erudition and on-site visit."* [Head of History]

Update on: June 2005 Report p.294

January 2006 Report p.289

Newsletter 5 Summer 2006

Ecommunity messages sent by the Subject Officer during 2006

## 11-19 Reform: GCE History

### What has already happened?

(a) The QCA has published two factsheets on what is happening:

'The 11-19 reform programme'

<http://www.qca.org.uk/downloads/qca-06-2423-11-19-ref-prog-web.pdf>

'A levels, GCSEs and an extended Project'

<http://www.qca.org.uk/downloads/qca-06-2431-a-lvls-gcses-web.pdf>

(b) OCR consulted its History teachers at the Autumn 2004 INSET meetings and via Newsletters 1 and 2. A further consultation took place in Spring 2006.

(c) In March 2006, QCA published draft new GCE and individual subject criteria for consultation:  
[http://www.qca.org.uk/12086\\_16132.html](http://www.qca.org.uk/12086_16132.html)

When the final approved criteria are published by the QCA during autumn 2006, OCR will have the structural rules around which the *specification* must be developed (e.g. 4 units, regulations on synoptic assessment, internal assessment rules, requirements for the study of British History, assessment objectives and their weightings).

(d) In May 2006, QCA published proposals for consultation on an Extended Project:

[http://www.qca.org.uk/12086\\_16611.html](http://www.qca.org.uk/12086_16611.html)

### What next?

Autumn 2006	QCA publishes final criteria. QCA publishes new A2 requirements for "stretch & challenge" Third OCR consultation of its History teachers.
Spring 2007	OCR submits draft <i>specification</i> , specimen papers & markschemes to QCA.
September 2007	OCR publishes approved <i>spec</i> , papers & markschemes.
Autumn 2007	OCR INSET on the new <i>specification</i> .
Easter 2008	OCR publishes <i>specification</i> 's support materials.
September 2008	Teaching starts.
Autumn 2008	OCR Teacher Workshops on the new <i>specification</i> .
January 2009	First AS examinations.
January 2010	First A2 examinations.

**OCR will continue to keep its teachers up-to-date on developments.**  
**The E-community will be the primary vehicle used to do this,**  
supplemented by the biannual Newsletter,  
the 2006-2007, 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 INSET meetings, and  
the 2007, 2008 and 2009 January and June Reports.

**Advanced Subsidiary & Advanced GCE History 3835/7835**

**Unit Threshold Marks**

		<b>Maximum Mark</b>	<b>a</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>c</b>	<b>d</b>	<b>e</b>	<b>u</b>
<b>2580</b>	Raw	60	45	39	34	29	24	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
<b>2581</b>	Raw	60	45	39	34	29	24	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
<b>2582</b>	Raw	60	45	39	34	29	24	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
<b>2583</b>	Raw	45	37	32	27	23	19	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2584</b>	Raw	45	37	32	27	23	19	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2585</b>	Raw	45	34	30	26	23	20	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2586</b>	Raw	45	34	30	26	23	20	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2587</b>	Raw	90	68	61	55	49	43	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2588</b>	Raw	90	68	61	55	49	43	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2589</b>	Raw	90	68	61	55	49	43	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2590</b>	Raw	120	91	82	73	64	56	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
<b>2591</b>	Raw	120	91	82	73	64	56	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
<b>2592</b>	Raw	90	72	64	56	48	41	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2593</b>	Raw	90	72	64	56	49	42	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0

**Specification Aggregation Results: 3835 AS History**

Threshold marks (in UMS)

	<b>Maximum Mark</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>U</b>
<b>3835</b>	300	240	210	180	150	120	0

The cumulative percentage of aggregating candidates was as follows:

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Total aggregating candidates</b>
<b>3835</b>	18.87	43.81	68.41	85.28	94.78	100	13789
<b>difference from June 2005</b>	+0.74	+0.57	-0.38	-0.93	-0.29	-	+115

The mean UMS mark was 198.25 (out of 300) which represents a fall of 0.33 marks.

**Specification Aggregation Results: 7835 A Level History**

Threshold marks (in UMS)

	<b>Maximum Mark</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>U</b>
<b>7835</b>	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

The cumulative percentage of aggregating candidates was as follows:

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Total aggregating candidates</b>
<b>7835</b>	23.79	52.93	78.95	93.80	98.89	100	12553
<b>difference from June 2005</b>	-0.44	+0.47	+0.81	+0.39	-0.18	-	+85

The mean UMS mark was 420.07 (out of 600) which represents a fall of 0.02 marks.



<b>Outcomes per Unit:</b>							
<b>Unit</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>Mean raw mark (max raw mark)</b>	<b>Candidates</b>
<b>2580</b>	32.95	53.64	72.16	82.80	90.82	39.17 ( 60)	686
<b>2581</b>	32.12	59.27	77.46	88.86	95.57	39.94 ( 60)	4424
<b>2582</b>	22.66	46.09	66.06	80.80	90.94	36.97 ( 60)	12545
<b>2583</b>	27.39	50.72	71.61	85.26	91.97	31.04 ( 45)	7795
<b>2584</b>	24.90	47.38	68.03	81.53	88.31	29.96 ( 45)	9987
<b>2585</b>	24.59	46.16	67.51	82.12	89.31	28.50 ( 45)	3921
<b>2586</b>	22.56	47.09	70.24	84.96	92.08	28.78 ( 45)	14258
<b>2587</b>	23.96	38.28	54.95	72.92	87.24	57.16 ( 90)	384
<b>2588</b>	25.32	43.16	61.15	77.31	88.45	57.98 ( 90)	3341
<b>2589</b>	20.93	42.35	61.56	78.79	90.14	57.88 ( 90)	7304
<b>2590</b>	25.09	41.71	61.60	79.42	89.02	77.33 (120)	3232
<b>2591</b>	23.52	41.11	61.31	78.46	88.26	77.50 (120)	8891
<b>2592</b>	22.68	42.27	65.58	83.67	92.56	60.80 ( 90)	11922
<b>2593</b>	13.26	33.06	54.34	72.01	86.74	56.61 ( 90)	611

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:  
[www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/understand/ums.jsp](http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/understand/ums.jsp)

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

## Report on Units 2580/01, 2581/01 and 2582/01

**Unit 2580/01 (Document Studies 871-1099)**

**Unit 2581/01 (Document Studies 1450-1693)**

**Unit 2582/01 (Document Studies 1774-1945)**

### General Comments

The total entry for these units remained very much the same as in June 2005. Units 2580 and 2581 outperformed Unit 2582, largely because of the weak performance of many candidates on 2582 Q7 (Nazi Germany 1933-45). Some 9% were retaking from June 2005 and 10% from January 2006. The spread of marks was much better than in previous years, almost certainly the result of removing the old Q(a). With the exception of Unit 2582, there were higher marks at the top end, more gaining 50 plus out of 60, but also more below marks 24. The removal of old Q(a) has produced a group of paper better able to assess what candidates can do with historical evidence.

Particularly pleasing this year has been direct evidence from the scripts that advice given in previous years has been absorbed in teaching and candidate practice. Those centres that have done this marked themselves out in terms of improved grades. In essence, it boils down to a more effective use and evaluation of sources, the key to a paper rooted in the use of historical evidence. However, many Centres and candidates continue to ignore the biannual Reports - and lose many marks accordingly. It is vital that Departments look at this advice, discuss it in their meetings and **integrate it into their teaching**. It is very clear that a substantial number of candidates do not know how to use and evaluate evidence beyond GCSE level. It is equally clear that many have not been taught how to do this. The Report will emphasise, yet again, the key mistakes made, but reference should also be made to our advice on how to improve progression contained in the past Reports, notably: **January 2004 pp.8-10; June 2004 pp.16-21; January 2005 [for grouping sources in Q(b) to achieve evaluation] pp.256-258; June 2005 [for how to extend this initial grouping to inform the whole answer] pp.310-312; January 2006 pp.293-295.**

One effect of knocking out the old Q(a) was to provide extra time for candidates to think and plan their answers. The outcome is mixed. There were some signs of better planning but not enough. Most candidates preferred to use their time to expand the answer to Q(a), the comparison. This was not the intention and although marks were better many, by introducing unnecessary own knowledge, lost marks at the top end. The change was intended to benefit Q(b) but there was little evidence of an improvement here. A fair few candidates wrote less than is expected, often only one side; scripts showed this to be a Centre-based problem. The greater time spent on Q(a) may explain why there was a noticeable rise in the number of candidates comparing all four Sources, instead of the two named. Candidates need to be warned.

Some candidates excel in their conceptual grasp and their use of language and vocabulary but a significant number continue to express themselves appallingly. Examiners lean over backwards to impose a sense of order and clarity on confused and confusing sentences. It is a major cause for concern as it impedes argument, clarity and communication. Spelling, especially grammar but also modern expressions sit uncomfortably in most historical periods. For example, the apostrophe in Nazis (Nazi's) was almost universal, 'led' was rarely spelt correctly, 'swatz stickers' put in an appearance, provenance could take many forms ('providence', 'prominence', 'provence'); 'hindsight' was variously reduced to 'hensight', 'heinsite' or 'hedging' and 'Antisemitism' cropped up as 'antisemanticism'. Several answers used the phrase 'bias to' to mean 'bias against', rendering the comment thoroughly ambiguous. There were also instances of the neologism 'biasy'. The Crusades, the German Reformation, and the Nazis tended to produce more colloquialisms e.g. 'Luther did not want to seem at all up himself'. Even more

irritating was the propensity to label the sources incorrectly. We have pointed out before that best practice is to identify the source by author to facilitate engagement with context and provenance. To list sources by letter and then get it wrong slows up the examiner. At another level candidates will read into sources what is not there e.g. Unit 2581 Q3(b) 'Source A supports Somerset's actions by claiming he was a 'good duke' who acted lawfully for his subjects'; Unit 2582 Q7(a) 'Source B fully supports the need for a continuing revolution backed by the loyal German people.'

What follows is not new but just a re-emphasis of the main weaknesses found in the two question types.

### **Sub-question (a)**

Much improvement here, especially as the extra time was largely devoted to it. The usual mistakes tended to link to particular questions (especially Unit 2582 Q7(a)). Once again we draw them to your attention:

- Although there is less evidence of **sequencing** in Units 2580 and 2581, a surprising number still did this in Unit 2582, especially on Q3(a), Q6(a) and Q7(a). This ensured marks in Bands IV at best. Evaluation on an individual source basis could be done well but the ensuing comparison would usually be left to the final paragraph. Indeed, the sequencing of provenance is now more common than that of content.
- In some Centres sources were **evaluated** primarily, and in many cases exclusively, using their own knowledge as a yardstick for judgement. Usually this precluded a comparison and contrast of content. (see also the comments on Q(b)).
- **Provenance** is of particular importance in both Q(a) and (b) yet it remains a problem for many candidates. Significant numbers make no reference to it and even more make naïve and generalised statements like, 'I know this from my own knowledge to be true', without any reference to where the knowledge has come from e.g. Unit 2581 Q3(b) where the source did not include any of the list of demands made by the rebels that could be used to set against what is available. Evaluation as assertion is **not** to be recommended. There is a real reluctance to use own knowledge as part of the location and context of a source or to reinforce or challenge its message. It is a question of the relative value one assigns to the source as evidence for a particular view.
- Beware a **'tick-list'** approach to provenance in Q(b). We have advised before about this, but it continues to undermine a significant number across the ability range. The existence of mnemonics is usually a bad sign. A list will ensure that provenance swamps the answer and a **comparison as evidence for**, or support for, is lost. Candidates use the content of the Band 1 Generic Mark Scheme to tick off the qualities of a source with no link to the comparison of the question's key issue. Whole Centres can look in vain for authenticity or some other 'absent' quality. As for 'consistency' candidates invoke it without explanation. What is meant by it? - internal consistency, consistency with each other, consistency with own knowledge?
- In both Q(a) and (b) some Sources provide an excellent opportunity to **read between the lines**, thus differentiating between **face value** and the sub-text e.g., Unit 2580 Q3 (a) Sources B and C; Unit 2581 Q 2(a) Sources A and B and Q5 (a) Sources B and C; Unit 2582 Q7 (a) Sources A and B. All too often, candidates accept all Sources at face value, except modern historians who are generally mightily distrusted. If a candidate does alight on it then it is rarely explored e.g. in Unit 2581 Q2(a) – 'Source B is written by a humanist and Lutheran sympathiser so we must question its provenance....'. The candidate failed to do so.

- **Official documents** or Sources which cannot be easily challenged can provide particular difficulties to candidates in both questions e.g., Writs in 2580 Q2(a), the Commons Declaration in Unit 2581 Q4(a) and Hitler's message to Blomberg in 2582 Q7(b). Candidates will resort to comments such as 'we can assume the debates are accurate' or 'exact events are described'. Instead they need to look for a wider contextual significance e.g. in the case of 2581 Q4(a) to stress that the Declaration comes after Pride's Purge and is therefore the expression of a self constituted type of MP.
- Candidates still provide general comparisons losing sight of the precise question, which always focuses on **evidence for a particular issue**. It is the latter which is ignored. This also prevents a **final judgement** as to which source might be the better evidence for understanding that issue.
- The use of **comparative words** ('whereas' etc) is to be encouraged but **not** as a substitute for specific and continuous comparison. Candidates will not be able to fool examiners. Like has to be compared with like for effective comparison to occur, linked to the question asked. It follows, for example, that a discussion of the provenance or content of only one source is bound to fail comparatively, yet it is an all-too-frequent occurrence.
- **Quoting a word or phrase out of context** to support a view different from that of the writer would appear to be on the increase e.g. quoting 'slavery is a local thing' in Q 4(a) Unit 2582 when the source says the opposite.

### Sub-Question (b)

As indicated there was less progress here than we had hoped. Good practice (sustained grouping according to argument about the view provided and counter-argument) is increasingly seen from many Centres, but a large number still have a long way to go to provide effective answers. Own knowledge is frequently thin and basic. Use of Sources is confined to a brief reference or a paraphrased plunder to substitute for a lack of focused own knowledge. This confines candidates to Band III at best and, more usually, Band IV or even Band V. The particular points we would like to stress this summer are as follows:

- **Sequencing and listing** sources remains an obstacle to evaluation and encourages referencing and description. Sometimes candidates try to avoid the appearance of sequencing by taking the sources out of alphabetical order. The essence of sequencing is not the order in which sources are considered but the fact that they are discussed separately with little attempt at grouping or cross-referencing.
- Some candidates still make **no reference to the sources** at all whilst many more, perhaps the majority, make **no attempt to evaluate** their contribution to the proposed view in the question. Those who do make an attempt tend to focus on perhaps just one, or at most two, of the sources. If everything else is in place they might attain Band II. An answer which argues a case, **but only uses the sources for reference, cannot go beyond a Band III**. It has been said many times before that this is a **Documents Paper**, the **sources are central to it** and should be at the heart of any answer to Q(b). No reference to sources, or at best only the odd word used from them (or the first and last word with dots in between), is **not good enough**. This growing practice puts the onus on the examiner to work out the argument and the contribution of the source. The onus is on the candidate.

- Getting the balance right between **source analysis** and **own knowledge** remains a problem for many. Whilst some are largely 'own knowledge' based most are scanty when it comes to this and rarely use it for its rightful purpose, to extend or challenge the view in a source. One important function of 'own knowledge' which was often neglected when it would have been appropriate, is to set the sources into context. Source C in Q4 2581 only makes full sense when it is linked to Pride's Purge in the previous month and to the execution of Charles I later in the same month, (as mentioned in the introduction to the source). Similarly, Source A in Q2 Unit 2581 yields full value only when set in the context of the controversy over indulgences i.e. Luther's teaching. In Unit 2582, Source B in Q7 only makes sense in the context of growing conservative fears over the SA and as a key trigger for the Night of the Long Knives.
- However it is important to point out that **extensive own knowledge** is **not** a prerequisite for success. What is required is enough to establish content, alternatives and/or confirmation of a source. Thus, on Unit 2580 Q3(b) even if a candidate has been taught or can remember nothing about Anna Comnena, the introduction to the source provides powerful clues, which can be confirmed by the use of language and tone within the extract – 'savage fury'; 'grudge'; 'deprive'. Indeed candidates might be better advised to spend time, when assessing provenance and evaluating, to devote more attention to this aspect and less to some doubtful assertions about reliability.
- **Evaluation of the source** is often confined to a separate paragraph at the end; also the case in Q(a)s. It should **not** be. If isolated in this way it becomes part of a list and is de-linked from taking a role in answering the question. It is yet another bolt-on. It **must be integrated** into the argument or grouping of that source or sources so that its role is to lessen or strengthen that argument. It follows that '**stock evaluation**', apparently on the increase amongst weaker and middling candidates, gains no credit.
- A '**stock**' approach is particularly common when assessing **modern historians**. Their 'view' remains a difficulty for most candidates. The passage is either rejected (too far away; cannot possibly know) or, as with all other sources, merely plundered for the 'facts', as happened in 2582 Q7b with Source D (Alan Bullock on Hitler). Another line taken is that historians must know because of hindsight and wide research. Considered comment is rare. The key to handling this successfully is to look at the **view or interpretation offered** and proceed critically from there. Is it a political, economic or social perspective? Is it narrowly focused or not? With Eric Evans in Unit 2582 Q2(b), one could consider whether his accumulated evidence on the strengths of government hides the very real weaknesses in Chartism revealed in Sources A, B and C. Alan Bullock's in Source D Unit 2582 Q7(b) offers a very narrowly 'political' view of the Nazi Revolution, based around the achievement of a political dictatorship for Hitler by August 1934. It ignores the idea of a second Nazi Revolution altogether, whether National Socialist, racial or a wider Reich.
- Finally, and this seems so very obvious, but candidates frequently **misread the question** to a greater or lesser degree. The usual approach is to 'twist it' in some way or to lose sight of it in the concern to tick off the sources, to use own knowledge or to evaluate in a bolt-on manner. As a result much is tangential. The solution is to highlight key issues on the question paper, to **plan an answer** and keep the question in mind throughout. Be interactive with the material, grouping, sorting, highlighting introductions and attributions. It was good to see more plans on the scripts this summer, (but not if they became too extensive). The result in the latter case is an incomplete answer as timing becomes an issue.

### How to 'progress' with Sources from GCSE to AS

The low level of understanding of 'use the sources' in many scripts is disturbing in a Documents Paper. In many instances the responses would be given poor marks at GCSE, let alone AS. When moving on to tackle historians, passages and views at A2 the base line of A02 is very weak. Coursework is, similarly, a victim of such weakness. Equally disturbing is that some clearly able candidates are being severely disadvantaged by the approach they use in responding to both (a) and especially (b). **A more effective approach must be 'taught'** and here both candidates and teachers need to understand what is required. Over the years it has been very clear that there have been misconceptions amongst candidates over what is meant by the instruction 'use the sources' in Q (b). They frequently sit rather uncomfortably in the body of a conventional essay, merely illustrating, at worst, a descriptive narrative or, at best, an own-knowledge based argument. All too frequently this is a Centre-based problem, which would also suggest a teacher-based problem. The teaching of an historical enquiry as a Period Study with sources attached would appear to be the approach taken in some Centres. In previous Reports, we have flagged up the type of teaching and methods that will support and give confidence to candidates on these Units and prevent the practice of using sources for illustration only. It may be helpful to reinforce this by encouraging teachers to look very closely at the generic markscheme to see the practical consequences of a failure to neglect source skills and their teaching in the classroom. To see the way progression is rewarded in the hierarchy of skills is to see the challenge candidates face and makes it all too clear why they under-perform. All too often they lack the experience of dealing with evidence at AS level and resort to 'separated' GCSE skills that are not 'joined-up' to allow interpretation to be made at a higher level. What our generic markschemes set out to do is to establish a hierarchy in relation to sources, as follows:

- **Lower Band IV, V and VI** –where candidates use the sources as simply **sources of information**. They incorporate information from the source into their response (which may be good in relation to the key issue but are more often tangential). They do not necessarily acknowledge the sources in the response because they do not recognise the need to do so. They thus use the source at a very low level and even if their knowledge is sound they cannot be awarded many marks. There is a ceiling of Band IV if there is no acknowledgement of using sources at all. The balance will tend to be skewed towards basic own knowledge. There are 14/40 marks to differentiate in this area. Below this, answers are irrelevant - **Band VII**.
- **Band III and the top half of Band IV** – the **next level up** where candidates will use **sources for reference**, perhaps to embark on a point or to illustrate it e.g. 'Source B says that enclosure caused the rebellions'. There is no analysis of the source itself, but the candidate may analyse the general point referred to and may do so knowledgeably and at length. However, the use of the source itself is very limited. It can be rewarded up to the top of a Band III. There are 10/40 marks to differentiate in this area.
- **Bands I and II** – **the highest level** where candidates use the source as **source of evidence** built around an argument and counter-argument that depends upon them. They may realise one source may be able to sustain two different viewpoints. They recognise the need **to analyse and interpret** what is written in the sources and to evaluate the material in the **light of provenance** (authorship, date, purpose, etc). Since there are four sources, 'using' the source also involves considering the evidence in the **source as a set**, by grouping, cross referencing, etc. There are 11/40 marks available in Bands I and II to differentiate amongst these skills to a greater or lesser extent, though some who have a limited grasp will fall into a Band III.

It is to be hoped that centres will find this useful as a means of focusing on the various levels of source use. **It is vital to the way we mark candidate response and puts sources at the heart of the paper.** Own knowledge provides context, a means of testing the validity of a source and a possible deepening and extension of its message. At the moment, few reach Band I. Most reference sources to a greater or lesser degree and remain stuck in Band III and Band IV. A disturbingly large minority are at low Band IV and Band V. This Question now carries two-thirds of the marks so it is important that candidates know what they need to do.

### **INSET 2006-2007**

OCR's programme for GCE History next academic year was published in June 2006. As always, the History booklet was sent to every centre and placed on OCR's website. In response to suggestions from teachers, the main series of meetings for 2006-2007 will help colleagues to think about and develop more effective approaches to teaching exam units 2580-2591.

#### Feedback from the 2005-2006 series:

*"The opportunity to discuss with colleagues was very welcome."* [Head of History]

*"The quality of feedback on exam technique was excellent."* [Assistant Headteacher]

*"A very useful guide, plus good oversight into the course."* [Teach First Trainee]

*"The day clarified particular concerns I had."* [Curriculum Manager]

*"The course fitted the needs of the group – to the point."* [NQT]

*"Excellent advice that can easily be turned to practical method."* [VIth Form College Lecturer]

## Comments on Individual Questions

### Unit 2580/01

The numbers studying Medieval History continue to grow, albeit slowly. Whilst the Crusades remain the most popular option, Alfred has risen to second place and the Normans now take minority status. Questions were tackled with commitment and no little skill. The technical, linguistic and conceptual demands of the paper (kingship, expectation of service, oaths etc.) were met by reasoned, knowledgeable approaches. No complaints were received about the question paper.

#### 1 The Reign of Alfred the Great 871 – 899

**(a)** Answers on Alfred were the most impressive on the Unit. Candidates knew a lot about Burghs and Vikings. Some knew a lot about Alfredian naval reforms and use of water as a defensive measure, which was an advantage given that Source B specifically refers to rivers as boundaries. Content and provenance comparisons were straightforward given that Asser was universally recognised, if over-criticised for partiality (was there much reason to doubt his evidence apart from the obvious shrine-like nature of Athelney?). The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is a major source but was less well dealt with, both in terms of provenance and content. Candidates were reluctant to comment that they were not comparing like with like, specific defence measures alongside the necessary diplomatic buying- of- time for their preparation.

**(b)** The best focused squarely on 'remarkable' and 'complete' as keywords, in some cases shaping their answers around these terms. Weaker ones went off at a tangent about Alfred's other achievements whilst some displayed chronological confusion, using Source D line 24 to illustrate how reform was incomplete rather than understanding that as the starting point from which Alfred later made improvements. Source D was underplayed as a source whilst some were unable to construct a counter argument to the question's assertion. Stock evaluation of the modern historian was common, with candidates finding it hard to steer a middle course between 'too long after events and therefore hopefully unreliable' and 'in full possession of all facts and sources and thus entirely credible.' Too much own knowledge about the chronology, nature and severity of Viking raids caused imbalance in sound answers, especially where a long section of such contextual information was 'bolted-on' at the end of the answer.

#### 2 The Normans in England 1066 – 1087

**(a)** Most picked up on the key difference, a military summons based on land and use of the fyrd and other methods. Few spotted that in Source C the need for the fyrd was created by a rebellion of the feudal system itself ('scorned the summons'). A minority of Centres seemed not to have looked at the fyrd at all, a serious handicap in both the (a) and (b) questions. As regards provenance, the nature and limitation of writs as sources were well grasped by many but fewer commented on Orderic Vitalis. Here we would like to apologise for the misleading introduction. It should have read 'a chronicler, who was born in England,' (not Normandy). Examiners were carefully briefed. No candidate was penalised and none seemed affected by it. Indeed, a few candidates pointed out the mistake but most made little attempt to discuss Orderic's evidence.



**(b)** It was disappointing that few unpacked the emboldened word ‘primarily’. On the other hand, some Centres had clearly taught candidates to a very high level about the theoretical and practical issues surrounding the introduction (if such it was) of feudalism, with a few candidates referring explicitly to subinfeudation when looking at Source B. Fewer commented on the extension to the Church of military obligation. Some argued the fyrd was an early form of feudalism, but some who took this line struggled to achieve clarity, distracted by other issues around feudalism away from the question of how far it and other factors were responsible for the success of William’s military organisation. High Band I answers could easily use a basic grouping of Sources A and B v Sources C and D which allows a full and genuine comparison to be made of the effectiveness of William’s measures.

### **Teacher Study Day: Norman England**

A day course for teachers to develop their subject knowledge is being run on the Normans at the British Museum on 18 January 2007. The day will combine a session with a senior examiner on Unit 2583 England 1042-1100 with sessions led by Museum experts and a talk by Professor David Bates of the Institute of Historical Research. For details, please see the 2006-2007 History INSET booklet p.7.

#### Feedback from 2005-2006 days:

*“Excellent and stimulating – introduced new perspectives and recharged batteries.”* [Head of History]

*“Very useful for teaching preparation.”* [Advanced Skills Teacher]

*“Good blend of providing exam-based information and issues for direct student benefit with subject information and issues the teacher’s benefit.”* [Deputy Headteacher]

*“Just to say how very valuable and enjoyable the day was – if only all INSET could be so stimulating with such a mixture of exam technique, academic erudition and on-site visit.”* [Head of History]

### **3 The First Crusade and its Origins 1073 – 1099**

**(a)** Common comparisons of content were based upon the Emperor’s lack of hospitality. Fewer remarks were made about Alexius’s promise to help in Source B or the Crusaders’ dependence on such aid in Source C. Indeed, the subtleties of Fulcher’s writing escaped many candidates who were happier with the certainties of the *Gesta Francorum*. A few were determined to reverse the question and to focus entirely on Alexius’s view of the Crusaders, contrary to what is required. The best candidates identified the pro-Bohemond slant of the *Gesta* and how this affected the tone. Many handled the tone of both Sources extremely well. The weakest were less able to achieve any effective comparison of provenance and tended to identify simple similarities, such as both were Crusaders, but not the differences (few picked up that Fulcher stayed in the East).

**(b)** The chronology and main issues were well understood by almost all. Some showed very strong contextual knowledge of the types and amount of Byzantine aid. However, many used the four Sources to argue in favour of the question’s assertion and then used own knowledge (Muslim diversity and religious zeal most commonly) to disagree with it. Many good candidates got diverted into writing long essays on why the First Crusade was successful without linking their discussions effectively to the question. This approach encouraged a lack of balance towards own knowledge. It is possible to use Sources A-D to challenge the assertion and this source-based approach is, of course, much to be preferred given the nature of this paper. For example, few made much out of the evidence in Source D that it was some crusaders who persuaded Alexius not to proceed to the siege of Antioch and thereby led to the breakdown of Byzantine-Crusader relationships.

### Unit 2581/01

Questions 2 and 3 remained the most popular, followed by Qs 1 and 4. Q5 remains a minority option. One complaint was received about Q2(a).

#### 1 The War of the Roses 1450 - 85

**(a)** This was soundly answered. Weaker answers failed to examine the Sources in sufficient detail to identify the differences. Both Sources focus on the hostility between Hastings and the Woodvilles, but Source C is more specific in its reference to Dorset and to Richard of Gloucester. Candidates found it more difficult to make useful comments on the provenance of Chronicles and diplomatic reports. Some were well informed on the authorship. Several assumed that Source B was written in 1483, perhaps assuming chroniclers wrote an end-of-year report. Bringing together the gloss and attribution would help avoid stock comment. Very few picked up the reference to the 'more far-sighted' members of the Council in Source B and while several noted Richard's 'lust for power' in Source C, hardly any saw the significance of the words that preceded it. The best candidates drew out the anti-Woodville sentiments conveyed by Source B's reference to 'far sightedness' and Source C's phrase 'the ignoble family of the Queen.' Some thought the Council, wishing the prince to 'succeed his father in all his glory', was some sort of elective process. Weaker candidates sometimes could not distinguish that the Chronicler was reporting the views of others and ascribed them to him.

**(b)** This too was well answered with the more effective responses grouping Sources A and D to indicate Yorkist strength in 1483 and Sources B and C its weaknesses. The best answers, however, noted that none of the sources is quite straightforward. Source A, for example gives lavish praise to Edwards's financial policies but also suggests that his measures may have created resentment (the resumption of the royal estates 'without regard'). Some made little of Source A but others noted the cross reference to Source D and the position on both sides of the argument. The best noted that Source D refers to Edward's political strengths as well as his financial success, but then went on to use their own knowledge to point out the personal nature of his achievement. Yet many comments on Source D (a modern historian) were stock. As already noted chronicles are not handled well on provenance. This is an example of a candidate who had a try:

*Mancini perhaps suffers from the fact that he is not as well connected as Source B and also being foreign, he may not fully grasp the dynamics of the Council and government. The Crowland Chronicler may have been around the government longer and so knows more about the Council members, but he fails to express this in as much detail as Mancini does. Nevertheless, combined together, both sources offer an overall insight into the instability after Edward's death...'*

Surprisingly few put the Sources in the context of Edward's unexpected and untimely death. The following opening paragraph of an answer gave enhanced value to the points from the sources discussed afterwards:

*'When Edward IV died in 1483 it was highly unexpected by all. At the time of his death he seemed very much secure on his throne. Lancastrian opposition had been all but crushed, finance was in good health- but alas, Edward was not and as he died left many questions over the inheritance of England's crown unanswered...'*

The main problem with answers is the failure to use the sources as the driving force for the answer rather than reproducing essays written earlier.

## 2 The German Reformation 1517 - 30

**(a)** The question asked candidates to discuss the support provided by Source A for the view of Luther in Source B, not the other way around as some candidates seemed to think. An effective approach was to establish the main points made by Source B and then look in Source A for support or otherwise. A fair proportion addressed issues of provenance, context, date and reliability. Some did not and these were of special importance since both the similarities (humility, for example) and the differences (education, response to criticism) can best be explained by the fact that, when he wrote 'Resolutions', Luther still hoped to bring about change from within the Church and escape the charge of heresy. Events moved fast 1518-19, so the situation was different when Mosellanus wrote Source B. Those candidates who glossed the dates (written 'about the same time') weakened their answers considerably. Not everyone could fathom the tone of Source A, which was necessary if it was to be compared with Source B. Many accepted the two Sources at face value. What follows is an example of a useful opening to the comparison which weaves in evaluation of the sources with pointing out a contrast in content:

*'In Source A, Luther is pleading his case and trying to present himself as humble to the Pope. He claims 'I am not a great scholar but have a stupid mind and little education' to try to inspire this view and possibly to convince the Papacy that he is not a threat. This is in stark contrast to Source B which argues 'Martin Luther is so learned ...' but he as well has his own incentives for depicting this view of Luther. As a humanist he was probably trying to defend Luther who followed many of the same principles. It is therefore hard to draw conclusions as to the true view. However as Luther is trying to ameliorate the situation we must say that Source B is possibly more reliable.'*

In Source B 'there is nothing superior about him' caused some difficulty of interpretation and Mosellanus' reference to Luther's 'happy face' did nothing to help more simple-minded answers.

**(b)** Many candidates seemed to find it difficult to work out what the question was asking them to do. The main focus was on whether or not Luther was aggressive. Whilst most did that, very few explained how far his teachings were responsible for this hostility, despite the clear opportunities provided in the Sources, especially Source A (Indulgences and Papal Supremacy), Source D (the Eucharist) and possibly Source C. Most answers argued that Sources A and B showed he was not aggressive and Sources C and D that he was. This did produce a debate and gained sound marks, but because it ignored the suggestion that hostility was caused more by his teachings, did not merit the Band I. Many of the best linked teaching and manner in their conclusion e.g. his aggressive manner exacerbated hostility caused primarily by his teaching and argued that judgement must take into account the changing relationship of Luther with Rome, beginning with the initial challenge to an academic debate over indulgences, and also to other reforms. A frequent mistake was to locate Source C at an earlier date, placing it in the context of Luther's 'captivity'. Weaker candidates were also confused over 'the Lord's Supper' in Source D, not understanding the Eucharistic theology of any party.

