

# HISTORY

Paper 9769/11  
British History Outlines c.300-1547

## General Comments on Outlines Papers

The Outlines paper offered candidates a wide choice of questions of different types. Some required depth of knowledge, others more width.

There were responses which showed consistent analysis, a clear and sometimes sophisticated style and an ability to consider and judge alternative explanations. It was pleasing to see evidence that candidates had devoted thought to the period. The best responses addressed the specific question asked, considered the whole topic as far as it was relevant and were supported with careful analysis.

Weaker answers were characterised by a tendency to generalised comment, or consideration of only part of the topic and were less well supported by analysis. Sometimes the question was not adequately addressed or candidates did not respond to dates in the question. Candidates who provided an answer for a question they had prepared for, rather than for the question on the paper, were limited to low band marks.

Most candidates chose from a relatively narrow range of questions and candidates from particular Centres tended, not surprisingly, to answer on a similar selection of topics. When candidates tried to answer questions outside this range of topics, the results seemed to indicate that they had not prepared adequately. Where questions required a broader sweep, for example in the themes sections, candidates sometimes displayed uneven knowledge. For example, answers to **Question 29** on Paper **1(c)** frequently showed little knowledge after 1894 and in **Question 34** on **1(c)**, little knowledge after 1924, or in some cases, 1922.

Reliance on a small number of topics may not be the best way to approach this sort of paper.

There was a tendency in some cases to import material that had been prepared in connection with a topic, even when it was not relevant to the question, and this limited the level of marks the candidate could reach. Though it is good to be aware of different interpretations and historiographical surveys, these should be related to the issue in the question, not merely to the topic. Response to the question is the vital element in success and a careful consideration of the wording of the question and its implications is vital, even if it means writing less. Often candidates seemed eager to put down what they knew with insufficient discrimination, and this sometimes appeared to result from insufficient knowledge that did relate to the question. This was quite often a feature of answers to Paper **1(b)**, **Question 22**, which became an account of financial policy as well as foreign policy.

Almost all candidates answered three questions. Generally there was an even standard, but some candidates were obviously struggling to find a third question and some final answers were significantly weaker. On the whole though, time was managed effectively.

## Comments on individual questions for Paper 1(a)

### Question 1

There were some sound explanations of the Roman retreat but some answers could have focused more fully on the external factors - arguably the prime reason for the departure of the Romans, as well as on the unrest and upheaval in Britannia. There was some good use of archaeological evidence.

## Question 2

Candidates needed to focus on both the 'extensive' and 'settlement' parts of the question, and not all candidates found this straightforward. There was a good deal of description of the settlements and some recital of the evidence from archaeology which was often only loosely aimed at the question. Some answers, having encouragingly set up the excavation evidence, then dismissed it as unreliable, which did not take arguments as far as they could go.

## Question 5

Interestingly, some candidates challenged the terms of the question, arguing that Northumbria was not that dominant. This could be acceptable as long as there was consideration of the reasons for the rise of the more powerful Northumbrian rulers such as Edwin, Oswald and Oswiu. The question asked why the Kingdom of Northumbria achieved dominance, so a concentration on the rival claimants for the domination of England in the period, or lengthy discussions of exactly what Bede meant by 'imperium' was not required.

## Question 6

Some answers to this question showed a lack of detailed knowledge about what Theodore, and particularly Wilfrid, actually did. There was consideration of the reliability of the sources on the life of Wilfrid and some assessment of the different emphases the two men had in spreading Christianity. Candidates often concluded that the bureaucracy of Theodore did more than the, admittedly more exciting, contribution of Wilfrid. Some did see this contrast as a continuation of the Roman/Celtic divide.

## Question 7

Candidates generally voted for Offa and not just because of the Dyke. They saw Aethelbald as the layer of the foundations of the Mercian state, but Offa taking it to 'a whole new plane', as a result of his encouragement of trade, relations with Charlemagne and the Papacy and, of course, defences through the Dyke. Evidence from written sources and artefacts such as coins was well used.

## Question 8

Alfred's military successes were well known and well explained, but solid answers could have been improved by more on cultural achievements, which, it was often concluded, set him apart from the other powerful Anglo-Saxon rulers, who were not, therefore, termed 'Great'. The detail on his contribution to the advance of learning and the arts could have been stronger.

## Question 12

There was generally a balanced assessment of the reign of Edward the Confessor, dominated by his relationship with Godwine and Harold – some candidates arguing that the influence of the Godwines was a weakness, while others felt Edward dealt quite successfully with the family. Some argued that, given the circumstances of his upbringing and accession, Edward achieved more than could have been expected. His failure to provide a direct heir was, arguably, a weakness, but not necessarily an aspect over which he had much control.

## Question 13

This question asked about William as King of England, so that long accounts of his skill in winning the title in 1066 were of less relevance. It was pleasing to see plenty of other material, but candidates did sometimes diverge into how successful William was, rather than focus on the reasons for this. His own character and undoubted abilities were often seen as the key factor, blending leniency and ruthlessness with knowing what to change and what to leave alone.

## Question 15

Some good answers were seen, as well as others which tended to describe the achievements of Henry I, rather than to evaluate their extent. Better candidates found some means of measuring what was achieved, either by stating Henry's aims and how far they were fulfilled, or by contrasting the situation in 1100 with that in 1135. They mostly felt that the survival of much of his work, despite the 'anarchy' under Stephen, was a testament to what he had accomplished.

### Question 22

There were some encouraging aspects to responses here. King Stephen's reputation was much redeemed by these answers and the upholding of royal authority in areas of the country which he controlled was well explained. Some of the argument went almost too far in correcting traditional views, and after quoting the chroniclers, and dismissing them as hysterical churchmen bemoaning their losses, there was almost no mention of disorder of any kind. Matilda was seen as maintaining authority in the areas under her jurisdiction, which could be considered as 'royal'.

### Question 23

Candidates were proficient in the assessment of the achievements for their outcome, but were less happy with the qualitative judgement involved with considering 'over-estimated'. Some of the answers simply listed legal reforms, and other achievements. It was generally argued, with varying degrees of success, that, in the end, Henry was the winner in the quarrel with the church, but that his family difficulties and the resurgence of France, beginning in his later years, detracted from the permanence of his achievements.

### Question 24

John's problems were a popular choice and candidates were well informed. There were some good responses which selected examples of John being untrustworthy, from his marriage to his behaviour after Mirebeau and his treatment of Arthur and some of his prisoners. These were then set against other factors, such as the financial problems and the abilities of Philip Augustus, and the idea that the Angevin Empire was unsustainable in the long term. Some candidates were less skilled at applying their knowledge relevantly, and long accounts of John's wooing of Isabella of Angouleme did not advance the argument very far.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 9769/12

British History Outlines c.1399-1815

## General Comments on Outlines Papers

The Outlines paper offered candidates a wide choice of questions of different types. Some required depth of knowledge, others more width.

There were responses which showed consistent analysis, a clear and sometimes sophisticated style and an ability to consider and judge alternative explanations. It was pleasing to see evidence that candidates had devoted thought to the period. The best responses addressed the specific question asked, considered the whole topic as far as it was relevant and were supported with careful analysis.

Weaker answers were characterised by a tendency to generalised comment, or consideration of only part of the topic and were less well supported by analysis. Sometimes the question was not adequately addressed or candidates did not respond to dates in the question. Candidates who provided an answer for a question they had prepared for, rather than for the question on the paper, were limited to low band marks.

Most candidates chose from a relatively narrow range of questions and candidates from particular Centres tended, not surprisingly, to answer on a similar selection of topics. When candidates tried to answer questions outside this range of topics, the results seemed to indicate that they had not prepared adequately. Where questions required a broader sweep, for example in the themes sections, candidates sometimes displayed uneven knowledge. For example, answers to **Question 29** on Paper **1(c)** frequently showed little knowledge after 1894 and in **Question 34** on **1(c)**, little knowledge after 1924, or in some cases, 1922.

Reliance on a small number of topics may not be the best way to approach this sort of paper.

There was a tendency in some cases to import material that had been prepared in connection with a topic, even when it was not relevant to the question, and this limited the level of marks the candidate could reach. Though it is good to be aware of different interpretations and historiographical surveys, these should be related to the issue in the question, not merely to the topic. Response to the question is the vital element in success and a careful consideration of the wording of the question and its implications is vital, even if it means writing less. Often candidates seemed eager to put down what they knew with insufficient discrimination, and this sometimes appeared to result from insufficient knowledge that did relate to the question. This was quite often a feature of answers to Paper **1(b)**, **Question 22**, which became an account of financial policy as well as foreign policy.

