



# A Level

## History A

---

**Session:** 2010 June  
**Type:** Report  
**Code:** H106-H506

**History A**

Advanced GCE A2 H506

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H106

**Reports on the Units**

---

**June 2010**

**HX06/R/10**

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622  
Facsimile: 01223 552610  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

Advanced GCE History (H506)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE History (H106)

### REPORTS ON THE UNITS

Unit/Content	Page
Chief Examiner Report	1
F961/02 AS Period Studies – General comments	2
F961/01 British History Period Studies – Medieval and Early modern	4
F961/02 British History Period studies	13
F962/01 European and World History Period Studies – Medieval and early modern	19
F962/02 European and World History Period Studies – Modern	24
F963 and F964 AS History Enquiries	32
F965 Historical Interpretations and Investigations	38
F966 Historical Themes	41
F966/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1066-1715	43
F966/02 Modern 1789-1997	49

## **Chief Examiner Report**

This assessment series saw the completion of the first cohort of candidates who embarked on the OCR Specification A Level History in September 2009. The four unit module was a new experience for many Centres and, although legacy units, such as Period Studies, Document Studies and Themes in History, were retained albeit in a modified form, the internally marked and externally moderated Coursework was an innovation. Changes were also apparent in several study topics, the length of their assessment and the application of skills-based mark schemes. The new Spec A A Level therefore represented a blend of traditional and novel features.

Many if not most Centres judge the quality of a course according to how well their candidates perform and there is little doubt that the overall performance of AS candidates in both Period Studies and Enquiries has been very good (see detailed reports below). Most papers have resulted in an increase of between 1 and 3 marks in the mean mark compared with June 2009, with the greatest improvement in European Period Studies and Medieval and Early Modern Enquiries papers. The A2 units have also experienced a rise in the mean mark, exceeding anything achieved in the legacy units. Coursework achieved a mark of 57 (out of 80) and Themes a mark of 75 (out of 120). Each of the A2 units had a new mark scheme that targeted specific skills which placed particular emphasis on analysis, synthesis and judgementally derived arguments. The first year of assessing Coursework was always likely to be an uncertain journey for many Centres: uncertain whether they were delivering the unit properly, uncertain if their marking was fair and accurate and uncertain how their candidates would perform. One is left with the overall impression that this journey has been an enriching experience, and Centres deserve every credit for this achievement. The Themes unit has also seen a number of changes: a longer assessment, greater coverage in the content of some topics, and the omission of an Insert of dates and events. The quality of work produced by most Centres was very encouraging and is further commented upon in the Principal Examiner's report below. Centres should be congratulated in the way they have responded to this 'stretch and challenge' unit; most candidates rose to the challenge and appear to have fulfilled or exceeded their potential.

Of course, just as some Centres will be delighted with their results, others will be disappointed, but it is to be hoped that all Centres will build upon their experiences. The Principal Examiners' reports clearly indicate areas that need particular attention. Though few essays were purely descriptive or mainly narrative, weaker candidates still have a tendency to write assertive statements without supplying any or much supporting evidence. Some candidates still write formulaic answers often to a slightly different question from the one that has been set. The importance of candidates focusing on the command words in the question and thinking for themselves exactly what is required, rather than producing a rehearsed answer, cannot be stressed enough. The quality of English also remains very variable. Centres need to remind their candidates of the importance of writing formal English. The use of idioms, clichés and colloquialisms is to be avoided, and every effort made to write proper names, places and events in full rather than tolerate the lazy habit of writing abbreviations. All candidates can also help themselves by structuring their ideas and knowledge into paragraphs. This practice enables the writer to marshal his/her thoughts and develop an argument; it also helps the examiner to follow the line of reasoning and explanation from beginning to end. In conclusion, the wealth of advice contained in the following reports is designed to help Centres and their candidates make further progress. It should be remembered that although the performance of most candidates has been extremely encouraging, there is always room for improvement.

## F961/02 AS Period Studies – General comments

The overall standard of the responses seen by examiners was encouraging. Many commented on the general improvement in the amount of relevant historical knowledge displayed by candidates and there were fewer answers where candidates did not display some attempt to argue and focus on the question. It was noticeable that there were fewer answers that were simply descriptive with no analytical comment, even if it was sometimes very weak. However, there were still a number who displayed poor knowledge, not just of the issue in the question, but also of the topic and any attempt to argue was simply assertion.

There was little evidence of candidates struggling to manage their use of time and most were able to complete two answers in full. Some examiners even commented that there were occasions when the second essay was better than the first, probably because candidates had less time to spend off-loading all they knew about a topic and instead they were more focused on the question set.

Centres would be well advised to encourage students to answer the question that actually appears rather than one they have done before or have rehearsed. This was particularly true of questions with a named factor that was often ignored or dealt with as one point in a number of factors. The best answers used the named factor as a thread which ran throughout the essay. However, centres and candidates do need reminding that it is impossible to reach more than Level IV on AO1b if the named factor is ignored or more than Level III if they write solely about the named factor. Even if candidates wish to disagree with the statement they must explain why they do not think that X was the most important factor before going on to deal with other factors. This year also saw a depressing number of formulaic responses with candidates from the same centre writing a very similar response typically with the first sentence being 'Many historians argue' or 'It is a matter of historical debate' and then going through in order from most important to least important. This essay-by-numbers approach limited candidates' achievement and is symptomatic of over-coaching students. Centres would be far better teaching generic skills, advising students not to predict questions and then let them think for themselves, tailoring knowledge to answer the specific question.

Over recent years there has been an increasing tendency for candidates to speculate and adopt the 'what if' approach to History. This approach should be avoided and candidates should confine themselves to drawing their conclusions from what actually happened, rather than making sweeping and speculative comments that they are unable to support.

Better answers were analytical from the start, gave an opinion in the first paragraph and then used their knowledge to argue a point of view and actually come to a judgement. If centres are looking to improve the performance of their 'middling' candidates this would be a good area on which to focus. There are a number of candidates whose analysis is not fully developed and may be little more than a 'bolt on' at the end of a paragraph. However, if these candidates could be encouraged to devote more time to explanation or offering a judgement, based on earlier comments, their overall performance would improve. Centres would also benefit from further encouraging their candidates to look carefully for the key command words in the question and ensure they focus on them, at least in their concluding sentences of a paragraph or, if nothing more, in their conclusion. Once again this links back to the learnt or formulaic response which does not encourage candidates to think about the actual question being asked.

Although the amount of factual knowledge displayed by candidates did appear to have improved there were still the usual areas that need addressing. There were a significant number of candidates who did not know the dates of key events and this should be expected as a matter of course. The usual confusions over facts continued to appear and it would be fair to say that there were a significant number of candidates who confused the Depression of 1929 with

hyperinflation. This would be considered a serious error at GCSE and really should be avoided at AS. However, not only is it factually inaccurate but also usually leads to the wrong conclusion being drawn and, as a result, candidates not obtaining the marks they should. It is also reasonable to expect candidates to be familiar with the concepts associated with the period and topics they are studying and this does appear to be getting worse. There a number who think that parliament, government and cabinet are interchangeable and quite happily switch between them regardless of the context. In a similar vein, candidates should attempt to distinguish between questions that relate to the success of a leader and the success of a Prime Minister. There are also topic-specific concepts that candidates need to be more confident in handling, most noticeable this summer was 'splendid isolation'. This problem could be broadened out as some seemed unable to distinguish between cause and consequence and were happier writing about the former despite the wording of the question. However, most notable were the number who did not understand the use of the term 'distinctiveness' and were willing to exchange it for almost any other concept. This resulted in a number of answers that lost their focus and, despite displaying a good range of knowledge, scored poorly on AO1b.

The standard of English continues to disappoint examiners. A number of students seem to have difficulty in understanding the correct way to capitalise letters in a sentence. A good example of this is the following describing Eustace of Boulogne and the so-called "Fracas at Dover": '...[Eustace] was going back after Seeing edward, Stopped at dover for supplies...' This is not an isolated incidence of this kind of grammatical error. There are also the perennial problems of the use of abbreviations and it would be appreciated if centres encouraged their candidates to avoid it. It is a formal examination and candidates should respond to questions in a formal manner. The continued use of 'would of' rather than 'would have' is another example, and again it would be helpful if centres could encourage the correct approach. The same is true of tenses where there were a number who wrote answers in the present tense!

There were very few rubric infringements and when they did occur it was usually candidates trying to answer all three questions on a Study Topic. It goes without saying that by cutting down the amount of time available for each question they were not able to develop their ideas and as a result scored low marks. However, there were a few who answered only one question and obviously this had a very significant impact on their overall performance.