## 3 Mid Tudor Crises 1540 - 58

**(a)** This question saw a range of responses from across the Bands. Most noted the agreement between the Sources that enclosure and religion were major grievances put forward by the rebels and most also noted that Source C claimed that religion was only a 'pretended' grievance. It was encouraging too that many candidates saw that Somerset's view was self-serving. Common weaknesses were that not all appreciated that 'common land' in Source B referred to enclosure, ignoring loot as a motive despite noting Somerset's low opinion of the rebels, and diverting from motivation to discussion of the government's reaction. Comparatively few noted the greater emphasis in Source C on the class nature of the revolts ('great hatred of gentlemen'). The provenance of B caused problems for some with few knowing anything about Italy or Venice (there were references to the King of Italy). Source C was better handled, many

spotting Somerset's attempt to shift the blame, with abler candidates commenting on the later date of Source C. This is an example of a successful approach:

*'There are a number of reasons for the rebellions that sources B and C agree on. Source B states that the cause is that the "great landowners occupy the pastures of the poor people" and Somerset also reports that the rebels want "to pull down enclosures and parks" and "recover their common land". Source B can be taken as reliable evidence because the Venetian Ambassador had no political motive for his writing other than to report events. Also the fact that both sources use this motive as the primary one would suggest it was true.*

*Another similarity between the two sources is that they both mention religion as a pretext for the rebellions of 1549: Source B reports that the rebels "require a return of the mass" and Source C that "others pretend religion is their motive". The difference between these two accounts though, is highlighted in Somerset's word "pretend" he is sceptical about how much rebellion is motivated by religion, whereas Dandolo reports this motive as if it is fact. This is possibly because Somerset does not want the idea of religion and his Prayer Book, just introduced, to be the cause of the rebellion because that would make him responsible.*

*Another area in which the sources differ is the fact that Somerset is "expressing his view" rather than "reporting" like Dandolo. He uses opinions, describing the rebels as "the vilest and worst sort of men" and "ruffians" compared with Dandolo's more factual account, where he says, "the government... put upwards of 500 persons to the sword" and gives no opinion.*

*Somerset's view also states that a motive for the rebels had was "to rule for a time". As evidence for the motives, Source C, although it does agree with Source B on the matter of enclosures, is more useful as evidence for Somerset's opinion on the motives than on the actual motives – which are laid out as factual, unbiased events in Dandolo's Source B.'*

**(b)** Candidates need to realise that on economic issues contemporaries had a shaky grasp of economic theory. Our understanding is informed by that theory but the sources, nonetheless, make attempts to construct their own hypotheses, often based on personal observation. It is here that candidates need to focus. The weakness was a misunderstanding of 'Somerset's policies concerning enclosure'. Many wrote about 'Somerset's policy of enclosure', which could only be taken to mean that he encouraged it – and often further discussion indicated that this was indeed what candidates meant by the phrase. Few noticed its inconsistency with D's reference to his enclosure commission. Sometimes, indeed, they went on to discuss Source D without noticing the contradiction with what they had written earlier. The misconception also made it difficult to interpret Source A appropriately. On the other hand, most were able to argue sensibly about Somerset's religious policies and many used own knowledge to introduce foreign policy, linking it to debasement. As initially observed fair numbers seemed happier answering the question from their own knowledge than through the sources as required. A fair few made little or no use of them at all. Few seemed to know where to place A in the argument and the indication here and in Source C of an element of a 'class war', irrespective of Somerset, passed most candidates by. The inclusion in the question of the word 'mistaken' was rarely taken up. This is an example of a useful explanation of the enclosure issue:

*'...Enclosures were out of Somerset's hands. He did, however, launch Hales' "Enclosure commissions" to find out the problems and is often called "The Good Duke" for his care for the commonwealth. These commissions, however, are said in Source D to have "caused rather than stopped the revolts". This is a revisionist view of a historian and is written by Bush in the 2000. This source is a typical view of revisionist historians and I know that Somerset's adviser Paget blamed Somerset's "softness and goodness to the poor" for the revolts too. Therefore this would suggest Somerset's policies to be the cause...'*

The following extract illustrates what better students can achieve. It demonstrates clearly how a source has been used to extend the argument. It has then been supported by the candidate's own knowledge and interpreted in the light of future knowledge:

*'As source D shows, one of Somerset's main failings and a cause of instability was that he "went against the advice of the Council", a reference to Somerset's formation of a "kitchen cabinet" of Commonwealth writers such as John Hales. However, that Somerset was drawn to do this was primarily due to Henry's legacy, which meant that as a Lord Protector without legitimate power he had to operate via underhand practices.'*

The way that Source evaluation can be seamlessly linked with own knowledge is demonstrated in this extract:

*'Source C, written by Somerset himself, seems to push religion aside, perhaps showing that Somerset acknowledged the fact that his new religious policy was mistaken. The statement that the rebels' religious demands were pretended seems ridiculous considering that Somerset was in full knowledge that the Western rebels had made radical religious demands including the reinstating of the Act of Six Articles and a reintroduction of the heresy laws.'*

#### **4 The English Civil War 1637 - 49**

**(a)** Both sources presented difficulties for many candidates. Some took Source A at face value, thus failing to recognise either that it was really a royalist attack on the Levellers or that it could be regarded as a true representation of their ideas. Others noted that it was described as exaggerated but failed to consider in what ways it might have been so. Source C presented candidates with two challenges. First, it needed to be set in the context of January 1649. The introduction gave the clue – 'less than a month before the execution of Charles I'. This Common's Declaration was, therefore, part of the process of abolishing the monarchy and establishing the republic. Secondly it states in so many words that the 'Commons of England ... have this supreme power' – **not** the people but their representatives. Comparatively few candidates noted this distinction between popular and parliamentary sovereignty or explained what it meant. Given these problems valid comparison was often limited, taking the sources at face value, denying access to Band I and II. Those who did tackle the angle of Source A found it easier to make the comparison, as the following response demonstrated:

*'The sources clash on the subject of the idea of supreme power of the people and their attitudes could not be more different.'*

*In source A Royalist Marchmont Nedham, through a rather witty little verse, supposedly spoken from the Levellers' point of view portrays the Levellers as a bloodthirsty anarchic mob. A parcel of rogues with no real principles or values, they just wish to, "Chop off his (Charles') head". Charles being a stubborn man, at the time was either refusing to agree with propositions or cunningly procrastinating the issues. He, to the Royalists, had the divine right of kings and would not stand down on issues of giving away his powers to Parliament. So, "for his conscience let him die" is an ironic verse to show stupidity in the levellers' mere anger-charged motives. Using words like 'kill' and 'cry' he leaves the Levellers seeming like yobs. And if yobs support supreme power of the people, that supreme power of the people would mean only one thing: chaos.*

*Source C on the other hand, portrays a much more positive view towards the idea...'*

Only a minority attempted to differentiate between the direct power of the people and the indirect through representatives. Some explained the theoretical difference:

*'...However, the sources differ in that Source A says that people would have power themselves – not through an elected body. On the other side, Source C disagrees with these more radical Leveller views and says Parliament would be elected by the people and represent the people. This can still be classed Supreme Power to the people, but it is not so direct in that people can only influence Parliament, they do not have complete power.'*

Others went further to contrast the theory with the reality:

*'[Source C] claims that parliament "representing the people, have the supreme power" and this is false as, even at this time, most members of the public were against the execution of Charles. There was a "Rump Parliament", consisting of around 60 members who were all revolutionists pushing to execute the King. They did not represent the people at all.'*

On provenance remarkably few referred to the most obvious point of comparison, the typicality of the views in A and C. Candidates preferred to focus on the attitude of monarchy rather than the supreme power of the people.

**(b)** The best answers made a clear distinction between hostility to the monarchy and hostility to Charles, as the question intended, but many treated it as simply about hostility to the King. It was agreed to allow good examples of this to reach Band I. This was part of the reason for the difficulty many candidates had in using C effectively, a difficulty compounded by the common failure previously noted to set this source in the context of January 1649. A common fault was the introduction of own knowledge from the Personal Rule and before. There was detail on Buckingham, Wentworth, Laud, even the death of Charles's brother in 1612 and folk memories of Elizabeth. Good answers showed a tight awareness of dates. Since there was no thought of executing Charles, even in 1646-47 this material could only be of marginal relevance as a cause of ongoing mistrust. References to the failed negotiations of 1647-49, (though not the Nineteen Propositions, which were frequently confused with the Newcastle Propositions) was more pertinent and enabled candidates to extend analysis of the sources and to widen the debate about the causes of the execution. The Sources focus on the period 1647-49. Diverting excessively outside this drew candidates away from evaluating these. Some candidates gave 'religion' as a reason for execution wherever religious terminology appeared in the sources without seeming to realise that religious language was often used to express political ideas in the mid 17<sup>th</sup> century. After all, Charles' strongest argument for the power of the monarchy was Divine Right; if he was to be opposed it would often be by showing that he had fortified that Divine protection by his actions and this is what the New Model Army was saying in Source B. Despite the above some did try to analyse the sources in the light of the person/institution distinction:

*'As source A shows, if in an exaggerated manner, the Levellers were opposed to the monarch, regardless of Charles' personal record of arbitrary rule...'*

*'..it is noteworthy that resentment for the monarchy in general is referred to only in passing; the sources as a set are far more concerned with other reasons. Resentment for the monarchy was responsible for the execution to a certain degree, as outlined by the New Model Army' condemnation of it. However, resentment of the institution alone would not have been cause enough to try and execute the King'.*

*'Source B makes it clear the New Model Army regarded Charles with hostility naming him and the monarchy as "one of the ten horns of the Beast." The animosity to Charles has spilled over to animosity to the concept of monarchy as well.'*

*'One army preacher even called Charles "Charles Stuart."*

*'Though source C may be considered hostile to monarchy it was more that MP's did not trust Charles enough, so felt it necessary to make themselves more powerful.'*

*'After Charles' execution it was not decided straight away to abolish the monarchy..'*

This is a particularly lucid example of this distinction being made:

*'Yet this anti-monarchical fervour was limited. It did not extend beyond the army. The difficulty in agreeing to execute the king – with Parliament having to be purged, and Cromwell lambasting MPs to sign the death warrant, shows that execution was not the aim. In fact there were many who were anti-Charles but pro-monarchy, and only a few like Ludlow who were anti-monarchical.'*

### **5 Louis XIV's France 1661 – 1693**

**(a)** This was soundly answered. The basic contrast was fairly obvious and picked up by most candidates. A fair number picked up some of the less obvious similarities such as the underlying tone of the Source C which suggests unmistakably that Louis is the one making decisions ('I order you ...') and that there are indications in Source B that Colbert is highly regarded by Louis ('showered with benefits') even if he is taking him to task on this occasion. Discussions of provenance, on the other hand, were sometimes less than convincing. Some tried to explain the difference in terms of a change in attitude between 1671 and 1674, for which there was little evidence in the sources, while ignoring the obvious explanation given in the introduction to Source C that Louis was away on campaign. This question provided a good opportunity to distinguish between those who could read between the lines and those who took the sources at face value. Only a few hinted at the distinction between treating Colbert's ability and the intention and insistence on absolutism.

**(b)** The question was intended to suggest that Colbert's influence was not very great, but some candidates, placing the emphasis on the word 'influence', quite legitimately took it to mean that Colbert did have influence, even though it was limited. It was pleasing to see that many candidates grouped the Sources (A and B showing Louis very much in control, Sources C and D showing much more trust given to Colbert). It was also pleasing that a fair number incorporated evaluation of the sources appropriately into their argument e.g. expressing scepticism about Spanheim's account of the cause of Colbert's death. Source D was, however, the one that was most commonly ignored altogether or unsatisfactorily analysed, comparatively few candidates noticing that it shows that Colbert was in charge of building Versailles. Many candidates were able to display and make appropriate use of good knowledge of Colbert.

## **Unit 2582/01**

This has the largest candidature by far but, alas, the weakest, particularly concentrated in the most popular question (Q7 on the Nazis). This year saw particular weakness on this question, despite a change in the mark scheme to allow for the approach taken by the vast majority who had little idea of what a Nazi Revolution might consist of. Qs 3, 4 and 6 remain popular, with smaller but significant numbers doing Qs 1, 2 and 5. No complaints were received about any question.

### **1 The Origins of the French Revolution 1774-92**

**(a)** Some superlative answers were seen to both questions on this topic. The comparison was particularly well done by a fair few but weaker candidates struggled and clearly had an uncertain grasp of the ideas and concepts of the Enlightenment, let alone its impact. Some failed to probe the provenance of either source. The date of Source B proved troublesome for some (1825), clearly a view recollected, but as such some dismissed it as 'secondary' despite the clear evidence it gave of the impact of the Enlightenment on the nobility and of the Revolution of the Nobility prior to 1789. The provenance of Source D, a modern historian, also caused problems for those who evaded consideration of her interpretation and of the challenges one might make against it, e.g. her take on the evidence of taking up Church careers which could be for reasons other than enlightened ideas. The accusation of reliance on personal favourites at the heart of government was also hardly new, nor was it a product necessarily of enlightened views. Better answers were able to conclude that there was little strong evidence outside the nobility for a considerable impact. This was also a good example of where typicality could be usefully discussed. In one Centre, every candidate used all four Sources when answering this question.

**(b)** The greatest weakness here, and a temptation which many middling candidates succumbed to, was to write a 'cause of the French Revolution' essay relegating the source to a referential role. They frequently sidelined Enlightened ideas as well in their concern to investigate governmental malaise, the financial cost of war (in links with Source D) and economic and social factors. This prevented many from moving beyond Band III. The sources were barely mentioned, let alone evaluated. Source A was a particular casualty yet could yield much about the idea of the enlightenment. Good candidates could point to an organised iconography of revolutionary change, boldly put in place at the very beginning of the Revolution, linking Rousseau, anti-clericalism, concepts of virtue, caps of liberty and even a citizen army. One did not need to be literate to understand it yet detractors could question its circulation and whether it could move beyond individuals and groups ideas to action. The latter may not have been its intent. Most also missed that Malouet in Source C may, like Segur in Source B, have admired some of the enlightened ideas – then ideas could only have had good effects if they had been used by virtuous men! As always many fail to pick up on the emboldened part of the question, in this case main cause. This was a clue as to how grouping might proceed. Source A assumes the enlightenment as a main cause, and Source C certainly does, but Source B does not explicitly state it as a main cause whilst Source D argues strongly for financial factors. Such precautions would have prevented long essays that lost sight of the enlightenment.

### **2 The Condition of England 1832 - 53**

**(a)** Answers to this topic were pleasingly well done, although the spread of response was wide. Part (a) gave plenty for candidates to get their teeth into (aims and events) and better answers used the division into aims and events to organise their response. Most preferred to point comparatively to events rather than aims. By doing this they missed the wider aims mentioned in Source A. Few picked up all the points and many subtitles were missed. For example Source B, comments that he saw up to 300 involved. Clearly this is not a total figure which Source A tries to fix at 8,000 plus. Careful reading was also necessary to establish differences on 'firing'. In Source A, people had 'already broken and then fired into the Hotel' whereas Source B, within a disclaimer, thinks the firing began from the troops within, although it



is possible he was referring to the popular break- in. Many candidates handled the provenance well, especially that of Source A where the Moral Force agenda was usually understood (if rarely linked to the final sentence – ‘Chartists do not approve or encourage violence for the attainment of just rights’). Source B seemed to confuse candidates more. Some misread the introduction to mean that the evidence was that of John Frost rather than an anonymous eye witness whose balanced evidence may be more reliable. Others dismissed Source B as completely biased for no apparent reason.

**(b)** Candidates seemed to enjoy writing about this, too much so as many turned it into a general essay on Chartism which, after some brief and referential comments on the source, left them far behind. Most used the source well, but approached it through government attitudes rather than probing for examples of other factors in the failure of Chartism. Sources A and B provide much evidence for uncertain aims, confusion and regionalism as well as the prepared use of the local authorities. Source C casts considerable doubt on the leadership qualities of O'Connor as well as formidable preparation by central government, yet most wrote extensively about the violent nature of O'Connor. He is hardly a belligerent participant in Source C. For many, own-knowledge proved the major trap as it twisted the question away from its focus on what was the main reason for Chartist failure. A fair number failed to notice the emboldened ‘main’ and produced an undifferentiated list, a minority even turned it into a question on why the Anti-Corn Law League was more successful. Helpful hints in the Sources and introductions were missed by most. Few pointed to the focus in Source D on government (see the earlier section on general comments for how to tackle historians) or cross-reference its point about not creating martyrs to the introductory information in Source B about Frost’s fate – ‘sentenced to death he was later transported’. The reference to the Third Petition in the steer to Source C was frequently missed so some did not recognise what was going on in the Source. Although most could recognise the Moral Force nature of Source A, comment on Source B was confused (neutral?; Physical Force, especially if the identity was confused as Frost) whilst only the best commented that Russell in Source C may have been over-triumphalist about his success when writing to the Queen. Nonetheless, one candidate commented about the British politeness of the scene described pointing out that it represented a ‘normalisation’ of Chartism towards ‘expected behaviour’, a very sophisticated point to make. On a pleasing note, many used the comment in Source D on the import of the 1832 Reform Act to very good effect.

### **3 Italian Unification 1848 - 70**

This question attracted some of the best answers on 2582 and Centres are to be congratulated on the high level of understanding shown. Several examiners commented that the candidates appeared to be really interested in this topic.

**(a)** Far too many failed to realise that a whole source may not contain a full focus on the issue raised by the question. In the case of both sources, evidence on the Piedmontese monarchy was there but was not immediately to the fore. This led many candidates effectively to start answering, in mini form, Q(b) on Cavour, Garibaldi and Mazzini. They then repeated this, relevantly, when they moved on to Q(b). The only area where there was the possibility of cross-over was Cavour and a few, when dealing with him did, belatedly, realise their mistake. The less able found the conditional clauses too much and resorted to paraphrasing content. Comment on the importance of the monarchy seemed reluctant to confront the evidence of both sources that it seemed to either respond to external pressure or resist it, but better candidates made much of the restraints mentioned in Source B. Provenance was discussed well in relation to Source B and Cavour is given the credit for enhancing the importance of the monarchy (although some misread Bianca, Count Cavour, as Cavour himself), but less well on C where far fewer picked up the double nature of the source. Most read no further than ‘a former follower of Mazzini’ in the introduction, thereby skewing their answers. The Source only made sense if one realised he was an ‘official in a later Italian government’, and where the King of Italy was from the House of Savoy. His remarks could then be seen as not wanting to upset anybody, hence the guarded

criticism of his former hero Mazzini who could have eclipsed the role of the monarchy. What follows is a workable response to provenance of sequence:

*[a] 'In conclusion, it is vital to assess the reliability of Sources B and C...Source B is an extract from a book solely to defend Cavour and was also written two years after Cavour's death. This implies that the writer may have been likely to romanticise the actions of Cavour in his quest to involve the monarchy in the process of unification. Source C is the work of a former Mazzinian. It is likely that the writer could be a little biased when describing the actions of Mazzini...However it also mentions that the writer was an official in alter government. He is therefore likely to be more respectful to the King...in order to further his own political career.'*

Weaker candidates simply did not understand the information provided in both sources, failing to pin down the precise importance of the monarchy.

**(b)** This was done very well by most. Even weaker candidates found it accessible, and gleefully pronounced it a 'good and very important question'. Most adopted the format of looking at Mazzini, Garibaldi and Cavour in turn with most dismissing Mazzini (despite the constant mention of him in all but Source A) and then slogging it out between Garibaldi (the winner for those who admired men of action) and Cavour (the clear favourite for the diplomats and those who favoured cunning plans). Very few remembered that the question asserted 'equal' importance so that some answers were a little out of focus. Some answers proceeded source by source. Given the question this worked as comparison could then be made of the three but it did prevent grouping and over referencing. The best answers managed a mixture, identifying a Source(s) that supported the idea of equal importance (Source C for example) then finding those that highlighted one above the others. Own-knowledge was best used to support ideas in the Sources. Those with prepared answers on a familiar question struggled to use the sources other than as reference or illustration (Band III at best), but most made some attempt at evaluation of the sources. Source A was noted as an English source which looked particularly favourably at Garibaldi, a popular figure in England (and the biscuit had a walk-on role). England and France were cited (sometimes 'sighted') as having an impact on Cavour. The provenance of Source C could be very useful if both aspects of Tivaroni's past were noted. Source D confused some, many missing the introduction which clearly stated that Mazzini saw Garibaldi as the hero who sacrificed most. Some argued that the one who sacrificed the most was not necessarily the one who was the most important. It was pleasing to see some candidates discuss the significance of ten pillars (from both 'wings' of unification mourning, to an uneasy and sulky compromise that undermined the central thrust of unity in the cartoon, with quite a few spotting that Cavour appears to hang back, probably restraining the enthusiasm of Victor Emmanuel for Garibaldi, something that was then expanded on using own knowledge). Weaker candidates were confused by arms – Mazzini's two, Victor Emmanuel's one, Cavour with no arms (!) What follows is, in basic terms, what we hope to find on provenance:

*[b] 'Source A, however, sees Garibaldi as being of the highest importance. It claims that Cavour 'is a great man', but 'Cavour is limited by England and France'. Garibaldi feels sufficiently strong to accomplish his task singlehanded...from the wars of 1848-9 and the help France provided in the Second War of independence 1859 it is clear that Piedmont and Cavour were limited by a need for outside help...In conclusion, all of these sources may have some form of bias to them. Garibaldi's overwhelming popularity in Britain may explain the Times article in Source A. He was seen as a hero and had earned the respect of Palmerston...Sources B and C are written under political bias and Source D is drawn soon after the death of Garibaldi, perhaps romanticising his contribution.'*

#### 4 The Origins of the American Civil War 1848 - 61

This topic too was answered reasonably well by most candidates.

(a) Provenance was clear here, the dates all but coinciding and was handled well by all. Tone could have been explored more than it was and the temptation was to merely describe who wrote which, where and when. The mistake was to make it sequential instead of comparative. Weaker candidates mistakenly thought it referred to two different judgements – Dred Scott (which it did in both) and the unconstitutionality of the Missouri Compromise. Most errors were made on comparing content when the focus on the Supreme Court was not always obvious. Some wanted to explain the background to the Dred Scott case. The irony in Source A was missed by some so they asserted the Sources agreed that the judgement was ‘a success and a triumph.’ Some words confused: *learned*, *impartial* and *unprejudiced* were not the same as *propagandist*. The best answers found similarities in that the judgement was a constitutional issue and it represented a victory for the South. This question was, along with the Nazis, inexplicably the one most prone to see candidates use all four Sources.

(b) This question produced some effective answers. Stronger candidates had no problem in extrapolating from the judgement that it was a short term gain for the South and then could develop the rise of Lincoln and increased antagonism from the North etc. Helpful distinctions were made between short, medium and longer term consequences of the decisions. Weaker candidates struggled. Several wrote an answer as if it was the role of the Dred Scott case rather than the decision which brought about Civil War. They simply obstructed the run up to the case in great detail. Others forsook the sources except for illustration and embarked on ‘the build up to the Civil War’ type answer. Middling and weaker candidates weakened their answers by a great deal of sequential use of the sources, although some used Sources A and C to indicate harm and Sources B and D to hint at good for the Southern Cause. Some took Lincoln in Source C literally and said that Illinois was now a slave state. Douglas in Source D proved the most puzzling for most. Some claimed it had nothing to do with the issue but popular sovereignty was well known to others. Only the best made the point from Source D that Dred Scott did not make much difference either way. Provenance could be fairly weak on this question and Source D was a case in point where the context of the debates (leadership etc) was little known or of the ‘House Divided’ speech in Source C. Similarly few could extrapolate the public response in North and South from what they might read in Sources A and B. This, as noted, inevitably threw many back on own-knowledge which could include John Brown and drift along even as far as Fort Sumpter in some cases. We learned a great deal about ‘Bleeding Kansas.’

#### 5 The Irish Question in the Age of Parnell 1877 - 93

Except for a few centres this topics was not well answered.

(a) Several compared the wrong Sources, using A, not B. Most recognised that Sources B and C were both against Home Rule (the introduction told them this anyway), but could not see the difference in why each was opposed to Home Rule, the precedent to be set in Source B for a US-style federal constitution, the hollowness of the concession in Source C if Ireland was in theory to be grateful constitutional nationhood but in practice to be limited in what she could do. Gladstone would have further enflamed the fire of Irish nationalism. There was much recitation of context without understanding. Clearly, two ‘Unionist’ sources foxed many. There was, as a result, little reference to provenance beyond the fact that both were MPs (more likely spelt “MP’s”). There was much generic use of sources without understanding e.g. “*Sources B and C which are authentic primary sources are typical and consistent of the general anti Home-Rule Liberal Unionist views*”. This does not get us very far. The introduction gave plenty to work on in relation to the content and tone of both, but few seized the obvious opportunity. It was clear from many answers that knowledge of the terms of the Home Rule Bill in 1886 was weak or nonexistent. This may be why so many struggled with what either view was. In Source B for

example, many struggled to explain why Ireland would be left with no flag, no army or navy and concluded that this would pose a threat to Irish security. This then became their 'angle' on the question, failing to see those elements would be left under the control of Westminster.

**(b)** Answers here were mixed. The main problem was that constitutional change was not understood. Some argued that all four Sources showed a fear of it, a considerable misreading of at least three of the Sources and candidates were certainly unaware of the subtlety revealed. The cartoon in Source A was very poorly interpreted. Few got further than the introduction followed by an uncomprehending description. It was taken to express fear of constitutional changes when the few better candidates realised it shed far more light on the motives of Churchill and religious opposition (perhaps 'Sectarian Strife' was not understood or the Devil could not be linked to religious imagery). Only when Source D was considered did some candidates make the link with Churchill. Only a few were able to recognise the religious factors in Sources A and D, the constitutional in Source B (although rather more seized on it points) and the political in Source C. Own knowledge was not integrated into source evaluation (few were able to) and usually took the form of the terms of Home Rule (which were used here, the events leading to the Bill, the impact of the Bill but **not** the reason for opposition to the Bill). The weakest did a quick travel through the Sources but effectively focused on why Home Rule failed. Many were unsure of whether the issue of Ulster and religious sectarianism, raised in Sources A and D, were part of fear of constitutional change or a different point. Better candidates realised they were related, Ulster fearing constitutional change because of wider and deeper cultural and religious concerns, the view of the Historian in Source D. Source C, the 'political' one, was least well used in this question. One looked in vain for a discussion of the 'view' of the historian in Source D, a subtle 'take' that could be linked to the other Sources, especially Conservative and Liberal party motives as revealed in Sources A and B.

## **6 England in a New Century 1900 – 1918**

Answers to this question were very mixed.

**(a)** Many were able to produce a good middling comparison of both content and provenance, but surprisingly few were able to reach the higher levels and an enormous number of errors crept in. There were very few full comparisons. Most, for example, missed the double-dealing of Bonar Law, obvious if the context is known, hoodwinking Asquith in Source A. Despite being told Frances was Lloyd George's mistress, several referred to 'him'. Source B said clearly that Asquith resigned five days later, but persistently candidates claimed it was five days earlier. Some read Asquith's comment in Source A ('I fully accept ... war cabinet') to mean that he supported the idea - which then led to comparative difficulties. Others answered that because Source B was Stevenson's diary she would not be prejudiced because it was not for publication, a good example of 'stock' comment overriding the 'history' of the period.

**(b)** This again produced a lot of middling answer for all the usual reasons (referencing sources, too much own-knowledge etc.). The two alternative interpretations suggested in the question should have made it easy for candidates to mount an argument, but they did not seem to want to tackle the question in that way. Own knowledge was extensive and party divisions and the crisis of Nov-Dec 1916 were often described at length, leaving little time for Sources C and D to be considered. Details of the Coupon Election could completely eclipse both Source C and the question itself. Oddly, information on war-time events and the impact of the Liberals beyond those mentioned in the source was sparse outside the Asquith/Lloyd George split, (some believed that Lloyd George became a Conservative). There was some reference to debate and some, not always very relevantly, referred back to Liberal achievements of 1906-11. There was confusion as to which issues were related to internal division and which to the war. Lack of sharp knowledge of how the war split the Liberals was a key failing. The provenance of Source D was handled poorly because few examined critically, alongside the other Sources, their collective view that the 'split' was more important in weakening the Liberals than the war. However, Source C proved the most problematic. Some thought it from an Irish Nationalist; others from the

Conservatives. Few knew what to do with it (as evidence for internal divisions about to be perpetuated into peacetime and into the first general election since 1910, although it could be equally read to mean the impact of war continued to have its affect on Lloyd George's 'continued leadership' as prime minister in a Coalition). There was a clear link from Source C to the comment in Source D that party division was 'confirmed in the 1918 election'. Better answers tracked how inter-related the two factors were, war conduct creating the potential for a leadership split in the first place.

## 7 Nazi Germany 1933 – 45

This saw the weakest response of all the Unit 2582 topics as, alas, is often the case. This year it seemed to be even more, with many being placed in Bands IV, V and VI. In part, this is a reflection of a coming together of most of the faults raised in the general comments, in part the prevalence of weak candidates on this option, but it was also down to the sheer ignorance of many. So weak was the response to (b) that at standardisation the mark scheme was modified to open access to Band I for a response that purely took a narrow political dictatorship interpretation of the question of a Nazi Revolution instead of looking at wider definitions or a second Revolution, racial, expansionist or whatever. From a minority, however, examiners saw impressive answers.

(a) The effectiveness of answers here was undermined by ignorance of both Rohm's ideas (as opposed to his role and especially his fate, where examiners were not spared the details) and of von Papen's stance. The latter, in Source B, was especially misunderstood by most candidates. Some realised he opposed the type of revolution Rohm wanted but most were confused by his earlier 'loyal' comments into thinking that he was both a Nazi (who were assumed to all think alike) and a supporter of Rohm. Few could spot that his reference to 'hard-line, radical fanatics, referred to in Source B were Rohm and the SA. They could not see that pleas for more democracy (rich coming from von Papen) would not be received well by Hitler or most Nazis for that matter. As a potential representative of the wealthy upper and middle classes, he would hardly welcome Rohm's comments on the need to struggle against them. Few seemed to have any understanding of Rohm's national **socialist** agenda so that crucial distinction with von Papen was lost. Candidates seemed unable to cope with this idea of a socialist element in Nazism, despite their acronym. The most we got from some was the violence of the SA and some effective comments on tone. It follows that von Papen's personal agenda was rarely picked up. Not many realised the important date differences (most commented 'they were about the same' time) and the changing context. Von Papen was thus not seen as a belated response to Rohm's threat or as one of the triggers for the Night of the Long Knives, a couple of weeks later. Provenance was often just repeats of the introduction followed by claims that Rohm was unreliable because he was writing for a newspaper and von Papen was unreliable because he was speaking to radical students and trying to win them over (in fact he was speaking to an audience that would agree with him, a limited audience of the establishment worried about SA national revolutionary plans). What follows are two extracts from an answer, the first from a candidates who understood the context and the second from a weaker candidate who resorts to general comments on von Papen:

*[a] 'The fundamental difference is that Papen believes the revolution is finished [he never really supported Nazism, saying that he and his monarchist nationalist cabinet had 'hired' Hitler as Chancellor] and Rohm believed that there was more to be done. They represent the two extremes of Nazism – radical socialism and traditionalism. Hitler was somewhere between the two – not supporting democracy but certainly not a socialist.'*

*[a] 'Source B is a speech from Von Papen who expresses his concerns of the revolution. His attitude differs to Source A, and the provenance of this source is fairly reliable although it may be biased. We become aware that he has belief in the Nazis, having gained almost total power, however his concern is how they use this power...his tone is similar to source A in the*

*sense that they both believe they have and will remain successful, but also the fact that they must know exactly how to deal with upcoming events, or else it could backfire.'*

**(b)** As already mentioned, the mark scheme was modified to accommodate the majority answer which focused purely on a political dictatorship approach and whether this had been achieved by August 1934. Again, they concluded that it had, citing Sources B, C and D (and sometimes Source A, despite its date). Better answers realised that Source A suggested, despite its date, that the revolution might not be over (whilst weaker answers asserted a year was more than enough to achieve a revolution – but then most did not understand the type of revolution Rohm had in mind and so could not bring this to bear in their answers). The very best differentiated between the consolidation of power and the social revolution. Few knew how to use Source C, or to take the hint that an agreement with the army might suggest other agendas. A more assured route to Bands I and II was to focus on defining what was meant by 'Nazi Revolution'. One definition would be the consolidation of a political dictatorship but others would involve *Gleichschaltung*, *Volksgemeinschaft*, national socialism (as suggested by Rohm in Source A), racial agendas (Aryanisation), *Lebensraum* and European expansion, especially to the East. Better candidates did refer to these, arguing that in these areas and even in matters of government, much remained to be done, although some seemed to think all were achieved in 1934. These did not have to be discussed in any depth but they would enrich and balance otherwise narrowly political answers. Few were able to root such good points in the tensions exhibited in Sources A and B. The Sources were frequently sequenced and referenced. Source D especially was badly handled, few taking the opportunity to locate its view on events, a narrowly political one and criticising it as such. Bullock was generally seen as too close to events to be reliable and the title of his book revealed bias (or 'biast' or how he was 'bias' or even 'baste'). Instead its contents were listed and many diversions on the Reichstag Fire were indulged in. This tack was also taken by those whose own knowledge on the Hitler Youth education, the Jews, the churches, the economy etc., took over at the expense of the Source. Hitler was credited with amazing feats, e.g. creating too many jobs, solving with Stressemann hyperinflation in the 1920s. The links between Sources D, which included the Night of the Long Knives and A were often missed. Some appreciated more was needed than just a political consolidation but then limited themselves by arguing that the revolution may not have been complete because of lingering opposition from youth groups. A lot of material on opposition after 1934 was then off-loaded which gained minimal credit and was of limited value in this context. Perhaps many felt constrained by the date, August 1934. Used in the context of this question, it clearly invited discussion of issues beyond the date to access 'completeness'. Candidates need to be aware of how to handle this. What follows are two short extracts (b)s, the first from a strong Band I conclusion, the second a much weaker conclusion which does not really know how to handle it.