Almost all candidates answered three questions. Generally there was an even standard, but some candidates were obviously struggling to find a third question and some final answers were significantly weaker. On the whole though, time was managed effectively.

## Comments on individual questions for Paper 1(b)

### Question 9

It was good to see some evaluative and analytical approaches to this question. Candidates often concentrated on the foreign policies of the first twenty years of the reign and analysed these to see what was achieved and so how far Henry VIII was 'great'. Some candidates improved on this by moving on to the Henrician Reformation, as an accretion to Henry's power. Evaluation then concluded that the gains in foreign policy were transitory, the administrative reforms the work of Wolsey and Cromwell and that England lacked the resources to allow Henry to become 'great'. In some responses this rather ignored the reputation that Henry won - in his own, and in subsequent times, and which could have been a useful area of discussion in this broadly based question.

### Question 10

The answers to this question were mostly focused on the top down argument that the initiative came from Henry and he was the main beneficiary. There was discussion of the debate about how far the church was respected or popular, generally concluding that, despite anti-clericalism among intellectuals, there was no large-scale demand for change from below.

### Question 11

Some good answers were seen, but candidates would have benefitted from engaging more with the terms of the question and specifically considering 'sterile'. A number of candidates wrote more about how successful Mary I was, which is not quite the same thing. Better answers focused on aspects where there was no useful outcome like the Spanish marriage or the Counter-Reformation, and contrasted these with the achievements in finance and administration from which Elizabeth benefited. Mary did show also that a woman could rule in her own right. Some discussed Mary's legacy as being counter-productive in that Roman Catholicism was suspect in England for many years later.

### Question 12

Candidates needed to know what Elizabeth's aims and beliefs were to answer this question effectively. Most were able to explain that she wanted a church that was acceptable to the majority of the population. Some did point out that ascertaining what Elizabeth believed was not that simple. Good candidates then argued that there were other influences from the House of Lords to returning Marian exiles, and evaluated the impact of these factors.

### Question 14

Few responses to this question were seen. Answers were general in character and would have been improved by using examples from Elizabeth's relationship with the House of Commons. There was often more discussion of co-operation and consent than of challenge and conflict, but both needed to be considered for marks in the higher Bands.

### Question 20

This question was answered by a chronological approach, rather than an identification of over-arching reasons for defeat, with illustrations from the various rebellions. Hence no broad picture emerged and the discussion diverged, at times, into an account of the causes of rebellions, as opposed to why they failed.

### Question 22

Good answers saw the dilemmas that foreign policy caused, and took a balanced view. In places, knowledge was thin, especially on Charles's policies. There was better analysis of the effectiveness of James's policy and few relied just on description. Judgements could have been further developed.

### Question 23

In the better answers, there was some good treatment of James's initial dealings with Puritans and many did keep a focus on 'wisely'. On the whole, this was tackled more effectively than **Question 22** – the two most popular Stuart questions. There was also some sustained analysis of policies, though some tended to write in general terms, particularly about Charles, rather than sustaining a focus on the challenge of Puritanism. Some answers fell away after James I and others became rather descriptive of Charles's policies

### Question 32

Some candidates focused well on 'justifiable' and produced some interesting assessments and judgements. Others were eager to run through the main causes of the American Revolution and, in some cases, to add comments about whether the claims of the colonists were justifiable. This does need some consideration of criteria and focus on key concepts. This was a major weakness of some answers which simply focused on explanations. Better answers did get a balance between the claims of the colonists and the justifications of the British for measures which caused conflict. Most wrote mainly about taxation and some answers would have benefitted from a wider focus.

**Question 35**

Some answers to this lacked focus and support on the whole period in the question, but others were full, analytical and showed a sophisticated understanding of the nature of British rule, reaching a very high level.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 9769/13  
British History Outlines c.1689-2000

## General Comments on Outlines Papers

The Outlines paper offered candidates a wide choice of questions of different types. Some required depth of knowledge, others more width.

There were responses which showed consistent analysis, a clear and sometimes sophisticated style and an ability to consider and judge alternative explanations. It was pleasing to see evidence that candidates had devoted thought to the whole period. The best responses addressed the specific question asked, considered the whole topic as far as it was relevant and were supported with careful analysis.

Weaker answers were characterised by a tendency to generalised comment, or consideration of only part of the topic and were less well supported by analysis. Sometimes the question itself was not adequately addressed or candidates did not respond to the dates in the question. Candidates who provided an answer for a question they had prepared for, rather than for the question on the paper, were limited to low band marks.

Most candidates chose from a relatively narrow range of questions and candidates from particular Centres tended, not surprisingly, to answer on a similar selection of topics. When candidates tried to answer questions outside this range of topics, the results seemed to indicate that they had not prepared adequately. Where questions required a broader sweep, for example in the Themes sections, candidates sometimes displayed uneven knowledge. For example, answers to **Question 29** on Paper **1(c)** frequently showed little knowledge after 1894 and in **Question 34** on **1(c)**, little knowledge after 1924, or in some cases, 1922.

Reliance on a small number of topics may not be the best way to approach this sort of paper.

There was a tendency in some cases to import material that had been prepared in connection with a topic, even when it was not relevant to the question, and this limited the level of marks the candidate could reach. Though it is good to be aware of different interpretations and historiographical surveys, these should be related to the issue in the question, not merely to the topic. Response to the question is the vital element in success and a careful consideration of the wording of the question and its implications is vital, even if it means writing less. Often candidates seemed eager to put down what they knew with insufficient discrimination, and this sometimes appeared to result from insufficient knowledge that did relate to the question. This was quite often a feature of answers to Paper **1(b)**, **Question 22** which became an account of financial policy as well as foreign policy.

Almost all candidates answered three questions. Generally there was an even standard, but some were obviously struggling to find a third question and some final answers were significantly weaker. On the whole though, time was managed effectively.

## Comments on individual questions for Paper 1(c)

The favourite combinations were 8, 17, 20 or 21, with some adding 26 and 29 with 34 and 37. There were some answers to 18, 25, 35 and 38. Thus the range of topics studied seemed quite limited.

### **Question 8**

This question, on Pitt the Younger, was one of the better answered questions, with most answers identifying areas of good fortune and areas where success depended on his own ability. Some used the latter as a peg with which to hang all they knew about his reforms, but generally there was some argument and some

distinction made between the elements. Given the strong knowledge displayed by candidates, more argument and more distinctions could have made for some even better answers.

### Question 17

There was quite a wide range of answers here. The best answers were those where the candidates addressed the question set, offering a balanced analysis and a good understanding of the measures in the context of the limitations that early nineteenth century governments faced. Less strong answers offered some analysis that lacked balance, with measures seen as ineffective or unnecessarily reactionary, and without any indication of a counter-view. Other weaker answers saw measures as effective just because they dealt with unrest or relied on a general survey of Liverpool's measures with a sort of 'nod' to the question that this or that measure was therefore effective. It should be emphasised that candidates should answer the question set – which is about how Liverpool tackled problems – not how serious were the problems or why there were problems. These may be considered, but the focus is a judgement on Lord Liverpool's government.

### Question 18

This was not a very popular question but there were some balanced and analytical answers which considered a range of explanations. Weaker answers did not give much, if any consideration to the key issue of the question. There were some lists of factors, but many did attempt a judgement.

### Question 20

This was a popular question, which gave rise to quite a wide variety of responses. Better answers questioned the view about leadership and argued in a variety of ways about what was the most important element, often producing good analyses of the context in which the Chartists operated. Some challenged the concept of failure but no one allowed this to dominate the answer or wrote an alternative essay about how far it succeeded. Less successful answers wrote about the origins, course and decline of Chartism and some did not include enough information about the leadership to give a full answer the question. Most of these dealt in a rather general way with the issue in the question, and then produced a rather indiscriminating list of other factors without weighing the importance of the key issue.

### Question 21

Stronger answers offered some sustained explanation and balanced long- and short-term factors and saw Peel in the context of a changing political system. Weaker answers produced a list of reasons and sometimes wrote a great deal about previous factors so that the Repeal of the Corn Laws was treated as a minor afterthought. Some essays included generalised comment on Peel's character together with limited explanation of the nature of opposition within the party, and why they withdrew their loyalty.

### Question 22

There were some good answers which balanced Conservative strengths with Liberal weaknesses and personal against organisational factors. Weaker answers wrote about Disraeli's policies after 1874, which was outside the dates in the question.