Centres could help examiners by asking invigilators to remind candidates of the need to leave a gap of at least four lines between the two questions. This is important so that examiners have the necessary space to write their comments for each Assessment Objective and their overall total. Invigilators could also help by reminding candidates to number their questions correctly and to enter the question number on both the front of the paper and at the start of each essay. There is no need for candidates to write out the question when this has been done.

# F961/01 British History Period Studies – Medieval and Early modern

## Question Specific Comments

### 1 How successfully did Edward the Confessor deal with the Godwin family?

This was generally answered very well. There was no obvious or natural structure for an answer to this question and it was tackled in several different ways. Some divided the reign into three periods: the early years, the crisis of 1051-2 and the years following Godwin's death in 1053. Others divided it according to personal, political, or ecclesiastical dealings. A more sophisticated approach was to examine how Edward benefited from the Godwins, in his succession, in witnessing charters, in his relations with Denmark, on missions, including Harold's enigmatic one of 1064 to the continent, and for military and marcher security, such as Harold's and Tostig's in Wales, and then discussing whether the vast Godwin landholding and power reduced or supported Edward's authority. Another clear structure that both referred directly to the wording of the question and led to neat analysis was to consider Edward's dealings with each of the Godwin family in turn: Godwin himself, Edith, and then the sons, Sweyn, Harold, Tostig. Many candidates felt Edward was not spectacularly successful and his moment of triumph over the Godwins was short-lived – and then he became acquiescent and concentrated on Westminster Abbey, leaving the rest to Harold. Some did try for a more nuanced approach and suggested Edward's tactics with the Godwins deserved more praise, while others argued that the circumstances of his upbringing and accession gave him little room to manoeuvre. Some responses failed to identify the issues involved in Edward's childless marriage as symptomatic of "How successfully" he dealt with the Godwin family. Also, merely noting that the eventual succession of Harold Godwinson to the throne shows that Edward didn't deal successfully with the Godwins is again too simplistic a judgement. Candidates possessed knowledge of the principal events of Edward's reign, but at a lower level events were not always effectively linked to the question. For example, Edward's vulnerability at the moment of his accession appeared in answers, but its impact on his relationship with the Godwin family wasn't always properly understood. Many candidates argued that the promotion of Godwin's sons to earldoms and Edward's marriage to Edith which followed soon after his coronation provided examples of Edward successfully dealing with the family. However, these events surely suggest that Edward was merely carrying out the will of Earl Godwin; as such, they highlight the weakness of his position.

Although candidates demonstrated an awareness of both the political and social contexts of Edward's appointment (Cnut was frequently mentioned in relation to the condition of the country in 1042 and England's relations with Scandinavian countries), very few answers discussed the issue of Edward's Norman identity and its associated problems which eventually led to the 1051 crisis. Edward's promotion of Normans (or, to put it more accurately, 'foreigners') acted as a catalyst in the breakdown of his relationship with Earl Godwin and should have been identified as an example of his unsuccessful treatment of the family. Moreover, few answers mentioned Edward's long exile in Normandy, which undoubtedly constituted an obstacle to harmonious relations between the new king and the Godwin family. Edward's marriage to Edith was mishandled to some extent because it wasn't judged from Edward's perspective. It was certainly a success for the Godwins, but from Edward's point of view, it was a significant failure, since it placed him almost entirely at the mercy of the Godwin family. The evident change in Edward's relationship with the family after Earl Godwin's death was surprisingly omitted. Edward clearly preferred Harold and Tostig to their father, a fact which is confirmed by Edward's deathbed bequest of the kingdom to Harold and is reflected in contemporary sources (also see Barlow's



biography). Some candidates thought Harold's accession was a fitting end to the reign of a king who failed to control England's most powerful family. But the situation is far more complicated than this.

At the lower levels candidates often described Edward's relations with the Godwins, with little or bolt on, undeveloped assessment of his success in controlling them. Candidates sometimes explained why he was unsuccessful, rather than addressing *'how successful'*. Some weaker candidates were inclined to assert that post Godwin's death in 1053, relations were automatically good.

## **2 To what extent was military force the most important factor in overcoming opposition to the rule of William I.**

This was a very popular question, which seemed to have been practiced by centres in advance. Stock answers were common (force, use of castles, use of feudalism examined). Some candidates were able to analyse different factors successfully but many just described some of the rebellions of the period, or described the use of castles without explaining how successfully they were used. This question invited a natural analytical structure, which usually comprised the main factor of force, sometimes including the use of castles, compromise or diplomacy and other factors like rebels' disunity. Candidates obviously mentioned the 1070 Harrying of the North as being an extreme example of force, but they gave many other instances in a broad appraisal. Candidates seemed to know more about the named factor than they did about any alternative factors. A few candidates misunderstood the question and focussed on the reasons for William winning the Battle of Hastings. This resulted in them being unable to attain above a level V or IV depending on whether they had briefly mentioned any other points that could be awarded marks. Certain examples lent themselves to a discussion of multiple factors, such as the siege of Exeter, 1067, where force, some tolerance on taxation and a castle were all involved. Warwick castle was instrumental in preventing Edwin and Morcar from linking up with the Welsh. The partial success of William's payment to the Danes and the success of the Peace of Abernethy 1072 in isolating Edgar Atheling were cited as examples of diplomacy though all candidates agreed that a show of force was also needed. The detailed knowledge of a range of rebellions and of the function of many castles was very impressive. It was good to read a discussion of their garrisons as well as of their buildings.

At the lower end, analysis was often poorly substantiated, leaving arguments weak and ineffective. Too many candidates were unable to provide an accurate chronology of the rebellions during the period 1066-1075. In particular, the events of 1069-70 in the north of England were poorly understood. Indeed, weaker candidates tended to avoid mentioning these events. Another significant omission was Edgar Ætheling, who barely featured. As the grandson of Edmund Ironside, Edgar held a legitimate claim to the throne, and on several occasions after Hastings, he acted as a focal point for Anglo-Saxon support. Indeed, the northern rebellion of 1069-70 represented a determined effort by Edgar and his supporters to challenge William's accession.

## **3 How far did England become a feudal state during the reign of William I?**

This was not attempted by many candidates and those that did attempt it did not do so with a great deal of success. The weakest candidates gave a brief description of the feudal hierarchy. More successful candidates were able to talk about local government and fines. Answers tended to be too generalised; knowledge was inadequate, and most candidates seemed unaware of the context of any changes discussed. Some answers effectively addressed the issue of continuity in government (which, incidentally, would make a much better question; see the work of W. L. Warren in particular), but these candidates couldn't make effective use of this knowledge. Some candidates talked about the 'feudal pyramid' with the king at the top, but candidates were unaware of the significance of Domesday Book and the Salisbury Oath (the latter wasn't mentioned at all).

**4 'The power of the nobility was the most important cause of unrest in the period from 1450 to 1470'. Do you agree?**

A reasonable number of candidates attempted this question. Candidates often found it difficult to structure their essays, so that they covered the events of Henry VI and Edward IV's reign. However, a simple structure, comprising a solid discussion of the power of certain nobles followed by examination of other factors including the weaknesses of Henry VI could have been followed. Candidates found it easiest to deal with the reasons why unrest broke out under Edward, citing Warwick's dissatisfaction and the Woodville marriage, amongst other reasons. Unrest in Henry VI's reign was often harder going; the weakest candidates were very confused about the different protagonists. There were often brief descriptions of Henry VI's incapacity but candidates did not find it easy to link this with unrest. Very few candidates were able to look at factors in turn and analyse their significance across the entire period. A number of candidates did not pay heed to the dates in the question and included consideration of Richard III's and, occasionally, Henry VII's reigns (and not simply by way of comparison to earlier, relevant issues). Similarly, a number of answers considered ONLY the reign of Henry VI. However, there appeared to be others who did not like the look of the factor in the question and so wrote the prepared answer on causes of the Wars of the Roses. In some instances those who did focus on the nobles, did not always keep to the problem of their power. It was their ambition which was the problem. One waited in vain for a reference to extensive land holdings, affinities or bastard feudalism.