*(b) 'In conclusion, if the National Socialist revolution was, as Source D suggests, merely Hitler's assumption of absolute, unrestricted power, then the revolution was largely completed by August 1934... If however, the Nazi revolution was to be the execution of the policies mentioned in Hitler's Mein Kampf – lebensraum to the East, anti-Semitism etc., then the revolution had just begun, though was not to continue as Rohm wanted in Source A.'*

*(b) 'From Source A it is clear to see the Nazis do not have full power by 1933 because Rohm is still pushing for more power at this time and is clearly not satisfied with the current situation as far as establishing power goes. Even in 1934 the source suggests that the revolution was not complete as Von Papen is still stressing that there are still radical fanatics... The Night of the Long Knives was indeed curtail (sic) in Hitler gaining full power. When Hitler's men seized the traitors (sic) who were conspiring (sic) against him he consolidated (sic) the power of the SA that he along with many members of his party had craved.'*

The final extract is of a complete (b) answer which gained a low-to-mid Band I, combining argument, context and linking own knowledge to some evaluation.

*(b) Of these sources the majority, sources B, C and D seem to support this viewpoint. Only source A disputes the completeness of the Nazi revolution – “we will continue our struggle” according to Röhm, who claims that the Nazi revolution is “at the half way stage”. However, this was written over a year before August 1934.*

*In that time Röhm had been murdered in the Night of the Long Knives (this is the reference in source D to Hitler having “dispensed with this allies”) and the power of the SA had been crushed. The political climate had also changed as in June 1933, when the source was written, Hitler had the Enabling Act but had still come to power relatively recently, whereas by August 1934 Hitler had strengthened his grip on power and even felt confident enough to turn on his own supporters, the SA).*

*On the face of it, B seems to support the view that the Nazi revolution was complete by 1934. Shortly before this date Von Papen had said “now that the revolution has taken place” which suggests that it was complete. However Von Papen was not a Nazi but a conservative upper-class politician. The fact that he was still at this time an important political figure and a member of Hitler’s cabinet suggests that the revolution was not yet complete as Von Papen was still a potential check to Hitler’s power, particularly as he spoke for a wide range of the public – much of the catholic south of Germany and the upper-class – indeed he was a close friend of President Hindenburg, the one man in Germany with more power than Hitler. Papen also says “They (the people) will follow the Führer with unshakeable loyalty” which suggests that even at this stage Hitler had plenty of popular support. It is particularly interesting that even at this stage – two months before the death of Hindenburg – Papen refers to Hitler as “the Führer” even before he was confirmed as such, which suggests that even at this point Hitler had almost complete power.*

*As with source A, however, the Night of the Long Knives led to a change in the political climate. One of the writers of this speech was killed and Von Papen was sent as an envoy to Vienna. These events probably terrified him and removed his effectiveness as a political check.*

*Source C however dates from after the Night of the Long Knives and the death of Hindenburg. Hitler refers to the Army’s “oath of loyalty to me as your leader and your Commander-in-Chief”. This demonstrates not only does Hitler have the power of the President (i.e. Commander-in-Chief of armed forces) but that he has the support of the army. This is important in that with the army on his side, he has the power to defend himself and also to put down any opposition. Hence, this suggests by this point Hitler had complete power. However, it refers only to one area of society and hence does not suggest the revolution was complete in all areas.*

*In D, Bullock states emphatically that “the Nazi revolution was complete”. He backs this up by saying that Hitler had “suppressed the opposition, dispensed with his allies, asserted his mastery over the Party and SA... and secured the power of the Head of State”. This clearly suggests that Hitler had complete power and thus that the revolution was, in effect complete. “Hitler had become the dictator of Germany”.*

*In my opinion, whether the revolution was complete depends on the definition of revolution. Certainly the political revolution was complete – the last check to Hitler’s power (Hindenburg) had gone and Hitler had assumed his power. This is supported by sources C and D and although source A and B are not explicit they were written well before August 1934 and so it must be taken into account that the political situation had changed. However, a social revolution had hardly started and certainly the majority of Germans were not active Nazi supporters.*

## Report on Units 2583/01 and 2584/01

**Unit 2583/01 (Period Studies - English History 1042-1660)**

**Unit 2584/01 (Period Studies - English History 1780-1964)**

### General Comments

These general comments apply to both Units 2583 and 2584. They have the same assessment objectives and are subject to the same grading standards. The comments on the individual Questions begin with references to the Key Issues on which they are based. Each of the alternative Questions in a Study Topic is drawn from a different Key Issue. All of the four Key Issues in a Study Topic is assessed regularly. However, a Key Issue that is tested in a January examination might also be tested in a June examination although the Question will be different. If Key Issues 1 and 3 are assessed in a January or June examination, it should not be assumed that Questions in the next June examination will be based on Key Issues 2 and 4. Each of the four Key Issues is assessed over a reasonable period of time. Therefore it is important that Centres teach all of the Key Issues, giving them equal weight, and do not try to 'spot' Questions. Most Centres appear to do so but some groups of Candidates plumped heavily for one of the alternatives. It is possible that they had not given equal attention to other Key Issues because the Questions that they attempted were not obviously easier to the general cohort of entrants. It might be particularly useful if new centres cross-referenced the Questions with the description in the *Specification* of their selected Key Issue(s) and related Content.

The range of Questions attempted by candidates continued to be wide. Few Study Topics produced insufficient responses on which to base general comments. These Study Topics tended to be in social and economic history. It was encouraging that almost all the alternative Questions in the individual Study Topics produced a reasonable balance in the number attempted. Some 8% were retaking from June 2005 and 8% from January 2006.

The general standard of the candidates' work continued to be high in both Units and there was a clear improvement in Unit 2583. Most candidates wrote answers that were relevant, displayed appropriate knowledge and sufficient understanding of their Study Topics. The critical comments in this report should be interpreted in this context. A few scripts were superlative in quality. Examiners are constantly impressed by the standards that some AS Level candidates can achieve. This is not because the Questions are easy. The best answers were fluent, focused on explanation, contained appropriate knowledge, and displayed judgement.

This report might help some candidates to understand why they did not score high marks and, correspondingly, how they might improve their results if they re-sit the examination. It will also help centres to review their teaching. Most could suggest a series of reasons or factors that were relevant to the Questions that they answered. The most successful made links or contrasts between the factors. They explained which was the most successful and why it was most important. Answers in the middle mark Bands often included relevant and varied material, but lacked judgement about which was the most important, e.g.: (*'One reason why Wolsey retained power for so long was ... Another reason was ... Another reason was ... Therefore there were several reasons why Wolsey was in power for so long.'*)

It might be daunting for candidates to attempt to express their own judgement at AS Level but they should be encouraged to do so. Historians disagree about all of the Study Topics in these Units and examiners are not looking for the 'right' answer. The candidate who believes that Gladstone was a role model for politicians whereas Disraeli was a mere showman can get as high a mark as the candidate who views Disraeli as a hero and Gladstone as the embodiment of



Victorian hypocrisy. However, judgement should be supported by knowledge. Judgements without knowledge or evidence are mere assertions and cannot be rewarded highly.

Comments on several questions point to a need by some candidates to be more accurate about the chronology of developments. There was a tendency in some moderate and weak answers to be aware of the nature of issues and reasons for developments but to be less successful in linking them to specific events. This led to a lack of organisation. Centres might consider it worthwhile to prepare time charts that candidates can study, especially noting the links between the four Key Issues in a Study Topic. Previous reports have emphasised the importance of analysis and explanation; perhaps this has distorted the message that knowledge, including accurate chronology, is also important.

Candidates are allowed 45 minutes to write one answer and most managed their time effectively. Very few answers were apparently incomplete because of a shortage of time. However, although they were a minority, a number of candidates lacked the ability to write a developed answer. This might have been because of their lack of knowledge and understanding but it might have been the result of a lack of practice in writing an extended essay that is more complex than they were required to write for GCSE examinations. Marks are not awarded merely because of the length of answers but it is difficult to produce an essay of high quality in one page or little more. A similar skill is required in the Units 2585 and 2586, the Period Studies in European and World History. When studying these Units, candidates should be encouraged not only to make notes and discuss issues but also be given regular practice in developing the art of writing longer essays.

#### **INSET 2006-2007**

OCR's programme for GCE History next academic year was published in June 2006. As always, the History booklet was sent to every centre and placed on OCR's website. In response to suggestions from teachers, the main series of meetings for 2006-2007 will help colleagues to think about and develop more effective approaches to teaching exam units 2580-2591.

#### Feedback from the 2005-2006 series:

*"The opportunity to discuss with colleagues was very welcome."* [Head of History]

*"The quality of feedback on exam technique was excellent."* [Assistant Headteacher]

*"A very useful guide, plus good oversight into the course."* [Teach First Trainee]

*"The day clarified particular concerns I had."* [Curriculum Manager]

*"The course fitted the needs of the group – to the point."* [NQT]

*"Excellent advice that can easily be turned to practical method."* [11th Form College Lecturer]

### Comments on Individual Questions Unit 2583/01

No letters of complaint were received about any of the questions on this paper.

#### England 1042-1100

##### Q1 The Reign of Edward the Confessor 1042-1066

- (a) The question was based on the second Key Issue, 'What part did the Godwin family play in the reign?' The standard of most of the answers was sound and examiners read some very impressive answers to this Question, and to other questions on Anglo-Norman England. A good number of candidates delineated a number of the problems that the Godwin family presented to Edward the Confessor and assessed their relative importance. Examiners read some very sound essays that were analytical and varied. The moderate answers tended to focus on the problems of the succession and the events at the end of Edward's foreign. This was very relevant but the approach was incomplete.
- (b) The question was based on the third Key Issue, 'How important was Norman influence upon Edward?' Some candidates made relevant reference to Edward the Confessor's upbringing and most could explain the ways in which the Normans were influential during his reign in secular and ecclesiastical affairs. Sound answers brought the argument together by considering the succession issue. Some limited answers only described William of Normandy's claim to the throne.

#### Teacher Study Day: Norman England

A day course for teachers to develop their subject knowledge is being run on the Normans at the British Museum on 18 January 2007. The day will combine a session with a senior examiner on answering Unit 2583 England 1042-1100 with sessions led by experts from the Museum and a talk by Professor David Bates of the Institute of Historical Research. For details, please see the 2006-2007 History INSET booklet p.7.

#### Feedback from 2005-2006 days:

*"Excellent and stimulating – introduced new perspectives and recharged batteries."* [Head of History]

*"Very useful for teaching preparation."* [Advanced Skills Teacher]

*"Good blend of providing exam-based information and issues for direct student benefit with subject information and issues the teacher's benefit."* [Deputy Headteacher]

*"Just to say how very valuable and enjoyable the day was – if only all INSET could be so stimulating with such a mixture of exam technique, academic erudition and on-site visit."* [Head of History]

##### Q2 The Norman Conquest of England 1064-1072

- (a) The question was based on the second Key Issue, 'Why did William of Normandy win the Battle of Hastings?' There were many focused and clear answers that examined William of Normandy's responsibility for the outcome of the Battle of Hastings. Examiners were pleased that few answers were vague. Credit was given when William's importance was compared to other factors such as Harold's leadership of the Anglo-Saxons. The instruction 'How far ...?' meant that candidates had to consider the importance of William's leadership and compare it with other reasons for the Normans' success at Hastings. The balance of the argument depended on the argument that was

presented. It was relevant to explain the background to the invasion, for example William's careful preparations and Harold's problems in establishing himself as king, but the emphasis in the most successful answers was on the battle itself. A few argued that the outcome of the battle was a foregone conclusion, which would justify relegating the events of the battle itself to a minor part of the answer, but it was difficult to sustain this argument sufficiently to merit a high mark. Weaker answers sometimes related the events of the battle but did not provide explicit reasons for the Normans' victory.

- (b) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'Why was there opposition to William in England?' The question produced many effective responses which contained wide-ranging arguments. The standard of most of the answers was sound and some candidates deserved high credit for their analyses of the reasons for rebellions against William to 1071. The best answers considered similarities and differences. A few candidates did not observe the end point in the question and examined resistance to the end of William I's reign. Successful candidates dealt with individuals such as Edgar Aetheling and Hereward and there were highly creditable discussions of the distribution of rebellions in different provinces.

**Q3 Norman England 1066-1100**

- (a) The question was based on the second Key Issue, 'How far did the Norman Conquest affect land tenure..?' Whilst most answers were highly creditable, some candidates wrote more generally about social and economic changes after the Conquest. Their answers would have been improved if they had focused more on land tenure. Examiners read effective appraisals that appreciated some degree of change and continuity in land tenure from 1066 to 1100.

- (b) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'How far did William I change the government of England?' Examiners were pleased with the quality of most of the answers and some candidates deserved very high marks for their essays. These examined aspects of change and continuity in William I's government. Many candidates dealt with relevant issues in administration, taxation and law. The most successful answers came to a clear conclusion about which of change and continuity was predominant. Most candidates handled the question confidently and supported their arguments with accurate references to their knowledge. Few were irrelevant but some moderate candidates described William's government without exploring how far it represented change. Their essays deserved credit for knowledge but they did not achieve a high mark band because the explanation was limited.

**Q4 Society, Economy and Culture 1042-1100**

- (a) The question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'What changes did the Norman Conquest bring about in art and architecture?' Not many candidates attempted this question but the quality of most of their answers was high. A number of them were able to use local or particular examples when explaining Norman architecture. The most effective answers went beyond lists of characteristics and concentrated on explanations that used the examples effectively. Very few answers dealt with other artistic forms but this allowable because the question directed candidates to refer to one or more aspects of the arts.

- (b) The question was based on the second Key Issue, 'What effects did the Norman Conquest have on English towns and trade?' There were fewer very good answers to this question than to (a) but examiners read a number of answers that were satisfactory. The most frequent limitation was that candidates tended to provide only general descriptions of the post-Conquest economy. They did not assess sufficiently how far England became more prosperous, especially in its towns. There were some effective references to the effects on the northern economy of William I's harsh methods in suppressing rebellion.

## England 1042-1509

### Q5 The Threat to Order and Authority 1450-1470

- (a) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'Why had the Yorkists won the crown by 1461?' The number of candidates who study the later fifteenth century continues to be encouraging and examiners were pleased with the overall quality of the answers. The Question asked 'Why?' and examiners were looking for an analytical approach. Many candidates could offer a series of reasons for the Yorkists' success by 1461, present them in an orderly way, and justify what was thought to be the most important reason. Candidates were given credit when they considered the relative weakness of the Lancastrians as well as the advantages of the Yorkists. Some candidates who confined themselves to accounts of the conflict would have benefited if they had used their knowledge as the framework of a stronger explanation or argument. Some weak answers were uncertain about the chronology; candidates who wrote these answers might have benefited from preparing a time chart of developments.
- (b) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'How far had Edward IV restored royal authority by 1470?' The point made about chronology in the comments on question 5(a) can be repeated here. Some answers lacked a focus on the specified period. The question asked candidates to examine Edward IV's kingship to 1470. However, a number of answers dealt with his reign as a whole. Fortunately, these were a minority. The most frequent discriminating factor was the attention given to Edward IV's personal responsibility for his problems to 1471. Some answers deserved a very high reward for the quality of their explanations and ability to support their points consistently with historical knowledge. There were sound explanations of Edward's marriage to Elizabeth Woodville. The most successful essays considered and assessed other factors. Some claimed that the Lancastrians, led by Margaret of Anjou, were implacable whatever Edward might have done whilst the King was not responsible for Warwick's ambition, although he might have handled the Kingmaker unwisely.

### Q6 The End of the Yorkists 1471-1485

- (a) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'How effective was Edward IV's government from 1471?' The focus of good answers needed to be on the end of Edward IV's reign. It was relevant to deal with earlier aspects of his rule as long as they were linked to the situation at the end. Some candidates deserved high credit when they considered evidence of strength, such as his apparent mastery of the nobility, stronger financial position, and personal ascendancy; they supplemented this by assessing the difficulties that were apparent, especially the problematic succession. Some answers would have been improved if they had been less narrow; there was a tendency in less successful essays to concentrate exclusively on the succession issue.
- (b) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'Why was there opposition to Richard III?' This Question asked candidates to assess the support for Richard III after he became king. Candidates could write highly critical answers by arguing that his support was minimal, but the Question invited them to consider alternatives, even if they believed opposition was stronger. As in previous years, knowledge of Richard III's reign was good. However, also as in previous years, some candidates were too anxious to include unnecessarily extensive details of the Princes in the Tower. This might have left them short of time to discuss other relevant issues.

### Q7 The Reign of Henry VII 1485-1509

- (a) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'How dangerous to Henry's monarchy were the threats to his government, especially from the Pretenders?' The general standard of the answers was sound. The highest marks were awarded to candidates who went beyond accounts of Henry's opponents to examine how dangerous they were. There were some very effective answers that considered a wide

range of relevant aspects. Almost all of the answers deserved credit for relevance but some were too limited for a high mark. Candidates could usually explain Warbeck and Simnel accurately but sometimes seemed unaware of other Yorkists such as Lovell and the Staffords. Credit was given when candidates were able to explain the King's policies to weaken and defeat the Yorkists, such as a weakening of the nobility, the centralisation of authority and the reform of local administration. Weak answers sometimes confused the Pretenders and were uncertain of the ways in which Henry VII dealt with them.

- (b) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'How far did Henry VII achieve his aims in foreign relations?' It was allowable to argue that Henry VII was very successful in his foreign policy. Most candidates could explain aspects of his relations with other countries. A frequent discriminating factor between moderate and good answers was that the latter tried seriously to explain his aims, for example safeguarding his throne and strengthening finance and the economy. It was important to do so because the Question linked his aims and the King's success. Answers that contained sound and relevant knowledge and ended with a bald comment that he was successful in achieving his aims was unlikely to merit a high mark. On the other hand, examiners read many answers that were well organised, linked aims with assessment and illustrated the points with accurate knowledge.

**Q8 Social and Economic Issues 1450-1509**

- (a) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'What was the condition of religion?' There were fewer answers to this question than to others in the Study Topics from 1470 to 1509. The quality of the answers was variable; they tended to be either very good or very poor. The most effective answers showed a good understanding of the condition of the Church and linked it to English society. There were some worthwhile examples to illustrate the argument. There were also vague responses that showed little knowledge of either Church or society.
- (b) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'How did the English economy develop?' There were too few answers on which to base general comments.

**England 1509-1558**

**Q9 Henry VIII and Wolsey 1509-1529**

- (a) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'Why did Wolsey stay in power for so long?' The Question asked 'Why?' and the best answers were analytical. The candidates selected a series of reasons to explain why Wolsey held on to power for a long period; they put them in an order of importance and supported the reasons with sound knowledge. The general quality of the answers was very satisfactory and examiners read many excellent responses. Some answers would have been improved if they had considered a wider selection of reasons. Wolsey's relationship with Henry VIII was obviously very important but the better essays explained convincingly why the minister retained the King's confidence. It was relevant to explain how Wolsey took care to safeguard his power, even when it meant alienating some powerful groups. The question did not ask why Wolsey fell. It was not inherently irrelevant to discuss his fall, explaining why he lost his grip on power, but this point needed to be made briefly, perhaps in a conclusion. An excellent answer, focusing narrowly on the key issue, could have been written without reference to Wolsey's downfall. Some candidates spent too long on it.
- (b) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'Who controlled foreign affairs 1515-29: Henry VIII or Wolsey?' Most candidates displayed a sound factual knowledge of English foreign policy from 1515 to 1529. Some candidates told the story of diplomacy during these years but were less able to assess who of Henry VIII and Wolsey directed policy. The most promising approach to the Question was comparative. The best

essays examined the role of both men in directing foreign policy but they supplemented this with assessments of relative importance. Some answers were limited because they opted to discuss only one. High credit was given to the answers that showed an understanding of developments in foreign policy throughout the specified period whereas some essays tended to be partial in their treatment. However, there were many effective appraisals which demonstrated candidates' judgements. Some answers pointed out variations; the King was clearly in control at some points and in some issues whereas Wolsey seemed to be the directing force in others. Some contrasted Henry VIII's wish to direct the broad lines of policy whilst Wolsey was in charge of implementation, and sometime these forces were contradictory.

**Q10 Government, Politics and Foreign Affairs 1529-1558**

**(a)** The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'How significant was the work of Thomas Cromwell?' It might be claimed that the debate about a Cromwellian 'Tudor Revolution' is outdated now but it still raises important issues about government in the 1530s. Some candidates were able to describe the historiographical debate accurately. However, some answers only recorded the views of historians and the candidates did not attempt a judgement about which was most convincing. The most successful came to a considered conclusion. Knowledge of historiography is not a required assessment criterion at AS Level but accurate references are given credit. However, centres that approach this and other Study Topics through the historiography should discourage candidates from recording historians' views mechanically; they should try to evaluate them as they evaluate other historical knowledge. Candidates who tackled the question without reference to the views of historians could score the maximum mark. In fact, many such answers were better than the essays that referred mechanically to historians' views. The tendency in less effective answers that took the historiographical approach was that they did not supplement their argument by specific examples of developments. The most frequent discriminating factor was the extent to which answers considered change and continuity. There were some excellent answers that combined examples and explanation. The general standard of the answers was sound and some answers were extremely good. A tendency in weaker answers was to focus on religion and neglect government although the two were linked in Tudor England (for example royal supremacy). More time might have been given to Cromwell's work in the Privy Council and his strengthening of control over local government.

**(b)** The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'What was the impact of foreign relations on domestic affairs?' The majority of candidates who attempted the Question reached a satisfactory standard. Some showed a good understanding of the domestic implications of England's relations with France from 1543 to 1558. For example, they considered the consequent burden of expense on rulers who were already in financial difficulty. They examined Mary I's unpopularity that resulted from war with France and especially the loss of Calais.

**Q11 Church and State 1529-1558**

**(a)** The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'How far was the English Church in need of reform in 1529?' Centres whose candidates attempted this question are referred to the comments on historiography in Question 10(a) because this is another Study Topic that is often taught through its historiography. Most candidates were able to consider both the strengths and weaknesses of the Church in 1529 and come to a judgement. Some candidates asked pertinently how typical were the criticisms of men such as Simon Fish and how radical were the views of the humanists. A few candidates wandered too far from 1529 to spend time on the 1530s and the period of Henry VIII's Reformation. The period after 1529 was not irrelevant. Historians, including AS Level candidates, can draw conflicting conclusions about the condition of the Church in 1529. However, later references needed to be kept in check. Links to the Question were sometimes not made. Examiners were pleased with the quality of the majority of the

answers and there were many excellent essays where the candidates were fully in control of the argument.

- (b) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'How far was England a Protestant country in 1553?' The focus of the question was on the religious situation in England at the end of Edward VI's reign but it was allowable to consider earlier developments to put 1553 in context. A few candidates looked ahead to draw lessons from the reign of Mary I; this was also permissible. However, some candidates were tempted to write surveys that were too long. It was not necessary to relate many of the religious changes of Henry VIII's reign or to rehearse the details of the fierce anti-protestant policies of Mary I. Examiners were pleased with most of the answers. They focused on assessment and tried to examine both the extent and limits of support for Protestantism at the end of Edward VI's reign.

**Q12 Social and Economic Issues 1509-1558**

- (a) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'How were towns affected by economic and social developments?' There were fewer answers to questions (a) and (b) in this Study Topic than to other Topics in the period from 1509 to 1558 but most candidates who attempted the question wrote successful answers. There were few examples of irrelevance. Some candidates strengthened their answers by including examples. Some answers gained credit by noting regional differences between towns.
- (b) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'How serious a problem were enclosures from 1509 to 1558?' Some answers deserved high credit because they explained clearly the problems caused by enclosures and evaluated governments' efforts to control them. For example, references were made to the intermittent efforts of Wolsey, Thomas Cromwell and Somerset to restrict the worst effects of enclosures. A sound number of candidates were able to point out regional differences in the impact of enclosures. Moderate answers were usually better in their descriptions of enclosures than in their explanations of governments' policies. The general quality of the answers was sound.

**England 1547-1603**

**Q13 Church and State 1547-1603**

- (a) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'How much popular support was there for the various religious changes between 1547 and 1559?' The question asked candidates to assess the reasons why both Edward VI and Mary I found it difficult to win popular support for religious changes. Some candidates tackled it as a two-part question and did not look for similar factors; nor did they distinguish sufficiently between the two reigns. In contrast, a good number of answers included a comparative element. For example, they noted that support for the one regime often became opposition to the other. Another point that some candidates made was the speed by which policies were introduced. Neither the reforms of Edward VI's reign nor the reaction of Mary I had time to win universal acceptance. Such points, when made briefly, were creditable because it showed that these candidates were trying to look at the period as a whole. Overall the standard of the answers was good and a high proportion of the essays deserved a very high mark. Few were highly irrelevant but some were too unbalanced between the two reigns to deserve a high mark.
- (b) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'How successfully did Elizabeth I tackle the Puritan challenge to her religious settlement?' Candidates were able to suggest several reasons for Puritan influence during the reign of Elizabeth I; they did not have to agree that the most important was support in Parliament. However, answers could only merit a high mark if they showed an adequate knowledge and understanding of the stated factor. There were some excellent discussions. Some candidates argued that Puritan influence in Parliament can be exaggerated and they preferred other

explanations. Some moderate answers limited themselves to accounts of Puritans in Parliament. They were very relevant but lacked the range that was characteristic of the best essays. A tendency in weak answers was confusion about basic terminology. For example, they wrote about Puritans and Protestants as if they were distinct. Historians agree that definitions of Puritans and Puritanism are difficult but this sort of confusion should not appear in AS scripts. Other answers gave the impression that the Puritans were a homogenous and unchanging group. On the other hand, a high number of candidates were as clear as could be expected about what is meant by the term Puritan, they were able to explain its different facets and groups, and were able to continue their arguments to the end of Elizabeth I's reign.

### **Teacher Study Day: Elizabeth I**

A day course for teachers to develop their subject knowledge is being run on Elizabeth I at the National Portrait Gallery, London on 27 February 2007. The day will combine a session with a senior examiner on answering Unit 2588 Elizabeth I with a session led by experts from the Gallery on the image of the Queen and a talk by Dr David Crankshaw of King's College London. For details, please see the 2006-2007 History INSET booklet p.9.

#### Feedback from 2005-2006 days:

*"Excellent and stimulating – introduced new perspectives and recharged batteries."* [Head of History]

*"Very useful for teaching preparation."* [Advanced Skills Teacher]

*"Good blend of providing exam-based information and issues for direct student benefit with subject information and issues the teacher's benefit."* [Deputy Headteacher]

*"Just to say how very valuable and enjoyable the day was – if only all INSET could be so stimulating with such a mixture of exam technique, academic erudition and on-site visit."* [Head of History]

### **Q14 Foreign Affairs 1547-1587**

**(a)** The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'What were the aims and constraints which lay behind Elizabeth I's policies?' Examiners were pleased by the numbers who considered a range of relevant factors. The most successful candidates avoided the temptation to take their arguments far beyond 1558. Their answers were explanatory and supported with good levels of historical knowledge. Some answers concentrated on relations with Spain; these were very relevant but the question opened up other issues that candidates could discuss, such as relations with France or Elizabeth I's problems as an inexperienced female ruler in dealing with difficult diplomatic problems.

**(b)** The Question was based on the fourth Key issue, 'What part did relations with France play in Elizabeth I's foreign policy between 1562 and 1584?' The emphasis was on the degree of change in Elizabeth I's policy towards France. The question asked 'How far ...?' and examiners were encouraged to read a number of answers that considered the extent of change and, by implication, the degree of continuity. There were convincing explanations of a succession of critical developments such as the outbreak of the French Wars of Religion, the Massacre of St. Bartholomew and marriage negotiations. Few essays were highly irrelevant but some were very partial and covered few of the aspects noted in the Content of the Key Issue. Overall, the answers were highly creditable.



**Q15 Government and Politics in Elizabethan England 1558-1603**

- (a) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'How far did the nature and role of Parliament change?' This was another question that asked 'How far?' Candidates varied in their arguments. Some candidates were able to discuss periods and causes of disagreement between Elizabeth I and Parliament but were less successful in examining areas of agreement. On the other hand, there were some excellent appraisals of the relationship, many of which preferred to argue for co-operation rather than conflict. These answers supported their claims with appropriate examples. They considered alternative explanations and came to a considered conclusion.
- (b) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'How far, and why, did the popularity and effectiveness of Elizabeth I's government decline after 1588?' Candidates were asked to consider the claim that the Irish Rebellion was Elizabeth I's most serious problem from 1588 to 1603. They did not have to agree but a high mark needed an adequate study of Ireland. The Content in the *Specification* indicated other issues that candidates could examine, 'The pressures of the war against Spain, financial problems Essex's Rebellion, the Parliament of 1601 and the monopolies debate'. The quality of most of the answers was high. Many candidates were able to discuss a creditable variety of problems. The most successful made links between them. For example, events in Ireland were a direct cause of Essex's Rebellion and resulted in major financial problems for Elizabeth.

**Q16 Social and Economic Issues 1547-1603**

- (a) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'How did industry change and develop?' There were fewer answers to question (a) than to (b). The number of very successful answers was limited. Centres are reminded to study equally all four Key Issues in their selected Study Topic(s).
- (b) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'How far was the second half of the sixteenth century a period of trade expansion?' Examiners read some sound answers that showed a high level of understanding of Elizabethan trade. A number of candidates were able to discuss some of the new overseas ventures that developed during the reign. A few answers were limited in value because they dealt generally with the Elizabethan economy rather than focussing on trade.

**England 1603-1660**

**Q17 Politics and Religion 1603-1629**

- (a) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'What part did foreign affairs play in the relations between the Stuart kings and Parliament?' Most of the answers were highly satisfactory and some reached a very high standard. The large majority of candidates displayed at least an adequate understanding of James I's reign as a whole and there were excellent appraisals of foreign policy. The most successful candidates considered the arguments in favour of, and those against, James I's handling of foreign policy and showed which were more convincing. The number of answers that showed little knowledge and understanding of the main issues was small.
- (b) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'What was the importance of financial issues in relations between the Stuart kings and Parliament?' The most frequent discriminating factor between moderate and good answers was the extent to which candidates could explain the financial issues between the early Stuarts and their Parliaments to 1629. Some candidates remembered the most important developments but could not explain the reasons why money caused problems; they saw it as self-evident. However, a high proportion of answers contained intelligent arguments that showed understanding. The most successful candidates also dealt with the brief period

of the years to 1629 in Charles I's reign that were relevant. Moderate answers sometimes neglected this period.

**Q18 Personal Rule and Civil War 1629-1649**

(a) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'How important was Charles I's personal rule (1629-40) in bringing about the Civil War?' Examiners were mostly pleased with the quality of the responses; they read many answers that examined a range of the problems that faced Charles I from 1629 to 1640. A high number of candidates wrote clear analyses and assessments of the King's problems; the most successful indicated which were the most serious. Some candidates could have linked the problems to his aims because they were an important part of the question ('Assess Charles I's most serious problems in achieving his aims ...'). What was the King trying to do? Other moderate candidates wrote answers that were too limited for a high mark, for example dealing almost exclusively with religion. Their answers were relevant but did not provide the breadth of treatment that is a characteristic of the best essays. Other essays tended to be satisfactory inasmuch as they demonstrated adequate knowledge but were less effective in presenting an argument that linked the King's aims and his problems. Some answers would have been improved if they had indicated which were Charles's most serious problems; they presented a list without any discrimination.

(b) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'Why did Parliament win the First Civil War?' It was encouraging to read answers that used more examples than Cromwell and Rupert to contrast the quality of generals in the First Civil War. The question asked candidates whether generalship was the most important reason for parliamentary success and the most successful candidates compared this factor with others, such as money and political leadership. Candidates were not required to agree that Parliament's generals were the most important factor in deciding success and failure in the First Civil War but marks in a high band needed at least a solid paragraph on the stated issue. Candidates who preferred another explanation could spend longer on that factor. Some answers would have been improved if they had included some examples of battles or tactics to illustrate general claims about rival generals. The overall quality of the answers was commendable and some were excellent. Some made the valid point that Parliament's early generals were not particularly successful and that diverse factors were important in different stages of the war.