### Question 26

This question was not well answered. Many candidates presented a narrow view of the concept of the balance of power in Europe. Some limited their response to description of some aspects of disagreement, while others included long accounts of the Fischer thesis and the responsibility of Germany, forgetting British policy. The accounts of specific crises presented in the answers was often vague. Some candidates did not see the distinction between Britain's treaty obligations and possible obligations brought about by the ententes, and the events that had strengthened them.

### Question 29

This was the only thematic topic attempted and results were variable. Some attempted a thematic approach, often involving lengthy descriptions of part of the period, or particular legislation. Most of the answers focused on Parnell, but some went back to 1800 or on to 1922, with little regard to the terms of the question and at the expense of vital material after 1894 and between 1910-14. The focus, too, was variable with some answers being more about the nature of Irish nationalism than its influence on British politics – which



was sometimes relegated to limited comments following description of aspects of the Irish problem. Few candidates included the impact of the Home Rule Party, especially when it held the balance of power, or its parliamentary tactics, and the Ulster issue was surprisingly neglected.

#### **Question 34**

This question was found difficult, and it appeared that many candidates who answered it were hoping for a question with a different range of dates. Some wished to write about the rise of Labour from 1900 to 1918 and some about the decline of the Liberals. Few achieved a spread of explanation through the period and many answers offered only generalised comments on the events of 1931. It is important for candidates to study more than parts of topics within a particular period.

There were very few responses to questions 35 and 36.

#### **Question 37**

This was popular and most identified Bevan's responsibilities, though some attributed all Labour's domestic policy to him. Some grappled with the concept of 'architect', but sometimes belatedly. Some referred to the views of Correlli Barnett in questioning achievements as a concept. This could have worked well if the references had been well integrated into answers to this question. Some argued that the Beveridge Report was the real architect, but often these did not convey a very clear idea of the report's proposals. Attempts to compare the roles of other figures were not generally well supported. Some sustained an argument based on considering the place of the NHS in the domestic achievements, but generally comment on this key feature of Labour policy was restricted. The view that it was the major achievement because it is still there was seen in quite a few scripts. This was not a strong argument.

#### **Question 38**

There were not many answers and not all saw the point of the question, and few dealt with the whole period – some did not go beyond 1950 which limited the marks available.

Generally, candidates scored highly when they addressed the questions directly, used knowledge flexibly and avoided general and rather unfocused comment or excessive description. Where they were less successful, they did not consider enough the implications of the question, or were unable to select from what they knew - or they simply could not command enough knowledge to cover the period or the major points of the question.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 9769/21

European History Outlines c.300-c.1516

## General Comments on Outlines Papers

There were some impressive and encouraging answers, which displayed excellent and detailed knowledge, allied to strong analysis and argument. Many of these were well-organised and supported, including some on the Themes questions.

Encouragingly, some reference was made to the views of historians and a few examples of primary sources were used but these were not a major focus. Evaluation of a series of factors was well done in some cases, but in others it tended to rest on assertion. It is important that candidates do not fall back on over-generalised comment and that when there is a factor in the question, that this factor is the basis of the answer. For example, if the question concerns the responsibility of Austria-Hungary for the First World War, then that must be the basis of the answer, rather than a list of 'causes of the First World War', which might serve any question.

Some candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of the questions set. Others would have benefitted further from reading the precise wording of questions more carefully, and questions which have a considerable time span, such as Themes questions, should be approached within a non-chronological framework. Candidates should look to avoid importing carefully learnt and prepared material into responses without considering the question set. They need to demonstrate that the demands of the question have been fully understood, and higher band marks can be achieved by candidates who exhibit a clear sense of judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling of the relevant material, rather than reliance on a weight of facts.

There was little evidence that time constraints had affected performance and most candidates were able to write three reasonably substantial answers.

## Comments on individual questions

### **Question 8**

There was some sound coverage of Charlemagne's military achievements. The administrative aspects of his empire were less well explained. Some good candidates argued that his personality was all dominating as it encompassed his religious, military and bureaucratic aims. Others diverted into peripheral topics, such as what Charlemagne understood by Empire and the controversy over his coronation.

### **Question 12**

This question was not always well answered as the focus was not always on the factor in the question. Among those who did answer with relevance, some felt each king had a different prime reason for survival, such as luck, cunning or support from the church. Some argued that the divisions among their enemies gave them the opportunity to survive and then exploit their other assets such as the backing the church gave them.

### **Question 13**

There were not many responses to this question and the coverage of a long period challenged candidates. Key figures like Alfonso of Aragon were often identified to illustrate success, while the setbacks tended to be listed, although the results of failures were analysed by some. The question, 'How successful', invited candidates to make a judgement, and candidates would have improved their responses if they had approached the question in this way. One measurement of success that was often invoked was the eventual outcome of the Reconquest.

#### **Question 14**

Some candidates were able to identify and describe the issues that arose from The Investiture Contest, but found explaining why they were important more difficult. Some pointed out that the modern world would not feel this was a major issue. Some, to their credit, did try to mount a balanced argument, indicating that, in the end, Canossa, which looked so promising for the Papacy, worked in the Emperor's favour.

#### **Question 16**

There was a sense of balance to some responses which contained much reference to Operation Barbarossa and myths about Frederick to show how deserved his reputation was, whilst also pointing out that Hitler was not necessarily a good historian. Most answers looked at his achievements in Italy and Germany as a means of judging his reputation. Some relied overly on description, especially of the rivalry with Henry the Lion, and others would have benefitted from fuller and genuine evaluation, rather than a listing of factors. Some defined his aims and judged him by how far these were realised, which was a more effective approach.

#### **Question 17**

A comparative approach, base around key themes, could have been effective here. In many responses the two kings were linked together, and their individual contributions were not covered as fully as they could have been. Some argued that Louis VII undermined much of what had been achieved by Louis VI and did little more than contain the power of the Angevins. One aspect which was often mentioned was that they prepared the ground for the substantial advances under Philip Augustus.

#### **Question 18**

This was a well-answered question, with most candidates able to give a number of explanations of both internal and external factors. The best candidates tried to judge between these, weighing up Capetian administrative developments against the imperfections of King John and the unfortunate, ill-timed death of Richard I. Some did conclude that Philip was very lucky, others that he was very skilful.

#### **Question 19**

The few responses seen argued coherently that Innocent was successful within his Pontificate but that his legacy was short-lived. His aims were sensibly defined at the start of the answers.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 9769/22

European History Outlines c.1378-c.1815

## General Comments on Outlines Papers

There were some impressive and encouraging answers, which displayed excellent and detailed knowledge, allied to strong analysis and argument. Many of these were well-organised and supported, including some on the Themes questions.

Encouragingly, some reference was made to the views of historians and a few examples of primary sources were used but these were not a major focus. Evaluation of a series of factors was well done in some cases, but in others it tended to rest on assertion. It is important that candidates do not fall back on over-generalised comment and that when there is a factor in the question, that this factor is the basis of the answer. For example, if the question concerns the responsibility of Austria-Hungary for the First World War, then that must be the basis of the answer, rather than a list of 'causes of the First World War', which might serve any question.

Some candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of the questions set. Others would have benefitted further from reading the precise wording of questions more carefully, and questions which have a considerable time span, such as Themes questions, should be approached within a non-chronological framework. Candidates should look to avoid importing carefully learnt and prepared material into responses without considering the question set. They need to demonstrate that the demands of the question have been fully understood, and higher band marks can be achieved by candidates who exhibit a clear sense of judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling of the relevant material, rather than reliance on a weight of facts.

There was little evidence that time constraints had affected performance and most candidates were able to write three reasonably substantial answers.

## Comments on individual questions

### **Question 3**

This question was done in a well-focused way, with most answers dealing with consequences in a direct way and offering reasons for the fall of the city. Better answers put the fall into a long-term context and weighed the short-term reasons. There was some sound knowledge shown, though weaker answers were, of course, more generalised and unbalanced.

### **Question 9**

This question produced answers which showed a clear understanding of the question and were well-informed. Better responses considered alternative explanations and offered sustained evaluation of the possible motives. Weaker ones wrote more generally about 'successes and failures' or explained the problems that Maximilian (or 'Max' as he was affectionately referred to by some candidates) faced.