**5 How serious a threat to Henry VII's rule was the Yorkist challenge?**

This question was popular and handled better than question 4. Many answers concentrated on Simnel and Warbeck and ignored other Yorkist threats. A few candidates were able to go beyond examining Henry's response to each rebellion/pretender, examining his more positive steps to engage the Yorkists, such as his marriage to Elizabeth of York. Most candidates knew about the pretenders though one or two can still confuse Simnel with Warbeck. There was also considerable confusion from some candidates as to who the Pretenders were claiming to be. Some thought Simnel and Warbeck made identical claims but at different times; some thought they were both simply the two "Princes in the Tower" and were vague about who these were. What distinguished the better candidates was their understanding of the nature and breadth of the Yorkist challenge. This comprised the remaining loyal followers of Richard III, notably Lovell who tried a rising with the Staffords in 1486. It also included, more seriously, the surviving descendants of the York family, particularly the earl of Warwick and the de la Pole brothers. Very few candidates could name the three relevant de la Poles, John, earl of Lincoln, though one candidate wisely wondered why he was supporting Simnel at Stoke, Edmund de la Pole, earl of Suffolk who was handed over to Henry in 1506, and Richard de la Pole who remained a threat into Henry VIII's reign. Many could assess the patronage of Margaret of Burgundy for Yorkist claimants, and note the support of France and Scotland when it suited them. Ireland was still referred to as foreign.

**6 The handling of finances was Henry VII's most successful domestic achievement.' How far do you agree?**

The question proved largely straightforward for all calibres of candidate as it was clear that various factors were to be assessed in addition to finances. The degree of understanding of the financial system and methods under Henry VII determined the success in debating the main factor. Candidates usually addressed a range of different factors, although the level of detailed support varied across scripts. Many candidates attempted to link Henry's handling of finance with his handling of the nobility but this was rarely little more than a brief comment or description. A few candidates claimed that Henry was very successful in restoring law and order but failed to substantiate such views to any great extent. Control of retaining was a very popular issue which cropped up regularly. Bonds and recognisances were often mentioned but not in depth, suggesting that candidates did not always understand their use. In general, answers tempted to

attempt analysis and knowledge but not with great success or to any depth. Scripts occasionally dwelled on foreign policy issues, without linking them to domestic issues. A number of responses tried to weigh up Henry's success with finances compared to other aspects of his rule. This could prove effective. However, a significant number of those candidates included foreign policy. This could be made to be relevant if, for example, a clear link was drawn to impact on finances or dynastic security but often this link was not made.

**7 'Henry VIII's foreign policy from 1509 to 1529 brought little benefit for England'. How far do you agree?**

This popular question produced a wide range of responses. The word 'benefit' was the problem which the better candidates tackled well in that they discussed England's defences and England's economy. For instance, the Scottish border was successfully secured after the battle of Flodden with the regency of Margaret Tudor, and the acquisition of Tournai might have helped the English cloth trade with Flanders. When other candidates discussed economic effects of foreign policy, they often confused the English economy with crown finances, especially on the costs of warfare, except when dealing with subsidies. Several mentioned the uprising caused by the Amicable Grant which was an occasion when heavy taxation by the crown for the purposes of war had to be revoked because of its unpopularity. The most common way of answering the question of benefit was limited to prestige and status. As usual, the Treaty of London 1518 and the Field of the Cloth of Gold were used as examples for this and evaluated very critically by good candidates.

More candidates than usual were able to discuss the events of the mid and late 1520's, which included in some cases the impact of the divorce negotiations and whether the fall of Wolsey was a benefit for England. Because of past questions, Henry VIII's aims dominated many answers leading to irrelevance. There was some confusion on the Mary who married Louis XII; it should be Henry's sister and not his daughter.

However, at the weaker end there were a significant number of candidates whose was focused entirely on relations with France or on the major events of the Field of the Cloth o Gold and the Treaty of London. In many instances knowledge of relations with Scotland was either very poor or completely absent.

**8 How successful were Henry VIII's wars with France and Scotland in the period from 1540 to 1547?**

This question was less popular than question 7. There were a number of quite brief but very good answers which included considerable detail, for instance on costs. Most candidates dealt first with Solway Moss 1542, its aftermath and the Treaty of Greenwich 1543. There were sound discussions of whether this had been a successful war in view of the continued recognition of the Auld Alliance, the failure of prince Edward to marry Mary, Queen of Scots, and Hertford's continuing campaigns. Most mentioned the costs of this war. They then moved on to the French invasion with the capture of Boulogne 1544, the value of which was critically assessed by most candidates, as were the terms of the peace treaties of Crepy 1544 and Campe/Ardres 1546. The only aspect that was often omitted was the attempted invasion of the French fleet 1545 and the loss of the Mary Rose. Many drew the conclusion that the success in France, albeit small, was more important to Henry than that in Scotland. At the lower end candidates lacked sufficiently detailed knowledge to enable them to analyse the level of success of the wars. In these instances chronological understanding was often skewed or inaccurate. A few candidates looked forward to the legacy left by Henry at his death but most assessed their success in broad terms, claiming that they were too expensive or achieved nothing, without supporting such arguments with detailed evidence. The balance between discussion of France and Scotland was something to which some candidates could have paid closer attention.

**9 How serious were the social and economic problems faced by Edward VI and Mary I?**

Although this was quite a popular question there were many very weak answers. These largely described only government policies and not the problems. Even when the issue of the problems was addressed many failed to address the issue of 'how serious'. Answers often employed many assertions, such as Henry's wars left England very poor or there was discontent throughout the country. There was little understanding of the price rise, of debasement which was mentioned by some candidates, of enclosure, of poverty and vagrancy. Both the 1549 rebellions were described as social problems per se but with no emphasis on the social and economic causes. Indeed Somerset's policy on enclosure was usually misunderstood as most candidates thought his support for enclosure caused the revolt. The same blanket description occurred with Wyatt's rebellion which was described by most candidates in relation to Mary's marriage and religion but with no consideration of the unemployed cloth workers following the Antwerp collapse. Even the Marian overcoming of Lady Jane Grey and Northumberland was described by some as a social problem. Knowledge on Mary's reign was negligible or wrong, such as harvests were good under Mary, when in 1555 and 1556 they were extremely bad and only one or two knew of her financial reforms. No one mentioned the impact of the war against France on Mary's finances, but then very few mentioned Mary's reign at all. There were many answers that displayed very little understanding of the concepts of social and economic problems and saw the question as an opportunity to write all they knew about the reigns of Edward and Mary; the focus was very often government, religion and even foreign policy, with scant attention given to the actual demands of the question.

**10 How widespread was criticism of the Church in England on the eve of the Reformation?**

A large number of candidates tackled this question. There were a lot of stock answers that dealt with exactly the same issues (Simony, Nepotism, Absenteeism, Pluralism, Anti-papalism, Lollardy, Humanists, Church building, general satisfaction) and used very similar evidence (Colet, Fish, Hunne, evidence from wills, the cost of the Louth steeple etc). How well candidates analysed such issues and used such evidence varied across the scripts. The worst described these issues in a vague manner, with little supporting evidence. Better scripts were able to argue reasonably convincingly that criticism was not widespread. Some candidates did slip into a historiographical approach and simply described the Elton/Dickens v the Revisionists debate. This approach does not score highly and centres are reminded that there is no need for candidates to be aware of the views of different historians, although they will gain credit if they use them to help support their argument, examiners really do want to know the views of the candidates and not read a digest of the views of a variety of historians.

**11 How successful were the governments of Somerset and Northumberland in establishing Protestantism from 1547 to 1553?**

This question was again popular and was reasonably well executed. Most candidates discriminated between Somerset and Northumberland and dealt with them separately. Knowledge was quite good, although some candidates fell into the trap of just describing developments. A few wasted time describing other elements of Somerset and Northumberland's regimes. Many candidates argued that whilst a legal reformation was carried out, a genuine conversion of people's views had not been. This was a valuable approach to take and allowed candidates to develop a good line of argument and reach clear judgements. Candidates often pointed to developments in Mary's reign to support this, arguing that her success in restoring Catholicism was clear evidence of the failure of Edward's policies at grass roots. Many developed this, arguing that the brevity of Edward's reign meant that there was not enough time

for the reforms to be embedded. Candidates were also inclined to note that there was opposition to Somerset's reforms in the form of the Western rebellion, although there were a number who confused this with Kett's rebellion. At the lower end there were a number of candidates who were only able to list the government changes and did not assess the success of the changes.

**12 'Puritanism's influence was always limited from 1558 to 1589.' How far do you agree?**

Fewer candidates attempted this question than the others in this section. This question was not always answered well because many candidates were intent on addressing the issue of the Puritan threat. Even some better answers, which addressed the question, spoke about the 'threat' of Puritans as well as their 'influence'. Candidates should avoid using the word 'threat' unless it appears in the question. The better answers examined a variety of ways in which Puritanism might have been influential, including the role of puritans in parliament, their links with the council, their influence over Grindal and their influence on the wider population, through publications and lectures etc. Most concluded that Puritanism's influence was limited by 1589 but had fluctuated slightly before that. The weaker candidates struggled with the concept of Puritanism, sometimes equating it with anyone who wasn't a Catholic. Other weaker answers dealt with the Catholic threat in addition. Some candidates knew why they thought puritans weren't influential but couldn't support these ideas with any detailed knowledge.