**Q19 The Interregnum 1649-1660**

(a) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'Why did Oliver Cromwell become Lord Protector?' The question had a clear end date (1653) but candidates were allowed some latitude about the start as long as the main focus of their answers was on the inception of the Protectorate. Some excellent answers focused very narrowly on the end of the Rump, the failure of the Parliament of the Saints (Barebones) and the introduction of the Protectorate. Candidates gained credit by analysing the terms of the instrument of Government to explain the attractions of the new constitution to Cromwell. Others were vague about this; they could explain why Cromwell was disillusioned with the Rump and Barebones but simply asserted his support for the Protectorate. The tendency of some of the limited answers was to spend too long on the preceding period. For example, some essays devoted too much attention to the period from the end of the First Civil War to 1649 and their writers were perhaps short of time when they dealt with more salient issues. These issues were not irrelevant but they were peripheral and could have been summarised quickly. This might point to a problem of planning effective answers. Good answers are able to deal briefly with less essential issues to focus more extensively on major items. Examiners were pleased with the quality of most of the responses. There were few highly irrelevant answers.

(b) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'How successful was the Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell?' The Question suggested that Cromwell's religious policies were the

most successful aspect of his domestic rule as Lord Protector. Candidates could agree or disagree with the claim but a high mark needed an adequate understanding of religion in this period. Most candidates who attempted the Question wrote relevantly and clearly. There were some extremely worthwhile assessments of religion. The Question was limited to domestic issues ('religious policies were the most successful aspect of his domestic rule'). Some claimed that Cromwell's achievements in foreign policy were more impressive. This point could be made appropriately in a conclusion but, in view of the clear demands of the Question, some answers devoted too much time to it.

**Q20 Society and the Economy 1603-1660**

- (a)** The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'Why did London play an increasingly important part in national affairs?' There were more answers to question (b) than to (a). A few candidates wrote vaguely about London and not many candidates who attempted the question produced work of a sound standard. However, some good answers linked the city to the national economy successfully.
- (b)** The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'Why was there a growth in radical religious groups after 1640?' The quality of many answers was sound and examiners read some very successful answers. Few were irrelevant. Most contained some measure of explanation and analysis. The most successful focused on analysis rather than description and deserved a high reward because the question asked 'Why?' They included some pertinent references to particular religious groups. Some candidates considered not only the 'positive' reasons for the rise of radical groups, for example the conviction that that the civil war and its victory represented God's approval, but also the complementary 'negative' reasons, such as the end of censorship and the disappearance of bodies such as the Court of High Commission that had kept religious radicalism in check.

### Comments on Individual Questions Unit 2584/01

One letter of complaint was received about Q1(a) & (b), one about Q3(a) & (b), and one about Q4(a).

#### INSET 2006-2007

OCR's programme for GCE History next academic year was published in June 2006. As always, the History booklet was sent to every centre and placed on OCR's website. In response to suggestions from teachers, the main series of meetings for 2006-2007 will help colleagues to think about and develop more effective approaches to teaching exam units 2580-2591.

#### Feedback from the 2005-2006 series:

*"The opportunity to discuss with colleagues was very welcome."* [Head of History]

*"The quality of feedback on exam technique was excellent."* [Assistant Headteacher]

*"A very useful guide, plus good oversight into the course."* [Teach First Trainee]

*"The day clarified particular concerns I had."* [Curriculum Manager]

*"The course fitted the needs of the group – to the point."* [NQT]

*"Excellent advice that can easily be turned to practical method."* [VIth Form College Lecturer]

#### England 1780-1846

##### Q1 The Age of Pitt and Liverpool 1783-1830

(a) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'How and why was Lord Liverpool able to survive the radical challenges of 1812-22?' Most attempted it successfully and examiners read accomplished essays considering methods, law and policies towards radicals. Some, however, showed little knowledge and understanding of Liverpool. Indeed, some wrote essays heavily focused on pre-1800 with very little in them about the years after 1812. Most concluded that there was little that was new, but some effective counter-arguments were also seen that considered the relative seriousness of the different situations.

(b) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'How Liberal were the Tory governments of 1822-30?' The overall quality was sound. Examiners read many answers that were relevant, well organised and based on explanation. The standard of knowledge was usually good. There were some interesting arguments that denied that these governments were liberal, claiming that most concessions were made reluctantly and were not supported by important Tory leaders. Among issues that were discussed by a large number of successful candidates were: revisions of the corn laws, home office reforms, the repeal of the Combination and Test and Corporation Acts, and Roman Catholic Emancipation. As in the past, the bracketed reference to 'Ireland' was included to remind candidates that Ireland then belonged within the domestic agenda – script evidence shows that some never seem to be sure.

##### Q2 War and Peace 1793-1841

(a) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'How and why did Britain win such a long war with France, 1793-1815?' The majority of candidates wrote relevantly about British strategy during the French wars of 1793 to 1815. It was possible to disagree with the claim in the question that coalition diplomacy was the most important factor in this strategy. Some preferred to emphasise the importance of naval or military strategies. A number of candidates made the excellent point that different strategies were important

at different times and that coalition diplomacy was more successful in the later period of the wars. However, candidates who preferred another explanation needed to show at least a basic understanding and knowledge of coalition diplomacy if they were to achieve a high mark. Examiners were encouraged by the proportion of relevant and clearly argued essays. The less successful answers usually told the story of the wars but did not explain British strategies.

- (b) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'How effectively did Canning and Palmerston secure British interests 1822-41?' This Question on Canning and Palmerston was best answered with a comparative approach because it asked who was the more successful Foreign Secretary. A reasonable balance was another criterion for a high mark. Whilst candidates could spend more time discussing whomever they thought more successful, it was necessary to demonstrate a reasonable understanding of both ministers. The general standard was sound; only a few were too unbalanced, when candidates argued that one minister was more successful and assumed that they did not need to discuss the other.

**Q3 The Age of Peel 1829-1846**

- (a) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'How effective was Peel as a party political leader?' Examiners reported that most candidates demonstrated a good level of knowledge and understanding of Peel in this Question and in (b). The most frequent discriminating factor between satisfactory and very good responses was usually the extent to which they considered how far he transformed his party after the Reform Act. Some excellent answers considered his success and his failure. Some who otherwise wrote sound explanations of his success did not consider the significance of the split in 1846. A few essays deserved moderate marks because they were content just to describe Peel's policies and offer no assessment of them and make no link to the challenges of the 1832 Reform Act. There were worthwhile discussions of the significance of the Tamworth Manifesto, party organisation (although Peel was not primarily responsible for this), and the awareness that the Tories needed to widen their appeal. On the other hand, an analysis of the 1841 election shows it was won in spite of comparatively little success in attracting new voters.

- (b) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'Why is Peel's ministry of 1841-6 considered to be so successful?' An example of an acceptable alternative approach was the answer which denied Peel's second ministry of 1841-46 was a success because of the disastrous 1846 split. In explaining his wish to deal with industrial change, references were made to budgets, bank reforms and factory legislation. Some who otherwise wrote relevantly and convincingly did not address the significance of the repeal of the Corn Laws. Some made effective links between Peel's background and his attitude to social and economic reforms.

**Q4 The Economy and Industrialisation 1780-1846**

- (a) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'Why was Britain the first industrial nation?' Some wrote vague essays, seeming to lack much knowledge of this quarter of the *specification*. Others wrote very effective answers considering the relative flexibility of social structures that allowed people to acquire wealth, even if they were few in number compared with the population as a whole; nonconformist activities were especially well-known. Successful linkage to population trends and to the growth of towns and cities was also a common feature in answers. With this basis, candidates then assessed other factors that enabled Britain to become an industrial nation, for example the economic effects of investment, geographical factors, the importance of individual inventors and inventions.

- (b) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'Why were there so many problems in the countryside?' Most could describe the main processes of rural change, but fewer dealt well with the problems that they caused. Some essays were very general. However, it was encouraging to read answers that showed a sense of period; they were aware of change from the later eighteenth century to the middle of the nineteenth century. They illustrated their arguments about the pressures of rural change by referring to some of the main examples of unrest such as the Swing Riots.

## **Britain 1846-1906**

### **Q5 Whigs and Liberals 1846-1874**

- (a) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'Why was Palmerston the dominant political leader from 1855 to 1865?' Some candidates preferred to argue that Palmerston's foreign policies were more important than his domestic policies in making him such a dominant politician in the middle of the nineteenth century. This was valid but a high mark needed some awareness of his domestic policies. For example, they pointed to his support for Gladstone's financial measures, his leadership of the Whigs and other groups as they were transformed into the Liberals, and the weakness of the Conservatives. Examiners were pleased with the quality of most of the answers. Some essays deserved very high marks for their clarity, relevance and judgement, supported by sound knowledge.

- (b) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'How were the Whigs transformed into Liberals over the period 1846-68?' Whilst most answers were very satisfactory, some were too narrow for a very high mark. These tended to take the line that, because Gladstone himself was the most important reason for the creation of a successful Liberal party from 1846 to 1868, it was unnecessary to discuss and assess other factors. However, there were numerous answers that deserved a very high mark because they considered a range of reasons for the Liberals' success. They usually agreed about the prime importance of Gladstone but they were able to supplement this by considerations of other issues; some persuasively contrasted Gladstone's influence with that of other Liberal leaders.

### **Q6 The Conservatives 1846-1880**

- (a) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'What was Disraelian Conservatism?' Examiners reported that some candidates wrote answers that were too narrow: often very sound on the period from 1874 but thin on the previous period. These were often able to achieve a sound mark but it was difficult for them to reach the highest band of marks. Some candidates could have explained more clearly what they understood by 'one-nation Conservatism'. Nevertheless, a high proportion of candidates explained the term clearly and linked it to Disraeli's policies. They were able to discuss sufficiently the period before he became Prime Minister in 1874. An impressive number of candidates deserved to score very high marks. Whilst most candidates obviously admired Disraeli, others were more critical. Some even believed him to have been a charlatan. They dismissed any claim that his policies were based on ideas of 'one nation'; he was seen as basically self-serving. Again this was an acceptable alternative approach as long as the (real or imagined) ideals of 'one-nation Conservatism' were explained.

- (b) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'How popular was Disraeli's second ministry 1874-80?' There were many well-informed essays about Disraeli's foreign and imperial policies from 1874 to 1880. Knowledge of aspects of policy was usually sound. The discriminating factor between satisfactory and good answers was usually the extent to which candidates could explain and assess his problems. For example, some candidates deserved credit when they dealt with the impact of Gladstone's criticism. It was relevant to point out that Russian power was potentially dangerous in many regions

of interest to Britain whilst Turkey was not Britain's most popular ally. Distance was a problem; it was not easy to control events that affected foreign policy. Disraeli was held responsible but it was not easy for him to control events in regions such as India and parts of Africa.

**Q7 Foreign and Imperial Policies 1846-1902**

**(a)** The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'What principles governed (foreign and imperial) policy in this period?' Most answers were relevant and there were some very convincing scripts. A high number of candidates showed a good awareness of developments in foreign policy over an extended period. They explained what might be meant by 'the balance of power'. Other answers would have been improved if they had explained the issue more clearly. A balance between which countries? A balance for what purpose? The more effective candidates supplemented discussion of this factor with other issues in foreign policy, such as economic interest and imperial expansion. Some very thoughtful candidates pointed out that the underlying priorities of foreign policy changed over the course of the period. For example imperial concerns were probably more important at the end of the nineteenth century than in the middle. There were some very worthwhile answers where the arguments linked the different factors. Some highly creditable essays listed relevant factors but did not make such links nor did they attempt contrasts because sometimes the principles were contradictory. Most candidates were able to support their arguments with appropriate knowledge.

**(b)** The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'Why was the policy of imperialism so popular in Britain between 1880 and 1902?' The overall quality was high. Some excellent answers appreciated changes and contradictions in popular attitudes to imperialism in the later nineteenth century. Candidates were given credit when they supported their arguments with specific examples. A characteristic of some was a tendency to be vague. Another pattern in less successful answers was they represented the 'prepared' answer that was written in the examination without close reference to the Question that was asked. This was usually an essay about causes of imperial expansion, which was not automatically irrelevant but it sometimes produced answers on peripheral issues.

**Q8 Trade Unions and Labour 1867-1906**

**(a)** The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'Why did the Conservative and Liberal parties lose support from the Trade Unionists?' The quality of the answers was variable. There tended to be two sort of weakness. The first was a vagueness about the development of trade unions during the relevant period (1876 to 1906). The second was uncertainty about the attitudes of the major political parties. Candidates could often recall major industrial disputes, which deserved credit for knowledge, but they were unable to link these to the development of the trade unions. On the other hand, a satisfactory number of candidates wrote commendable answers that dealt successfully with the Key Issue.

**(b)** The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'How important was the role of Keir Hardie and Ramsay MacDonald in creating the Labour party?' There were a number of interesting and varied studies of the emergence of the Labour party by 1906. Many candidates could assess the importance of Keir Hardie but some were also aware of the importance of other leaders. A high proportion of answers displayed variety when they explained and assessed the reasons for the emergence of the party. The most successful candidates went beyond a list of factors and explained which they believed to have been most important and why.

## **Britain 1899-1964**

### **Q9 Liberals and Labour 1899-1918**

- (a) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'To what extent was a modern welfare state created by the Liberals between 1906 and 1914?' Most candidates were able to describe correctly the major reforms of the Liberals to 1914. This laid the basis of a successful answer. The most successful candidates went beyond this to assess the success of the reforms because this was a requirement of the Question ('How successful were the Liberal reforms ...?'). The standard of most answers was high and it was interesting to variation in the assessments. Some candidates gave high praise to the reforms whilst others were more persuaded by their limitations. The Study Topic ends in 1918 and examiners do not require knowledge of periods after this date. A few candidates compared the pre-1914 programme with the welfare state policies after the Second World War. This was valid although it was not required. Candidates could achieve the highest mark band by keep to the terms of the Question, which asked candidates for an assessment to 1914. The overall quality was very good.
- (b) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'How far was the First World War responsible for the growth of the Labour and the decline of the Liberal party?' The quality of most answers was sound and some were excellent, but some would have gained a higher mark had they shown more understanding links between the unions and the Labour and Liberal parties. Candidates were able to offer other suggestions to explain the growing challenge of the Labour party, for example the growing weakness of the Liberals, especially after the Asquith-Lloyd George split.

### **Q10 Inter-War Domestic Problems 1918-1939**

- (a) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'What were the causes and significance of the General Strike of 1926?' Examiners read some well-informed clear essays that deserved high marks but the overall quality of the answers was variable because some candidates only wrote about the causes of the Strike. The Question reflected the part of the Content about the Strike's 'impact on the economy and politics'. Candidates who focused on the terms of the Question and examined the effects of the General Strike deserved higher marks than those who wrote at length about causes and stopped their answers in 1926.
- (b) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'How effective were the Labour governments of 1924 and 1929-31?' Many wrote relevantly and produced strong arguments supported by appropriate knowledge. There were some effective comparisons of the problems of the two Labour governments. Some answers would have been improved if they had differentiated more between the governments; it was sometimes uncertain whether the references were to the first or the second government.

### **Q11 Foreign Policy 1939-1963**

- (a) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'How did World War II change the direction of British foreign policy?' The majority of candidates could explain the main change in British attitudes to the USSR from 1941. There were some excellent analyses that were based on good knowledge. Some candidates were very aware of tensions in British policy even before the onset of the Cold War at the end of hostilities with Germany. Some answers were incomplete because they did not consider the period from 1939 to 1941. The USSR was suspected by the British government in 1939 and soon became an ally of Germany. Hitler's invasion of the Soviet Union led to a change in Stalin's policy and to a consequent change in British policy. Weaker candidates assumed, some even stated, that Britain and the USSR were allies in 1939. The period



at the end of the war was discussed more confidently by most of the moderate candidates.

- (b) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'Why did Britain's attitude to European co-operation and integration change?' The standard of most answers was encouraging and some reached a very high level. It was very relevant to discuss developments outside Europe, such as decolonisation, but these points needed to be linked to changing attitudes to Europe to deserve a good mark. Some answers would have been improved if they had made this link more clearly. For example, they dealt with Britain's economic post-war problems and decolonisation but the impact on Britain's views of Europe was implicit. The most success answers were explicit in this respect. They traced accurately the stages of change and assessed its extent.

**Q12 Post-War Britain 1945-1964**

- (a) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'Why did the Labour party win the election of 1945 so overwhelmingly yet lose in 1951?' Most of the answers were satisfactory and some candidates showed a very good grasp of the Labour governments from 1945 to 1951. Attention was paid to the main elements of the Content indicated in the Study Topic, 'rationing, wage freezes, balance of payments, internal divisions'. Some widened the issues relevantly to include the defence expenditure. These were linked to the governments' reforms and aspirations in health, housing, education, and economic policy including nationalisation. Some would have benefitted if they had noted the internal pressures and conflicts that resulted within the Labour party, for example the argument about prescription charges.

- (b) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'Why did Labour win the election of 1964?' The standard of the answers was encouraging. Most candidates wrote relevantly about the 1964 election; they discussed the negative features that made the Conservatives less popular and the positive advantages of Labour, such as Wilson, the new and attractive leader. Some answers contained unselective surveys that contained much material from the 1950s that was not closely related to the outcome of the 1964 election. For example, although the Suez Crisis and Eden's failure were remembered, they did not play a large part in helping Labour to win in 1964. That said, some answers were very strong.

## Report on Units 2585/01 and 2586/01

### Unit 2585/01 (Period Studies - European History 1046-1718) Unit 2586/01 (Period Studies – European & World History 1789-1989)

#### General Comments

The questions worked effectively and allowed differentiation between candidates. Within both papers there remain a number of very popular topics, whilst others draw either a very small number or even no candidates. On 2585 the option on the Crusades and Ferdinand and Isabella draw by far the highest number of candidates, whilst on 2586 the Nazis still dominate, although Russia has a large number of takers. On 2585 most questions attracted some takers, with the exception of Social, Economic and Intellectual Development of the Twelfth Century (Q4), although the Reform of the Church (Q1), France and Empire (Q2), The Problems of Spain (Q18), The Thirty Years War (Q19) and Social Issues in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century (Q24) were particularly low. On 2586 very few candidates tackle Revolution and Repression, whilst there are no entries for the USA option on Politics and Reform 1877-1919.

Some 10% were retaking from June 2005 and 9% from January 2006. There were very few rubric infringements, although a very small number answered more than one question. There was very little evidence that time was a problem. However, it was noticeable that the plans of some candidates were excessively long and probably detracted from the essay.

Examiners commented on the decline in the quality of the written English and there were certainly occasions when this did make it difficult to follow a candidate's argument. It is important for centres to encourage their candidates to read widely as this will not only give them a wide range of examples and viewpoints, but it will expose them to good quality, written English. The most common problems continue to be the use of capital letters, the incorrect use of the apostrophe and 'would of' instead of 'would have'. Many candidates are also using abbreviations for monarchs or events and this is not acceptable in a formal piece of writing.

Once again many examiners have commented on the poor chronological knowledge of many candidates. The failure to get events in the right order or to confuse events did result in arguments being undermined. In particular, the annual problem of muddling hyperinflation with the Depression had a major impact on many answers on the Nazis. However, there were also issues with the French and Russian Revolutions and the Dutch Revolt. In the latter developments were ascribed to William of Orange long after he was dead! Previous reports have encouraged centres to ensure that they encourage their candidates to make timelines for their topic and learn them; this comment can only be reiterated.

General advice on how to tackle particular types of questions has been given in previous reports. Centres are encouraged to refer to these reports and make their candidates fully aware of question types and how they can score well. Many examiners have once again commented on the failure of a large number of candidates to understand what is required when they are asked to assess a range of factors. This is crucial as most **questions generally require relative assessment of relevant factors**. There were still many answers that assert either a particular factor is the most important or success/failure. Responses that do this will not access the higher levels. The other general comment worth making about approaches to question types concerns questions that require candidates to consider 'success', better answers establish the criteria against which success will be judged in the introduction and then refer back to them throughout the essay.

### **INSET 2006-2007**

OCR's programme for GCE History next academic year was published in June 2006. As always, the History booklet was sent to every centre and placed on OCR's website. In response to suggestions from teachers, the main series of meetings for 2006-2007 will help colleagues to think about and develop more effective approaches to teaching exam units 2580-2591.

#### Feedback from the 2005-2006 series:

*"The opportunity to discuss with colleagues was very welcome."* [Head of History]

*"The quality of feedback on exam technique was excellent."* [Assistant Headteacher]

*"A very useful guide, plus good oversight into the course."* [Teach First Trainee]

*"The day clarified particular concerns I had."* [Curriculum Manager]

*"The course fitted the needs of the group – to the point."* [NQT]

*"Excellent advice that can easily be turned to practical method."* [VIth Form College Lecturer]

### **Comments on Individual Questions Unit 2585/01**

One centre sought clarification about Question 9b.

### **Europe 1046-1250**

1) There were very few answers to either question and it is difficult to make general comments. However, most knew a great deal about the topic, with answers containing a lot of factual detail. At times, that detail was excessive, and it got in the way of any argument these candidates were trying to make.

2) There were too few answers to be able to make meaningful comments on either question.

3) This option was the most popular on the paper. Most candidates tackled 3a, but there was still a large number who did 3b.

a) There were many good answers, but also a large number who failed to do themselves justice because their knowledge of military tactics was either very limited or non-existent. Better answers did consider military issues such as cavalry, siege warfare and the seizure of important towns, such as Antioch, before the taking of Jerusalem. Many, however, simply argued that leadership was a military tactic; this was acceptable provided there was some specific issue of military tactics considered and linked into leadership. There were many answers where military tactics were dismissed within a couple of sentences as candidates preferred to write about Muslim disunity or religious zeal. The latter issue also presented some problems as candidates did not link religious zeal to success, but rather argued it helped to motivate the crusaders, which was not the question. Factual knowledge supporting the arguments was usually very good and few weak answers were seen. At the top end, candidates were able to prioritise and draw links between factors, for example showing how leaders were able to take advantage of Muslim disunity.

b) The phrase 'internal discord' did cause some candidates a problem, but as with 3a the overall standard was high. Most knew a great deal about the problems facing the Crusader states, the problems started when they had to assess the seriousness of the problem and draw links. The better answers demonstrated clearly that 'Internal discord' was only a serious problem at the end of the period and that this coincided with Muslim unity under Saladin, stressing that it was this combination that was the most serious weakness. Weaker answers simply asserted that it was a

combination of factors. Some better answers also linked material back to the period of success in order to show how serious particular problems were and demonstrate that the Crusaders were able to overcome single problems but could not deal with a combination of factors.

4) There were no answers for either question.

### Europe 1450-1530

5a) This was quite a popular question and a wide range of answers were seen. At the lower end, candidates found it hard to focus on Florence and wrote about other states as well or were able to describe conditions within Florence without explaining how they led to Florence playing a leading role. Better answers considered a wide range of factors, particularly looking at the Medici family and their role in patronage and how that encouraged the development of art. Many also considered the political and economic structure within the state and showed how that aided the growth.

5b) This was quite popular and it was pleasing to see an improvement in the quality of candidate's specific knowledge about works of art. There were far fewer answers which relied on sweeping generalisations and most answers were able to use a wide range of examples to support their arguments. Better answers focused on the word 'merely' and were able to show where Renaissance art went beyond being merely imitations of classical examples, but had built on this and combined classical ideas with new.

6a) This continues to be a very popular topic. There were more answers for 6a than 6b. There were a wide range of answers covering the whole mark range. At the top end there were some outstanding pieces of writing where candidates evaluated a range of issues before reaching a balanced conclusion. Many of the better answers argued that it was never Ferdinand and Isabella's intention to unite the country and therefore we should not expect to see unity in 1516. Even where there was some evidence of unity candidates were still able to show that it was not complete, many focused on the Inquisition, but pointed to the different aims in the two kingdoms, whereas others considered the issue of foreign policy. Limits to unit were seen in many areas, particularly government with the *hermandades*. There was confusion over the issue of currency as some candidates were not aware that the only common coin was the *excelente*.

6b) This question caused more problems than 6a, but largely because candidates did not read the question carefully. The question requires candidates to consider Charles' position in 1520, not 1516 and this therefore requires some knowledge of the Comuneros revolt if the candidate is to do justice to the question. The *Specification* refers specifically to Charles' position in 1520 so candidates should not have been surprised by the question. Many candidates did not know the demands of the Comuneros and therefore found it difficult. There were very few answers which considered the revolt of the Germania, but this could have been used effectively to argue that it was opportunistic and not due to unsolved problems. In a similar vein some were also unaware of the issues relating to Ferdinand and Isabella, such as the dislike of the *corregidores*.

7a) This was a fairly popular question and drew a wide range of responses. A wide range of reasons were considered, but where candidates did fall down was in their ability to assess the relative importance. Factors considered included military might, the capture of Constantinople, leadership and the need to prove oneself and this was frequently linked with religion as Ghazi rulers and how war was seen as a way of life.

7b) This question proved much more problematic. Many candidates were able to write quite well on the impact on the Ottoman Empire but were unable to make more than a fleeting reference to the impact on Western Europe. Unfortunately many candidates seemed unaware of what constituted Western Europe and wrote about the Balkans or the slaughter of the inhabitants of Constantinople. When the impact on Western Europe was considered it was often confined to a few general comments about the impact on Christendom. There were very few answers that were able to consider the impact on Venice and its naval power. Although there was no

requirement for candidates to have a 50:50 balance between the two areas some candidates failed to reach the top level simply because of their paucity of knowledge surrounding the impact on Western Europe, yet it is part of one of the key issues for study.

8a) This was much more popular than question 8b and saw a wide range of responses. However, many candidates were unable to distinguish between reasons and motives or between motives and enabling factors, such as technological developments. As a consequence much time was frequently spent writing about developments in shipping and navigational aids, which were not a motive for exploration, but an enabling factor. Better answers considered a range of economic factors, from Portugal's internal economy to slavery, spices and gold and then weighed these up against other issues such as religion and political stability.

8b) This was less popular and candidates and candidates sometimes struggled with specific examples. It was a pity as the knowledge of naval and technological developments could have been used with greater effect on this question!

### **Europe 1498-1560**

9a) This was a popular question, but many candidates simply gave a list of reasons for the spread of Lutheranism within Germany and found it difficult to consider the named factor. This was a question where a sound chronological knowledge was crucial, not only in knowing when Charles was present within the Empire, but also to be able to link key developments, such as the Diets, to his presence. The better answers often showed that Lutheranism had started before Charles became Emperor or that if it was to be stopped then it had to be in the early years when Charles was absent. However, this was balanced against Charles' weak position within Germany and some argued that even if he had been present he lacked the power to tackle the problem. Other factors, such as the power and independence of the princes played a large role, as did the power of the printing press and the condition of the church within Germany and this was often linked to a dislike of the papacy.

9b) This was less popular, but still provided a good range of answers. The determining factor for a good answer was usually the criteria used to determine success. Candidates who tried to address the question of how successful scored well. Some candidate's knowledge of his policy towards the Turks was particularly weak and this made it hard for them to weigh up different areas. There were very few candidates who found it hard to separate his policy as Holy Roman Emperor from that as King of Spain. A handful drew interesting distinctions between his activities as 'German Emperor' and as a Habsburg dynast.

10a) This was a popular question but, as with 6a, many candidates appeared to lack a specific knowledge of the Comuneros revolt or the Germanias, yet these were two of the biggest challenges he faced. It should also be noted that these issues are clearly present in the *specification*. Most candidates were able to explain, or at least describe, the problems caused by him being a foreigner, but found it harder to weigh these up against other factors.

10b) Although this was less popular than 10a there were a wide range of answers. The better answers had a good knowledge base from which to reach balanced conclusions. However, as with 9b, a lack of precise factual detail did hamper many of the weaker answers. This was particularly true when dealing with Italy after Pavia and in all the dealings with North Africa, where knowledge of events other than Tunis was quite rare. Once again the question was taken directly from the Key Issues and should not have been a surprise to candidates.

11a) This question presented a challenge to many, but there were very answers that simply considered how absolute Francis was. Answers often focused on an analysis of the success and failures of the monarchy under Francis, rather than focusing on the strengths of the monarchy. Some candidates took the line that the greatest strength was the personality of the monarch and this was fine, others considered issues such as finance and the power to tax, whilst others looked at regional government or Francis' ability to impose his will. There were frequently good

discussions of his relationship with his nobility, but this was often linked back to his personality. The and to assess did appear to cause some difficulty as candidates were unable to either prioritise and justify their choices or say how strong a particular area was and simply said the monarchy was strong.

11b) This was less popular than 11a, largely because candidates found it difficult to write in any depth about Henri II. Confusion over what happened under each monarch did not help the quality of the answers, for example it was not under Francis I that France regained Calais. Candidates would also have benefited from a better knowledge of the Treaty of Cateau-Cambresis.

12a) There were some very good answers to this question, as well as some very descriptive approaches that simply narrated the changes, rather than explaining the increased importance. Better answers looked at the increased effectiveness of well-drilled, massed pikemen and arquebusiers against medieval knights. They also considered the cost of such soldiers in comparison to knights and linked this in with developments in military technology.

12b) This question produced some very well argued answers in which factors were taken and evaluated. However, very few considered whether there was an actual growth in the size of the armies.

### **Europe 1545-1610**

13a) Many candidates found it quite difficult to write in sufficient depth about the named factor, or where they did, simply described what was done and found it hard to relate it to bringing about the Counter Reformation. Many wanted to get onto other factors, such as Trent of the New Orders as soon as possible.

#### **Teacher Study Day: Philip II; the Catholic Reformation**

A day course for teachers to develop their subject knowledge is being run on both Philip II and on the Catholic Reformation at the Victoria & Albert Museum, London on 9 March 2007. The day will combine a session with a senior examiner on answering Unit 2588 Philip II with a session led by experts from the Museum on aspects of the Catholic Reformation and a talk by Professor Rodriguez-Salgado of the London School of Economics on Philip II. For details, please see the 2006-2007 History INSET booklet p.8.

#### Feedback from 2005-2006 days:

*“Excellent and stimulating – introduced new perspectives and recharged batteries.”* [Head of History]

*“Very useful for teaching preparation.”* [Advanced Skills Teacher]

*“Good blend of providing exam-based information and issues for direct student benefit with subject information and issues the teacher’s benefit.”* [Deputy Headteacher]

*“Just to say how very valuable and enjoyable the day was – if only all INSET could be so stimulating with such a mixture of exam technique, academic erudition and on-site visit.”* [Head of History]

13b) There were some very good answers to this question where candidates really engaged with the debate and did not simply describe the views of historians. The latter approach did result in some candidates, who obviously had a good factual knowledge failing to reach high levels. Centres do need to be aware that where questions are set around a historical debate, candidates must not simply describe the views of historians, but use them to answer the question. The better answers considered both sides of the argument and showed that there was much reform already underway before Luther's challenge and pointed to examples such as the Oratory of Divine Love. Just as encouraging was candidates who pointed out that many of the new developments took place in Italy and Spain where there was no threat from Lutheranism or Calvinism or that many of the activities were occurring in areas outside Europe unaffected by the Reformation.

14a) This was more popular than 14b, many candidates had little trouble in identifying the problems, but found it a greater challenge to actually assess their seriousness. Issues such as the religious divide was often the focus of answers, but it was noticeable that few suggested this was not settled and did not draw out the idea of 'a state within a state' and believed that the Huguenot problem had been solved. The same was true of the Catholic threat and few pointed to Henri's assassination, which could have been used to show that although he appeared to have brought religious peace this was not true. Candidates could have looked ahead and suggested that the problems after his death suggested that in dealing with the problems in the period his success was personal. Many answers failed to see how issues developed within the given period; others focused outside the period and wrote at length on the work of Sully. Other candidates drifted to how problems were solved, rather than focusing on the question of assess.

14b) Candidates were able to identify various groups of opposition and describe the problem, but found it harder to assess how successful he was in dealing with the issue. Comments made in 14a on religious opposition apply as effectively here.

15a) This was quite popular, but presented many weaker candidates with the problem of defining regionalism. Regional traditions are specifically mentioned in the Key Issues and Content of the *Specification*. Regionalism was seen as the north/south divide, or in some cases the divide between various towns, or an economic and religious divide; a variety of approaches was seen as acceptable. However, many candidates largely ignored the issue and discussed other issues.

15b) This was quite popular and some candidates were able to weigh up William of Orange's contribution to Dutch success against other factors. The biggest weakness was candidate's lack of chronological knowledge as many ascribed developments to William after he had died. Candidates also need to be aware of William's success or lack of in dealing with foreign powers as there was confusion in this area. William's death was sometimes seen as his greatest contribution by creating a martyr; others suggested that Maurice of Nassau should be given more credit. The key to success was weighing up William against other factors.

16a) The issue of personal style did not present many problems, although some candidates wrote exclusively on this or were unable to link it to his problems in ruling Spain and finished up just describing his methods of ruling. Most focused on his reading of material and the delays it caused, some also linked in his religious zeal to this and its impact.

### **Teacher Study Day: Philip II; the Catholic Reformation**

A day course for teachers to develop their subject knowledge is being run on both Philip II and on the Catholic Reformation at the Victoria & Albert Museum, London on 9 March 2007. The day will combine a session with a senior examiner on answering Unit 2588 Philip II with a session led by experts from the Museum on aspects of the Catholic Reformation and a talk by Professor Rodriguez-Salgado of the London School of Economics on Philip II. For details, please see the 2006-2007 History INSET booklet p.8.