### **Question 16**

Better answers to this question sustained a focus on the key issue in the question and used knowledge flexibly and well to develop and weight possible explanations. It is important to offer a judgement. Weaker responses comprised lists of explanations for the Wars of Religion, sometimes dealing with religion in a limited way. It must be stressed that questions like this require the concept of 'wars of religion' to be at the heart of the answer and if other factors are considered they should be considered in the light of the question. The listing of factors favoured by some candidates sometimes failed to make the necessary link to civil strife at all, and assumed that the link, say, between the financial weakness of the French monarchy and years of conflict was self-evident.

### Question 22

Candidates are wise not to attempt a chronological approach to Themes questions, but answers should be clearly based in the period of the question; in responses to this question, candidates tended to draw examples from the previous centuries. Some failed to see the distinction between manifestations of anti-Semitism and the underlying causes, and there was quite a lot of generalisation.

### Question 25

There were some good answers which not only referred to Spain and Portugal, but put them in a wider European context. Generally the focus was on explanation, though some well-informed answers strayed into the story of exploration, perhaps seduced by the inherent interest of this topic and its vivid subject matter. It was not a wise choice for those candidates who knew only about Portugal. Most, however, showed knowledge of both.

### Question 26

As with 22 above, explanations were stronger than exemplification. Better answers grappled with the concept of social control and it would have been worth defining terms, rather than giving an account of different causes and trying to refer from time to time to the key issue. Most linked social control with state control, but there were some more searching approaches which explored the ramifications of social control at different levels and included the sexual control of women. There were some impressive surveys and few offered mere descriptions. Some were challenged to maintain a sustained focus on the main issue, but there was good understanding shown, even if more precise reference to manifestations in the period would, generally, have helped candidates' arguments.

### Question 29

It was good to see that Sweden was being studied and on the whole this was answered competently, even if candidates were happier with the first part of the question. There were some excellent sustained explanations, but some were rather general and some made the assumption that the work of the rulers was important in the Swedish achievement of Baltic supremacy, but did not actually make clear explanation. Answers could have been further improved by more on the military achievements of Gustavus Adolphus, and the time scale of growth.

### Question 31

Most tried to offer a judgement and better answers sustained a balanced estimation of his achievements. It might have been better to establish the estimation of his achievements, rather than the situation in 1640, in order to provide a basis for judgement. However, there were attempts at balance and some sound analysis. Few fell back on description and few, encouragingly, merely argued that he either did or did not deserve his reputation. There was some thoughtful analysis and reasonable supporting material, often used with discrimination.

### Question 33

It was important for candidates to be selective here and most did try and focus on authority, though the range and relevance of material was variable. Most attempted to consider strengths and limitations, but some produced rather a list-like identification of successes and failures. The range of supporting material could have been more extensive and more distinction drawn between different periods of a long reign.

### Question 34

Most did try to sustain a focus on the question, and better answers produced a good balance between elements of innovation and elements of continuity or areas where change was superficial and short-lived. Candidates who thought that forcing the nobles to attend balls was an infringement of their rights certainly had a point, but fortunately most of those who answered this question did not dwell on the attempts to Europeanise Russian high society, and used a range of material, though religion was not always considered. There were some well-focused balanced and well-informed answers and most grappled with the question to some extent.

**Question 35**

This was, on the whole, better done than **Question 29** on the rise of Sweden. There were some good analyses of the insecure foundations of Swedish power and the changing context of the power balance in the Baltic. There was not always as much on the role of Charles XII as might have been expected, and some resorted to some description, but generally answers showed understanding.

**Question 50**

It is important that this sort of question is supported by a range of exemplification and does not become too generalised.

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9769/23**  
**European History Outlines c.1715–2000**

## **General Comments on Outlines Papers**

There were some impressive and encouraging answers, which displayed excellent and detailed knowledge, allied to strong analysis and argument. Many of these were well-organised and supported, including some on the Themes questions.

Encouragingly, some reference was made to the views of historians and a few examples of primary sources were used but these were not a major focus. Evaluation of a series of factors was well done in some cases, but in others it tended to rest on assertion. It is important that candidates do not fall back on over-generalised comment and that when there is a factor in the question, that this factor is the basis of the answer. For example, if the question concerns the responsibility of Austria-Hungary for the First World War, then that must be the basis of the answer, rather than a list of 'causes of the First World War', which might serve any question.

Some candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of the questions set. Others would have benefitted further from reading the precise wording of questions more carefully, and questions which have a considerable time span, such as Themes questions, should be approached within a non-chronological framework. Candidates should look to avoid importing carefully learnt and prepared material into responses without considering the question set. They need to demonstrate that the demands of the question have been fully understood, and higher band marks can be achieved by candidates who exhibit a clear sense of judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling of the relevant material, rather than reliance on a weight of facts.

There was little evidence that time constraints had affected performance and most candidates were able to write three reasonably substantial answers.

## **Comments on individual questions**

### **Question 17**

There were some good analyses and better answers related their arguments to aims, keeping a balance between knowledge of the aims and the long and short-term successes. Weaker responses contained much description or general comment about the fairness or otherwise of the work of the Congress, rather than keeping a focus on the question set. There were also some interesting but rather generalised answers, which were insufficiently supported but showed some understanding.

### **Question 19**

It was pleasing to see some sophisticated understanding about the nature and extent of German nationalism. Some candidates were able to keep their focus on the question, considering the issue of nationalism and relating other explanations to it; other just produced a general list of factors which might have answered, or attempted to answer any question on unification. Such candidates tended to produce some very cursory treatments of nationalism prior to accounts of the Zollverein and Bismarck.

### **Question 20**

The question produced quite a range of responses but generally understanding was good. Better answers engaged with the vital words 'How far?' The fascination of the story lured some towards some rather indiscriminating narrative, but most candidates did try and comment on foreign intervention as a factor and there was some sound knowledge, often covering the period after 1860. Weaker responses tended to just offer some factors which brought about Italian unification.

### Question 21

Most candidates who answered this saw the point of the question and were able to adapt relevant material to the demands of the question. Generally, the 1850s seemed to be better-known than the 1860s, but few offered only one decade and most offered a view on the hypothesis contained within the question. Weaker responses lacked a developed judgement based on an effective comparison and there were some responses which seemed more like general answers on the success of Napoleon III's domestic policies.

### Question 23

This was one of the more successfully-tackled questions, with some balanced judgement and some really penetrating and well-supported analyses. Some wrote at length about colonies but most saw what Bismarck's aims were and analysed their success. An unexpected weakness was the omission, or very limited treatment of, the Congress of Berlin. There might have been more consideration of relations with Russia after 1878.

### Question 26

Better answers gave Austria Hungary her due; weaker answers produced a potted account of some crises; some were very eager to discuss Germany's responsibility, and Germany hi-jacked answers. There was not enough discrimination shown in the way that some answers were planned and focused. The impression was given that whatever the question on the causes of the First World War, some candidates would have produced pretty much the same answer. It is really essential to respond to the actual question set, and it should be noted that there were some impressive surveys which did just that.

### Question 30

This saw few answers and the standard differed quite widely. There was impressive knowledge and understanding at the top end and the idea in the question was explained and challenged with a very good range of evidence, which was well used. Weaker responses did not seem to see the point of the question, or refer much to 1943.

In summary, candidates achieved more when they kept a focus on the question's requirements and responded to key concepts in the question directly. Those who were flexible and selective in selecting and using knowledge did better than those who included knowledge for its own sake, and to no particular purpose. Those who developed and clarified explanations did better than those who offered partial explanations which relied on the reader making necessary links. Those who dealt firmly with any named factor in the question and kept it as the central focus of the answer did better than those who treated it in a cursory manner or ignored it. Those who had clearly thought out issues and had amassed relevant supporting material of their own, and engaged with major issues, on the whole did better than those who reproduced with varying accuracy and depth, a pre-learnt model answer. Centres are urged to emphasise to candidates that they should strive to ensure that work is legible.



# HISTORY

---

Paper 9769/03  
US History Outlines c.1750 – 2000

## General Comments

It was pleasing to see an interest in US History and also to see a relatively wide number of topics being chosen by candidates. The standard varied, with some good answers which responded to the demands of the questions set and used knowledge flexibly, and with discrimination, to support well-constructed and relevant arguments. At the other end of the mark range, answers were not relevant, arguments were limited and poorly-supported and knowledge was applied with little discrimination. Between these two types of answer there was a reasonable spread of marks, indicating that the questions had discriminated successfully.