**13 'Foreign affairs were the most serious problem facing Elizabeth in 1558.' How far do you agree?**

A popular question which posed few problems for candidates. A lot of candidates were able to look at different problems faced by Elizabeth in turn. The narrow scope of the question appeared to concern a few, with a lot of candidates finding it difficult to assess how serious problems were in 1558. A good number of candidates examined the seriousness of the problems across the first ten years or so of her reign. However, even weaker candidates were able to discuss Elizabeth's inherited war with France and the potential danger posed by Spain. Mary Queen of Scots featured in most answers, usually in the context of the 'Auld Alliance', but better answers treated Mary separately in relation to Elizabeth's legitimacy. However, some points were handled less effectively. Too much emphasis was placed on the Marian exiles as potential troublemakers in 1558. In some cases, candidates contradicted themselves by acknowledging their limited numbers. In others, they were treated as the principal domestic obstacle Elizabeth had to overcome in order to secure the religious settlement – a flawed interpretation when the majority of the population were Catholic. Indeed, few answers acknowledged the seriousness of the problem posed by the population's Catholic sympathies. Some of the highest-scoring essays argued that this problem was more serious in northern England, where religious beliefs were more traditional, than in the south-east, where Protestantism was more popular. Too many answers described England as a Protestant country in 1558.

The problem posed by the makeup of the Privy Council in 1558 appeared in many answers, but analysis of it lacked detailed knowledge. In general, candidates were unable to name Mary I's privy counsellors who were still in office in 1558, and discussion of Elizabeth's new appointments was restricted to Leicester and William Cecil, if any individuals were named at all. The significance of this problem in 1558 is debatable. In an age when the monarch was surrounded by favourites, most leading courtiers would have surely assumed that Elizabeth's accession would have been accompanied by a change in personnel. Stronger answers linked this problem to the issue of religion, but it was usually done in a vague and less effective way. Weaker answers talked generally about the importance of the Privy Council but were unsure how far to press the point; clearly, in these cases, teachers had included it in a list of problems facing Elizabeth in 1558, but the students did not fully understand why.

Many candidates included the succession as a problem in 1558. Whilst the question of marriage was certainly important, the succession only became a pressing issue as the reign progressed. In 1558, Elizabeth was only (just) 25 and had plenty of child-bearing years in front of her. To argue that the succession was a prominent problem in 1558 – as some candidates did – suggests a certain amount of misunderstanding of this part of her reign. The focus of some essays was too narrow. Clearly, an answer to this type of question, which expects candidates to evaluate the importance of a range of problems, requires an assessment of more than just foreign affairs and another point. Finally, most candidates were able to link foreign affairs, marriage and Mary Queen of Scots to religion. Despite this, religion was not always seen as the most serious problem

#### **14 To what extent did the power of Parliament increase during the reign of Elizabeth I**

This was not a popular question. Nearly all answers contained some reference to John Neale and the 'Puritan Choir'. The best answers expressed a broad understanding of Neale's argument, which was very refreshing. (It isn't always clear that candidates who refer to the 'Puritan Choir' fully understand its implications.) These candidates were able to link it to this question by attributing the growth in Parliament's power to Elizabeth's predecessors' need to use it in order to legitimise their changes to the country's religion. Thus, when Elizabeth acceded, Parliament had already become indispensable to the exercise of monarchical power. Elizabeth's task was to control Parliament, which she did successfully until the final years of her reign when her power was waning. In contrast, weaker answers were distracted by Neale's 'Puritan Choir' and became bogged down in discussion of the nature of the religious settlement. It was not uncommon to find answers that lacked focus. Detailed knowledge of MPs' challenges to royal authority was frequently lacking; the Wentworth brothers were often executed instead of imprisoned and the dates and details of Peter Wentworth's run-ins with the queen were often confused. Too many candidates possessed insufficient knowledge to analyse these incidents effectively; William Strickland, for example, hardly appeared. Some candidates confused Parliament with the Privy Council, a mistake that seems to occur each session. Many candidates presented Mary Queen of Scots' execution as an example of a parliamentary victory over Elizabeth; by doing so, they failed to acknowledge the role of the Privy Council in the affair. It would have been pleasing to see some candidates whose knowledge of historiography (although not a requirement at AS Level) stretched beyond Neale and his 'Puritan Choir'. Whilst the majority of candidates continue to have some knowledge of Neale's thesis (even if it is only basic), few can elucidate the views of Norman Jones or Geoffrey Elton beyond saying that they are right and Neale is wrong.

Weaker answers spent a side of often only assertion that Parliament's power increased followed by half aside saying it declined. There was misunderstanding of the role and function of Parliament, though the Privy Council seemed better understood than in previous paper and many were aware of the use Elizabeth made of her councillors to manage the Commons and Lords. A number had learnt the statistics on the number of sessions during the reign and which ones voted subsidies but did not always use this evidence.

#### **15 'Rebellion was the most serious problem Elizabeth I faced in the period from 1558 to 1603.' How far do you agree?**

This was a very popular question. Some candidates assessed the different problems facing Elizabeth (normally Ireland, Essex, poor harvest, complaints about monopolies) solidly. A good number of candidates failed to read the question properly and covered events from the earlier part of her reign, particularly the Northern Rising and the Babington Plot. The war with Spain and the Cecil v Essex rivalry, prior to the Essex rebellion, did not get much attention paid to them. As ever, the weaker answers gave a description (sometimes brief) of events, couple with assertions. Better answers discussed Tyrone's rebellion in Ireland, the support and 12,000 troops that he gathered, the English defeat at Yellowford, the 1601 Spanish landing at Kinsale, many realising that the rebellion continued past Eliz's death and which in turn sparked the Essex

rebellion and decided in fairly equal measure as to which was the more serious and why. Some of the better answers also linked the unrest in Ireland and the Essex rebellion by describing how Elizabeth's punishment of Essex for agreeing a truce with Hugh O'Neill provoked the earl's revolt. Some candidates effectively argued that the Irish rebellion was not a serious problem per se; it was Hugh O'Neill's relationship with Philip II that intensified the situation, since Ireland could be used as a launching pad for a Spanish invasion. Some answers tried to compare rebellion with the social and economic trends and issues that led to incidents such as the London food riots and the Oxfordshire risings that dominated the 1590's though few realised that this was across Europe. Monopolies and the emergence of new blood at court were also discussed.

Only a small number of answers referred to the Armada in anything beyond a sentence and very few discussed the 19 year war with Spain and its impact.

**16 To what extent was James I extravagance the most important cause of his financial problems?**

This question attracted a wide range of responses. At the lower end there were many very general responses that lacked any detailed knowledge of the key events and developments and candidates relied on sweeping assertions; it was surprising that key events such as the Great Contract went largely unmentioned. However, at the higher levels candidates had very thorough and detailed knowledge of the expenditure by James on his favourites, on his family and on his court entertainments. Other factors that were well substantiated were the debt left by Elizabeth, the effects of inflation and the archaic nature of the English fiscal system. A lot of accurate figures were quoted though some candidates left off the pound signs. Some did confuse different types of revenue, for instance stating that feudal revenue included monopolies, and some referred to parliament lending subsidies but it was refreshing to meet one candidate who could refer accurately to ordinary revenue. It was also surprising that many failed to discuss the role of parliament in the failure.

**17 Assess the reasons why Charles I personal rule broke down in the years 1639-1640.**

This was the least popular of the questions in this section and also saw of the weakest answers. There were a number of candidates who wanted to write about the origins of personal rule and an even greater number who failed to focus on the events of the later years. Knowledge of events of 1639-1640 was sketchy in many answers and references to the Scottish War were often brief, yet this was the key to the question. Some better answers did attempt to argue that without the war Charles would have been able to carry on ruling without parliament as the country was stable and many were content, although some did point to the decline in revenues from Ship Money. However, all too often, candidates spent too long on describing the context leading up to 1639 and were not selective. As a result, they did not focus on the key issues.