#### Feedback from 2005-2006 days:

*“Excellent and stimulating – introduced new perspectives and recharged batteries.”* [Head of History]

*“Very useful for teaching preparation.”* [Advanced Skills Teacher]

*“Good blend of providing exam-based information and issues for direct student benefit with subject information and issues the teacher’s benefit.”* [Deputy Headteacher]

*“Just to say how very valuable and enjoyable the day was – if only all INSET could be so stimulating with such a mixture of exam technique, academic erudition and on-site visit.”* [Head of History]

16b) This question did throw up the usual problem with this type of question, where candidates give an exhaustive description of the problem, but fail to come to grips with assessing the seriousness. Most answers focused on finance and the economy, which was a major issue. However, many were unaware of the bullion issue and the illusion of wealth that it created. Some answers were all doom and gloom and could see no hope for Philip III, despite peace with France, a decline in the threat from the Turks and a lack of religious problems.

17a) This produced a wide range of answers. Candidates either tended to focus heavily on the Huguenot problem at the expense of other factors, or there was little knowledge of the named factor, which distorted its evaluation against other issues.

17b) This question did cause a few problems for candidates who did not read the question carefully. Some candidates ignored the focus of the question, foreign policy and proceeded to write about domestic issues. Other candidates did not know enough about the foreign policy of Mazarin and dismissed it within a couple of lines. There was even some confusion between the Habsburgs and Huguenots, whereas better answers did look at the continued determination to secure France from Habsburg encirclement. Candidates could also have looked at where Mazarin went further than Richelieu in seeking alliances with Protestant powers. However, continuity could have provided the focus as both wanted to end the threat of encirclement and extend French influence and boundaries.

18) There were too few answers to be able to make meaningful comments.

19) There were too few answers to be able to make meaningful comments.

20a) This was not a popular question; most did 20b. Those who did tackle this tended to deal in generalised answers; bad weather created bad harvests which resulted in disease and famine. Specific knowledge of developments within France was very limited. Some candidates made advantageous use of comparison with Dutch success, but they were often ensnared into irrelevant comparisons and therefore lost focus.



20b) This was much more popular than 20a and produced a wide range in quality. Some candidates described developments in astronomy at great length, with little reference to other developments. Other answers explained why developments in astronomy were limited and pointed to the concerns of the church and the challenges the new ideas presented. Better answers included reference to the work of Copernicus and Newton and were able to link their work to developments in other fields, showing how astronomy aided work there. There was some knowledge of developments in biology.

### **Europe 1660-1718**

21a) There were a reasonable number of answers to this question, but many were very descriptive and lacked evaluative comments. Weaker answers were lacking in depth of knowledge and were usually confined to the coverage of a limited number of areas.

21b) Many answers focused around the inevitability of the decline of Sweden, but were unable to develop this fully and tended to get involved in describing the historical debate. Very few candidates were able to write at any length on the named factor, despite it appearing as a Key Issue for study in the *Specification*.

22a) Although this was quite popular many answers did not focus on the demands of the question. Very few candidates were able to write about the position of powers other than France in 1661. There was little evaluation of the impact of the recent treaties on Spain, the Holy Roman Empire, Sweden or the Netherlands and many focused almost entirely on the strength of France. This usually involved detailed comment about military reform and economic strengths. This was disappointing as the first key issue for study is 'What was the balance of power in 1661?'

22b) This was more popular and at the top there were some excellent answers, showing an ability to weigh up the aims and developments in Louis' foreign policy and consider the wars from a variety of view points. Many believed there was a change in his foreign policy during his reign, whereas others argued for consistency. Many did argue that the desire to strengthen the north-east borders, in particular, was evidence of a defensive approach.

23a) This is not a widely-taught topic. Some answers struggled with the idea of 'limited', whilst others strayed into the area of foreign policy, which was only occasionally made relevant.

23b) There was a reasonable range of responses, but often issues were not fully developed. There were some good links between personality and policies.

24) There were too few answers to be able to make meaningful comments.

### Comments on Individual Questions Unit 2586/01

There were no complaints from centres about any of the questions on this paper.

#### **INSET 2006-2007**

OCR's programme for GCE History next academic year was published in June 2006. As always, the History booklet was sent to every centre and placed on OCR's website. In response to suggestions from teachers, the main series of meetings for 2006-2007 will help colleagues to think about and develop more effective approaches to teaching exam units 2580-2591.

#### Feedback from the 2005-2006 series:

*"The opportunity to discuss with colleagues was very welcome."* [Head of History]

*"The quality of feedback on exam technique was excellent."* [Assistant Headteacher]

*"A very useful guide, plus good oversight into the course."* [Teach First Trainee]

*"The day clarified particular concerns I had."* [Curriculum Manager]

*"The course fitted the needs of the group – to the point."* [NQT]

*"Excellent advice that can easily be turned to practical method."* [VIth Form College Lecturer]

#### **Europe 1789-1849**

1a) This question was answered well by many, but some found it difficult to link economic problems to the course of events. Weaker answers struggle to get their heads around the complex chronology, and once they fit events out of sequence they lose sense of cause and effect. It is important they do know the six years in detail. Many answers interpreted economic causes in a very narrow sense, considering only poor harvests or high bread prices, very few appreciated that government finances was an area that needed consideration. As a result many, even quite able candidates, stated that economic factors started the revolution and then went on to list other factors, as a result they finished up with a list essay marked in Band III. However, better answers showed an in-depth knowledge of the topic and were able to assess economic problems and compare the extent of their effect with issues such as war, counter-revolution and the king's actions.

1b) Some answers showed little idea about the Reign of Terror, some were unsure when it began or ended and weaker answers simply described the events. Some candidates saw this as simply a domestic topic and ignored its impact on the war. Even better answers sometimes concentrated on the causes and justification, rather than the costs and benefits. It is important that candidates read the question carefully and answer the actual questions set rather than reproduce a pre-learnt answer to a different (usually past) question.

2a) The key to a good answer was an answer's ability to pick up on the idea of 'French people'. Better answers looked at a variety of groups in French society and evaluated the benefits of the reforms for them before reaching a conclusion as to which group/s benefited the most. Most had a good knowledge of the reforms, but weaker answers found it harder to apply this knowledge to the question set.

2b) This was generally well answered and many displayed excellent factual knowledge, the problems arose when they drifted into narrative. Many displayed a wide knowledge of his military career and were able to discuss this and weigh this up against a number of other factors in an analytical answer.

3a) This topic is less frequently taught than either the French Revolution or Napoleon, but still produced a range of answers. There appeared to be two problems with the responses seen; firstly, some argued well, but had limited factual support and as a result drifted into assertion of success or failure, secondly, some did not focus on the actual question set and answered a question from a previous paper.

3b) There were insufficient answers to offer any valid feedback.

4a) This is not a widely-taught study topic. Many answers were poorly done with quite a few drawing on information from the Confederation or Southern Italy - candidates must read questions carefully.

4b) There were insufficient answers to make any valid general comments.

### **Europe 1825-1890**

Italy is a very popular topic and there were a large number of answers which covered the full range.

5a) This produced some excellent answers with many answers displaying a very detailed knowledge of events. A variety of reasons for the failures were offered, many concentrated on the military strength of Austria, but other factors, such as divisions within Italy were also offered as the main factor. It was pleasing to see the large number who did assess and not simply describe the reasons and who were able to draw links between the factors. Many, for example, showed that the internal divisions made it much easier for Austrian forces to regain control and linked the divisions into the Papal Allocution. At the lower end, there were answers that lacked the precise examples when they wrote about internal divisions within Italy or the lack of a common aim.

5b) This question also produced many good answers, perhaps the only problem being that some did not understand the term 'diplomacy'. However, many were able to explain the importance of events such as the Crimean War and Plombières. Better answers identified the need to write about Cavour's interaction with foreign powers, although some even wrote about relations within Italy, and were able to contrast this with other factors. Weaker answers did drift into a narrative of Italian Unification or dismissed the contribution of Cavour and wrote about Garibaldi, whilst others saw Cavour as the architect of Unification and argued that without him nothing would have happened. In drawing links between factors many were able to point to events in the south and show how, if Cavour had united the north, it was Garibaldi who should be given credit for the south, although again this was balanced against other factors.

6a) As with question 5b, the issue of diplomacy did appear to present weaker answers with a problem. Many were unwilling to discuss Bismarck, let alone his diplomacy and instead told the story of German Unification. Many answers preferred to write at length on the role of economic factors and did not seem able to weigh up the relative importance of a range of factors.

6b) This was less popular than 6a and saw a large number of answers that described Bismarck's policy towards the Catholics and Socialists, rather than assessing the reasons why he pursued anti-catholic and anti-socialist policies. Even some of the better answers lacked a depth of knowledge and understanding.

7a) There were insufficient answers to make any valid general comments.

7b) This saw some very encouraging answers. The better answers started by establishing criteria against which to judge Napoleon's success and then used this to judge a wide range of his dealings, covering events from the Crimean War, to Mexico and the Franco-Prussian War. Many saw a change over time in his success, with the latter period being less successful, culminating in his downfall. However, others also saw that success in a particular area changed

over time, initial success followed by failure. Weaker answers were characterised by the coverage of a narrow range of events.

8a) This question produced a wide range of responses, ranging from the very general that talked about 'poor conditions' to those that were aware of the different groups within Russia and were able to explain their development. The better answers were also able to assess and explain which the most important reason for their growth was, this ranged from the Tsar's policies to the growth of an intelligentsia. Weaker answers also tended to narrate what happened in Russia during the period and then simply conclude that this caused opposition.

8b) There were a wide range of answers to this question, differentiating well between candidates. Most were able to go beyond the Emancipation of the Serfs; in fact some answers ignored it altogether, and consider a wide range of reforms. Some candidates established criteria against which to judge success and this helped them to evaluate the reforms. There was some interesting consideration of Alexander's need to preserve autocracy and whether any reform could therefore be considered a success, particularly in the long term as it simply encouraged the desire for further reform.

### **America 1846-1919**

9a) This question was more popular than 9b. This was often done quite well; where this happened, candidates had focused on the key issue of northern resources and argued the case for and against the hypothesis. They were also able to link resources with other factors, for example international recognition was not forthcoming because Britain and France did more trade with the north or that superior resource allowed Grant to engage in a war of attrition. The better answers saw how the change in the nature of the war helped the north as resources became more important. However, weaker answers did slip into a general discussion of why the north won without tailoring their knowledge to the actual question set. Some other weaker answers simply described the resources available to the north without showing how they contributed to victory and others assumed that a northern victory was inevitable and ignored the great difficulty the north had in conquering the south.

9b) This was less well done than 9a. The better answers were able to produce a balanced evaluation of his strengths and weaknesses, but many lacked sufficient depth or produced a pre-learned answer that compared Lincoln's leadership with that of Davis.

10) There were no answers to either question.

11a) Although the number of candidates who study this option is limited, many answers were of a high level, showing thorough analysis. Candidates often displayed a good depth of knowledge and were able to link this back to the question. However, there were exceptions and it is important that candidates do have specific examples available to support their general ideas.

11b) The same comments apply as for 11a. The question was generally answered well, but weaker answers often lacked the specific detail required to sustain an argument and as a result some finished up asserting, rather than explaining.

12a) This is quite a popular option, but there were many weak answers. Many candidates simply went through a narrative of events or embarked upon a polemic about how racist nineteenth-century America was. Better answers saw Reconstruction as imposed on the south by the north and that it was a temporary interlude or that more sympathetic Presidents gradually eroded black's rights. Many candidates discussed the issues without explaining why the position had improved so little, others rephrased the question and answered 'to what extent'.

12b) This question was approached in a very similar way to 12a. Some candidates found it very difficult to argue to what extent and simply argued that their rights had been eroded. As a consequence, many simply gave a list of things that amounted to a severe erosion of rights.

### **Europe 1890-1945**

13a) This was a popular question and saw a wide range of responses. There were two key problems for weaker candidates. Many found it hard to identify the problems that the Tsar faced and then consider how serious the problem was in light of the attempts to modernise. In particular, they found it hard to deploy knowledge of Witte or Stolypin because they did not perceive there was a problem for the Tsar. There were some candidates who could not go beyond the general problem of backwardness, whilst others drifted into narrative. The second issue, having identified the problem, was to address the question of seriousness. There were some answers that did not get beyond the 1905 revolution, whilst others went beyond 1914 and looked at the downfall of the Tsar. The better answers were able to classify how serious the problems were, having considered a range of problems, drawing links between them and assessing the seriousness by looking at whether they were solved, disappeared or changed by altered circumstances.

13b) This question produced a wide range of answers and saw a number of common mistakes. The first problem was that some candidates confused the February and October Revolutions. Some candidates simply listed reasons for the revolution and were unable to assess their relative importance. Even some who were able to classify factors under long-term, short-term and 'trigger' seemed unclear about what to do next or what these terms meant. Unfortunately, long-term factors did result in some candidates writing at excessive length on problems pre-1890 which were also not then linked directly to the question. Relatively few were able to assess the relative importance of the factors. Understanding of tensions between long-term decline and the immediate effects of the war was not much in evidence.

14a) This was quite a popular question and saw a wide range of responses. Although examiners were not expecting a 50:50 balance between Britain and Germany, or a comparison, some answers did adopt this approach very effectively. There were some candidates who did not go beyond the end of the war, whilst others concentrated on the period after the war. Either approach was acceptable, although it had been hoped that both would have been covered. Knowledge of the economic impact of the war on the two countries varied, some showing a greater knowledge of Britain, others of Germany.

14b) This was more popular than 14a and produced a very wide range of answers. It would be fair to say that some did not go beyond GCSE in either their understanding or knowledge, some seeing this as an opportunity to describe the terms of the Treaty and then assert that this shows it must have been revenge, or to write about whether the Treaty was fair. Better answers were able to look at both sides of the hypothesis and argued that different leaders wanted different things. They were usually able to support their argument by linking this to the actual terms of Versailles. Some candidates argued that if revenge was the sole motive then the terms would have been much harsher and pointed to the terms of Brest-Litovsk or pointed to Clemenceau's desire to break up Germany into separate states, others pointed to Wilson's fourteen points to show there were other concerns. Interestingly, it was the motives of Lloyd George that caused the greatest difficulty.

15a) This was a popular question, but candidates often struggled with the phrase 'talents and abilities', preferring to write about other factors that brought him to power such as weakness of opposition or the fear of communism. When candidates did write about talents and abilities, it was often in a very general form. Many lacked a clear chronological grasp of events and very few could write about the March on Rome with any degree of certainty, yet this was the actual trigger that brought him to power. Candidates were far more knowledgeable about the failures of the Liberal governments, the economic problems facing Italy or the fear of communism. Better answers were able to link these to Mussolini's talents by showing how he was able to exploit these issues through, for example, propaganda.

15b) This was less popular than 15a and the biggest discriminator was the extent to which candidates discussed the idea of 'full dictatorship'. Many simply wrote about dictatorship and focused on the issue of the Acerbo Law and the murder of Matteoti. The better answers saw the limits to his dictatorship and wrote particularly about the Church and the potential power of the king. Other good answers considered how Mussolini moved by slow stages towards a dictatorship.

16a) This was the most popular question on the Unit 2586 paper and drew a wide range of responses. Weaker candidates, in particular, do appear to struggle with economic factors and this question was no exception. There were a large number who did not understand what the Depression was, many confusing it with 1923 and hyperinflation, and even fewer who could write in detail about its impact on Hitler's rise to power. Many simply described the events of October 1929 and did not get beyond the simple statement that it caused unemployment and therefore a desire for alternatives to Weimar. The better answers were able to relate this to the issue of benefits and the collapse of the Grand Coalition and ultimately rule by decree, which accustomed many Germans to the end of democracy. Some were also able to explain how Hitler was able to exploit the Depression and pointed to his use of propaganda. Propaganda was seen by many as an important factor in his rise to power, but candidates needed to ensure that the evidence they used to support this was taken from pre-1933 (so reference to films such as *Olympia* fell outside the scope of the question). Many weaker candidates focused on the period before the Depression and gave the impression that Hitler's rise was inevitable; even the Munich Putsch of 1923 was seen as the most important factor. A similar line was taken with the Treaty of Versailles, but quite a few candidates were unable to explain why, if this was the most important factor, Hitler did not come to power before 1933. Concentration on this earlier period limited the mark Band reached as candidates had really failed to explain his rise to power because effective answers did need a strong concentration on the period 1929-33. There were some candidates who had a good understanding of the intrigues of 1932-33 and were able to discuss this as an alternative main factor, suggesting that the decline in Nazi votes in the November 1932 election meant that it was the intrigue, rather than popular support that brought them to power. This also provided the opportunity for better candidates to link factors, suggesting that without the popular support on at elections it is unlikely that von Papen and Hindenburg would have approached Hitler. There were also too many candidates who lacked a good chronological basis and therefore wrote substantially about events after January 1933.

16b) This was less popular than 16a, but still produced a wide range of answers. Many focused on a very narrow range of issues, usually unemployment or 'guns v butter', whilst others answered in a list fashion, looking at recovery, rearmament and then war. Weaker answers often took this latter approach, but then narrated what happened in each period, rather than analysing. The better answers usually established a set of criteria against which to judge success and then related policy back to it. There were some candidates who did not understand what was meant by economic policy or who got sidetracked by foreign policy or social policy. There were some interesting discussions about self-sufficiency and the preparedness for war. Some candidates argued that it was successful in preparing Germany for a blitzkrieg style war, but was ultimately a failure because of the type of war that Hitler had to fight.

### **Europe and the World 1919-1989**

17a) Although this question was quite popular, many answers were weak and failed to focus on the actual demands of the question, suggesting very few reasons for the lack of conflict. Many tended to be a narrative of events or offered a focus on the minor conflicts which the League either solved or did not solve. There were a few who were able to establish a series of reasons, most focusing on the war weariness of the Great Powers as a main cause, and reach a judgement as to the most important. Other issues considered were: the work of the League, the terms of the Treaties which weakened Germany, other International agreements such as Locarno and the Kellogg-Briand Pact. Unfortunately, there were some candidates who wrote about the 1930s, considering Manchuria and Abyssinia.

17b) This produced many weak answers. Very few had sufficient knowledge of British foreign policy to tackle this and many failed to go beyond general comments about appeasement or the Munich Conference. Most dismissed the key issue and wrote about why Hitler started the war, without actually addressing the question.

18a) There were some answers to this question, but many candidates found it hard to organise the material, except within a narrative framework. Many narrated Stalin's rise to power and a large number wrote about his policies in the 1930s. However, better candidates who were able to think on their feet and address the question to produce some impressive pieces of work.

18b) This produced a range of answers from the very weak to the impressive, particularly where a candidate was able to focus on the phrase 'effectively'. However, some simply described the nature of Soviet power rather than evaluating its effectiveness. Others adopted a country by country description without really trying to draw together and consider various methods of constraint.

19a) This study topic is not widely taught. Many answers lacked knowledge of either Yalta or Potsdam. Some confused the two conferences and very few mentioned the dropping of the atom bomb during Potsdam. Some candidates were aware of wartime differences between the allies, but were unable to link this to the conferences. The better answers did see a difference between the two conferences, with Yalta taking place whilst the war was still to be won, whereas Potsdam was more concerned about the post-war world and saw the war a brief interlude in hostile relations between East and West.

19b) There were a few notable examples to generally weak answers. Many candidates knew very little about the Warsaw Pact and, even if they did, wrote about it only in an East-West Cold War context, rather than as a means of strengthening control in Eastern Europe. There were some who confused the Berlin Wall with the Berlin Blockade and others who had Stalin building the Wall. The better answers were able to contrast these two events with Hungary and the Prague Spring, but such answers were rare.

20a) This was less popular than 20b, but still saw a large number of answers. Most answers focused on a narrative of the war and wrote about military success and failure, which often resulted in a failure, success, draw approach. Many knew a great deal about the military events and the causes of the war, but were unable to use this effectively to address the full demands of the question. Many candidates found it difficult to establish criteria for success and this often limited their analysis.

20b) This was a popular question and saw a wide range of responses. At the top end there were some very good answers that linked together a range of factors to produce a balanced answer; this often involved a consideration of American military tactics and the guerrilla warfare of the communists, resulting in a loss of popular support. Some candidates spent too much time outlining the general problem of South East Asia/Indo-China. There were also many answers that simply listed reasons for the Communist victory and did not assess their relative importance, which was a pity as they often displayed a great deal of knowledge.

## Report on Units 2587 - 2589

**Unit 2587/01 (Historical Investigations 768-1216)**  
**Unit 2588/11 – 2588/14 (Historical Investigations 1556-1725)**  
**Unit 2589/11 – 2589/17 (Historical Investigations 1799-1955)**

### General Comments

The introduction of sub-codes for entries allowed examiners to identify a topic which they preferred not to mark. Few examples of errors in the use of these codes were found and the vast majority of packets held answers to the option for which the each centre's candidates had been entered. Some 1% were retaking from June 2005 and 13% from January 2006.

One common point raised by many examiners was the careless reading of questions and Passages by candidates and the detailed reports on individual questions highlight a number of examples. The importance of thorough reading cannot be emphasised enough. Once the comparison question is no longer on the paper (June 2007 onwards), we hope that candidates will use the increased time available to read the paper with particular attention.

In (i), examiners were mostly delighted that this question will shortly be removed from the paper. Its last appearance will be in January 2007. Candidates continued to list the content of the Passages and not the views contained in them, to leave comparison to the final paragraph, to compare the provenance and to include large amounts of extraneous material. Most candidates have never fully appreciated that this is meant to be a short, straightforward comparison of two views and they have tried to make the process needlessly complex. Some candidates compared the wrong Passages and some included all the Passages. Some spent too long on this question to the detriment of their performance elsewhere. Where candidates understood what they had to do, full marks were often awarded to answers which made a number of point by point comparisons without much need for a great deal of sophistication. Examiners commented that good answers here were often quite brief and hence candidates went on to do well, as they had more time in hand.

In (ii), candidates continued to be prone to summarising the content of the Passages with minimal comment and little contextual knowledge and less evaluation. Some outlined the content of the Passages and then wrote an essay on the topic in the question. There were still candidates who did not seem to know what is meant by evaluation or even that it was a technique expected of them. The mark scheme for this question was glossed for this session to try to explain more fully just what is required for each mark Band, particularly with regard to evaluation. Other candidates used too much contextual knowledge and largely ignored the Passages or included extra information at the end of their answers which was of little relevance to the question set. Candidates who did consider the views in the Passages were inclined to outline them but not to reach any kind of judgement. The descriptors of Bands I and II clearly state that a judgement must be reached to access these Bands. Candidates should be pleased to have an opportunity to express their own views, supported by evidence, and not simply be content to regurgitate the views of others without comment. Good candidates, in contrast, were able to analyse all the Passages, not necessarily in equal depth for each, and to cross-reference them showing how they agreed or differed. Contextual knowledge was integrated into the argument and related directly to the views put forward in the Passages. They often began promisingly by grouping the Passages in a brief introduction to show how they related to the key issue.



Examiners felt that answers to this question were weaker than to either the essay questions or the comparison in (i). The Principal Examiners' Report for January 2005 contains advice on these and on what we mean by debate (pp. 292-293). Some spent too long on this question and their essay suffered as a result.

In essay questions, techniques were usually better although there was still a tendency to produce a prepared response to a different question, in some cases a question from a previous session, which was rarely skilfully adapted for the actual question set. Pre-prepared commentary about orthodox, revisionist or post-revisionist views continued to be vigorous and far too often its use was counter-productive. Weaker answers wrote unfocused descriptions or narrative in the place of analytical discussion and also had insufficient detailed knowledge. This latter point was made by several examiners, who saw a clear correlation between good subject knowledge and high marks. Some failed to inject any sense of debate into their answers, listing factors indiscriminately. A number wrote relatively short essays, sometimes after quite elaborate plans and failed to complete a conclusion or to sum up their argument. Some who were clearly pressed for time, persisted in covering one or two aspects of the answer in detail, when outlining several factors and reaching a conclusion would be a better technique. Several examiners felt this was an increasing tendency and hoped that the reduction of the number of questions to be answered on the paper might help here. Some chose to answer the essay question first to avoid this problem, but this could lead to Passages answers being undeveloped. Better answers kept their answers relevant by a clear introduction to debate in their opening paragraph or by defining key terms like *military genius* or *radical* and so providing a basis for their discussion.

The vexed issue of presentation was again mentioned by several Examiners. Correct English allows candidates to frame their answers more convincingly and obscuring the argument with weak expression is obviously detrimental. One new examiner referred to the overall standard of spelling and grammar and sentence construction as *alarmingly poor*. Another noticed candidates who wrote their essays as one long paragraph, making it difficult to see how their argument was being developed while another examiner remarked on candidates who began a new paragraph for each sentence, often leaving a line between the paragraphs, so that, again, disjointed reading resulted. The use of abbreviations was more common. It was suggested this is a result of the text messaging culture, but candidates should be aware that 'PG', 'EI', 'Liz' or 'MC' are not acceptable in formal writing. The inability to spell common words (e.g. 'led', 'their' and 'there', 'where' and 'were') was as frequent as ever. Illegible handwriting was mentioned by several examiners and the use of a scribe is to be urged in cases where Centres foresee a problem.

Candidates need to make it obvious when they are using a Passage by clear references. In some cases examiners were reduced to guesswork. Candidates are asked to fill in the number of the questions which they have answered on the front of the booklet, but many neglect this simple task and Centres are reminded that this should be checked when papers are being collected.

All examiners were pleased to report that they had seen some excellent work, well focused on the question set, and, at best showing that candidates can think for themselves and reach original and even unexpected conclusions. For most examiners this is their real reward and there are few examiners who fail to learn something from the scripts they read in each session.

The Report for June 2002 has detailed advice on answering all the types of question (pp.32-41) and the Report for June 2005 has examples of responses with comments from the Principal Examiner (pp.360-366).

### **Changes to Units 2587-2589 starting June 2007: a reminder**

The January 2007 exams will be the last to have two sub-questions set on the passages. The change was formally announced in the Notice to Centres of March 2005. The 2005 edition of the *Specification* incorporates these changes and they have been flagged up in the June 2005 and January 2006 Reports as well as in Newsletter 3 (Summer 2005) and Newsletter 6 (Winter 2005-06).

Revised generics and a full set of exemplar papers have been available on OCR's website since the Notice to Centres in March 2005. The exemplar papers are the June 2004 papers adapted to the new format so question-specific markschemes are already available.

### **INSET 2006-2007**

OCR's programme for GCE History next academic year was published in June 2006. As always, the History booklet was sent to every centre and placed on OCR's website. In response to suggestions from teachers, the main series of meetings for 2006-2007 will help colleagues to think about and develop more effective approaches to teaching exam units 2580-2591.

#### Feedback from the 2005-2006 series:

*"The opportunity to discuss with colleagues was very welcome."* [Head of History]

*"The quality of feedback on exam technique was excellent."* [Assistant Headteacher]

*"A very useful guide, plus good oversight into the course."* [Teach First Trainee]

*"The day clarified particular concerns I had."* [Curriculum Manager]

*"The course fitted the needs of the group – to the point."* [NQT]

*"Excellent advice that can easily be turned to practical method."* [VIth Form College Lecturer]

### **Comments on Individual Questions Unit 2587**

No letters of complaint were received about any of the questions on this paper.

#### **Charlemagne**

1(i) Most candidates understood the Passages and were able to cite relevant phrases from each Passage to make their comparison. Some were confused by *clerical concept* in B and tried to compare this with *conceived in Christian terms* in C. Most answered satisfactorily but a few found it harder to find similarities. Some missed the points about the assembly at Aachen in both Passages.

(ii) Candidates found this question more taxing. They tended to miss the *already evident* in the question and so did not focus on this aspect. Passages B and C were usually well evaluated with reference to Ganshof's decomposition theory for B and the mention in Passage C of *another reforming assembly*, which allowed them to bring in previous reform capitularies such as Herstal, the General Admonition and Frankfurt. One candidate suggested that reform was certainly needed as Charlemagne was so *thick* that he could not grasp the concept of empire. Passages A and D required more thought and candidates who dismissed one or both as irrelevant needed to make more effort. Passage A could be evaluated from contextual knowledge about the role of the emperor in determining doctrine and the importance of recognition by Byzantium. Some argued that better relations with Michael freed Charlemagne to concentrate on more reform. The significance of *brother* in line 3 was often missed. The

judgements of previous synods where Charlemagne had tackled Iconclasm and Adoptionism could also help with evaluation. Candidates could use D to show that the *divisio* was according to Salic Law and to argue that it was less important than D indicated. Some discussed how far it reflected Charlemagne's determination to preserve his reforms or even to see further reform. Some quoted quite extensively from other historians in their evaluation, whereas a reference to their views backed by factual material to support or deny those views is a better approach.

2 This essay was less well answered than Q3. Some preferred to discuss whether Charlemagne did campaign after 800 or not. This could be seen as a related debate, worth a glance in the introduction, but it was not the focus of the answer. Decomposition also enticed some, leading to an assessment of the debate as to whether the empire fell apart as a result of the ending of large-scale conquest. There also needed to be a sense of debate with consideration of the relative importance of the various factors. There was some reference to issues like Charlemagne's age and health, his more static life at Aachen, the existing extent of his territories and the reasons why it was unwise or unattractive to move out further. Few brought in the administrative problems of his later reign, as evidenced by the capitularies and here Ganshof could have been used relevantly, or the problems of mobilisation about which there is some debate.

3 This essay attracted some high quality responses with good analysis of a range of factors. Candidates had plenty of factual material with which to illustrate their arguments, but some found it difficult to be selective and so discussed a few factors in great detail. There needed to be careful definition of the factors and assessment of their relative importance. Several candidates achieved this by setting the personal piety type factors like papal influence and the need for correct texts in worship against the practical usefulness factors like the need for educated administrators. There might be some overlapping, but this type of approach worked better than the answers which read like a list. The influences of Rome, Lombardy and Byzantium were less well covered, but some candidates were well informed about the precedent and example of Charlemagne's father and Carloman. They could, however spend too long on the precedents at the expense of Charlemagne.

### King John

4(i) Many produced poor comparisons and missed some of the relevant points. Both Passages made it clear that John had financial problems but the opening lines of A were rarely used. Whereas D suggested John's problems were largely financial, A included other problems, but also indicated that John had enjoyed some success in solving them with Ireland *pacified* and the Welsh *dispersed* while D took the view that there was little John could do about price rises.

(ii) This question focused on a popular part of the syllabus for this option, but many in their enthusiasm to display their knowledge missed the word *overwhelming* and much preferred to concentrate on assessing how far John was to blame. Hence the points made in A about John's success, notably in extracting money from the Cistercians, were often brushed aside to make much more of his enmity with de Braose, not, arguably, an overwhelming difficulty since John solved it in his own inimitable way. Similarly the mention in Passage C that some French barons remained loyal to John was rarely taken up or the reference to the heavy scutage he levied in Passage B. Some of the contextual knowledge was not well related to the Passages and some went back to events before 1204 and the loss of the lands in the first place. A few candidates wanted to blame John entirely and claimed the price rises explained in Passage D were his personal responsibility.

5 This was a question taken directly from the *specification* but this did not help all candidates. Some listed the reasons with little sense of debate, forgetting that the command *assess* implies a need to evaluate the relative importance of reasons. Some made the debate around how far John was to blame and how far other factors, which was acceptable as long as the other factors were covered in a balanced way. There could be too much about the marriage to Isabella and its outcome, often in a narrative form. There was often good coverage of the

debate about the relative wealth of the English and French crowns and how far the Angevin empire was doomed anyway or how far Henry II and Richard I had left John an impossible task. The impact of the death of Eleanor of Aquitaine was rarely mentioned. Candidates may point out that John has had a bad press from the chronicles, but they still want to condemn him on all sides and few accepted that he might have returned to England in December 1203 for sound strategic reasons.

6 This was not well answered. There was a distinct lack of detailed knowledge about the exact terms of the submission to the Papacy in 1213. Some were able to focus on *humiliation* and older interpretations and then to indicate the benefits which accrued to John from his surrender, but these were the minority. Some made no reference to England becoming a papal fief and so did not discuss how far this was beneficial to John. The return to England of the exiles, including some long standing opponents of John, rarely featured, but the papal annulment of Magna Carta was better known. Some padded answers out with explanations of the origins of the quarrel, the interdict and excommunication and so on. These events could be used briefly and pertinently in the analysis and a few candidates were able to do so and to mount a good argument and counter-argument in an effective way.

### Comments on Individual Questions Unit 2588/11 – 2588/14

The candidature for this paper was: 611 for Philip II, 1896 for Elizabeth I, 584 for Oliver Cromwell and 250 for Peter the Great. No complaints were received about any of the questions on this paper.

#### Unit 2588 sub-codes: keeping your scripts separate

Your Exams Office now has to make entries using a sub-code for each candidate. The code(s) that they need is/are listed in their *Administrative Guide & Entry Procedures 2007* file.

If you teach different options within Unit 2588, the code used will be different for each option. Separate examiner labels and attendance registers will be sent to your Exams Office for each option.