Candidates planned their time well, with final answers being as good as their other answers. It was clear that most candidates were able to offer answers to different periods of study and it was encouraging that some had studied a wide chronological range. Written expression was often strong and many candidates wrote with a sense of interest and enjoyment. The performance of candidates was generally encouraging.

There was much of interest and worth in the answers seen, and the advice in the report is focused on trying to ensure that knowledge will be used more effectively, analysis will be more sustained and supported and questions responded to with greater consistency. Candidates should be careful not to import prepared and carefully learnt material into answers without considering the question. It is important to be flexible in using knowledge. It is important to come to a judgement – some of the conclusions were not entirely related to the questions. If asked about what best explains something, this calls for a sense of judgement – not just a list of factors. To put it another way, the essays should be led by argument, rather than rely on example.

## Comments on individual questions:

1. There were some clear responses, but some answers showed some lack of depth and too much reliance on description. These weaker answers tended to run through a learnt sequence of events or 'causes', with comments on how much lack of control each showed. The implications of 'control' were not sufficiently considered and there was insufficient evaluation of the extent of loss of control in the context of the situation in 1776, or the extent of support for radical action. The good answers provided detailed evidence and evaluation.
2. There were some worthwhile references to key thinkers, but generally there was a lack of depth of knowledge and understanding about their ideas in relation to the question. Some turned it into an essay about why the British lost the war and they would have performed better if they could have discussed what motivated the Colonists.
3. This question required candidates to engage with key political ideas being debated at the time the constitution was being created. It was also necessary to consider the whole period and avoid a general narrative account. Unfortunately, some candidates relied on a very basic account of some of the issues involved in the Constitution, without addressing all the demands of the question.
8. This question demanded some concept of how 'Greatness' either was measured at the time or could be measured now. Some candidates approached this by writing about the importance of Lincoln as a factor in the North's victory in the Civil War. There were some who offered a list of Lincoln's successes and failures and some who argued for his importance or his political effectiveness. Often these were worthwhile and supported analyses, but at times the terms of the question were not fully engaged with. In such cases knowledge was good, but was not always applied to the demands of the question.

9. Very few candidates chose to answer this question so it is difficult to generalise about performance. It is important that the word 'impact' should be understood by any candidate who tackles this type of question.
12. This question on government policy towards the Native Americans was seen by some candidates as an invitation to write about the impact of the expansion of the USA on Native Americans. They needed to evaluate how far this was a result of government policy. There are key words here – 'culture' is one and 'determined' another. The better candidates based their answers on the cultural aspect and how this was affected by government policy, whilst also looking at other factors. Some correctly covered the whole period, though others were too narrowly focused.
20. There were some strong explanations offered and considered here, with practical and ideological motives being considered and assessed. Some seemed to want to write on how expansionist US foreign policy was, rather than offering consistent explanations. Others offered a more general survey of US foreign policy, not always focusing consistently on 'expansionist'. This causation question allowed candidates to focus on the possible explanations.
22. This was another causation question which resulted in a wide range of marks. Many were very informed about a range of factors, especially the Lusitania and the Zimmermann Telegram, but fewer engaged with the key concept in the question and some drifted to Wilson's post-war views at the Paris Peace Conference. Some offered a judgement about validity. Those who offered a list of explained factors did not score highly as the question asked candidates to say how valid the judgement was.
23. 'Crisis of moral values' required some defining and explaining. Some were very keen to explain the change in US society in the 1920s or thought that the Ku Klux Klan and Prohibition were important, without always relating this work to saying how accurate the claim was. The question did result in some insightful analysis and evaluation of the nature and extent of the perceived crisis. At the bottom end there were some limited comments about smoking and flappers that did not score highly.
24. Many found the explanation of the link between economic phenomena of the 1920s and the Depression, difficult. Thus some answers offered a series of descriptions of various elements of the 1920s economy. Others explained the Crash of 1929 and assumed a link between that and the Depression. Some good examples did assess the factors and offered a strong understanding of how overproduction, wealth inequality, government policy and the iniquities of the banks as well as share speculation, contributed to depression and showed some understanding of the relative importance of different explanations. The best answers showed economic and historical understanding.
26. This was approached mainly in terms of 'the man' and 'his times' – did his personal ambition, personality and self-publicising skills offer the main explanation, or was it the context of anti-Communism and the strains of the Cold War? Generally, the issues were understood. There were some candidates whose answers showed a lack of depth and a reluctance to offer supported judgement.
28. Though some did engage with attempts to analyse and evaluate explanations, others only offered a superficial run through of 'causes of US failure', without saying which best explained the failure. Some were aware of the difficulties presented by different explanations, but other answers would have benefitted from more developed analysis.
29. There was a considerable amount of understanding why, in general terms, Johnson had been underestimated and knowledge of domestic policy was often very sound. Some candidates concentrated on the strengths and weaknesses of Johnson, rather than engaging very directly with the concept of 'underestimated', and on what grounds his policies had been thought to have been inadequate – rather than just saying that he was in the shadow of Kennedy, or people were so angry about Vietnam, they ignored his domestic achievements.
30. This question gave rise to some quite detailed knowledge. The question was not whether Nixon deserves his reputation or his successes and failures; it was about moral principles and too often this concept was not at the heart of the answers. This was not always true, and there was penetrating and direct analysis at the top end, focusing on evidence for and against the proposition Nixon lacked moral principles, but there were some candidates who gave generalised comments which did not engage fully and consistently with the question.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 9769/04

African and Asian History Outlines c. 1750 – 2000

## General comments

Most of the answers were to questions on China and Japan, although **Section 5** was visited. There was quite a wide variation in standards, but the top answers were highly impressive. They offered controlled and highly analytical responses which used knowledge well, and were well-informed. There were answers which were exceptionally lucid and well-written and their authors clearly relished the chance to perform at a high level. Few answers relied entirely on narrative, but there were examples of responses which seemed to have been trapped by knowledge, rather than being in command of it. Some candidates needed to stick to the question set and offer arguments rather than assertions. In general answers were focused and offered explanation at different levels, although a few candidates who produced two good answers seemed to find it difficult to maintain that standard in the third. Overall, lack of knowledge was less of a problem than using it flexibly. There was a high incidence of clear and accurate writing generally, with some very stylish and effective prose at the top of the mark range.

Many answers showed a sense of interest in and involvement with the topics. A few candidates infringed the rubric and it is important that not all questions attempted come from one section of the paper alone.

## Comments on individual questions

17. There were some very strong arguments and it was encouraging when answers went beyond a sort of list of possible consequences. Most engaged with the significance of the Rebellion, but some wrote extensively about its background, sometimes at the expense of the actual question. There were some ambitious attempts to challenge traditional assumptions about the Rebellion's significance, sometimes at the expense of a clear explanation of why it has been thought to be so significant. It is admirable to evaluate explanations, once explanations have been established.
18. Nearly all candidates identified the ideals and most offered some sort of supported argument about whether they had been achieved. Some took a more descriptive and chronological approach, which was nevertheless effective in showing the degree of short-term and long-term results. Better answers showed a balanced analysis and indeed there was some good understanding of the nature and effects of the Revolution.
19. Answers tended to be quite strong on the pre-1937 leadership but could not always separate military and political factors and seemed to peter out when considering the post-1945 situation. There was some effective detail on Jiang's attempts to reform China and good detail on the 1930s with much understanding shown about the strengths and weaknesses of Jiang's leadership. Most attempted some sort of balanced and considered judgement, though there were some rather generalised responses at the lower end of the mark range.
27. There was some very strong knowledge and understanding here and this was one of the most successfully-tackled questions, frequently with very good evaluation of the motivation behind the reforms. Some, however, were led into a general account of expansion and a few seemed to have hoped for a different question and simply wrote at length on the idea of military expansion into a general survey of the 1920s and 1930s. Those who did keep a focus on the question offered analytical answers and at the top end there were some penetrating and sophisticated discussions.
37. Some compared China and Japan as examples of Asian countries with different rates of modernisation. This was a narrow for a thematic question, but within that limitation, there were some well-organized and highly analytical responses. The best answers focussed on explaining the differences rather than just describing them. Given that this was the first year of the examination, answers that were restricted to two countries were understandable, but Centres should be aware that

the idea of a Themes question is to allow the development of a wider perspective and that the question implies a comparison of more than two countries.

On the whole, candidates seem to have managed their time well and though there were some instances of a weak final answer. Questions were generally well understood. In some cases the impression was given of candidates writing about what they did know about in the hope that they would gain at least some marks. It does reinforce the need for a reasonably wide coverage of two topic areas to allow candidates a reasonable choice. There were few who relied totally on either indiscriminating narrative or shallow generalisation. Candidates would do best to spend time thinking how best to use what they know.