**18 'The desire of parliament to increase its power was the most important reason for the outbreak of the Civil War in 1642.' How far do you agree?**

This was a popular question with candidates. However, answers to this question were weaker than expected because candidates did not focus on the immediate causes of the outbreak of war, as implied in the question ('in 1642'). Many students wanted to begin this discussion in the reign of James I. As a result many responses were unfocused and rambling. Many students had difficulty in defining the ways that Parliament might have wanted to increase its power although in the better answers the key issues were identified with some certainty. Charles was generally perceived to be the one to blame for the outbreak of war in 1642 and his religious policies were seen as the main problem. Some were able to show the ways in which Parliament were increasing in power at the expense of the King. However, weaker candidates tended to provide little more than narratives of events rather than reach a judgement. Many candidates made general points about the extent to which the Personal Rule and the king's preference for

*Reports on the Units taken in June 2010*

Arminianism, which the Puritans disliked, aggravated Parliament. Detailed knowledge of the Root and Branch Bill and the Nineteen Propositions was limited, but the Grand Remonstrance was often discussed in relation to Pym's growing distrust of the king. This was an example of where candidates require a better knowledge of the chronology of these years. The Triennial Act, for example, was often placed after Wentworth's execution.

UCLES



## **F961/02 British History Period studies**

### **Question specific comments**

#### **1 How successfully did Lord Liverpool's government deal with the radical challenge from 1812 to 1822?**

This was a very popular question, but some candidates tended to answer recent past questions rather than this one. This usually meant focusing on how serious the radical challenge was. At the lower end candidates described what the government did and these answers frequently went through each element of unrest in a chronological order. There were some analytical comments at the end of paragraphs, but these were usually cursory or sweeping in their nature. Better answers often adopted a more thematic approach, considering the success of using force, spies and legislation. Some considered whether the government was actually successful or whether it was the weakness of the challenge that was key; this approach was acceptable provided government action was not simply dismissed as irrelevant. Weaker candidates tended to describe, often in great detail, listing different radical groups and events; occasionally they tried to explain importance as a threat; more rarely did they really engage with how Liverpool's government responded. However, many were aware of government legislation but less knowledgeable about other government strategies such as espionage and prosecutions. The main difficulty was in defining some criteria for judging success. Some candidates worked hard to do this in their introductions, others just sidestepped the issue altogether.

#### **2 To what extent did the Great Reform Act achieve the aims of the reformers?**

It was pleasing to see an increase in the number of candidates who tackled a question on this topic and also pleasing to note that the overall standard was better than the last time a question was set on this topic. The key to the top answers was an ability to differentiate between the aims of the different groups wanting reform as this allowed a wide-ranging analytical response. Knowledge of the Act was usually very good, but weaker answers were often only able to assert that reformers were either pleased or displeased. It was less popular than the question on Pitt and there were some candidates who wrote almost exclusively about Whig reforms in general; some drifted from the Great Reform Act into economic and social areas. Better informed candidates did examine key reasons linked to the goals of reformers; they often identified such groups and understood (e.g.) the parliamentary political context. Some were replete with knowledge of the Act, but there was a danger of letting such swamp answers. The best used such knowledge to illustrate and evaluate; they assessed the strengths and weaknesses of the Act, picking up on real advances (e.g. electoral register, precedent set) and limitations (small franchise, still corruption, etc).

#### **3 How successful were Peel's Irish reforms from 1829 to 1846?**

This question produced a very wide range of responses. There were some whose knowledge of Peel's reforms in Ireland was minimal and responses were limited to reference to a few key events, whilst others displayed a wide range of knowledge. It was a more popular question than question 2. And at the top levels candidates really did know about Peel and Ireland and addressed the question centrally and mixed knowledge with assessment, covering a wide range of issues. That said, often law and order was neglected and not enough made of the mixture of coercion and conciliation pursued by Peel. In most cases, Catholic Emancipation and the Famine featured (but there was often a drift into repeal of the Corn Laws), with some references to educational and religious issues. Land could have been examined more via the Devon Commission.

**4 How far did Gladstone's first ministry of 1868-1874 fulfil the aims of Gladstonian Liberalism?**

This question attracted a wide range of answers. At the lower end many fell into what might be described as the 'acts and facts' trap without any real appreciation of what Gladstonian Liberalism stood for. They simply wanted to offload as much information as possible on the acts. The key to a good answer was an ability to outline the key tenets of Gladstonian liberalism in the introduction and then relate measures to his ideology and evaluate how far he was able to put it into practice. The answers that adopted a thematic approach were often better than those that looked at individual pieces of legislation.

**5 How far was popular pressure the most important reason for the passing of the Second Reform Act?**

Many answers to this question were disappointing as candidates were not aware of the range of factors that determined the passage of the Bill. There were very few who had a sufficiently detailed knowledge of the named factor and were often reduced to sweeping generalisations or assertions. It did need more than a brief reference to the Hyde Park riots, which many candidates satisfied themselves with. Popular disturbance was often treated in a very broad manner, with little detail, some even went back to Chartist agitation as an example. Candidates were generally happier writing about Disraeli's personal aims and his rivalry with Gladstone or his desire to 'dish the Whigs'. It would also have been beneficial if candidates had been more aware of the differences between a 'bill' and an 'act' as confusion here did lead to some analysis that was awry.

**6 To what extent did Disraeli's second ministry of 1874-1880 improve the condition of the people?**

Although this question was quite popular there were a significant number of candidates who lacked the necessary details of his legislation to really address the question. Factual knowledge was sometimes confined to sweeping comments about the Artisan's Dwelling Act or the Sale of Food and Drugs Act. There was little consideration of the permissiveness of the legislation. Other answers argued that because it was often Cross or others who carried out the reforms it was not Disraeli who was responsible, but that missed the actual focus of the question which was on his ministry and not just him. There were also many who drifted into lengthy considerations of his foreign policy, where this was linked to the actual question of improving the condition of the people credit was given, but very few were able to do this. This question was a clear example of where precise factual knowledge was lacking and candidates need to be aware of the depth of knowledge required.

**7 How far did the aims of British policy in the Balkans remain the same from 1856 to 1902?**

This was quite a difficult question for some but most made quite a lot of it, even if not that many ventured much beyond 1878 or after and very few candidates were able to write confidently about the concept of any *change* in British Balkan policy during this period. There was some tendency to description but quite often candidates still linked such to elements of aims. Better responses looked at aims and outcomes (Mediterranean interests, trade, strategic needs, balance of power, bottling-up Russia). Surprisingly, some did not write in any depth about the 1878 Congress of Berlin. Where references to later in the period did feature, these focused on the 1890s. Many students ignored events after 1878, though some were able to write confidently about the significance of the Eastern Rumelian crisis, 1885, the Mediterranean Agreements and Graeco-Turkish War. At the lower end some candidates drifted into a general survey of British foreign and imperial policy, above all towards Africa. These weaker candidates also struggled with the more 'synoptic approach' needed when writing about a period of 46 years.

Consequently, many answers were dominated by detailed descriptions of particular events like the Treaty of Paris or the Near Eastern Crisis, 1875-78. Others produced 'big-picture' narratives covering all of the period with implicit analysis bolted-on at key point.

**8 'The growing German threat was the most important reason for British ending its policy of splendid isolation.' How far do you agree?**

There were some strong or very strong answers were read. Most candidates did cover the issue of Anglo-German relations and the perceived growing threat. They then set this in context and against other factors. Splendid Isolation was usually defined and set into its context. References to the 1902 Alliance with Japan were common, but some candidates tended to write rather too much about the period after c.1905-6, moving on to areas better covered by question 9. Some answers went too far back into the nineteenth century, thereby unbalancing the response. Some got a little too involved with French or Russian dimensions at cost of evaluating the named factor. There were some candidates who had obviously prepared for an alternative question which asked whether British foreign policy was ever *really splendid* or even *isolationist*. This meant that many answers kicked-off with lengthy introductions which did not focus on the precise wording of the question. Other candidates found it hard to concentrate on the context of Europe around 1900, when Britain was reviewing its foreign policy. They tended to write about later events such as the significance of HMS Dreadnought and both Moroccan crises on Anglo-German relations, instead of on issues such as the failure of Chamberlain's attempts to form stronger links in 1890s, the Kruger telegram etc. Stronger candidates were able to draw out the fact that an Anglo-German agreement came tantalisingly close whilst Anglo-French relations reached a nadir at Fashoda in 1898. Most students appreciated that they had to refer to other issues, not just the named factor, although weaker candidates could not get much beyond generalised assertions.