NB The scripts will very possibly go to different examiners.

#### Philip II

1(i) Some answered this question very successfully, but others failed to focus on whether Philip could solve his problems. Instead, they looked at details of his expenditure or whether war inevitably resulted from his *monarquía*. Financial concepts like dividends, *juros*, interest and bankruptcy were not always understood.

(ii) This question was generally better done. There were some candidates who paraphrased the extracts with little or no evaluation. Weaker candidates found Passage A hard to handle and missed points in Passage D as they did not understand the taxation system in Spain. Few seemed to recognise that Philip declared bankruptcy in order to clear his debts, but that this then involved higher interest rates for future borrowings. Some candidates felt any frivolous expenditure on palaces like the Escorial was completely unnecessary and avoidable.

#### Teacher Study Day: Philip II; the Catholic Reformation

A day course for teachers to develop subject knowledge is being run on both Philip II and on the Catholic Reformation at the Victoria & Albert Museum on 9 March 2007. The day will combine a session with a senior examiner on Unit 2588 Philip II with a session led by Museum experts on aspects of the Catholic Reformation and a talk by Professor Rodriguez-Salgado of the London School of Economics on Philip II. For details, please see the 2006-2007 History INSET booklet p.8.

#### Feedback from 2005-2006 days:

*“Excellent and stimulating – introduced new perspectives and recharged batteries.”* [Head of History]

*“Very useful for teaching preparation.”* [Advanced Skills Teacher]

*“Good blend of providing exam-based information and issues for direct student benefit with subject information and issues the teacher’s benefit.”* [Deputy Headteacher]

*“Just to say how very valuable and enjoyable the day was – if only all INSET could be so stimulating with such a mixture of exam technique, academic erudition and on-site visit.”* [Head of History]

2 This question was the less popular of the two essay questions. Candidates did not always assess both the role and the success of the Inquisition. Some lost focus by becoming preoccupied by the Black Legend discussion. A few considered the role of the Inquisition in causing the Dutch revolt, although the question specified mainland Spain. However, some very effective essays were read, with clear evaluation of the debate and detailed knowledge of the role of the inquisition in both reforming the church and its pursuit of heretics.

3 Candidates usually had good knowledge on this question. Their difficulties arose from doubt as to how best to organise their answers. The most effective were those who took a series of aims and analysed how consistently Philip followed them. The less strong often found they had too much information and struggled to relate it well to the question. The word 'strategy' confused some who had little understanding of its implications. The usual pitfalls, to which attention has frequently been drawn, engulfed some: they included the Netherlands as foreign policy or they wrote about the schools of history without much reference to the details of Philip's policy. There was some sound evaluation of the Parker 'Grand Strategy' thesis and several candidates were able to demolish this notion comprehensively. Others argued that the annexation of Portugal was an important turning point in the analysis of consistency and divided the material chronologically. Dealing with each country with which Philip was concerned in turn could be effective, but some candidates who tried this approach found it difficult to maintain it throughout the answer. Others were able to argue well in this way noting that Philip's policy towards France and England could be interpreted as consistent in relation to some aims and inconsistent in relation to other objectives. There were also more candidates prepared to risk a judgement of their own in this question.

### **Elizabeth I**

4(i) Candidates did not focus on the role of the Privy Council and in the process often made this question more difficult for themselves. Weaker candidates could not even identify the essential similarity that the Council provided advice to the queen. Instead candidates concentrated on factionalism and used the reference in Passage B to a Protestant group but then could not reconcile this with the disagreement between Dudley and Cecil in Passage D. Equally some took phrases out of context to argue that Passage D said advice was never the function of the Council. A number of Examiners reported that candidates spent too long on this question at the expense of the essay. This was not a good technique, especially if candidates were not able to see the salient points quickly.

(ii) Many candidates found this question easier. There was plenty of information in the Passages about how Elizabeth made decisions and received advice. There was often some good pertinent own knowledge about Mary, Queen of Scots, the marriage issue, intervention in the Netherlands and the problems caused by Essex. Many argued that Elizabeth's control slipped at the close of her reign. But there were candidates who could not distinguish between Parliament and the Council so the Puritan Choir made regular appearances and the references to courtiers and the court in Passages C and D led some candidates to diverge from the focus on the Council. Weaker candidates did not have sufficient contextual knowledge and some even missed the helpful reference to Mary, Queen of Scots in Passage A.

5 This was a popular question and some very strong answers were seen. These were able to use their knowledge of the threats from the Puritans to argue clearly that they were not all that much of a threat. Some suggested that Elizabeth and Whitgift exaggerated the threat, which was a valid argument as long as it did not become the focus of the essay. Most candidates defined the term, but they did then need to assess the threat from each of the groups they had identified. Some simply stated that Presbyterians and Separatists were a greater threat, without ever explaining why. Elizabeth's suspension of Grindal frequently figured but her reasons were less often assessed. There are still candidates who evaluate the extent of the Puritan threat by asserting that the Catholic threat was much greater, with a wealth of detail, most of which is not relevant to the question set. There was some impressive knowledge about Puritan groups and

their activities, not just in Parliament, and also the efforts of the Church authorities to combat them. Both Jewel and Hooker were often mentioned. The best candidates were able to distinguish between the potentially serious threat to good order in the church and the less threatening campaign for further reformation of the church. The debate between Neale and Elton usually featured. One confused candidate referred to two historians called 'Elton' and 'John'. But others were able to inject a real sense of debate into their answers without any reference to named historians. At least one candidate took the view that Puritans were a threat and marshalled a good range of evidence to support the case. A well presented counter-argument against the prevailing interpretation is always welcome as a sign of independent thought by a candidate. The spelling of Calvinism was often wrong.

### **Teacher Study Day: Elizabeth I**

A day course for teachers to develop their subject knowledge is being run on Elizabeth I at the National Portrait Gallery, London on 27 February 2007. The day will combine a session with a senior examiner on answering Unit 2588 Elizabeth I with a session led by experts from the Gallery on the image of the Queen and a talk by Dr David Crankshaw of King's College London. For details, please see the 2006-2007 History INSET booklet p.9.

#### Feedback from 2005-2006 days:

*"Excellent and stimulating – introduced new perspectives and recharged batteries."* [Head of History]

*"Very useful for teaching preparation."* [Advanced Skills Teacher]

*"Good blend of providing exam-based information and issues for direct student benefit with subject information and issues the teacher's benefit."* [Deputy Headteacher]

*"Just to say how very valuable and enjoyable the day was – if only all INSET could be so stimulating with such a mixture of exam technique, academic erudition and on-site visit."* [Head of History]

6 This question was answered by fewer candidates. They often did not read it carefully, seeing it as asking how much of a threat the Catholics were or what were the reasons for the decline. Both these questions have been set in the past, but candidates cannot expect questions to repeat themselves year by year. One or two did not seem to understand the term *cease* and even asserted that *"by 1603 Catholicism had died out which meant that England did not cease to be a nation of Catholics"*. Weaker candidates tried to bring in the Puritan Choir as evidence for the Catholic threat. Candidates often did not have enough knowledge to assess the extent of Catholic survival. Once they reached Mary, Queen of Scots they diverted mostly to the Catholic threat but returned to the question when discussing the impact of the missionary priests. There were some notable exceptions where candidates clearly relished the opportunity to investigate a differently slanted question and to assess the debate about how far Catholicism survived. The work of Susan Doran was a useful starting point.

### **Oliver Cromwell**

7(i) Candidates tried to find more comparative points in the Passages than were there and needlessly lengthy answers were seen. Both Passages indicated Cromwell took a long time to reach a final decision, but few saw this similarity. The chief difference was identified in the introductions to the Passages, but many diverted to consider the role of Providence in Cromwell's thought processes. Some had a poor grasp of the chronology and saw the Putney Debates and Pride's Purge as simultaneous events, despite the clear guidance as to exact dating.

(ii) Candidates were happier dealing with the issue of a reluctant regicide, apart from those who did not understand the term. Some thought it meant a regency and the offer of the crown. Some found Passage D harder to handle as the distinction between regicide and removal from power was more subtle here. Passage C also led to difficulties as it embraced two viewpoints: that Cromwell thought the king was a murderer, but that he also thought it might not be the role of the army to punish him. It is not unknown for Passages to contain more than one argument and candidates should be prepared for this. Contextual knowledge was not extensive, despite the hints in the Passages about the impact of events of 1647-48 on Cromwell's thinking. But there were some references to cruel necessity. Evaluation of the arguments seemed to be particularly weak in this question.

8 This was not quite the question which candidates were expecting and some were determined to write what they had prepared, relevant or not. But many were aware of what Cromwell did in the First Civil War, usually more fully about his contribution to the campaigns. Some argued that recruitment and provisioning of troops counted as off the battlefield activity, and this was acceptable if used relevantly. There was less knowledge about Cromwell's doings in Parliament, apart from the Self-Denying Ordinance. The more serious defects in the answers lay in the prevalent failure to make any assessment of his contribution. His victories were given and explained but how they related to the winning of the war was not well evaluated. The dates of the question were ignored by some who reached as far back as Cromwell's schooldays and as far forward as his refusal of the crown. Much information about Cromwell in Parliament before 1642 was included. Some candidates, influenced perhaps by the film *Cromwell*, persist in asserting that Cromwell was one of the five MPs whom Charles I tried to arrest.

9 This question was aimed at a standard debate about Cromwell's rule, but was rarely answered well. There was some confusion between government and Parliament. If candidates only referred to the latter then the outcome was not likely to be good. A chronological account of the period was a common approach. Again, the terms of the question were ignored and material from the Rump Parliament and the Nominated Assembly was often cited. But there were exceptional responses which analysed the debate confidently, using evidence to show Cromwell's adherence to the Instrument of Government and his summoning of Parliaments, declining of the crown and his attitude to the Biddle and Nayler cases set against the Major-Generals, resting on bayonets, and the dissolution of Parliaments.



**Unit 2588 sub-codes: keeping your scripts separate**

Your Exams Office now has to make entries using a sub-code for each candidate. The code(s) that they need is/are listed in their *Administrative Guide & Entry Procedures 2007* file.

If you teach different options within Unit 2588, the code used will be different for each option. Separate examiner labels and attendance registers will be sent to your Exams Office for each option.

NB The scripts will very possibly go to different examiners.

**Peter the Great**

10(i) Some candidates did not seem able to understand what is meant by character. They tended to revert to listing and to trying to attribute the Passages to particular schools of history. Sometimes they dissected Peter's character according to the historiography, but this was not what they were asked to do. The reference in Passage D to fondness for animals led to some comment but not to excess. The mixture of 'good' and 'bad' characteristics in the Passages confused some candidates. However, a number of candidates were able to produce very strong comparisons of the two views.

(ii) Candidates found it challenging to relate character to achievements but most were able to respond successfully. Generally they found plenty of evidence, both in the Passages and from their own knowledge. A few asserted Peter was, for example, brave and this helped his achievements without any explanation of why this was. Examples which helped predominated and one examiner suspected that hindered was not always understood. Candidates did not lack contextual knowledge, but it did need to be used to evaluate the view in the Passages, rather than as a list of all the candidate knew about Peter's achievements.

11 The terms defensive and aggressive were understood much more universally and candidates were able to relate their knowledge well to this question. Most defined aims clearly and assessed them from what they knew about Peter's policies. The concept of a defensive war has become more readily understood by candidates. Most were able to write about Peter's policies regarding Turkey, Sweden and Persia. There was less emphasis on Persia than the other areas, but most candidates did refer to Persia, which has been neglected sometimes in previous answers to questions on Peter's foreign policy. Detailed knowledge of some of Peter's campaigns was not always evident and some candidates assessed their general success without considering the terms of the question. The various schools of history were less quoted in the answers, as candidates realised this was not wholly appropriate here, which was another advance.

12 This question was also well answered, as long as candidates knew what revolutionary implied, related the term to their evaluation of Peters' policies and made this debate the focus of their response. Some tried to argue his aims were revolutionary but his achievements were not or that his changes differed from those of his predecessors and were revolutionary as a result, or they were similar to those of earlier rulers and so were not revolutionary. There was some drift into different debates, such as how far Peter followed a westernising policy or an anti-noble policy. There was more tendency in this answer to include assertions about what orthodox or revisionist historians would argue. The question, again, presented clear alternatives, between which the candidates were asked to judge and hence the debate arose from the structure of the question. There were candidates who spent far too long dissecting the term revolutionary and made minimal reference to changes carried out by Peter. The question stated within Russia, but this escaped the attention of some and foreign policy was included. The building up of the armed forces could be seen as relevant, but not the use to which they were put outside Russia. Similarly long accounts of the Great Journey were not needed.

### Comments on Individual Questions Unit 2589/11 – 2589/17

The candidature for this paper was: 507 for Napoleon I, 832 for Gladstone and Disraeli, 574 for Bismarck, 1051 for Roosevelt, 2036 for Lenin, 1514 for Chamberlain and 790 for Stalin. One letter of complaint was received on Q1(ii).

#### Unit 2589 sub-codes: keeping your scripts separate

Your Exams Office now has to make entries using a sub-code for each candidate. The code(s) that they need is/are listed in their *Administrative Guide & Entry Procedures 2007* file.

If you teach different options within Unit 2589, the code used will be different for each option. Separate examiner labels and attendance registers will be sent to your Exams Office for each option.

NB The scripts will very possibly go to different examiners.

### Napoleon I

1(i) Candidates were not always able to pick out the comparative points in the Passages. They often seemed to skim over the first sentence in Passage B and so missed the popularity among the common people, which echoed the popular movement in Passage A. Equally, the reference to popular enthusiasm declining in A was not noticed or compared with the continuing support from country people and small-town bourgeoisie in Passage B. Also, lines 3-4 were not carefully read so many asserted Napoleon hated priests and nobles. Some of these errors could have been avoided by candidates reading the steers to the Passages carefully.

(ii) Those candidates who understood the term 'notables' were few in number. They were frequently assumed to be the same as the nobles. This was despite the clear references to the notables in three of the Passages and their omission from Passage B which implied that Napoleon did not necessarily need their support. Contextual knowledge on reasons for Napoleon's fall was sometimes slight. Some considered very effectively the combination of domestic and foreign influences on his downfall, considering which was more significant. A number made good comparison between reasons for his first overthrow and his second.

2 This was the less popular of the essays, but those answering it were usually able to define the terms of the question and apply their knowledge relevantly. They were aware of debate and could discuss both sides of the debate effectively.

3 This was a popular question but in this case the term 'military genius' was not always defined. It is not the same thing as being a successful general. Many candidates, who did focus on the key issue, were eager to demolish Napoleon's reputation so thoroughly that it became hard to imagine how he had ever achieved his position. Revisionism can go too far. The question of how much Napoleon owed to the army he inherited was often discussed but perceptive candidates argued that the use of existing resources can be a mark of genius. Examiners felt that knowledge on the campaigns is improving with references moving beyond Ulm and Austerlitz to include Eylau, Wagram, Borodino and Marengo. Some were aware of change over a period of time and so saw Napoleon as a genius in his early career, but less so later. However, it was also noted that accurate spelling of the names of Napoleon's generals was rare. Even Ney was beyond some candidates. Not all candidates seemed to be familiar with the historical debate about Napoleon's qualities or derived their information from previously set Passages only. Hence there was mention of 'blundering to glory' or Napoleon as a 'scrambler' but not always understanding of what these descriptions meant. Weaker candidates offered a list of factors which might have impacted on Napoleon as a military commander or a narrative of his successes and failures.

### Gladstone and Disraeli 1846-80

4(i) Most candidates were able to pick out the relevant different points in the Passages but had more trouble with the similarities where some subtlety was needed. For example, B referred to the fact that Disraeli was not responsible for what actually happened and D to the wars as partly bad luck. Candidates do need to think about the implications of the phrases in the Passages and always expect explicit comparisons to leap out at them. Candidates did better on how far responsibility should be apportioned to Lytton or Frere. Weaker candidates had a marked tendency to list points but to make little direct comparison.

(ii) This was often answered well. There were some who failed to look carefully at the terms of the question and gave examples which were drawn from foreign, rather than imperial, policies. It is time that candidates knew the difference as this has been highlighted in several previous reports. Candidates were aware of the context of the Midlothian campaign and so evaluated Passage A well and Passage C quite well, but struggled with the other Passages. Some were carried away by the exuberance of Gladstone's criticisms and described these at length but failed to discuss how far they were justified. Detailed knowledge of the background to events in South Africa and Afghanistan was not often displayed to help with evaluation. Gladstone's later problems in these areas, although these are not included in the *Specification*, were adduced as evidence that his criticisms were not justified and this was credited, but not expected.

5 This was the less popular of the two essay questions and rarely led to good answers. Some candidates strayed beyond 1868. The problems seemed to lie in structuring the argument coherently as opposed to making a few points about the difficulties Disraeli faced in coming to lead the party. Details of his eventful early life sometimes crowded out discussion of the impact of the split over the Corn Laws or the Second Reform Act. As the option begins in 1846, Disraeli's early life is not required knowledge but, as always, relevant use of such material was credited. One or two perceptive candidates did indicate that as Disraeli was aged 64 in 1868, he might not have felt that he had been lucky.

6 This was a popular question, but many candidates did not define the term 'radical' in any meaningful way. Hence there was much outlining of the legislation followed by the assertion that it was/was not radical. Some argued that measures which had been put forward by earlier administrations could not be classed as radical and others that proposals which were not successful in achieving their aims were similarly not radical. Detailed knowledge of the provisions and the impact of the reforms was not often seen. Even the Education Act, a key measure, was not always mentioned and then it was confused with other Education Acts with claims that primary education now became universal and free, which was then considered as being radical. The Licensing Act was better known but candidates could not decide if it was radical in its aims and because it was unpopular or not radical because it was unpopular. Some candidates attributed Disraeli's reforms to Gladstone, most frequently the Artisans' Dwellings Act and some diverted into describing the reception given to the reforms by the various groups within the Liberal party. Examiners are sometimes amazed by the varied, ingenious ways which candidates employ to avoid answering the question set. Irish reforms were sometimes better known, although a few candidates did not mention them at all. Some knew about Gladstone's later reforms in Ireland and were confused. Several claimed the Land Act introduced 'the 3 Fs'. Able candidates were confident in their assessment of the effect of the reforms and some argued that in the long term they could be seen as more radical than appeared at the time, notably to some members of the Liberal party. These candidates were also aware that earlier historians had seen this government as one of the greatest reforming ministries of the nineteenth century. Some examiners reported that this was the best answered of the essay questions on the entire paper.

An extract follows from one of these good essays, which used knowledge of the measures and of the debate to consider how far the reforms were radical and some of the reasons why radical reform was limited:

*“However, much of the legislation created during Gladstone’s first ministry, and in particular during the most productive period (1870-72) was fatally flawed, not least due to divisive competing interests within the Liberal party. Shannon has noted that, although one might have expected truly radical reform, caveats were often added to bills that weakened their power. An excellent example is the Education Act of 1870, over which the Liberal party was split between Anglicans who desired a firm religious grounding for education, creating the Cowper-Temple clause which enforced a broadly Bible based learning scheme, and nonconformists whose wishes were found in Article 25 permitting withdrawal of students whose parental religion conflicted with that being taught. Both sides of the debate were alienated by what they saw as an insufficiently radical change; a similar example can be seen over the Trade unions, which were legalised in 1871, which could be seen as a radical change in attitudes to working class organisations, but were then severely restricted by the bar on peaceful picketing that same year. As Shannon has noted, ‘the legislative potential of the Liberal majority was wasted in parliamentary bickering’. Nevertheless it should be noted that significant change was possible, as in the removal of purchase of commissions in the army, the opening up of the Civil Service and the introduction of the secret ballot. Some, notably Hammond, have been led to refer to 1868-74 as ‘the Great Ministry’.”*

### **Unit 2589 sub-codes: keeping your scripts separate**

Your Exams Office now has to make entries using a sub-code for each candidate. The code(s) that they need is/are listed in their *Administrative Guide & Entry Procedures 2007* file.

If you teach different options within Unit 2589, the code used will be different for each option. Separate examiner labels and attendance registers will be sent to your Exams Office for each option.

NB The scripts will very possibly go to different examiners.

### **Bismarck and the Unification of Germany 1858-71**

7(i) The comparison was generally well supported and most identified key differences. The similarity that Bismarck anticipated gains from promoting the candidature was a little more subtle, but most came close to seeing the point.

(ii) Candidates were so keen to embrace the debate on whether Bismarck planned to unify Germany that they missed ‘through war with France’. Passage B was the largest challenge to most candidates as it needed thought to link it to the issue. This again illustrates that, at this level, candidates cannot expect all the Passages to be quickly categorised as for or against the assertion in the question. Contextual knowledge was often hazy on the details of events of 1870 and perhaps this needs more emphasis when the topic is being studied.

8 This was the more popular question. There were some very strong answers which focused on weaknesses of other states and went beyond the supposed military shortcomings of Austria and their exclusion from the Zollverein. Some wrote about the general diplomatic situation and described Bismarck’s relationships with all the European powers. Some who wanted to write about economic factors did so anyway, sometimes with a nod to the question and sometimes with no reference to it. Many candidates wrote at length on the role of the Zollverein and general economic growth with particular reference to the expansion of the railway system. Other factors were less well assessed. Better responses linked economic factors to military might and placed these against the role of Bismarck.

9 Not many candidates attempted this question, but those who did, were often well aware of the debate about liberalism and the significance of the Indemnity Bill. It seems likely that candidates who choose less popular questions do so because they are well prepared on the topic and so results tend to be stronger.

### **Roosevelt's America 1920-41**

10(i) Candidates found the Passages accessible but tended to list points from each in turn. Some missed similarities such as the saturation in B and car ownership in C. This was also a question where weaker candidates compared the provenance of the Passages, rather than the views they contained.

(ii) This question was usually well tackled. Candidates had plenty of contextual knowledge, but some tended to write a mini-essay and lose focus on the interpretations in the Passages. The iniquities of the Republicans were frequently detailed and other factors not considered. Candidates are expected to focus on the factor put forward in the question and not to brush it aside in order to write about what they have prepared. Passages B and C related directly to over-production, while A and D raised other possible causes of the collapse and these interpretations needed to be evaluated from contextual knowledge. Passage B confused some candidates as it referred to alternative interpretations, but candidates should know that Passages may well do this and there have been plenty of previous examples to give them practice in the necessary skills. Some examiners reported that treating the Passages sequentially, summarising content with little attempt to evaluate, was particularly prevalent in this question.

11 This was popular, but too often answers consisted of a list of factors which led to the repeal of prohibition without addressing the question set. Candidates knew a good deal about this topic, but need to be more flexible in using their material for a specific issue. Some of the detail about the activities of gangsters was little more than padding. Many answers had little sense of debate as they asserted that prohibition failed and so, by implication, its aims were not met. If the views of historians were mentioned, they were not always interpretative as in *'many historians say Al Capone earned a lot from bootlegging'*. Better answers at least discussed some aims of the supporters of prohibition and some of these were able to produce an argument and counter-argument. One or two brave pioneers suggested the aims of supporters were largely met, but media attention was focused on the more lurid aspects of the failure. Others spent so long outlining the aims of supporters there was no time to assess the degree of success or failure.

Three extracts follow, all of which illustrate ways in which candidates could relate their knowledge to the actual question. These are not necessarily top quality responses, but they show how the question could be tackled with some success:

*"Although there were many setbacks, prohibition was enforced, but only for a minority of Americans. There were those living in urban areas who were not able to get hold of alcohol and there were others that could not afford alcohol. Alongside this, treasury agents did prevent some alcohol from reaching its final destination, catching sailors on 'rum row' and 'bootleggers' crossing borders."*

*"The positive aims of Prohibition in creating a 'Brave New World' within post-war America may be seen to have failed given the difficulties created between federal and State governments in enforcing Prohibition. Rather than a strong, united society pursuing moral purity, corruption and conflict arose on many levels as frustration arose between Washington and the States through a lack of funds and resources to enforce prohibition and the wide acceptance of bribes from those expected to be enforcing the law. The widespread opposition and reluctance to conform to the value system promoted by National Prohibition may be recognised as the clearest example of the inability of Prohibition to reach the aims of its supporters. To a degree, the campaign for Prohibition was an attempt to force one view of society held by WASPs on to the whole"*

population and the resistance which arose from many groups clearly highlights the failure of this aim.”

“Some aims of supporters were met. Women, mainly from lower class families, benefited as their men could not get to one of the 30,000 ‘speakeasies’ that were around in 1926, so you could say that target was met. The employees of big business could not afford the ‘speakeasies’ either, so they were coming in sober and ready to work. On the other hand the religious groups wanted alcohol outlawed for the benefit of everyone. This no-one could say was done. ‘Speakeasies’ were crowded with the middle classes that were looking for a good time.”

12 There were fewer answers to this question. The main problem lay in organising the material. Questions on the New Deal often lead to lists of measures and this was no exception. Some candidates did not manage to move much beyond the first hundred days. Better candidates focused on ‘Relief, Recovery and Reform’ and this was an effective way to assess the impact of the New Deal. There was awareness of the different interpretations on the topic. Opposition to the New Deal could be made relevant as evidence that its achievements were not that great, but long accounts of the various opposition groups and individuals was not likely to gain much credit. One examiner quoted an example of informal writing in one answer. ‘*Although an excellent idea, many pensions could not be accessed until 1940. So, if you needed your pension now, tough.*’

#### **Unit 2589 sub-codes: keeping your scripts separate**

Your Exams Office now has to make entries using a sub-code for each candidate. The code(s) that they need is/are listed in their *Administrative Guide & Entry Procedures 2007* file.

If you teach different options within Unit 2589, the code used will be different for each option. Separate examiner labels and attendance registers will be sent to your Exams Office for each option.

NB The scripts will very possibly go to different examiners.

#### **Lenin and the Establishment of Bolshevik Power 1903-24**

13(i) Most candidates coped well with the comparison and several examiners felt it was the best answered of the (i) questions on the paper. Some candidates saw the splits in the Bolshevik party mentioned in B as a source of strength, despite the clear guidance in the steer. Most picked up the similarity between the last lines of B and the *swelling support* in C, showing that candidates can appreciate subtler points.

(ii) Answers tended to seize on the reference to the threat the Bolsheviks posed and to dissect this issue with relatively limited use of the Passages. Analysis of Lenin’s leadership often turned into a list of other factors about why the Provisional Government fell, rather than an evaluation of his role. Some who had, at least, read the question more carefully, then asserted that Lenin was not mentioned in some Passages, which were thus useless. This showed candidates were skimming, rather than reading, the Passages.

14 There was some good discussion of the debate about how effective the Bolsheviks were in this period, with the Soviet view generally being refuted, but there were candidates who argued for an alternative interpretation with considerable force and verve. Some candidates missed the ending of the question in February 1917 and included the April Theses and other later events. The weakest were encouraged by the word ‘Tsarism’ and wrote about the reasons for the downfall of the Tsar, with little or no consideration of the role of Lenin. Questions on the role of the Bolsheviks before 1917 have rarely been well tackled, so examiners were pleased to see some improvement in knowledge. There were still weaker candidates who wrote a narrative of events.

An extract follows from an essay which put forward and evaluated the Soviet view:

*“Soviet historians argue that this period (after 1905) was a ‘transition period’ and the Bolsheviks were only just presenting their ideology to the people. They also faced the task of rekindling the desire for a revolution, which all historians agree was a great challenge for them. By 1907 Lenin realised the need to achieve political representation and changed his ideology, deciding to participate in the elected Duma. However, this caused a serious backlash, with some of his own party members leaving, thus showing weakness in the party. Soviet historians claim this is a continuation of the transitional period. By 1912 the party split had become official, but instead of seeing this as a failure, Lenin and many soviet historians claim it was a crucial advance for the Bolsheviks and that the strikes happening through the cities were a result of Bolsheviks guiding the workers. This had a positive effect with party membership increasing. However, alternative historians quickly point out that the Bolshevik representation in the Duma was still very low.”*

15 This question was more popular and candidates were well informed about the different interpretations of terror tactics. Some had difficulty in selecting examples to show terror for military, ideological or survival reasons and argued that the various motives were closely linked. Some found evidence, such as the Kronstadt repression which did have little to do with war and much to do with political survival. The view that the Civil War was a desperate situation for the Bolsheviks and hence the use of terror necessary was given less credence than the suggestion of sinister and unpleasant motives. The idea that political ideology can inspire actions seemed to be a foreign concept to some candidates. The death of the Tsar and his family was not often cited as an instance of terror. Some weaker candidates did not seem to be aware of any debate on this issue.

### **Chamberlain and Anglo-German Relations 1918-39**

16(i) The similarities between the Passages were noticed by most candidates. Some missed the more critical note in the last lines of Passages B.

(ii) Examiners reported that some candidates did not note that the question specified ‘at the 1938 Munich Conference’ and so wrote about general arguments for and against appeasement. One candidate was confused by the opening of Passage A and argued that the main pressure was economic as although Munich cost a lot, war would have cost even more.

17 The word which candidates missed here was ‘unrealistic’. Hence they presented a list of reasons for British policy with little evaluation and much assertion. Some extended their coverage into the 1930s especially to the Anglo-German Naval Agreement. Others missed the word ‘Germany’ and wrote about British policy generally. Some were better focused and could discuss how far Britain was actually isolated and link this to ‘unrealistic’ or otherwise.

18 Some candidates challenged the terms of the question and argued that there was no change as Chamberlain remained committed to appeasement and had to be propelled into war in the end. This is acceptable but the basis of the question does need to be addressed and there is generally seen to have been some change in March 1939, if only on the surface. Candidates also needed to focus on the causes of change and not the results of change. The need to strengthen Britain’s defences and the swings in public opinion were usually well analysed but the details of what happened when were hazy in the minds of some candidates. The guarantee to Poland was a case in point and some even placed events like the Anschluss in the later months of 1939. Factual knowledge of key, relatively short, periods can reasonably be expected to be quite detailed.

**Unit 2589 sub-codes: keeping your scripts separate**

Your Exams Office now has to make entries using a sub-code for each candidate. The code(s) that they need is/are listed in their *Administrative Guide & Entry Procedures 2007* file.

If you teach different options within Unit 2589, the code used will be different for each option. Separate examiner labels and attendance registers will be sent to your Exams Office for each option.

NB The scripts will very possibly go to different examiners.

**Stalin and the Development of the Cold War in Europe 1941-55**

19(i) Passage A was clearly stated to be an advertisement by a US company, yet candidates were determined to label it as a post-revisionist expose of traditional historiography or in other inappropriate ways. Candidates often failed to see that Passage A, although largely extolling the business opportunities presented, did also say that countries urgently needed American products and services, which could be seen as a more humanitarian approach.

(ii) The emphasis on schools of historical thought sometimes obscured the answers and failed to make sound use of the Passages. Candidates continue to waste time trying to fit each Passage into one of the 'boxes' known to them. Better candidates kept to the focus on 'selfless generosity'. One concluded perceptively that the US may have been generous, but was hardly selfless. A few candidates misread 'selfless' as 'selfish' which led to a confused outcome.

20 Candidates tended either to know about the Conferences or about earlier disagreements on the second front, but not often both. Hence they could not get a feel for the period as a whole and few could reach much of a conclusion, regarding all factors as equally important.

21 There were a fair number of good candidates who were well informed and used a series of examples to show how USSR security had been compromised in the past and so how much it influenced Stalin. They seemed, in this question, more able to relate the schools of history to the material and not just see the terms as abstractions. Some were able to see the Berlin crisis in this way as well. 1944-45 was less well covered. There were weaker candidates who produced the interpretations of the causes of the Cold War with little reference to actual events, but their numbers do seem to be decreasing. Some had their own agenda and were determined to defend Stalin to the hilt and blame the US as the clear aggressor. Candidates are often very ready to denigrate historians for being influenced in their interpretations by the events of their own times, but might perhaps reflect on whether they, too, could be equally at fault.



**Report on  
Unit 2590/11 & 2590/12 (Themes in History 1066-1796)  
Unit 2591/11 & 2591/12 (Themes in History 1763-1996)**

**General Comments**

The introduction of sub-codes for entries allowed examiners to identify a topic which they preferred not to mark. Both papers resulted in effective differentiation. Not surprisingly in a synoptic unit there was a wide range of responses, but the overall quality was good. Some excellent essays reflected a real sense of control and ability to synthesise a variety of factors over the whole period. Most attempted an argument with some analysis, though some found synthesis more difficult to sustain. Some 1% were retaking from June 2005 and 4% from January 2006.

Weaker features, nevertheless, persist. Not answering the question set remains the most prevalent problem; some candidates are still prone to setting their own agenda or only dealing with the exact question in the conclusion. Some Centres this year appear to have instructed candidates to quote historians and set up a historiographical framework. This approach is neither required nor recommended. Most knew a lot of facts but either unload them with little regard for the question or wrote narrative accounts with minimal assessment. Candidates who approach their essays thematically do score more highly than those who use a descriptive or chronological framework. A trend among weaker answers when dealing with comparative questions was to describe a factor, then other factors, before making a conclusion. Turning-point questions also caused some difficulties. Too often, every significant event was seen as a turning-point with little attempt to evaluate or differentiate between them. Insufficient attention was also paid to key terms in the question, such as 'main', 'most', and 'more', or 'so concerned' (Q8 in Unit 2590/12) and 'so long' (Q9 in Unit 2591/11). Although most candidates experienced little difficulty writing in the allotted time, some failed to produce two balanced answers, devoting too much time to detailed planning or an over-long first essay.