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9769/52**

**Special Subjects – The Crusades, 1095–1192**

## **General Comments on Special Subjects**

Please note that these general comments apply to all special subject papers and so are not specific to this paper.

The paper tests a range of skills and generally candidates seemed more at ease with the essay than in using documents. Time planning was good and knowledge was often sound in the essays. Essay questions did sometimes seem prepared, with candidates being eager to show that they knew lots of explanations. Some candidates needed to build on their knowledge as the questions required judgement and assessment.

There were answers which dealt very well with the comparison question, offering similarities and differences and looking at the nature of the evidence to explain these. It is vital that candidates are able to identify and understand the main themes of the two documents and avoid restricting themselves to general differences or similarities. This task yielded a very wide range of responses.

In answers to the second document question and the essays, knowledge was not always used enough and explanation was more common than the higher order skills of evaluation and sustained analysis. Having said that, there were some very strong analyses of the documents as a set, which offered clear judgements and support from carefully selected knowledge. The best answers used evidence and source material for which credit was given. A significant number of candidates seemed unsure of how to tackle this sort of question and relied heavily on just paraphrasing or describing the content of the documents.

There was some awareness of conflicting interpretations but relatively limited awareness of modern historical writing. While it was good to see Taylor, Trevor-Roper and Bullock being discussed, for example, in some answers on Nazi Germany, it was a little disappointing that in a Special Subject there was not more reference to more recent work. Some essays did show a fluent mastery of the arguments and were impressively analytical, but there was quite a wide range of responses. Encouragingly few relied on narrative and the standard of communication was generally high. Many knew a lot, but might have reflected more on their knowledge.

Candidates need to ensure that they make use of the documents as well as their own knowledge when answering the two parts of Question 1. Any question that includes 'How far...', 'Assess ...' or 'Evaluate...' requires candidates to go beyond explanation to the higher order skills of evaluation and sustained analysis if they are to access the higher levels of the mark scheme.

## **Comments on Individual questions**

### **5b The Crusades**

#### **Question 1**

- (a) Most candidates were able to see the similarities in the failures of leadership but some missed the difference in D, which had some praise for the leaders. The attitudes of the two authors were well known and used to explain the differences.
- (b) Candidates came to varied conclusions about the state of the Crusader Kingdoms, some seeing strengths in Baldwin's leadership and in the zeal of Balian. Most did feel that the final outcome showed it was a society in decline. There was less use of D than the other documents and some variation in how it was interpreted, some seeing the knight service as a strength and others arguing the numbers were much smaller than in earlier years.

**Question 2**

This was the most frequently attempted of the essays and a number of factors were outlined such as the religious enthusiasm of the Crusaders, their armies and military tactics, the help from Byzantium and the disunity among their opponents. Candidates found it more challenging to make any differentiation between these factors and so come to a conclusion as to which had the greater influence.

**Question 3**

This was not a popular question and too few answers were seen to provide any useful comments.

**Question 4**

The question required candidates to assess over confident leadership as against military errors as the cause of the failure of the Second Crusade. Whilst it was useful to provide scene setting and briefly look at other explanations such as hostility from Byzantium and supply problems, candidates needed to concentrate more on the factors mentioned in the question. There was a need to identify the most vital reasons.



# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9769/54**

**Special Subjects – Reformation Europe, 1516–1559**

## **General Comments on Special Subjects**

Please note that these general comments apply to all special subject papers and so are not specific to this paper.

The paper tests a range of skills and generally candidates seemed more at ease with the essay than in using documents. Time planning was good and knowledge was often sound in the essays. Essay questions did sometimes seem prepared, with candidates being eager to show that they knew lots of explanations. Some candidates needed to build on their knowledge as the questions required judgement and assessment.

There were answers which dealt very well with the comparison question, offering similarities and differences and looking at the nature of the evidence to explain these. It is vital that candidates are able to identify and understand the main themes of the two documents and avoid restricting themselves to general differences or similarities. This task yielded a very wide range of responses.

In answers to the second document question and the essays, knowledge was not always used enough and explanation was more common than the higher order skills of evaluation and sustained analysis. Having said that, there were some very strong analyses of the documents as a set, which offered clear judgements and support from carefully selected knowledge. The best answers used evidence and source material for which credit was given. A significant number of candidates seemed unsure of how to tackle this sort of question and relied heavily on just paraphrasing or describing the content of the documents.

There was some awareness of conflicting interpretations but relatively limited awareness of modern historical writing. While it was good to see Taylor, Trevor-Roper and Bullock being discussed, for example, in some answers on Nazi Germany, it was a little disappointing that in a Special Subject there was not more reference to more recent work. Some essays did show a fluent mastery of the arguments and were impressively analytical, but there was quite a wide range of responses. Encouragingly few relied on narrative and the standard of communication was generally high. Many knew a lot, but might have reflected more on their knowledge.

Candidates need to ensure that they make use of the documents as well as their own knowledge when answering the two parts of Question 1. Any question that includes 'How far...', 'Assess ...' or 'Evaluate...' requires candidates to go beyond explanation to the higher order skills of evaluation and sustained analysis if they are to access the higher levels of the mark scheme.

## **Comments on Individual questions**

### **5d Reformation Europe**

#### **Question 1**

- (a) This question was generally answered effectively, with candidates identifying similarities and differences and explaining them as resulting from the different recipients of Calvin's letters and the dates of the letters. Francis I and Antoine of Bourbon and their religious outlooks were both well known.
- (b) Some candidates sensibly began with E as a guideline to the debate and the dual nature of Calvin's views. They could then use the other documents for support. Candidates argued that the letter to Bullinger was likely to show Calvin's true feelings more than any of the other documents, which was a good approach. Contextual knowledge sometimes became too dominant, with detailed accounts of events in Geneva and Calvin's attitude to lay authority there, using the fate of

Servetus as an example. Although this question was generally well answered it is always better to analyse the documents fully first.

### **Question 2**

This was the most popular of the essay questions and there were some well informed and scholarly accounts. The personal rivalry was generally seen as the main driving force, although the inherited claims, the fears of the French and the interference from the Papacy were correctly seen as other factors. Better candidates did consider why the rivalry was prolonged, citing the implacable enmity of Francis I and Henry II towards Charles V, but also the inability of Charles to strike a knockout blow and wipe out the opposition. Some answers centred on Charles and looked at the question entirely from his perspective rather than providing a balanced discussion and evaluation.

### **Question 3**

Not many answers to this question were seen. Some concentrated on the religious orders and others compared their contribution with that of the Papacy and the Inquisition. Candidates needed to think carefully about the demands of the question. This would have avoided confusing the reformed orders with the Lutheran reformation, leading to essays about how Luther and the Humanists stimulated reform.

### **Question 4**

The best candidates did mention the impact of reformers like Munster, along with economic factors. The latter were often seen as more vital, along with a general hostility to authority. Weaker candidates found it quite difficult to keep to the focus of this question and tended to divert to consider Luther's theology and then conclude that it had little effect on illiterate peasants. They needed to look in more detail at other issues surrounding the Peasants' Wars to reach a conclusion supported by evidence.



# HISTORY

---

Paper 9769/56

Special Subjects – French Revolution, 1774–1794

## General Comments on Special Subjects

Please note that these general comments apply to all special subject papers and so are not specific to this paper.

The paper tests a range of skills and generally candidates seemed more at ease with the essay than in using documents. Time planning was good and knowledge was often sound in the essays. Essay questions did sometimes seem prepared, with candidates being eager to show that they knew lots of explanations. Some candidates needed to build on their knowledge as the questions required judgement and assessment.

There were answers which dealt very well with the comparison question, offering similarities and differences and looking at the nature of the evidence to explain these. It is vital that candidates are able to identify and understand the main themes of the two documents and avoid restricting themselves to general differences or similarities. This task yielded a very wide range of responses.

In answers to the second document question and the essays, knowledge was not always used enough and explanation was more common than the higher order skills of evaluation and sustained analysis. Having said that, there were some very strong analyses of the documents as a set, which offered clear judgements and support from carefully selected knowledge. The best answers used evidence and source material for which credit was given. A significant number of candidates seemed unsure of how to tackle this sort of question and relied heavily on just paraphrasing or describing the content of the documents.