**9 'Britain's entente with France was the most important reason for its decision to go to war in 1914.' How far do you agree?**

There were a number of strong answers to this question. However, there were many candidates who did not focus clearly enough on the precise wording of the question and did not focus precisely enough on the Entente. This meant that answers were far too generalised, because candidates were anticipating a question just about Britain's decision to go to war, rather than one with a named factor to address as well as other issues. Some candidates had obviously prepared for a question about the '*long and short term*' reasons for World War One and were determined to get this information into their answers no matter what! This question also produced many responses that contained implicit analysis, incredibly detailed descriptions of the minutiae of the July Crisis and the greatest number of misspellings of Britain – i.e. Britian. . A common error was to see the Entente Cordiale and indeed the later Triple Entente as an alliance. However, good answers often picked up on the subtleties of the Entente, and were aware of the growing Anglo-French harmony as well as of the role of Grey and the Foreign Office in shaping thinking; some had good knowledge of the Grey-Asquith axis and of the Cabinet splits as well as the importance of events in Belgium. The latter featured as did public opinion within Britain, domestic pressures (a few wrote too much on these), Anglo-German rivalries, the Balkans (events there were not always tied to the needs of the question).

**10 'The loss of working class support was the most important reason for the fall of Lloyd George's government in 1922.' How far do you agree?**

This question was very popular and generally well answered. Most students had a good knowledge of the facts, but some found it hard to expand on the issue of 'working class support'. A key issue was how candidates interpreted 'working class support'. Many did not, or chose to ignore it or make assertions. Better answers picked up on such areas as the economy, industrial relations, trade unions, unrest, growth of the Labour Party (much fruitful examination

could have been made there). Most knew plenty about other factors involved in the fall of Lloyd George, including the Conservative Party's attitudes, scandals and corruption, foreign policy, more occasionally Ireland. Something more could have been made of Lloyd George's political style and its corrosive effects. Those candidates who knew of electoral trends had a useful route to follow. At the lower end, many lacked details of the breakdown of the coalition and gave little consideration to the Carlton Club meeting, when they did mention it they were often unable to link it back to other issues, particularly why the Conservatives would want to withdraw their support.

### **11 How successful was Baldwin as leader of the Conservative party?**

This question produced a wide range of answers. Usually, more was said about him as PM than party leader, but some did alight on such useful areas his image, electoral appeal and success levels, role in reorganising the party very significant to electoral success levels) and role in healing divisions left by 1922. A common feature, particularly of weaker candidates, was to write too much about Baldwin and the General Strike and possibly the Abdication Crisis – some times using this as a way to assess his skills in a crisis, often simply describing events. There is a ready tendency to make too much of the General Strike at the expense of other and important issues. Another area featured was the electoral events of 1923 and the formation of a Labour Government. Not that many got into his role in the National Government from 1931 (including its formation, relations with MacDonald) and some spent too much time looking at his role in setting up repayment of American loans before he became party leader. There were many who were unable to distinguish between him as leader of the party and as Prime Minister and a clear distinction would certainly have helped as it might have led to a consideration of his electoral success or his ability to create a 'new Conservatism'. Both of these areas would have provided considerable scope for examination.

### **12 How far had Britain recovered from the Depression by 1939?**

On the whole, this question was not well answered with most candidates writing as if this was a question they had to, rather than wanted to do! Their answers were generally vague and confused; with many mixing in details of the economic problems of the 1920s, such as the General Strike and Churchill as Chancellor! The candidate responses also illustrated, by omission, the particular requirements of the discipline of economic, as opposed to political history [statistics, exact details and other comparison data]. This must be a vital element of this particular section. Even the better answers appeared to want a question on the success or otherwise of government economic policies in the period and were certainly not expecting this angle. Overall knowledge was very limited and comments on the Special Areas Act, for example, were poor. It was surprising how little many knew about the new industries and their growth or even the regional divide between north and south. Some suggested that the recovery was quite extensive because of rearmament, but were unable to substantiate such claims.

### **13 How far did British power decline from 1945 to 1990?**

This question produced a wide range of responses in terms of quality. Better students had a good knowledge of the period and were able to refer to evidence in each of the five decades in question. These responses were able to weigh up the significance of key events, though many candidates seem to believe the recapturing of the Falkland Islands in 1982 completely restored Britain's prestige after the Suez debacle in 1956. However, weaker candidates found it difficult to cover such a wide period and adopt a more thematic approach which would provide a better structure. Often these answers were chronological and failed to cover significant elements of the period.

**14 Assess the reasons why Britain's nuclear policy caused controversy from 1945 to 1990.**

There were very few answers to this question and it was the least popular in this section. As with the previous question, some candidates found it difficult to cover a large period and adopt a thematic approach which would give their answer a better structure. However, there were some discursive answers which explored topics such as MAD or the morality of nuclear weapons but offered little specific evidence. Once again candidates did need more specific details of events to support their arguments.

**15 How far did the USA influence British foreign policy under Thatcher?**

This question was generally well answered, although a significant number of candidates had obviously prepared for a more general question on the successes and failures of Thatcher's foreign policy. This was clearly apparent in their answers! There were many who found it difficult to consider what other factors might have influenced policy and therefore limited themselves to considering the USA. Knowledge of the events was usually sound, although there were some where there was excessive focus on the Falklands, Libya and Grenada.

**16 How successful was Macmillan as leader of the Conservative party?**

The best answered of the questions in this topic. However, there some who drifted into discussions of other Conservative leaders and of social policies. Many candidates were unable to establish criteria for judging success and this frequently resulted in largely descriptive answers. Some candidates wrote generally about the governments of 1951-64 with little reference to the question.. Stronger responses did pick up on such issues as image and appeal, electoral success (1959) and interwove information on 'stop-go' and social policy areas. At times there was too much emphasis on the economic policies and affluence which was not linked to the issue of Macmillan and his success as leader. More could have been made of the party leader dimensions involved; a very few candidates did try to address this. Some went into the past question area of the role of scandals in the eventual fall of the Conservatives, whilst some others wrote excessively about the Labour party and the reasons for their defeat in 1951 or victory in 1964.

**17 'The Labour governments of 1964 to 1970 and 1974 to 1979 failed to solve the economic problems they faced.' How far do you agree?**

A significant number found this question challenging, but it was quite popular and done well by some. Some candidates knew very little or else got muddled as to policy areas and outcomes. Better ones did know something of key policy areas (industrial relations, attempts to revive the economy, devaluation, fiscal measures, grand economic strategies, IMF intervention) and a few were able to offer decently formed comparisons and so evaluations of the impact of policies. Many could describe the problems and the measure taken by the governments, but very few were able to provide a convincing argument about the degree of success or failure in dealing with the issues. Some answers were seriously unbalanced with excessive focus on one period and there were others who seemed to assume that Labour was constantly in power, or who still wrote about the Heath administration in some detail.

**18 'Thatcher's economic policies failed to achieve significant economic change.' How far do you agree?**

This was a popular question, but the key issue of 'change' was often not addressed by candidates. This was the key to a good answer and candidates who established criteria against which to judge change or compared her policies and their impact with the previous situation or longer term trends did well. Some candidate wrote generally or descriptively of everything Thatcher did (including foreign policy). Some did not put enough emphasis on the economic

change dimension, preferring to describe the key features of her policies. Better answers picked up on monetarism linked to fiscal strategies, the initial hard times then boom, enterprise, privatisation, public spending controls, trade unions. Few mentioned the poll tax or else some mentioned it far too much, unbalancing answers as a result, and relatively few really tried to assess the overall impact of ;policy areas and success or failure, or else simply asserted such.

UCLES

## **F962/01 European and World History Period Studies – Medieval and early modern**

### **1 To what extent was superior military leadership the main reason for the success of the First Crusade?**

This was a very popular question, although some students had little support for their general points about military leadership. In weaker answers there were some irrelevant sections on the reasons why people went on crusade, but in stronger answers there were many excellent examples of the weighing up factors and reaching substantiated conclusions. Some of the stronger students went further and compared the first crusade to later crusades to back up their arguments. However, there were occasions when candidates were unable to provide examples of good leadership, other than Bohemond. There was also sometimes a failure to link issues to the title e.g. religious motivation and Muslim disunity were both considered, but often without demonstrating its effects on particular battles. However, some made a distinction between the military leadership of such as Bohemond and the religious leadership of Adhemar le Puy.

### **2 'The military order were the main reason for the survival of the Kingdom of Jerusalem.' How far do you agree?**

Many fewer candidates attempted this question than the other two in the section and it was far less well done. Some candidates saw it as an invitation to write everything they knew on the military orders and few other factors were discussed. The question was occasionally read as Outremer, rather than Jerusalem. There were other candidates who either did not read the question properly or were determined to reproduce a pre-learnt answer on the survival of Outremer, a good example of where excessive coaching can have a detrimental impact. Even where candidates attempted to focus on the demands of the question, knowledge seemed to be thin and it appeared as if this is a topic that is not covered sufficiently in centres' approach to the Crusades.