A large number still make poor use of the Timeline, even giving the wrong dates or using no dates at all at all. The overall quality of written English has declined. The use of abbreviations continues to be disappointing: 'H7', 'AAs', 'MQS', 'Fed' were typical examples, and several wrote their answers in the present tense, which is a practice that should be discouraged. This year a number of candidates produced work which was nearly illegible owing to the small size of their handwriting. Centres need to be reminded of the importance of neat, clear handwriting. This helps the argument to flow and leaves a more favourable impression with the examiner.

**Unit 2590 sub-codes: keeping your scripts separate**

Your Exams Office now has to make entries using a sub-code for each candidate. The code(s) that they need is/are listed in their *Administrative Guide & Entry Procedures 2007* file.

If you teach both Medieval & Early Modern options within Unit 2590, the code used will be different for each option. Separate examiner labels and attendance registers will be sent to your Exams Office for each option.

NB The scripts will very possibly go to different examiners.

### **INSET 2006-2007**

OCR's programme for GCE History next academic year was published in June 2006. As always, the History booklet was sent to every centre and placed on OCR's website. In response to suggestions from teachers, the main series of meetings for 2006-2007 will help colleagues to think about and develop more effective approaches to teaching exam units 2580-2591.

#### Feedback from the 2005-2006 series:

*"The opportunity to discuss with colleagues was very welcome."* [Head of History]

*"The quality of feedback on exam technique was excellent."* [Assistant Headteacher]

*"A very useful guide, plus good oversight into the course."* [Teach First Trainee]

*"The day clarified particular concerns I had."* [Curriculum Manager]

*"The course fitted the needs of the group – to the point."* [NQT]

*"Excellent advice that can easily be turned to practical method."* [VIth Form College Lecturer]

### **Comments on Individual Questions Unit 2590/11 & 2590/12**

The candidature for this paper was: 380 Medieval, 2852 Early Modern.. No complaints were received from centres about any of the questions on this paper.

### **The Government of England 1066-1216**

1. This question generated a range of responses, though many candidates seemed to think that it was about the chief justiciar rather than the changes to central government. The best essays set the importance of the chief justiciar in the context of other changes, including the overall growth of centralisation, in the course of the period. Several pointed out that the development of the chief justiciar was most important when the monarch was absent. In weaker scripts, some candidates evaluated the importance of each factor but offered no comparison. Some knew little about the chief justiciar or ignored the element of central government and wrote about local government officers instead. Some omitted anything after Henry II or misread the question as 'the most important reason for the development of centralised government was ...'

2. This was the least well-answered in the set. Many struggled to explain or define feudalism and there was often little focus on the extent or way that feudalism changed in its contribution to military organisation. Some wanted to explain why military organisation changed rather than the extent to which feudalism changed as a part of it. The best essays recognised elements of continuity and change in the role of feudalism and evaluated explicitly the degree of continuity. Some stressed the importance of mercenaries over the feudal host; others argued that money raised from feudalism was used to pay for the mercenaries and was therefore still as important. Some candidates wrote about castles and where this was focused or linked with feudalism, they were credited; but several candidates described the military organisation of England without focusing on the role of feudalism.

3. This was a good discriminating question. The best candidates offered a synthesis across the period, looking at reasons for poor relations under other monarchs as well as under Stephen and John, or using other reigns as a contrast. Most candidates focused on Stephen's reign as a reaction to Henry I and John's reign as a reaction to strong Angevin government, and weighed up the developments against other factors such as the personality of the monarch, the loss of land in France or the king's presence in England. Less effective answers concentrated almost exclusively on Stephen and John, or failed to provide a comparative evaluation, or mistook 'poor

relations' for 'rebellion' or 'breakdown of government'. The weakest essays wrote a narrative on the development of strong government. Some dismissed the premise in the question only then to assert that it was weak government that caused the trouble, citing the reigns of Stephen and John as examples while omitting examples of friction in any other reign.

### **Crown, Church and Papacy 1066-1228**

4. This question generated as much heat as light in many candidates' essays. Many weaker candidates misinterpreted the question to explain why Lanfranc did more than others or to describe what he did without making the necessary comparison between Lanfranc and others who had a positive impact on the church. Some thought 'strengthening the church' meant how many churches were built. Knowledge of Anselm was often much better than that of Becket or Langton. Some of the best answers synthesised elements not only from the periods of the four archbishops in the *specification* but also included Theobald and Walter by way of comparison.

5. This was the most popular question in this set and candidates found it easier to analyse and explain changes in the role of the Papacy than to see signs of continuity, such as strengthening of the papal position in respect of the English church and/or monarchy. Most sowed that at the start of the period the Papacy played a minor role, despite support for William's invasion, and then compared this with the situation during John's reign. Better answers showed that this changing role was not constant and that the rate of change fluctuated during the period. Less effective essays discussed a limited range of aspects of the role of the Papacy, or even resorted to illustrating the role. Some candidates still make the mistake of identifying the Papacy as synonymous with 'the church'.

6. The least popular of this set, and the least well-answered. A problem for many candidates was how to make best use of their knowledge about the Cistercians to answer the question set. Some described their work but did not compare it with other developments, such as the new orders under Henry I, the appointment of Lanfranc and his reforms of monasticism, or the arrival of the friars. For some candidates, terminology was a problem, since they did not know the difference between a monastery and a religious order. The best answers showed that the Cistercians were important in reviving the monastic ideal, taking monasticism into new areas and introducing new forms of patronage, only later to lose that idealism.

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

7. A popular question and generally well-answered but one which caused some common misinterpretations. Some candidates, for instance, looked at how serious succession disputes were and assessed 'impact' in terms of their outcome rather than the relative importance of succession as a cause of rebellion. Common factual errors were to claim that Henry VII married Elizabeth as a result of Simnel's uprising, that Lovel was a Yorkist claimant and that Wyatt's rebellion prevented Mary from marrying Philip. It was noticeable that some candidates found it hard to show how Simnel and Warbeck were dynastic and simply claimed that these rebellions were Yorkist-led. Weaker candidates often discussed why rebellions failed, assessed the seriousness of rebellions or why rebellions were/were not important. Some candidates got no further than considering dynastic rebellions and so solely focused on the reign of Henry VII. Better answers recognised the multi-causal nature of rebellions, even if they did involve dynastic issues, such as the Pilgrimage of Grace or Wyatt. Some sought to distinguish rebellion from less fundamental kinds of disorder, and argued that succession declined in importance as the dynasty wore on. These answers synthesised and showed how succession was an issue throughout the period, although its nature changed from Yorkist plotting under Henry VII to factional/religious attempts to change the dynasty in Elizabeth's reign.

**Unit 2590 sub-codes: keeping your scripts separate**

Your Exams Office now has to make entries using a sub-code for each candidate. The code(s) that they need is/are listed in their *Administrative Guide & Entry Procedures 2007* file.

If you teach both Medieval & Early Modern options within Unit 2590, the code used will be different for each option. Separate examiner labels and attendance registers will be sent to your Exams Office for each option.

NB The scripts will very possibly go to different examiners.

8. This required careful thought about why authorities were so concerned about rebellion and disorder. For many, it was a chance to say how serious a threat was rebellion (a question set in January 2006), and so describe what happened and why rebellions were difficult to put down, or to run through the causes of rebellion. Some candidates translated 'so concerned about rebellion' into writing about developments 'concerning rebellion' and did not evaluate reasons for concern. Few candidates referred to the lack of a standing army or police force, or to the Tudors' dependence on the landed gentry and nobility for maintaining order. Some answers claimed that, as the period advanced, authorities became less concerned, but this does not really explain why Elizabeth took such savage action after 1596.

9. Good candidates tested both parts of the statement and argued that some rebellions ended in total failure, some were partially successful and a few were completely successful. They evaluated aims in the light of subsequent events, sometimes for example examining the impact of rebellion upon a government. The best candidates understood that the type of rebellion (dynastic compared with tax protests, religious compared with economic complaints) often determined the degree of success experienced by the rebels. Few government policies were revoked or reversed though some were modified in the aftermath. Most candidates challenged the idea of total failure but accepted defeat. Weaker essay explained or described why rebellions failed or attributed developments some ten years later to the impact of a rebellion. Many stretched the meaning of 'not a total defeat' by suggesting that any rebellion that provoked a reaction from the government was at least partially successful. Comments on defeat were often sweeping, stating that defeated rebels were always slaughtered but in the Pilgrimage, for instance, the rebels were neither defeated nor slaughtered. Those who died did so as a result of the Cumberland/Bigod rising.

**England's Changing Relations with Foreign Powers 1485-1603**

10. This was a poorly answered question. Some candidates were fixated on turning-points or wrote narratives of Anglo-Spanish relations making no reference at all to 'domestic affairs'. A few candidates interpreted 'domestic affairs' to mean personal or marital problems, and, while this had some relevance in relation to Henry VIII, it proved a sterile approach when applied to the rest of the period.

11. Instead of analysing reasons why Anglo-Scottish relations changed during the period, many struggled to prioritise factors or simply list reasons. Many found it harder working in the earlier period and few saw any distinction in relations between Henry VII's and Henry VIII's reigns. Better answers focused on the importance of the change in the Auld Alliance and understood the significance of the 1560s, linking these developments back to Henry VII and his daughter's marriage.

12. Many revealed a lack of understanding of 'dynastic factors' or focused exclusively on them and failed to provide a relative evaluation. Better answers compared dynastic with other factors and showed the change in importance over the period. Most argued dynastic factors were important under Henry VII but under Henry VIII factors such as military glory, the break with

Rome and continental alliances were more important. Few saw dynastic as important by the end of the period and suggested security and religion were more significant. Few assessed economic (finances, trade, commerce, exploration) factors over the whole period.

### **The Development of Limited Monarchy in England 1558-1689**

13. This question produced a wide range of answers. Some were excellent. They adopted a thematic approach, first defining 'effective' and then applying their criteria to each of the periods. Those who synthesised Charles II with other governments (including Cromwell) scored highly. Many suggested Elizabeth was at least as effective as Charles II, if not more so. Some, however, knew little of Charles II, displayed confusion over the concept of 'government' (often confusing it with parliament) and frequently interpreted 'effective' to mean successful. Some wrote too much on Elizabeth and very little on James I and James II.

14. The least popular of this set of questions. Some candidates found it hard to focus on the idea of personality and so tended to write about other issues which determined their relationship. Some simply resorted to writing a narrative of the reigns. For many, the kings' relationship with parliament was more accessible than a comparison of their personalities with other factors, and these essays tended to focus on the monarchs' attitude to parliament. Better answers compared personalities with policies, parliament and ministers, and used Charles's behaviour during the Civil War to illustrate the impact his personality had on parliament.

15. Most focused on Catholics and Puritans, and better essays showed how the challenge changed over time. Some showed excellent understanding of radical groups in the Interregnum. Non-conformists were little known. Some turned the question into one about anti-Catholicism rather than the challenge presented to the crown by Catholics. As a result, there was much confusion in the post-1660 period as to the relationship between Anglicans, Catholics and non-conformists.

### **Dissent and Conformity in England 1558-1689**

16. This topic was only answered by a handful of Centres. Few candidates really understood 'growing in strength', and most produced narratives of development in the Church of England over the period. Better answers compared particular periods, such as 1559, 1642, 1660 and 1689, but found it hard to sustain a comparison.

17. Some believed Charles I was a Catholic and failed to focus either on his reign as a turning-point or on anti-Catholicism over the period. Catholic plots were often ignored, and few explained why attitudes towards Catholics might change within a particular reign. Knowledge of continental affairs was also at a premium.

18. An insufficient number of answers prevents a useful report.

### **The Development of the Nation State: France 1498-1610**

19. The most successful evaluated the Church's role positively and negatively. The role of the Sorbonne, *parlements* and *chambre ardente* figured in these answers. Most argued that it did assist in the first half of the period but was more a force for disunity in the second. Generally, there was a poor level of knowledge and understanding about the Church. Indeed, many wrote about religion or described the role of Calvinists. Some wrote about how unified France was and blamed any disunity on the Protestants. Others dismissed the Catholic Church as an irrelevance and then turned to other more important factors in the development of France.

20. This was a well-answered question. Many candidates were well prepared and produced a synoptic evaluation that covered the whole period and identified moments of change as well as periods of continuity. A variety of elements were usually examined, religion being identified as the one that caused most disunity. Many answers in addition examined centralisation, law, language, territory and the personalities of rulers. A range of conclusions was reached: some argued that France became more unified; others that divisions still remained in 1610.

21. This question was the least popular of the set but it did produce some very good answers. The most interesting elements concerned religion and economic policy. Some saw Henry IV continue the toleration policy of Catherine de Medici; others suggested Henry built upon the foundations laid by Francis I and Henry II, particularly in terms of finance and administration. Most believed Henry put more emphasis on the economy and they were able to support this with good factual evidence. Weaker essays had limited knowledge of Henry IV and were unable to compare his achievements and failures with his predecessors.

### The Catholic Reformation in the Sixteenth Century

#### **Teacher Study Day: the Catholic Reformation; Philip II**

A day course for teachers to develop subject knowledge is being run on both Philip II and on the Catholic Reformation at the Victoria & Albert Museum on 9 March 2007. The day will combine a session with a senior examiner on Unit 2588 Philip II with a session led by Museum experts on aspects of the Catholic Reformation and a talk by Professor Rodriguez-Salgado of the London School of Economics on Philip II. For details, please see the 2006-2007 History INSET booklet p.8.

#### Feedback from 2005-2006 days:

*“Excellent and stimulating – introduced new perspectives and recharged batteries.”* [Head of History]

*“Very useful for teaching preparation.”* [Advanced Skills Teacher]

*“Good blend of providing exam-based information and issues for direct student benefit with subject information and issues the teacher’s benefit.”* [Deputy Headteacher]

*“Just to say how very valuable and enjoyable the day was – if only all INSET could be so stimulating with such a mixture of exam technique, academic erudition and on-site visit.”* [Head of History]

22. The best responses to this question assessed the work of Jesuits (both individually and as an order) in terms of the countries they visited, numbers of conversions, education legacy, social work and religious and political influence. This was then set in the context of the Catholic revival. They were aware of variable progress, successes and failures, and compared the Jesuits with other factors. Weaker answers described the work of the Jesuits or produced a list of factors to explain the Catholic Reformation.

23. An evaluation of turning points was needed and several candidates saw every fresh development as a turning point. There was plenty of descriptive material on Paul III, his predecessors and successors but in the majority of answers, there was little attempt to focus on the notion of a turning-point. Better responses often saw 1517 or 1527 or 1540 or 1563 or the pontificate of Gregory XIII or of Sixtus V as alternative turning points, and argued their case convincingly.

24. Some excellent responses. Knowledge of historiography was impressive and although not essential for the top Band, many high scoring essays made good use of this knowledge. Weaker essays concentrated too heavily on early movements and downplayed later developments. Some ignored the concept of ‘better term’ or failed to explain their reasons for their selection.

### **The Decline of Spain 1598-1700**

25. This question produced some very good answers. There was often effective use made of the historical debate. Some argued that there was no decline to halt as Spain had not risen; some suggested that it was in this period that the decline started with the failure of Olivares' Union; but most argued that the decline came later. Many suggested that attempts at reform were made by Olivares but failed; while others claimed that his foreign policy hastened decline. The best essays set Olivares and Philip IV in the context of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, and compared them with Lerma and Philip III and with Charles II and his advisers.

26. A well-answered question. Most candidates knew a great deal but the better ones focused their knowledge on the issue of 'greatly exaggerated'. They considered a variety of areas and concluded that in some respects decline had been exaggerated, but not in others. The question of relative decline vis-à-vis France was often raised but the main areas of analysis were finance, the economy, land, war and the personality of monarchs.

27. Candidates' knowledge was generally good. Many linked the wars to financial problems; others showed it was a relative decline against the rise of France. Most suggested that it was only towards the end of the period that the wars caused decline. Some argued in favour of the Dutch Revolt triggering decline. Weaker essays considered only war as a cause of decline.

### **The Ascendancy of France 1610-1715**

28. This question produced a variety of responses. Some were excellent, analysing Versailles as the centre of administration, its cultural and patronage function, its mystique and symbolism, and its attraction for the nobility. These features were set against other factors, usually administration, the army, finances, *parlements* and the Huguenots. Few referred to Jansenism and the Papacy. Weaker essays knew little about Versailles or dismissed it as a later development and having little relevance to the overall development of absolutism. Conversely a small number of candidates wrote exclusively about the building.

29. Unpopular and not well-answered. The economy was often seen simply in terms of royal finances, and surprisingly few candidates knew much about Colbert. Instead weaker candidates described how France rose to greatness courtesy of Richelieu, Mazarin and Louis XIV. Most argued that the economy mainly hindered France without realising that without financial and economic prosperity, Louis XIV would not have been able to wage war for such a long time and with so much success.

30. A well-answered question. Candidates knew considerable details about foreign aims, successes and failures over the whole period though most began their answers with Richelieu in 1635, ignoring his involvement in the Valtelline and in the Mantuan Succession War. A common error was to assume that the Habsburgs of Spain and Austria had a shared foreign policy and that Spain was defeated in the Thirty Years' War. Louis XIV's goal to defeat the United Provinces and curb their religious and economic prosperity was often overlooked. A minority of candidates concentrated solely on domestic policy.

### **From Absolutism to Enlightened Despotism 1661-1796**

31. Not well-answered. Reason was often confused with the Enlightenment or seen in opposition to it. For several candidates, this question was an opportunity to write all they knew about enlightened rulers. Better candidates distinguished between countries and explained why religion and customary practices were more influential during the early period.

32. Better answers approached this question thematically looking at factors such as religion, nobles, finances, personalities of rulers and ministers, and focused on reasons for continuity and change. Weaker essays produced narratives of the reigns.

33. Some candidates failed to address the causes of opposition and instead answered how enlightened were the rulers. Knowledge of Peter the Great was often considerably stronger than of Maria Theresa. Better essays organised their arguments thematically; weaker ones tackled each monarch in turn before offering an evaluation in the conclusion.



### Comments on Individual Questions Unit 2591/11 & 2591/12

The candidature for this paper was: 6574 British & European, 2317 American. One centre complained about Q1.

#### Unit 2591 sub-codes: keeping your scripts separate

Your Exams Office now has to make entries using a sub-code for each candidate. The code(s) that they need is/are listed in their *Administrative Guide & Entry Procedures 2007* file.

If you teach British/European and American options within Unit 2591, the code used will be different for each option. Separate examiner labels and attendance registers will be sent to your Exams Office for each option.

NB The scripts will very possibly go to different examiners.

#### INSET 2006-2007

OCR's programme for GCE History next academic year was published in June 2006. As always, the History booklet was sent to every centre and placed on OCR's website. In response to suggestions from teachers, the main series of meetings for 2006-2007 will help colleagues to think about and develop more effective approaches to teaching exam units 2580-2591.

##### Feedback from the 2005-2006 series:

*"The opportunity to discuss with colleagues was very welcome."* [Head of History]

*"The quality of feedback on exam technique was excellent."* [Assistant Headteacher]

*"A very useful guide, plus good oversight into the course."* [Teach First Trainee]

*"The day clarified particular concerns I had."* [Curriculum Manager]

*"The course fitted the needs of the group – to the point."* [NQT]

*"Excellent advice that can easily be turned to practical method."* [VIth Form College Lecturer]

#### Britain and Ireland 1798-1921

1. A popular and generally well-answered question. Most essays argued that Catholic Emancipation was the most damaging factor, before going on to examine other factors. Some really sophisticated answers rejected the question entirely and argued that the Protestant Ascendancy was slowly eroded as the period progressed. Others suggested that Catholic Emancipation enabled other factors to take place. Weaker students did not deal with other factors or had difficulty making a decisive judgement, and they were often stronger on land and religious issues than on parliamentary reform. Generally these candidates listed developments chronologically or had difficulty linking Catholic Emancipation to the Protestant Ascendancy. Several candidates simply did not know enough about Catholic Emancipation to make a credible attempt at the key part of the question.

2. This question worked very well and produced many good responses. Candidates seemed well drilled in defining and distinguishing between the two types of nationalism. The better essays coalesced them and explained how they interacted. A good example was O'Connell's veiled threats to move away from constitutional activity to more radical action. There were some

interesting and original arguments, though some would have benefited from more evidence and development, and a surprising number of otherwise good answers omitted the key period 1916-21. Weaker candidates had problems with the wording of the question and found definitions of the two types of nationalism difficult to handle. They also tended to concentrate mainly on constitutional nationalism.

3. This was the least popular question in the set, and produced the weakest responses. Many candidates did not really understand what was meant by 'popular support', and few widened it out to look at other factors. The main problem seemed to be candidates struggling to find examples upon which to base their generalisations. Surprisingly many Centres made little or no reference to Butt, Redmond and Parnell. Weaker candidates tended to write a lot about the Famine and drifted towards narrative accounts.

### **War and Society in Britain 1793-1918**

4. A minority option but answered quite well. Some candidates spent too much time on public and popular opinion and on the Crimean War. More attention should have been given to the concept of 'turning point' and setting up alternatives. Some candidates suggested the Napoleonic War, others World War One but only a few stressed the slow changes that occurred in many areas. The most successful answers focused on 'a changed approach to waging war' and backed up their argument with good knowledge.

5. A problem facing many candidates was discerning strategy from tactics and linking their knowledge of strategy to British interests. Most referred to both the army and navy and better essays evaluated the contrasting rate of change over the period. Few candidates showed a sound grasp of the wide range of British interests and the varied nature of threats, such as invasions, blockades, garrisons and the impact of technological change.

6. This was a well-answered question. Most candidates were very knowledgeable and able to illustrate their argument across the whole period. Weaker responses lacked organisation and development of argument, and tended to write narratives or focus too much on the Crimea and World War One. Only the best answers analysed the effect that literacy rates, radicalism and nonconformity had on shaping public attitudes towards war.

### **Poor Law to Welfare State 1834-1948**

7. There was a noticeable and pleasing feature in many scripts this year: candidates adopted a more thematic approach. However, many still struggled to back up their arguments with evidence, and knowledge of the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century was particularly thin. Candidates also need to be reminded that if a question is about poverty, it is not about living conditions. Weaker responses found the phrase 'financial cost' difficult to engage and often produced a chronological list of developments. They also struggled to find a balance of factors and to decide which one exerted the main influence.

8. The best candidates knew the 1919 Act pretty well but most had difficulty focusing on the concept of 'turning-point'. For many candidates, their response comprised a list of 20<sup>th</sup> century Acts or they ignored the 1919 Act altogether and instead wrote about other factors, which resulted in a number of uneven answers. Weaker candidates struggled to supply facts beyond the dateline and many failed to explain any links between these facts and the issue of 'quality housing'. Some preferred to describe developments in public health and disease.

9. Some good answers that showed selective relevance and sound coverage, highlighting the cautious attitude of the ruling parties before 1924. Most candidates, however, produced poor answers. 'So long' was not appreciated enough and while knowledge of the period 1834-48 was generally sound, candidates often jumped to the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Surprisingly, many omitted the Liberal reforms of 1906-11. Weaker candidates struggled to say what constituted a welfare state and knew little about the period beyond 1918.

### **The Development of Democracy in Britain 1868-1992**

10. Some had difficulty separating out 'political, social and economic issues', although examiners treated this approach leniently. Some devoted too much time to writing about the media, and many lacked basic knowledge of the electoral reform acts and so struggled to link them to various factors.

11. There were some very good answers from well-prepared candidates but many had problems dealing with the Asquith/Lloyd George relationship. Some had difficulty covering the whole period, especially post-1945, and most ignored the 1906 Liberal landslide. 'Party leadership' was often out of focus in answers and weaker responses rarely considered a range of possible factors.

12. The least popular question and not well answered. Neither the education system nor other factors were particularly well known and although some candidates knew a lot about educational reforms they struggled to link them to the development of democracy. Responses were often a narrative of educational reforms with little connection to political change.

### **The Development of the Mass Media 1896-1996**

13. Many candidates seemed hazy about what challenges were posed by radio and TV, and so wrote in broad generalisations, often with limited relevance. Better essays focused on the interplay between the three types of media. Even then the standard of work on this topic was uniformly weak.

14. Most presented a chronological list of events on main developments in the mass media. Failure to define 'popular culture' was a common weakness and too much attention was given to the post-1945 era. Responses were often mechanistic, suggesting perfectly valid ideas – for instance that censorship operated during the world wars - but then failing to explain how it affected popular culture. Many wanted to write about Americanisation and English football, and did so.

15. This was quite well answered. Some candidates turned the question into a focus on national crises rather than how and how far governments responded to the developments in the mass media. Weaker answers ignored 'To what extent ...' and so produced imbalanced arguments. There was also a surprising lack of knowledge of British Prime Ministers, and although most had something to say about Margaret Thatcher, there was little discussion on press conferences, government polling, televised party politics, spin doctoring and war reporting in general.

### **The Changing Nature of Warfare 1792-1919**

16. A variable performance. Some essays were excellent; others rather mediocre. Candidates who focused on 'success in the battlefield' and assessed the role of mass conscription, scored well. Most contrasted Napoleon's armies with his contemporaries; better candidates pointed out that other factors could be more important, as Wellington demonstrated at Waterloo. A problem for some candidates was how to link victories in battle in the 19<sup>th</sup> century to the effect of mass conscription without turning the essay into a narrative of technological change, military command, tactics and strategy. Poor answers were characterised by an absence of relevant examples of when conscription was effective or ineffective. Few referred to Russian conscription (1855-1917) that brought so little success.

17. Many candidates were unable to discern strategy from tactics and wrote as if they were synonymous. The French Wars, Crimean War, Wars of Unification and American Civil War figured in most answers but surprisingly little attention was given to World War One. There was a tendency to narrate how wars were fought without a common theme or structure to the argument. Few essays considered military theorists and, if they did, they were usually not related to military events. Better answers centred on the general shift from attack to defensive strategy in the course of the period and were able to incorporate the influence of military and technological innovations on military strategy.

18. This was the most popular question in the set. While there were some excellent essays, the majority had one or more weaknesses. Some focused entirely on developments in munitions and gave no attention to other factors such as communications, transport and medicine. If railways were considered, how they may have 'revolutionised warfare' was left unexplained. The weakest answers tended to describe technology rather than its impact, and an alarming number of essays omitted the First World War.

### **The Challenge of German Nationalism 1815-1919**

19. This question produced some excellent answers. The best had a wealth of knowledge and deployed it skilfully, offering substantial comparative synoptic analyses that directly engaged the question. Weaker responses often wrote about unity rather than disunity and tackled it as a narrative. Many were better on the period to 1866 and often glossed over the post-1890 period. Even better answers often overlooked how speedily 'unity' disappeared during World War One. The general trend was to agree that division was prominent and Bismarck's role in this was successfully evaluated. Class divisions, however, were less well handled.

20. The most popular question and answered well. The best candidates looked at all the factors, not just the economy, and understood that 'economic' meant more than finance. 'Coal and iron' was a favoured concept in most answers though the Zollverein was surprisingly overlooked or not fully explained by many candidates. The crucial link between the dynamic German economy and growing nationalism under William II was not well evaluated.

21. The least popular question in this set. The period between 1815 and 1866 presented problems for some candidates and very few brought out the role of Austrian leadership after 1849. Many candidates assumed that Prussian dominance began immediately after 1834, instead of showing it was a gradual change. Some gave little attention to Bismarck's role. The best answers gave a balanced evaluation of the two periods and showed skilful handling of anti-French feeling to unite all Germans against perceived French aggression.

### **Russian Dictatorship 1855-1956**

22. This question presented few problems for well-prepared candidates. The best ones recognised that most rulers applied a mixture of repression and reform (though few said what was meant by 'reform'). Many candidates asserted that rulers used either repression or reform as the preferred method of ruling. Few argued that agricultural and industrial policies involved reform, rather that both were part of the repression of Stalinist Russia. Weaker responses wrote answers to a different question on the effectiveness of repression as a tool of government, while some focused entirely on the plight of the peasants. Many produced chronological narratives of each ruler and made little or no attempt to synthesise 'preferred' methods of rule. The Provisional Government and Khrushchev were often ignored.

23. This was popular and a good discriminator. Weaker responses produced a narrative of each ruler and left any analysis or comparison to the conclusion. Some simply focused on Stalin or wrote vague assertions such as 'Alexander II was not effective because he was assassinated'. Some imposed a pre-determined and somewhat artificial structure in answering the question and, instead of comparing how effectively rulers dealt with opposition groups, compared the effectiveness of the opposition itself. Better candidates presented a balanced comparison that set Stalin in the context of other rulers. They analysed the nature, size and form of opposition each ruler had to face, defined the term 'effective' and compared each ruler before reaching a judgement. The Tsarist era was generally well done, a good approach being that Tsars allowed opposition to get away with too much while Soviet regimes were more effective because they were ruthless.

24. This was popular and produced a wide range of answers. For many candidates, it gave them the opportunity to write a narrative history of Russian peasantry, which confirmed that life was inexorably bleak. Even brighter spells were really a lighter shade of bleakness. As such 'uniformly' proved an able discriminator. Better candidates used a thematic approach and pointed out that many of the factors which blighted peasant life (for instance the weather, remoteness, famine, poor communications) were not the fault of the government. The impact of war in 1914 and 1941 and Stalin's reforms in health and education were often ignored and only better candidates considered the changes introduced by Khrushchev.

### **Unit 2591 sub-codes: keeping your scripts separate**

Your Exams Office now has to make entries using a sub-code for each candidate. The code(s) that they need is/are listed in their *Administrative Guide & Entry Procedures 2007* file.

If you teach British/European and American options within Unit 2591, the code used will be different for each option. Separate examiner labels and attendance registers will be sent to your Exams Office for each option.

NB The scripts will very possibly go to different examiners.

### **The Struggle for the Constitution 1763-1877**

25. Not too many answered this, and their answers were very variable. A minority of candidates produced excellent analyses of the Constitution and subsequent amendments. They showed considerable depth, insight and comprehensive treatment of a range of problems, often focusing on the ambiguities and weaknesses of the original Constitution but then used these as triggers for their ensuing analysis. Many, however, showed little knowledge and considerable ignorance of the legacy of the Constitution over the period in question. Several essays focused too much on the Constitution creating problems rather than solving them which led to a number of uneven answers.

26. Very popular and generally well done. Better answers examined various aspects of the presidency and showed good awareness of change across the period. Some considered three or four presidents, usually Washington, Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln, and rarely Buchanan, but not the presidency in relation to the other key centres of power such as Congress and the Supreme Court. Narratives and assertions were common approaches that fared less well.

27. This was the most popular question of the set. Weak answers concentrated solely on slavery and the weakest produced a narrative with little attempt to engage the question. Better responses brought out the importance of other issues, e.g. states' rights, geographical differences, western expansion, economic divisions and integrated these into the theme of slavery. More thoughtful scripts discussed the duration of the debate between slavery/non-slavery and the way invention of the cotton gin revived slavery, eliciting concerns in the North about the morality of slavery, and the likely outcomes if new States were admitted to the Union as cotton growing was extended into new areas acquired by the Louisiana Purchase. They would then go on to note links between the tariff question in the 1830s and both slavery and secession. Most agreed slavery was the dominant issue.

### **Civil Rights in the USA 1865-1980**

28. This was very popular and produced a wide range of responses. Better answers handled the concept of turning point well, assessing World War Two before comparing it with other possible turning points, usually Reconstruction or the 1950s-1960s. Good answers concluded that when America was vulnerable (for example during wartime), she tended to make concessions to

African Americans. Weaker essays had only a vague knowledge of 1941-45 or ignored it altogether and instead described/evaluated major points of development in African American history. The periods 1865-77 and 1970-80 were often overlooked. Many still see a turning-point as simply an important event, and so relate a catalogue of different developments.

*Copied from Newsletter 4 Winter 2005-06  
& January 2006 Report p.342*

**Unit 2591: Civil Rights in the USA 1865-1980**

No content has been added and no teaching requirements have been changed by the 2005 edition of the *Specification*: see the statement on p.1. Content paragraph 1 provides background to introduce students to the concept of civil rights so no question is ever set on it.

Teachers asked us to suggest specific examples to consider when thinking about “social groups” and “political agencies” as they introduce students to the concept of civil rights, thereby linking up with the similar background references on the Insert (e.g. *Roe v Wade*). That we have done, and it is all that we have done.

29. This question was not well answered. Candidates often had very little knowledge of Hispanic Americans and were unable to offer a synoptic and comparative assessment. Many resorted to narrative accounts of episodes that seemed to have little connection or point of reference. Few made a distinction between different ethnic groups, such as indigenous Hispanics, Mexicans and Puerto Ricans. Knowledge of Asian Americans was generally better but the concept of ‘change’ over time proved difficult for many candidates to handle. Prejudice in the early period was usually better addressed than progress after World War Two, and a surprisingly large number of essays failed to say that both groups had achieved full civil rights by the end of the period. The best candidates found common themes – often education, legal, social, employment and economic issues – and examined them from the Hispanic and Asian viewpoint simultaneously.