There was some awareness of conflicting interpretations but relatively limited awareness of modern historical writing. While it was good to see Taylor, Trevor-Roper and Bullock being discussed, for example, in some answers on Nazi Germany, it was a little disappointing that in a Special Subject there was not more reference to more recent work. Some essays did show a fluent mastery of the arguments and were impressively analytical, but there was quite a wide range of responses. Encouragingly few relied on narrative and the standard of communication was generally high. Many knew a lot, but might have reflected more on their knowledge.

Candidates need to ensure that they make use of the documents as well as their own knowledge when answering the two parts of Question 1. Any question that includes 'How far...', 'Assess ...' or 'Evaluate...' requires candidates to go beyond explanation to the higher order skills of evaluation and sustained analysis if they are to access the higher levels of the mark scheme.

## Comments on Individual questions

### **5f The French Revolution, 1774–1794**

#### **Question 1**

- (a) Candidates enjoyed the detail in Document B, being familiar with the surveillance society, and were able to disentangle its sinister overtones. They found document C more challenging and some did not grasp the underlying tension and took it too much at face value. There was a clear indication in C that there were plots as opposed to the vague suspicions of B.
- (b) Candidates had good contextual knowledge to hand. What they needed to do better was to link it to the documents, so using the latter to illustrate their contextual knowledge. Many felt that the worship of the Supreme Being as instigated by Robespierre was a key factor and needed to link this to the references to dictatorship in E. Some picked up on the mention of Tallien in D, with the

suspicions of him in B. There was good knowledge about Robespierre's speech mentioned in D, and this was well explained in context.

### **Question 2**

There were some very lively denunciations of the incapacity, inconsistency and indecisiveness of Louis XVI and Necker, which largely increased rather than diminished hostility to the crown. A series of misjudgements were analysed and lost opportunities to forge a better relationship with the Estates General were ruthlessly identified. This question elicited some very mature answers.

### **Question 3**

Good candidates managed to show how a chain of events built up an irresistible force leading to the Terror. The weaker essays tended to be rather a list of factors and there needed to be more evaluation of their role. The Terror, the end of the monarchy, the economic impact and the rise of Robespierre were all considered.

### **Question 4**

The superior strategy of Robespierre and the Montagnards was usually seen as the key here, in that their policies won the support of Paris and enabled them to defeat the Girondins and then pick off their other rivals in turn, in what one candidate referred to as 'salami tactics'. Robespierre himself was considered to be a major factor. There was a clear attempt in most of these answers to evaluate the factors.



# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9769/06**

**Personal Investigation**

There was a good deal of very pleasing work, with an impressive range of topics tackled. In terms of scope, there were Investigations ranging from the fall of the Roman Empire to the ending of the Cold War. Candidates offered Investigations into a wide range of themes, from political and economic emphasis, evaluation of the tactics of a range of wars, social, cultural and religious themes. Most Investigations focused on Britain or Europe, but there were pieces on American, Indian and Chinese history. It was particularly impressive that there was such diversity within Centres; this gave the impression that the work really was personal to the individual candidate. For the most part, these Investigations were all well resourced with impressive bibliographies, which, in most cases, it was clear from the footnotes had been used thoroughly. Most of the candidates had made use of a varied range of sources, often including contemporary documents and an impressive range of serious secondary sources. It is perfectly valid to make use of websites and search engines, but in some instances where the use of these predominated, usage was not particularly discriminating.

Work was generally well structured and most candidates maintained a good focus on the precise question posed. All candidates attempted to present an analytical response, with most achieving a very good level of analysis and debate. Almost all candidates demonstrated the ability to present a well-structured and coherent essay. It should be noted that attempts to break down the work with the use of side headings was usually detrimental to the flow of the argument; this practice should be discouraged.

Many of the Investigations recognised and met the criteria for the two highest bands and there were pieces which achieved the very highest marks. There were some candidates who would have benefitted from a focus on the issue of links and comparisons. Few candidates accomplished this criterion as successfully as the other criteria, although the banding definition for Band 1 states, 'Candidates at this level may well demonstrate a sophisticated awareness of links and comparisons to other countries and periods.' Whilst not a compulsory element, candidates can enhance their responses by demonstrating such links; indeed the most successful examples included links and comparisons as an occasional and natural part of the argument.

Most candidates placed in the higher bands achieved some sense of a critical appreciation of the sources they used. This was most successful when candidates employed a range of tactics – comparing sources; measuring sources against known factual material; evaluating by provenance; dating and context; corroboration and difference; utility and reliability; typicality or tone. The element of critical evaluation was least effective when it was self-conscious and offered stock evaluations, or evaluated by School of Historical Thought. This is an area where candidates could be encouraged to evaluate sources whilst they are undertaking their research, rather than impose a stock evaluation on all quotes at the point of writing the essay. There were also candidates who did not go further than simply bolting the occasional quote onto descriptive material. This was the exception, however.

All investigations were approved by a CIE Moderator. Instructions are very clear on the issue of the word limit (4000 words), yet a very large number of candidates exceeded the word limit – in some cases, by up to 10%. Clearly all candidates must be judged by the same criteria, and candidates who seriously breached the word limit did not have all of their work read. This means, for these candidates, that part, or all of the conclusion, was not marked. Similarly, there were candidates who were on or over the word limit who attempted to include evaluation or additional material in the footnotes, which is not acceptable. This is an area where teachers can advise their candidates and it is hoped that no investigations will exceed 4000 words in the future.



# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9769/73**

**Special Subjects – Germany, 1919–1945**

## **General Comments on Special Subjects**

Please note that these general comments apply to all special subject papers and so are not specific to this paper.

The paper tests a range of skills and generally candidates seemed more at ease with the essay than in using documents. Time planning was good and knowledge was often sound in the essays. Essay questions did sometimes seem prepared, with candidates being eager to show that they knew lots of explanations. Some candidates needed to build on their knowledge as the questions required judgement and assessment.

There were answers which dealt very well with the comparison question, offering similarities and differences and looking at the nature of the evidence to explain these. It is vital that candidates are able to identify and understand the main themes of the two documents and avoid restricting themselves to general differences or similarities. This task yielded a very wide range of responses.

In answers to the second document question and the essays, knowledge was not always used enough and explanation was more common than the higher order skills of evaluation and sustained analysis. Having said that, there were some very strong analyses of the documents as a set, which offered clear judgements and support from carefully selected knowledge. The best answers used evidence and source material for which credit was given. A significant number of candidates seemed unsure of how to tackle this sort of question and relied heavily on just paraphrasing or describing the content of the documents.

There was some awareness of conflicting interpretations but relatively limited awareness of modern historical writing. While it was good to see Taylor, Trevor-Roper and Bullock being discussed, for example, in some answers on Nazi Germany, it was a little disappointing that in a Special Subject there was not more reference to more recent work. Some essays did show a fluent mastery of the arguments and were impressively analytical, but there was quite a wide range of responses. Encouragingly few relied on narrative and the standard of communication was generally high. Many knew a lot, but might have reflected more on their knowledge.

Candidates need to ensure that they make use of the documents as well as their own knowledge when answering the two parts of Question 1. Any question that includes 'How far...', 'Assess ...' or 'Evaluate...' requires candidates to go beyond explanation to the higher order skills of evaluation and sustained analysis if they are to access the higher levels of the mark scheme.

## **Comments on Individual questions**

### **5I Germany, 1919–1945**

#### **Question 1**

- (a) The question required candidates to make use of Documents C and D in a question focussed on legality. Candidates generally grasped the theme of legality well, but others assumed it was to do with the 'legal revolution' after January 1933 and did not relate it to the specific issue. The better candidates did reflect on the similarities such as the racially-based social revolution, but some others merely showed how Strasser and Hitler seemed to differ. Candidates needed to look closely at the two documents rather than writing an essay about legality.
- (b) There were some good analyses of the relative role of legality, which used the documents and knowledge. There was generally good technique in that relatively few relied on a paraphrase of the documents. Most candidates stayed within the parameters of the question. Candidates do need to make sure that they follow the instructions in questions as several continued their answer beyond

1930. It is important that candidates make use of all the documents rather than concentrate on just a few of them. This approach tended to lead to an essay on the growth of the party, with limited references to the documents.

## **Question 2**

The better answers started with key themes and used the material to support their views. In other answers there was a fair amount of description, though most did see that legality was accompanied by violence and intimidation. There was some uncertainty about what conclusions to draw about Hitler's negotiations with the Centre Party. Some relied heavily on describing the main elements of the take over and adding in comments about legality.