### **3 Assess the consequences of the Third Crusade.**

The question produced a whole range of responses. Many candidates were able to list a number of consequences but were less successful in assessing them. Some interpreted the questions as reasons for failure or indeed success. Weaker students did not understand the word 'consequences' – when this error occurred, candidates took it to be wholly negative, e.g. consequences and successes. There were other candidates who gave very descriptive accounts of everything that happened during the Third Crusade but a few came up with very thoughtful assessments in response to a perhaps less familiar question. There was a tendency to drift away from consequences into reasons why things happened. The most able could see the significance of issues but a few failed to consider their relative significance. Where this happened candidates generally performed worse, demonstrating confusion in their answers. One centre has taken a thematic approach, looking at military, social and economic consequences. While this was successful for the most able candidates, weaker ones tended to struggle with the structure and produced answers that were more descriptive and assertive as a result. There was some failure to assess consequences, instead solely focussing on success and failure **during** the Crusade or before it, e.g. the Saladin Tithe and the success that it had in raising money for England.

**4 Assess the contribution of any two artists to the development of Renaissance art.**

The question was often seen as an assessment of the artists own contribution rather than the development of art as a whole. Some candidates chose to ignore the idea of 'two artists' and went on to look at a whole range. This only gained credit where it could be linked to the original chosen two. The weaker students made very little reference to artworks and when they did were unable to link them to the development of the Renaissance. They made general and simplistic comments about great artists including the famous Michaelangelo da Vinci no less. However there were some wonderful essays which were full of detailed knowledge and seemed to understand exactly what influence their chosen artists had. One interesting approach was to argue that in fact much was imitation and patronage was the crucial factor which they made a good case for. Unfortunately, there were a large number of candidates who found it difficult to get beyond the purely descriptive. It was particularly noticeable on this question that there were frequent errors in the spelling of key terms, for example artists' names and key techniques. Some candidates misinterpreted the question as asking for reasons that the Renaissance developed, including patronage and as a result scored lower marks than otherwise might have been the case.

**5 To what extent was the Renaissance in Venice distinctive?**

A number of candidates appeared to have considerable problems with the term 'distinctive'. Though some were able to point to particular features of Venetian art, more had problems with explaining what it had in common with the rest of Italy. There was often a long discussion of trade and government, unlinked to the title. There were a few students who focused on Venice as a city being distinctive rather than the Renaissance in the city which was not a very successful approach. Even those who referred to the artwork and architecture sometimes failed to point out the similarities with Florence and Rome as well as the differences. Others appeared to know so little about Venice that they decided to write about Florence and Rome instead! Where the question was addressed answers were thin and generalised – one attempt barely mentioned Venice, Renaissance or distinctiveness! Other answers displayed relatively poor knowledge of Venice as opposed to other centres of Renaissance development like Rome or Florence. Other answers focused on the distinctiveness of Venice as a city rather than as part of the Renaissance, leading to answers of borderline evidence with only a few key points that related them to the question. As a result many of the answers to this question were weak and candidates appeared surprised that the focus was on Venice rather than either Rome or Florence. It was particularly noticeable that knowledge about influence from the East was absent.

**6 How important was Erasmus in the development of Christian humanism?**

This was the least popular of the questions in this section and was hardly tackled by candidates, leaving examiners wondering whether this key issue is being the necessary attention. However, where it was attempted the range of responses was considerable, at the lower end answers focused on art and humanism almost exclusively, referring only briefly to the named factor, Erasmus. There were candidates who clearly understood the topic and not only had a considerable knowledge of Erasmus' work, but were able to use it to address the question.

**7 Assess the reasons why Europeans embarked on voyages of discovery in this period.**

Many candidates had good knowledge of the relevant issues. However, they often lacked a sharp focus on the question, tackling it from the point of view of achievements, which they argued must therefore imply motives. Progression to higher levels was also hampered by a general failure to establish links between or a hierarchy of motives. Even where candidates could quote explorers who went for 'riches and god' they failed to comment on the significance



of this. Many simply suggested that economic motives were cloaked by religious ones, but not that the two might exist together.

**8 Assess the importance of any two individuals to the development of overseas empires in this period.**

The answers covered a wide range of individuals and, as with the previous question, knowledge was reasonably good and many candidates were at least able to carry out some analysis. Others were more descriptive and there was little discussion of relative importance of issues or individuals. This question also witnessed the very heavy influence of a model answer for many candidates, and although it probably masked the weaknesses of some candidates, it might have prevented the more able from offering a more personal response to the question.

**9 'The impact of Spain on Mexico and Peru was entirely harmful in this period.' How far do you agree?**

Almost all candidates had a working knowledge of events in Mexico and Peru, but hardly any had precise detailed knowledge. There was considerable attention paid to the actual conquests, and this was not fully linked to the exact title. A few candidates managed to make a balanced judgement, though unsurprisingly weighted towards harm, but fewer were able to make relative judgements on the factors they discussed. It seemed that the emphasis in the teaching of this was on the negative aspects. Very little was said about any positive consequences but there was an attempt to compare the impact of the conquistadores with the regimes previously in power in Peru.

**10 Assess the reasons why Isabella was able to consolidate her rule of Castile by 1479.**

This question produced a mixed set of responses. Candidates seemed to have difficulty keeping within the date stated for this question, even those clearly of higher ability. Even those who focused on the early period often glossed over the civil war and were short on detail. There was a tendency to vagueness as to how the throne was secured/consolidated and some considered **either** securing **or** consolidating. Corregidores were persistently mentioned, in some depth. There was also some lengthy description of the period leading up to the war of succession, which was generally irrelevant to the question of consolidation. There was also some simplistic assessment of Isabella's gender in relation to her position and power, although better answers often assessed this in a sophisticated way. Generally candidates that focussed on 'personality' as a factor did less well (similar to the 'luck' factor in the Crusades answers) – as they tended towards general description rather than explanation. Many answers were characterised generally by reasonable knowledge, mainly focused on the marriage to Ferdinand and military success at the battle of Toro. However, candidates tended to miss the wider implications, notably the effects on the threat from Portugal as well as its effects on the nobles. Little mention was made of any specific noble or the early measures taken to bring them into line.

**11 To what extent did Ferdinand and Isabella unify Spain.**

This was by far the most popular question in this section and it was not surprising that it attracted a very wide range of answers. The best answers here defined areas of unity and those of disunity, addressing the question in terms of religious unity, foreign policy, economics and administration. This seemed to help these candidates address the question more effectively. Better answers were able to question just how much unity there actually was. Less able candidates struggled with the concept of unity and how to structure the question. Weaker candidates were more descriptive and some only focused narrowly on religion and not much else, whereas better candidates included a wide range of issues and demonstrated good knowledge and balance, mostly coming down on the side of lack of unity. There was however less success in ranking or linking factors.

**12 How successfully had Charles I dealt with the problems he faced by 1524?**

This was another familiar question but the quality of answers was disappointing with some very general and thin answers that mentioned the two revolts but no more than that. There was a marked tendency to wander from the date stated in the question to years beyond and write about the longer term religious and financial problems. The stronger candidates were able to add more substance and argued effectively that this was a more mixed picture than the largely successful story of his later reign. Some answers focused on the problems Charles faced rather than the ways in which they were dealt with. The question seemed to elicit descriptive rather than analytical responses – candidates described the problems in detail but failed to offer much on how they were handled or to reach any judgements. Where there was clearer focus on the question answers were rather brief. Many weaker candidates struggled with the structure of this question, which led some of them into descriptive passages about problems, followed by descriptions of solutions, with analysis only in the conclusion or left as weak comment.

**13 Assess the reasons why Charles V failed to crush Lutheranism by 1529.**

Many candidates had a good knowledge of a wide range of issues, and some were able to select carefully and produce a balanced answer. Others however, seemed overwhelmed with the wealth of information and were uncertain what to select in relation to the question. This led to some rather unbalanced answers, with candidates often indulging in great detail of less important issues sometimes at the expense of more important ones. There was some tendency towards description and a heavy factual content, but although there was some analysis of importance but not much on relative importance. It was also noticeable that some candidates had a distinct lack of awareness of the date and this caused some candidates to stray into irrelevance. Many seemed to have weak knowledge about the contribution that individual princes had beyond the ubiquitous Frederick the Wise.

**14 'Religious conflict enabled the princes to increase their power during the reign of Charles V.' How far do you agree?**

Answers were often very confused, particularly where candidates tried to take the line that religious conflict was not the main issue, or dealt with issues independently, ignoring their religious connections. Where religion was considered an issue, the focus tended to be on the independence it brought, without recognising that the very fact of being able to gain concessions was in itself a measure of increased power. Candidates were more successful where they accepted the given thesis and set about to prove it, even though this produced a narrower approach. There was also some confusion about the meaning of 'religious conflict' – some taking it to mean solely religiously influenced war rather than the wider definition apparent in the mark scheme. This led the candidates into elaborate and largely unsuccessful manoeuvres to link the two factors.