30. Quite well done but only by candidates who had sound factual knowledge of the topic. Some candidates challenged the question and argued that sometimes the Federal government helped Trade Union rights, while acknowledging that at other times it hindered them. They brought in a range of factors to explain the problem of Trade Union rights developing across the period. Weaker essays stopped in the 1930s or did not go on to cross-evaluate governmental roles against other factors. Some did not know the nature of Trade Union legislation and resorted to vague generalisations and assertions about weaknesses within the Union movement. The Wagner and Taft-Hartley Acts were often confused or misunderstood and some claimed that the Trade Unions had been destroyed by 1980.

**Report on Units 2592/11, 2592/12, 2592/13 & 2593/01**

**Unit 2592/11 (Independent Investigations 768-1450)**  
**Unit 2592/12 (Independent Investigations 1450-1740)**  
**Unit 2592/13 (Independent Investigations 1740-now)**  
**Unit 2593/01 (Independent Investigations – Open Book Exam)**

**General Comments**

*Copied from January 2006 Report p.344  
& Newsletter 5 (Summer 2006)*

**Independent Investigations: the role of the teacher**

As indicated in the September 2005 edition of the *Specification* pp.134, 138, teachers are reminded that they may now read draft work - to assist them in the on-going oral advice that they give to their students in tutorials. For further details, please see the Report on the June 2005 History exams p.379.

**NB** Teachers may still not mark anything, whether research notes or drafts of the Investigation. Written feedback is not permitted in any examiner-marked coursework.

**Unit 2592 sub-codes: keeping your scripts separate**

Your Exams Office now has to make entries using a sub-code for each candidate. The code(s) that they need is/are listed in their *Administrative Guide & Entry Procedures 2007* file.

If in your group of candidates you have Investigations in more than options within Unit 2592, the code used will be different for each option. Separate examiner labels and attendance registers will be sent to your Exams Office for each option – so you may have three sets if you have some medieval, some Early Modern & some Modern Investigations.

**NB** The scripts will almost certainly go to different examiners.  
Please do not put them all together in one packet.

**Centre Authentication Forms (CCS160)**  
**Units 2592/11, 2592/12, 2592/13 & 2593/01**

The QCA made these obligatory for all coursework in all subjects in March 2006. One CCS160 needs to be submitted with all of the scripts for each component (e.g. 2592/12). You may thus need three or even four separate CCS160s. Under QCA regulations, coursework marks will be set to 0 until the relevant CCS160 is received.

The introduction of sub-codes for entries allowed examiners to identify a period which they preferred not to mark. The candidature for this paper was: 601 Medieval, 2433 Early Modern and 8888 Modern. Some 0.8% were retaking Unit 2592 from June 2005; 1% were retaking Unit 2593 from June 2005.

The following passages will focus, for the most part and necessarily, on shortcomings of various kinds, but let us start by remembering what the coursework experience can achieve.

The best work displayed common attributes:

- an interweaving of critical source evaluation and close argument,
- the use of primary material to critique secondary sources,
- detailed comparisons between texts and a consistently analytical approach. They also demonstrated
- the advantages of choosing a topic that has clear parameters and where the history and the historiography can be brought together.

### **INSET 2006-2007**

OCR's programme for GCE History next academic year was published in June 2006. As always, the History booklet was sent to every centre and placed on OCR's website. The successful coursework half-day workshops of 2005-2006 will be repeated in December 2006-January 2007 – see the booklet p.6.

#### Feedback from the 2005-2006 series:

*"The opportunity to discuss with colleagues was very welcome."* [Head of History]

*"The quality of feedback on exam technique was excellent."* [Assistant Headteacher]

*"A very useful guide, plus good oversight into the course."* [Teach First Trainee]

*"The day clarified particular concerns I had."* [Curriculum Manager]

*"The course fitted the needs of the group – to the point."* [NQT]

*"Excellent advice that can easily be turned to practical method."* [VIth Form College Lecturer]

### **Section A: Preparation and title selection:**

As in previous years, most centres prepared their candidates well for the examination by helping them to choose viable titles and by monitoring their work in progress. In a minority of centres, however, this was clearly not the case. Less effective support was characterised by one or more of the following:

- failure of candidates to submit cogent proposal forms. It is not the job of assessors to 'fill in the gaps'. Their function is to comment on the suitability of the ideas as presented.
- failure of candidates to take advice offered by widely experienced coursework consultants – with generally unhappy results;
- failure, in some cases, to seek any kind of external advice at all – hence the 'what' or 'how' questions and predictable narrative to follow;
- failure to devise a question. Some candidates still entitle their work with only a statement, e.g. "The Life of Cardinal Richelieu" or "The Franco-Prussian War". Such investigations inevitable score low marks.
- failure to offer candidates the freedom to choose what they want to investigate. Most of the candidates from such centres produce 'stock' answers to marginally different questions on a limited range of topics.
- failure to discourage candidates from basing their argument on tertiary sources. Such investigations are written as if cross-referencing has taken place, e.g.: "*Taylor says ... However Bullock disagrees ...*" When both Taylor and Bullock are footnoted as coming from Hite and Hinton and this recurs through the study, it becomes clear that little actual reading has been done.



Several examiners commented on the quality (or otherwise) of specific titles and some of these are listed below. All examiners agree that it is essential for candidates to draw a distinction between topic and title, in order to pre-empt the 'learned response'. There is less agreement about the effectiveness of choosing familiar issues from other taught units. In some cases, this can lead to the kind of stultifying 'common title' approach noted above; in others, it can produce really good studies because the evidence is plentiful and known.

Who chooses the title? Does it matter? The evidence seems to be inconclusive: where candidates have a completely free choice, the result can be inspirational or dire – though mainly somewhere in between; where the centre offers a menu of distinct titles on a common theme, this can work well, but the false option (i.e. where the distinction is more apparent than real) tends to fail. For example, one centre offered candidates six options on the French Wars of Religion, each with a focus that was distinct from the others, requiring a different kind of argument. In another centre, however, 21 out of 24 candidates produced studies on witchcraft, most of which were variations on the same question (and well rehearsed, as several candidates cited 'class notes' in their bibliographies). The key issue here, surely, is not whether the candidate or the centre devises the title, but how good the title is and how distinctive the experience.

Conspiracy theories still attract candidates, e.g.:

- Marilyn Monroe's suicide
- The Warren Commission
- Jack the Ripper
- The Princes in the Tower

Such attempts rarely work well. They give little chance of engaging in a genuine debate, evaluating competing interpretations or reaching any kind of 'personalised' conclusion. Mercifully, nobody examined whether Jesus married Mary Magdalene and lived in the south of France – future candidates should be steered firmly off a 'da Vinci Code investigation'.

#### Questions that worked well:

- Were surface raiders more effective than U-boats in the battle of the Atlantic?
- 'Omnipotent and omniscient.' To what extent is this true of Adolf Hitler 1933-45?
- To what extent do historians agree about the death of Amy Robsart?
- To what extent was Oliver Cromwell a military dictator from 1653 to 1658?
- How far was being female a hindrance to Elizabeth I in her early reign?

None of these are startlingly original questions but all of them offer the possibility of clear debate and access to plenty of standard A level source material.

#### Questions that did not work so well:

- What were the origins and causes of the establishment of apartheid in South Africa ? (invites narrative)
- To what extent was Mary, Queen of Scots a failed leader, an adulteress, a murderess or an innocent victim? (too many foci)
- How effective as a 'Virgin Queen' was Elizabeth I in ruling England? (false issue)
- 'Was Garibaldi the sole architect of Italian Unification?' ('straw man' question).

The secret of choosing a good topic and designing a good title has not changed. The topic needs to be well defined and capable of generating valid historical controversy; and the wording of the question needs to signal that an argument is possible, or that more than one case can reasonably be made. No more, no less.

## Section B: Quality of argument

Of course, it is never as simple as this; the argument still has to be *made*, the evidence collected and deployed and a relevant judgement arrived at. This may usefully be likened to the process of building a dry stone wall for a pasture:

- Choosing the title [What kind of wall is it to be? What will it contain? Where will it run? Where will it stop?]
- Planning the argument [What kind of stone is available to build the wall? Are certain shapes of stone better than others? How can the stones be fitted together?]
- Making and evaluating the argument [Do the stones fit together as you thought they would? What about the gaps? Does one section of the wall hang together better than another? Is it as good as the wall built by your neighbour? Will it fall down with the first bit of bad weather?]
- Coming to a judgement [Is the finished wall as you envisioned it? If so, why? If not, why not? Does the wall fulfil the purpose for which it was built? Are the sheep happy with it?]

Examiners have offered some less enigmatic comments on the characteristics of more and less successful attempts at argument and these are listed below:

**Misunderstanding of the function of cross-reference.** This was the most frequently observed shortcoming this year. Too many studies contained lists of items of agreement/disagreement between historians that were at best marginally related to a prosecution of the argument. In the worst cases, studies consisted of nothing but cross-reference, so obscuring any argument that the candidate may have been trying to put forward.

There are still very competent candidates with a secure understanding of the material who get no further than describing and explaining the views of historians. The further steps of comment, analysis, cross-reference and evaluation are simply not attempted. The straightforward quoting and description of views is, of course, very different to arguing a case through the sources and reaching balanced personal judgements. Throughout the process of presenting a variety of views or interpretations, candidates really must attempt to come to personal, supported conclusions. The best investigations always have a good deal of the candidate in them and carry a strong sense of engagement.

Candidates need to be told that the purpose of cross-reference is to either strengthen (by agreement) or call into question (by disagreement) a particular line of argument. In other words, cross-reference is not an end in itself, but a *means* to an end. In the best practice, cross-reference is accompanied by a commentary on its effect or perhaps an adjudication/evaluation of the views expressed based on contextual knowledge or provenance.

Other characteristics noted by examiners included (in no particular order):

**Failure of candidates to perceive the essay as a means of answering the question they have asked** – i.e. allowing the topic, rather than the title, to dominate the answer.

**Insufficient preparation time.** Good practice shows centres set up monitoring and tutorial mechanisms to ensure that the Independent Investigation is allowed to ‘simmer’ for quite a while, alongside study of the examined units.

**Overlong introductions** – no more than half a page is recommended.

**Failure to structure the argument into clearly defined component sections.**

Some centres are very successful in guiding candidates and whole sets of studies appear where all the work is clearly structured, with each paragraph related to the question, or an argument and counter argument set out. Examiners should not be expected to have to work out where a new argument begins. Useful words like ‘however’, ‘moreover’, or ‘in contrast’ can simply and usefully be employed.

**Failure to edit the narrative for relevance.** Relevance can be an issue: in a study of whether Henry VII was little more than a miserly king, every feature of his reign was explored, whether it threw light on the central issue or not.

**Problems with narrative.** It is possible to identify two broad types of narrative: that which is purely descriptive and adds nothing to the argument; and that which is 'critical', typically employing a narrative or chronological context to identify causal factors in a longer argument. Candidates need to distinguish between the two and, in the latter case, make their intentions very clear to the reader.

**Lack of contextual knowledge of the chosen topic:**

(i) Far more worrying is the implicit assumption that questions are simply pegs on which to hang essays which appeared to have little connection with the titles. One question asked, 'How important was Lenin in the Russian Revolutions of 1917' and, despite acknowledging that Lenin was out of the country and the Bolsheviks were caught completely by surprise, still devoted two-thirds of the essay to the February Revolution. The notion of relevance was clearly not understood.

(ii) In essays on the extent of control exercised by Elizabeth I over her government. It is far too easily assumed that parliament was an integral (rather than a possible, or at best occasional) aspect of government. Some investigations concerning themselves with the Crown's relations with parliament, neglected any consideration of the role of the Council; those that did consider the Council – with reference to faction within it – often confused it with the Court.

**Failure to balance an answer with competing arguments.**

**Failure to demonstrate the relative importance of causal factors.** As in previous years, too many candidates were content merely to assert the relative importance of a chosen factor, without actually comparing its impact with that of any of the other factors (or establishing any kind of dependent relationship between causal factors). Still fewer could demonstrate the skills of counter-factual evaluation, in which the candidate considers critically whether any other outcome might have been possible, had a particular causal factor been absent. But this is what **relative** importance means. Failure to complete the analysis means that the title question – whatever it may be - remains unanswered (or at best partially answered).

**Failure to focus on what is being explained.** Some candidates could identify and debate the importance of causal factors, but without actually linking this to any part of the event, e.g. a general explanation of Hitler's rise to power that ignores contingent factors leading to the actual acquisition of power.

**Over-reliance on the vocabulary of the sources being used.** At worst, this amounts to plagiarism; however, more subtly, it is usually clear to the examiner where candidates have moved on from their own words to those of the source – which is not, of course, necessarily trying to answer the same question!

**Failure to reach a valid conclusion.** It is as though some candidates 'stop thinking' on completion of the penultimate paragraph, offering no more than a bolted-on summary of what has gone before. Candidates should be made aware that the conclusion is part of the investigation – the part where they should make their judgement clear, show how it has emerged from the preceding argument and justify it in these terms.

**Failure to proof read.** This can result in all kinds of errors (detailed in Section E below). The Investigation is the culmination of the work of a year or so and consequently deserves the best possible quality of presentation.

**Failure to educate the reader.** Although he was clearly immersed in the topic, no context was established and names were thrown in with an assumption that they were known to the reader... This was an able candidate who lost sight of his audience and how to use his extensive knowledge of the period to support an argument that could be seen to answer the question. He knew what the answer should be but it was lost in the chaos of knowing and assuming too much.

### Section C: Use of Sources

The task that gives its name to this component of the examination involves the investigation of an historical problem using evidence of various kinds. Candidates tend to respond to the problem by a *combination* of deductive and inductive reasoning (i.e. by making reasonable inferences from an *a priori* generalisation about the meaning of particular sources of evidence; or by using evidence from particular sources in order to make a series of general statements in answer to the question posed). The assumption underpinning the term 'investigation' is that the latter approach should dominate – but, alas, this is not always the case.

One new approach I found this year in more than one centre was to conclude the introduction, usually itself a summary of two or more views on the topic, by pre-judging the conclusion before the evidence had been considered. For example, *“the intentionalist school argues that Hitler was a strong dictator, the structuralist school argues that he was a ‘weak dictator’, and I shall argue, in agreement with the intentionalist school, that he was indeed a strong dictator”*. This may have resulted from misunderstanding of an instruction on some proposal forms to 'make clear your argument from the start' – taking this to mean 'state your opinion at the start'. These candidates were clearly excluding themselves from the inductive, investigative process - from openly considering a range of views, sources and evidence and reaching a balanced judgement.

Whether the instruction was misinterpreted or not, the outcome was consistent with comments made by several examiners about the drudgery of ploughing through large numbers of virtually identical responses, in which any vestiges of an 'independent investigation' are swept aside by the use of tertiary sources, by the meaningless 'labelling' of historians and 'schools of thought' or by commonly used, 'stock' evaluations of particular sources of evidence. The message is clear: if you want your candidates to do well, help them all that you can, but otherwise set them free.

Examiners also drew attention (in no particular order) to:

**The embedded source.** Candidates cannot satisfy AO2 requirements simply by embedding quotations into their own text as though they were self-justifying. They have to make it clear how evidence from the source is being *used* to advance the argument in some way.

**The custom of referring to sources outside the text of the investigation itself.** This usually takes the form of a historiographical re-hash that has no more than narrative quality: *“Therefore, one of the most successful elements of Nazi propaganda clearly was the cultivation of the Hitler myth – a view backed up extensively by Kershaw and Grunberger. Kershaw credibly emphasises the fact that the uniformity of the message did not conceal antagonisms and divisions... On the other hand, both Layton and Welch agree that propaganda markedly failed in its attempt to denounce the Christian churches.”*

**Misuse of the tertiary source.** Concise A-level text books are a starting point for an independent investigation – a set of signposts indicating pathways towards some 'bigger' books. For example, Neale's theories on the Puritan choir, or Elton's admiration for Thomas Cromwell are worth reading – and evaluating – in the original. Another reason for doing this is that a two-line snippet from Kershaw appearing in a tertiary source may not in fact be representative of the historian's 'whole position'. Tertiary sources, judiciously used, may enable a candidate to reach a middling mark, but usually no more than that.

**Labelling of historians.** At last, candidates are beginning to understand the disadvantages of assigning historians to particular groups or categories. ‘Structuralists’ and ‘Intentionalists’ are still fairly common, it has to be said, but one examiner commented that the best study he marked – on the Holocaust did not mention either word once! The more serious point, of course, is that labelling leads to assumptions about commonly-held group perspectives that may or may not be valid. It is the *history* that needs to be evaluated, not the historian. As one examiner remarked, “*Evaluation should be on the argument of the historian, not their labels*”.

**Citing historians.** It is good practice for candidates to draw attention to historians whose work they are using, but it is not really necessary to confer the title of ‘the historian’ on writers who are absolutely central to a subject (e.g. Evans on Peel or the Chartists; Elton on Thomas Cromwell; Kershaw on Hitler; Runciman on the Crusades). Some candidates wrote over-familiarly of ‘Chris Hill’ and ‘Dave Starkey’.

**‘Ad hominem’ evaluation.** Whereas labelling needs to be known for what it is – a generally unhelpful device for categorising broadly common viewpoints - this is a long way from saying that a historian cannot be influenced by either circumstance or prejudice. It is, therefore, sound practice to evaluate the context and/or predisposition of a historian if these can be shown to have a bearing on the opinions that he/she expresses. However, the process is fraught with difficulty, as the following extracts show. Consider, first, two examples of the worst kind of ‘stock evaluation’ (of which more than usual was reported this year):

*“The well-known Roman Catholic stance of Scarisbrick – his wife, for example, was leader of a large anti-abortion campaign - may perhaps throw doubt on the credibility of his evidence.”*

*“This quote is taken from a book in which Massie won the Pulitzer Prize in 1981 for his study on Peter the Great. Although there are faults in his argument, his message has to be considered with more credibility than Williams’, as Massie was a scholar at Yale and Oxford in European history.”*

*“I think Osler is a reliable source, since her document... exceeds twenty pages in length, covering a breadth of themes.”*

Contrast these with the following critique of the Webbs’ view of Stalin’s First 5-Year Plan [all quoted passages were fully footnoted in the original]:

*These opinions are strengthened by Sidney and Beatrice Webb, renowned social scientists, who, in their deeply “researched” volume, ‘Soviet Communism: A new Civilization?’ blamed food shortages on “a refusal of agriculturalists to sow... or to gather up the wheat when it is cut.” And even went so far as to claim that dekulakisation itself presented a useful and necessary process of “famine relief”.*

*However, Herriot, the ex-Premier and prominent French radical, as well as the Webbs - committed Fabian Socialists - were undoubtedly well-disposed to the idea of a communist state, thus leaving little doubt as to the existence of an intrinsic bias in their judgements. They were viewing cosmetic imagery from an elaborate propaganda campaign conducted by the Soviet Government in an attempt to convey the appearance of accomplishment. Before a visit by Westerners, a blanket was delicately laid over any evidence of famine, effectively deceiving foreign observers of its existence, and, as an American journalist noted, new censorship methods “exclude accredited foreign correspondents from those regions of the USSR where conditions are unfavourable”. Hence, although the foreign observers were valuable eyewitnesses, there is now clear evidence that they were deluded as to the real extent of repression, by both their inherent beliefs and Soviet deception.*

**Critical evaluation.** The range of techniques for evaluating source material (primary and/or secondary) is widening, and rightly so. A wider definition of the phrase was offered by (and gratefully received from) one of the candidates: *“Anything that adds something relevant to the meaning of a source”*. This might include, for example, critical commentary on a source using

wider knowledge; appreciation of the context of a source, or the circumstances of its production as well as the more familiar cross-reference or evaluation for reliability or utility.

**Impact of quotation.** Not all extracts have to be evaluated. Sometimes candidate may use a quotation from a source to drive home a point. However, they should choose carefully. Quotation needs to be memorable – there is little point in quoting two unremarkable lines from a secondary source that could equally well be written in the candidate’s own words. Similarly, when candidates use a source they need to ask how it is contributing to their argument and whether it is suitable. Quotation can embellish an argument, but the argument must lead to an answer to the question.

**Use of websites.** Uncritical use of websites remains a problem. One candidate offered ‘gendercide.com’, ‘guerrilla.news.com’ and ‘positiveatheism.org’ without any word of commentary on their provenance. This echoed the view of one examiner: *“Very few were able to either offer clear references to authorship and provenance or promulgate any legitimately critical evaluation of the ‘site’ as a ‘source’”*. One candidate offered a bibliography consisted of 10 websites and no books. Another attempted to juxtapose two politically opposed websites in his narrative, as though this amounted to critical cross-reference. Meanwhile, evaluation of websites, when attempted – *“This is a BBC website and therefore should be reliable.”* - offered scant solace. Wikipedia may be harmless in itself, but use of it to a significant degree does not enhance academic credibility. On the other hand, many made effective and discerning use of the Internet – for example, in seeking out primary sources. The obvious message is that candidates must be sure of the authorship/provenance of a website before they use it as evidence of anything (i.e. it should be verifiably academic in origin) – and ignore or reject it if the provenance is unclear.

#### **The strange decline of the primary source.**

Strange to relate, fewer seem to concern themselves with the critical use of primary source material – ‘strange’, because this should provide the lifeblood of historical enquiry and therefore raw material for the investigating historian. It seems to be the case (no more than an impression at this stage) that weaker candidates feel more comfortable dealing with secondary material. It is more certainly the case that the pervasive tertiary source has pushed many candidates in this direction – with often-unhappy results (see above). Consequently, techniques for handling primary material, developed from KS3 to GCSE and then to AS are often not extended.

Before leaving the subject of primary sources, however, it is worth noting that many candidates make astonishingly good use of primary material (regular readers may remember from last year an outstanding piece of work on the decline of Catholicism in the 16<sup>th</sup> Century, using mainly churchwardens’ accounts). Some undertake some original research, although that is not required for nay mark.

#### **Section D: Rubrics, presentation and expression**

The quality of presentation of completed studies is much better than it used to be. However, there is still some room for improvement:

**Unit 2592 sub-codes: keeping your scripts separate**

Your Exams Office has to make entries using a sub-code for each candidate. The code(s) that they need is/are listed in their *Administrative Guide & Entry Procedures 2007* file.

If in your group of candidates you have Investigations in more than options within Unit 2592, the code used will be different for each option. Separate examiner labels and attendance registers will be sent to your Exams Office for each option – so you may have three sets if you have some medieval, some Early Modern & some Modern Investigations.

**NB The scripts will almost certainly go to different examiners.  
Please do not put them all together in one packet.**

**Footnotes.** This has been an area of considerable improvement. Far fewer now attempt to conduct their argument through footnotes and items of clarification are kept to a minimum. A footnote should contain the name of the author, the title of the printed work, the date of publication and page number for each reference made. Candidates would also benefit from learning how to use *ibid* and *op.cit.*, obviating the need to repeat a title several times. Inclusion of page numbers in footnoted references is particularly important – as an indication of wider research, or of actual use of the extract itself. Where a quoted extract is from another source (e.g. a tertiary source), the reference should acknowledge this by the use of ‘in’ or ‘quoted in’ followed by the name of this other source. [NB all these are set out and illustrated in *Independent Investigations. Notes for Guidance of Teachers*, p.2.]

Candidates need to be made aware of the need to give the attribution of quotations in a footnote. Thus ‘Sir Christopher Hatton addressing parliament in 1589, quoted in Neale, Elizabeth and her Parliaments, Vol. II, (1957), p.199’ enables the reader to see who has said what under what circumstances. An unattributed quotation: ‘those vile wretches, those bloody priests and false traitors, here in our bosoms, but beyond the seas especially’ footnoted as ‘Neale, Elizabeth and her Parliaments, Vol. II, (1957), p.199.’ is of more limited use.

**Bibliography.** This should contain all of the printed material used in the production of the study. It may be divided into sections containing secondary and primary material. Items in the bibliography should be listed alphabetically, by surname of author, title of book (italicised), edition (if appropriate), date and place of publication. They should also correspond approximately to book titles referenced in the footnotes (‘approximately’, since some books may have been used for background research only). Suspicion tends to be raised when there is a significant mismatch between footnote references and bibliography items.

**Proof-reading.** Proof-reading pays significant dividends. One candidate referred to ‘Harper Collins’ as an author in both bibliography and footnotes; another to ‘the historian *ibid*’ (!). Errors of this kind may raise a smile, but there is a serious point to be made. These studies are completed over a period of months. Surely candidates can themselves – or with the help of a ‘literate other’ – remove most or all of the errors shown (including pages stapled in the wrong order). It is interesting to note that there are relatively few spelling errors in the examples offered – suggesting that the culprit may be over-reliance of the ‘spell checker’.

**Exceeding the word limit.** Examiners stop reading at 3,000 words. Incidentally, examiners are now supplied with samples of pages typed in various font sizes/line-spacing, with indicators of how many pages it will take to accommodate 3,000 words (allowing closer scrutiny of all those studies claiming ‘2999 approx’ words!).

## **Conclusion**

To end where we began in celebration of what the Independent Investigation can achieve. When it works – and it does for most of the time with most candidates - it provides an experience of ‘real life’ in preparation for (what ought to be) university-style work and the sort of forensic analysis that many graduates will meet in their working life thereafter. Its ‘individuality’ also stresses that quality of independence of mind and judgement that ought to be the hallmark of the ‘historian’.

### **Two smart tips**

In some studies – particularly those dealing military topics – a well-chosen map can say more than a page of text.

Why not take time out to analyse a piece of well written history with your students – focusing on e.g. paragraphing, writing style, use of evidence, footnoting, etc.



## Unit 2593/01 (Independent Investigations- Open Book Exam)

### General Comments

The Report on Units 2592/11 – 2592/13 should be read in conjunction with this Report. The estimated grades were down 6.5% at A, 2.7% at A-B and 10.3% at A-D. Two serious problems emerged from this year's examination:

**Title adaptation.** Each year, candidates are offered 10 new questions to answer by the Board, each representing a 'dimension' of historical study (political history, religious history etc). These questions are unavoidably broad in scope because they have to be capable of being answered by all candidates, regardless of what period(s) they have studied. The regulations are clear that candidates should apply their chosen Board-set question by providing a specific and appropriate example from the period they have studied. For example, in answering Question 3 on this year's paper [The Individual in History: *Evaluate at least two competing interpretations of any individual you have studied*], a candidate might choose to evaluate competing interpretations of Oliver Cromwell.

Normally, candidates write out an amended version of the Board-set question at the head of their study [In this case: *Evaluate at least two competing interpretations of Oliver Cromwell*] and proceed to answer the question. The assumption behind this process is that candidates, with the help of their teachers and coursework consultants, will choose examples that are *appropriate* i.e. examples that validly reflected the Board-set question of their choice.

Unfortunately, one or two otherwise well-written essays had to be marked down this year because this requirement was not fulfilled. The candidate could not answer the Board-set question. Instead, they had changed the question itself, sometimes quite considerably. One wonders what they made of the question paper that they were given at the start of the examination?

This cannot be expressed strongly enough: candidates who are not fully confident that the example they have chosen is consistent with the requirements of a particular Board-set question must seek advice from their teacher, or, if there is still some doubt, from a coursework consultant. Once they have settled on a question to answer, they must write this out at the start of their essay, alongside the number of the Board-set question to which it relates [in the above example, number '3'].

**Appending sources to the completed study.** Candidates may attach a collection of relevant source extracts to their completed studies, but they must make every effort to link the sources to the text in ways that help the reader to make sense of their function within the argument. Simply inserting a reference number that tallies with the number of the source in the itemised list will not do. Sources do not speak for themselves and it is the responsibility of candidates, not the examiner, to indicate what kind of evidence each source is contributing to the argument. This means that the candidate, in the main body of the study, needs to attribute each source used (e.g. authorship, relevance and/or circumstances of production), indicating why it is being used and, if possible, assessing its value to a particular line of argument. In the case of longer sources, the pertinent section of the source (i.e. the part relevant to its point of entry into the argument) should be highlighted.

**Critical evaluation.** Despite a number of outstandingly good scripts, this was again a weakness of the component - even though the paper is rooted in the investigation and evaluation of evidence. In the weakest work, no sources were used at all, or quotation was occasionally used for purposes only of embellishment or illustration. Many candidates found it difficult to balance the need for critical evaluations against that of answering the question in a clearly shaped, analytical construction. Dangers lurk in uncritical narrative and in weakly organised material (too many short paragraphs).

### **INSET 2006-2007**

OCR's programme for GCE History next academic year was published in June 2006. As always, the History booklet was sent to every centre and placed on OCR's website. The successful coursework half-day workshops of 2005-2006 will be repeated in December 2006-January 2007 – see the booklet p.6.

#### Feedback from the 2005-2006 series:

*"The opportunity to discuss with colleagues was very welcome."* [Head of History]

*"The quality of feedback on exam technique was excellent."* [Assistant Headteacher]

*"A very useful guide, plus good oversight into the course."* [Teach First Trainee]

*"The day clarified particular concerns I had."* [Curriculum Manager]

*"The course fitted the needs of the group – to the point."* [NQT]

*"Excellent advice that can easily be turned to practical method."* [VIth Form College Lecturer]

### **Comments on Individual Questions**

The best answers- as ever - were fluent, with a good overview start, constant eye on the question and measured, structured, evaluative argument built on critical use of source material.

#### **1 The Arts and History**

There were some very good answers on the Italian Renaissance which were well argued and firmly rooted in the context of the city-states. Other choices were less successful (e.g. on punk rock) largely because the essential links to the society in which they developed were simply not made by the candidate.

There was, however, an interesting study on China in the period 1949-76, which threw valuable light on the Cultural Revolution and another on German Expressionism showing how artists like Nolde and Bechmann developed their own individual style despite Nazi strictures.

#### **2 Economic History**

In general, this question was well done. There was an outstanding piece on the economic changes of Tudor England, especially inflation and agricultural reorganisation, which was related, among other things, to both increasing prosperity on the one hand and falling real wages for the poor on the other. Included, for good measure, was an excellent evaluation of the Tawney/Weber thesis.

#### **3 The Individual in History**

This was by far the most popular choice and it showed the biggest range of achievement from outstanding to very poor. Weaker candidates construed 'competing interpretations' very loosely and assessed the success/failures of, for example, Roosevelt's New Deal or Stalin's Five Year Plans with little reference to the individual concerned, or use of historians or sense of debate. Others who addressed the issue of whether Hitler was an anti-Semite were left with scarcely any debate at all. By contrast, there were some high quality efforts on Oliver Cromwell along the lines of ambitious hypocrite/champion of Godly Reformation. Here there was good development of a synthesis arguing that personal power needed to be seized in order to safeguard religious toleration and bring Godly Reformation to fruition. There was a disappointing concentration on Lenin, Hitler, Stalin and Elizabeth I, given the potential range of choice available.

#### **4 Local History**

Few candidates chose this option, but it was attempted with considerable success as an Independent Investigation for Unit 2592.

#### **5 Military History**

This was quite a popular question. One centre made a particularly good choice - focusing on the social and political repercussions of the Crimean War, made possible by the novelty of newspaper reporting and photographic accounts of the conflict.

#### **6 Political History**

Success in this question depended very much on the choice of topic area, and hence the identity of 'the powerful' and 'the powerless'. Tudor rebellions worked unevenly, but the October Revolution worked really well. The biggest single group chose Tudor rebellions and tended to see, for example, the Western Rising and Ket's Rebellion as opposition by the powerless and Wyatt's Rebellion, the Rising of the Northern Earls and the Essex Rebellion as action led by the powerful. There was some worthwhile argument and assessment, and the general conclusion was that 'cross-class' rebellion, such as the Pilgrimage of Grace, offered the greatest threat. One sophisticated approach argued that the policies of the Protector Somerset (the powerful) constituted the greater threat to established government.

#### **7 Religious History**

This question tended to attract some unwieldy answers, for example those attempting to cover the whole of the European Protestant reform movement. The argument was based on the differences in doctrine between the chief reformers and the challenge of the Counter-Reformation. Rather better were those that chose the Elizabethan Church, challenged by Puritanism from within and by both English and international Catholicism from without.

#### **8 Science and Technology**

No answers were submitted.

#### **9 Social History**

This question attracted a few, usually fairly sound answers – on either the Liberal Reforms 1906-14 or on the Elizabethan Poor Law.

#### **10 World History**

No answers were submitted.

### **OCR winners of the Royal Historical Society Frampton Prize**

Each exam board is asked by the Royal Historical Society to nominate every summer its highest scoring GCE History candidate for award of a Frampton Prize. The name and centre of each winner is published in the *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*.

<b><u>Year</u></b>	<b><u>Candidate</u></b>	<b><u>Centre</u></b>
2002	Laura Venning	Somervale School, Midsomer Norton
2003	Henry Ellis	Eton College, Windsor
2004	Natalie Whitty	Camden School for Girls, London
2005	Austen Saunders	Countesthorpe Community College, Leicester
2006	Thomas Holroyd	Leeds Grammar School





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

**OCR Information Bureau**

**(General Qualifications)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

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

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

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

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



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

© OCR 2006