## **Question 4**

There was some good awareness of the debate in answers, though as always, some were confused by 'structuralists' and 'intentionalists' and 'functionalists'. The crucial element is the evidence – more than the Schools of History, though reference to different views can be helpful. There was some reference to sources and there were some very strong analyses here by better candidates, which looked critically at different explanations and used evidence to evaluate and form a judgement. Some were obviously eager to offer rehearsed discussions of a debate. They needed to focus their answers more on responding to the actual question which asked about reactions to events. Some offered a series of explanations for Hitler's foreign policy, rather than considering the actual question.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 9769/74

Special Subjects – China under Mao Zedong, 1949–1976

## General Comments on Special Subjects

Please note that these general comments apply to all special subject papers and so are not specific to this paper.

The paper tests a range of skills and generally candidates seemed more at ease with the essay than in using documents. Time planning was good and knowledge was often sound in the essays. Essay questions did sometimes seem prepared, with candidates being eager to show that they knew lots of explanations. Some candidates needed to build on their knowledge as the questions required judgement and assessment.

There were answers which dealt very well with the comparison question, offering similarities and differences and looking at the nature of the evidence to explain these. It is vital that candidates are able to identify and understand the main themes of the two documents and avoid restricting themselves to general differences or similarities. This task yielded a very wide range of responses.

In answers to the second document question and the essays, knowledge was not always used enough and explanation was more common than the higher order skills of evaluation and sustained analysis. Having said that, there were some very strong analyses of the documents as a set, which offered clear judgements and support from carefully selected knowledge. The best answers used evidence and source material for which credit was given. A significant number of candidates seemed unsure of how to tackle this sort of question and relied heavily on just paraphrasing or describing the content of the documents.

There was some awareness of conflicting interpretations but relatively limited awareness of modern historical writing. While it was good to see Taylor, Trevor-Roper and Bullock being discussed, for example, in some answers on Nazi Germany, it was a little disappointing that in a Special Subject there was not more reference to more recent work. Some essays did show a fluent mastery of the arguments and were impressively analytical, but there was quite a wide range of responses. Encouragingly few relied on narrative and the standard of communication was generally high. Many knew a lot, but might have reflected more on their knowledge.

Candidates need to ensure that they make use of the documents as well as their own knowledge when answering the two parts of Question 1. Any question that includes 'How far...', 'Assess ...' or 'Evaluate...' requires candidates to go beyond explanation to the higher order skills of evaluation and sustained analysis if they are to access the higher levels of the mark scheme.

## Comments on Individual questions

### **5m China under Mao Zedong, 1949–1976**

#### **Question 1**

- (a) This question was generally well answered. Most candidates were able to offer comparisons and some noticed contrasts. Some referred to the provenance and context of the evidence.
- (b) The response was very variable. Given the comments in (a), it was surprising that, in some cases, this was not done better. Most, correctly, focused on the documents, rather than just writing an essay. However, in many cases there was very insufficient contextual knowledge and comments on the evidence tended to be simplistic and limited. It is important that judgement should be supported and not speculative – there is little to support the view that B is somehow an attempt to appease China to stop it interfering in Vietnam, for instance. Comments that the author of E was not there, so may be biased, are not helpful. Where there was a critical sense rooted in knowledge of the context,

then this was well rewarded, Candidates need to be read and obey the instruction 'It is essential to set (the documents) alongside, and make use of your own contextual knowledge'.

### **Question 2**

The question was 'how important was', not 'explain the role of' the leadership of Mao Zedong. It was expected that candidates would question the view that Mao was the key element or show that circumstances played a large role in Mao's leadership successes. Too often the impression was that candidates were repeating a general essay on the reasons for Communist victory, rather than assessing the importance of Mao. Some explanation was under developed. It may well be true, for example, that Mao's military tactics were vital, but this does need to be supported and explained, not merely stated as an unquestionable fact. In a special subject at this level, rather more critical sense is called for and more understanding of the relationship between different elements.

### **Question 3**

Most candidates, if not all, were aware of the possible debate here between personal power and genuine ideological motives. There was some impressive detailed knowledge of the in-fighting, but this was not always developed or directed at answering the question. Some relied on merely running through 'causes, course and results of the Cultural Revolution', while better answers isolated different possible motives, considered the evidence and offered a genuine assessment. This is the sort of approach that is to be encouraged.

### **Question 4**

There were too few answers to this question to show particular trends.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 9769/75

Special Subjects – The Civil Rights  
Movement in the US, 1954–1980

## General Comments on Special Subjects

Please note that these general comments apply to all special subject papers and so are not specific to this paper.

The paper tests a range of skills and generally candidates seemed more at ease with the essay than in using documents. Time planning was good and knowledge was often sound in the essays. Essay questions did sometimes seem prepared, with candidates being eager to show that they knew lots of explanations. Some candidates needed to build on their knowledge as the questions required judgement and assessment.

There were answers which dealt very well with the comparison question, offering similarities and differences and looking at the nature of the evidence to explain these. It is vital that candidates are able to identify and understand the main themes of the two documents and avoid restricting themselves to general differences or similarities. This task yielded a very wide range of responses.

In answers to the second document question and the essays, knowledge was not always used enough and explanation was more common than the higher order skills of evaluation and sustained analysis. Having said that, there were some very strong analyses of the documents as a set, which offered clear judgements and support from carefully selected knowledge. The best answers used evidence and source material for which credit was given. A significant number of candidates seemed unsure of how to tackle this sort of question and relied heavily on just paraphrasing or describing the content of the documents.

There was some awareness of conflicting interpretations but relatively limited awareness of modern historical writing. While it was good to see Taylor, Trevor-Roper and Bullock being discussed, for example, in some answers on Nazi Germany, it was a little disappointing that in a Special Subject there was not more reference to more recent work. Some essays did show a fluent mastery of the arguments and were impressively analytical, but there was quite a wide range of responses. Encouragingly few relied on narrative and the standard of communication was generally high. Many knew a lot, but might have reflected more on their knowledge.

Candidates need to ensure that they make use of the documents as well as their own knowledge when answering the two parts of Question 1. Any question that includes 'How far...', 'Assess ...' or 'Evaluate...' requires candidates to go beyond explanation to the higher order skills of evaluation and sustained analysis if they are to access the higher levels of the mark scheme.

## Comments on Individual questions

### **5n The Civil Rights Movement in the USA, 1954–1980**

#### **Question 1**

- (a) Most candidates were aware of the differences and a good number explained the similarities, sensibly avoiding an excessively descriptive and sequential approach, though few saw any significance in the different dates of the documents.
- (b) The amount of support for views offered was quite variable. For part (b) questions candidates should refer to 'contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A-E).' Some relied on the documents alone, rather than relating to the context fully. For some, it was simply the reference to Kennedy which triggered comment and some responded in a similar way to C. Seeing the name Malcolm X led immediately to comments on radicalism and there was often insufficient



reference to the actual text. There was generally an attempt to use the documents, though sometimes with limited critical sense. There were some strong answers which offered a sustained analysis based solidly on the texts alongside contextual knowledge, and offering well-supported analysis with a developed critical sense. The responses were variable, allowing good differentiation. Candidates can improve if they hone their skills in dealing with documentary evidence.

### Question 2

The question asked for an assessment of the role of the Supreme Court. At the top there was some sustained discussion and assessment, whilst weaker candidates had some misunderstanding of what the Supreme Court actually does in the USA. There was knowledge and understanding shown, but too often candidates used the question to offer what they knew about the reasons for the success of the Civil Rights Movement, rather than focussing on the role of the Supreme Court. Candidates, quite rightly, needed to look at other factors in the success of the Civil Rights Movement and always keep in mind the need to assess their relative influence with that of the Supreme Court.

### Question 3

This question elicited some thoughtful responses, with answers considering the relative importance of the two periods and avoiding a 'list'. Judgement was variable, though very good in places. There was more engagement and argument shown here than in answers to **Question 2**, in spite of some imbalance in a few responses. There was, obviously, no set answer expected and better candidates argued convincingly in different ways, reaching different supported conclusions.

### Question 4

There were some well-informed answers with good knowledge and explanation of Kennedy's position on Civil Rights. The debate was sometimes established between reluctance and constraint, and well followed through by the best candidates. Weaker candidates would have done better to respond directly to the question, rather than being too eager to get down explanations relating to the topic. The key concept of 'reluctant reformer' needed to be addressed, so in some cases more thought and planning was needed before starting to write an answer.