**15 'France was a greater threat to Charles V than the Ottoman Empire.' How far do you agree?**

This question produced a wide range of answers. There were a number of very good answers argued either way. In these instances candidates generally had excellent knowledge and used it to great effect. The best answers compared France and the Ottoman Empire point by point and reached a focused conclusion, which had often been sustained throughout. However, there were a significant number where candidates' specific knowledge about the Habsburg-Valois campaigns tended to be limited to one or two key incidents, with weak explanations provided, e.g. the threat to Charles was less from France because he didn't care about the lands that he lost, for example Metz. The Ottoman threat was generally covered better but still lacked in-depth knowledge, which weakened the argument. At the higher levels candidates brought in the joint threat of the two countries but even so, some failed to weave this usefully into an argument.

**16 How successful was Philip II's domestic policy in Spain?**

There were some very good answers to this question. Most were structured reasonably well by most candidates (economic, religious policies etc.) but still lacking in-depth knowledge and with relatively simplistic analysis. However, there was some confusion with a number of candidates describing Philip as the creator of the Inquisition and of the alcabala tax. Many did underplay the importance of court faction and government in general as religion and finance tended to dominate. Unfortunately some candidates showed little appreciation of any successes and therefore produced very poorly balanced answers. At lower levels there was detailed knowledge but a tendency to get bogged down in description with the main emphasis on finance, revolt of the Moriscos and in Aragon. A few misread the question and discussed foreign policy at length.

**17 How important was religion in causing revolt in the Netherlands to 1572?**

This question was a good discriminator with the stronger candidates focusing sharply on this early period and weighing up religion against other factors and seeing the links between them. Many candidates experienced difficulty in sticking to the period in this question. Weaker essays often focused only on the role of religion or were unwilling to stop in 1572. There were other answers that showed little understanding of the nature of the religious issues and no understanding as to how it related to the traditional liberties of the Netherlands. These answers were often very generalised – issues such as Bishopsrics and anti-heresy laws were rare. However better answers showed a good level of detail and also an understanding of the interconnectedness of factors, but judgements tended to be confined to the final summing up rather than in the body of the answer.

**18 Assess the reasons why Spain was unable to crush the revolt of the Netherlands in the 1570s and 1580s.**

This question enabled the stronger candidates to fully explore both the weakness of the Spanish and the strengths of the Dutch and many different well argued conclusions were reached. Weaker candidates were confused by the dates and some tried to focus on why the revolt broke out instead. There was generally a good explanation of geographical aspects relating to the revolts, and answers were reasonably well structured. However, it was noticeable that there was a lack of detailed knowledge relating to Philip's other foreign policy distractions and the policies and features of those sent to rule the Netherlands. This was particularly noticeable in some answers where there was an obsession with the Turks providing diversion for Philip, even though they were a limited problem after 1571. In some weaker answers there was also a tendency to include events or long contextual paragraphs relating to the 1560s, leading to irrelevance and some showed very generalised knowledge. Candidates were sometimes able to name some leaders but were unable to discuss with any confidence, their specific contribution. Candidates would be well advised to consider how factors were linked and ensure that Evaluation was not solely confined to the concluding paragraph.

## **F962/02 European and World History Period Studies – Modern**

### **1 To what extent did Napoleon's reforms during the Consulate apply the principles of the French Revolution?**

As usual with this type of question the weakness here was a lack of understanding of the principles of the Revolution which were seen in rather general terms and a failure to understand the Legal Code of 1804 which too many was a constitutional measure and 'abolished feudalism'. Those who did refer to precise elements in the Revolution often did well. The question was tackled in a number of successful ways; some organised their answers around arguments 'for' and 'against', whilst took each revolutionary principle in turn and analysed those. However, where weaker candidates did not understand the principles it severely limited their responses and some simply became a list of what Napoleon did. It is well worth candidates studying the revolutionary background to Napoleon. This was seen in the number who were unaware of the work of the Revolution and, as a result, credited Napoleon with abolishing feudalism. There were also naïve or anachronistic comments about women, religion and education.

### **2 To what extent was Napoleon's generalship the main reason for his successes in his military campaigns from 1796 to 1809?**

This was by far the most popular question in this section and therefore produced a very wide range of responses. As might be expected, there were very varying levels of understanding about Napoleon's military campaigns with some simplistic and vague assertions at the lower end and some impressive detailed understanding of military history in better answers. Napoleon's wars were at the heart of his life and work and if candidates do study this topic, then they should be willing to look seriously at Napoleon's campaigns and not rely on generalisations. There were a number who used material from outside the dates in the question, whether because they misread the question or simply did not know the dates of the campaigns, but they did not gain credit for this. Many saw tactics as different from generalship, which resulted in some very strange analysis as they argued it was not his generalship, but his tactics!

### **3 Assess the impact of the Continental System on Europe after 1806.**

This was the least popular question and also drew the weakest answers. Many did not go beyond the invasions of the Iberian Peninsula and Russia and answers often lacked an appreciation of the other aspects of the impact of the Continental System. Very few candidates seemed aware of economic and political effects of the Continental system and this was probably why the emphasis was on the Spanish and Russian campaigns. The question required a consideration of the impact on Europe and not simply on France, which some candidates restricted their answer to.

### **4 How successful was Louis XVIII in his rule of France?**

The better answers often divided Louis' reign up into a series of phases and considered his success in each. Other candidates established Louis' aims in the introduction and then considered whether he was able to achieve them and used that as their criteria for considering success. There were very few who did not at least try to assess 'how successful' and this usually resulted in some quite good levels being achieved. The greatest limitation to progress was when candidates adopted a more narrative approach and did not allow themselves sufficient time to address the 'how successful' element. Usually knowledge of the topic was very good and most were able to produce a balanced discussion of his success and failures.

**5 To what extent were economic and social problems the main reason for the Revolution in February 1848?**

This was a straightforward question, but there were a significant number of candidates who did not want to consider the named factor in any real detail. It was essential to consider the social and economic issues at reasonable length if they wanted to access the higher bands. However, there were some candidates who displayed little knowledge of either the political opposition or the role of Paris. The better answers did discuss the issues surrounding economic and social developments and linked them to other factors, but where this was not done there was a tendency for candidates to argue that everything was important, without any real development of the analysis. However, most answers at least tried to adopt an analytical approach and therefore achieved reasonable levels.

**6 To what extent were Napoleon III's economic and social policies successful?**

The overall level of knowledge on this topic was very variable. There were a number of candidates who knew very little about Napoleon's economic and social policies and resorted to sweeping generalisations, whilst others showed a good depth, particularly on the developments in Paris. In many instances knowledge of the economic policies were better than the social policies. In many instances a successful approach was to differentiate between the different periods of his rule and some argued that he was more successful in the 1850s than the 1860s. There were also some weaker answers that drifted away from social and economic issues and attempts to link political policies to these issues was not often very successful.

**7 How important was mining in opening up the West?**

Answers to this question were often very detailed and few dismissed the topic of mining and wrote a general account of expansion. However, if there was a problem with this question, it was that candidates did not know enough about mining and often dismissed it with brief references, even if they concluded that it was important. However, better answers were able to show the different phases, often writing about surface mining and then the involvement of larger companies. There were admirable attempts to link the different aspects of westward expansion and to reach a judgement about the relative importance by some candidates. There were a fair few who simply produced the 'list of causes of expansion' with mining as the first paragraph, and it cannot be stressed enough that there should be evaluation of the importance of a named issue for higher AO2 marks.

**8 Assess the reasons why westward expansion led to the destruction of Native American society.**

There was a tendency to description but some did isolate and weight different aspects of the impact that western expansion had, and some were very well-informed. Most candidates were able to identify a good range of factors and were usually knowledgeable about them. Better answers were able to prioritise factors and this was frequently done to a very high level. This was a clear example of where practice on the essential skills of this paper, namely reaching judgements allowed candidates to perform very well and is a skill to be encouraged in the classroom. However, at the lower end there were some who turned the question into a narrative of the period with only limited focus on westward expansion.

**9 'The strengths of the South's army were the main reason why the Civil War lasted so long.' How far do you agree?**

This question did require some thought and organization of material, and it was encouraging that many rose to the challenge and went beyond a list of factors as to why the war lasted so long. The better answers developed the points about the South focusing on Lee and the tactics of the South's army. They often went on to balance these against other factors, such as the failure of

the North's army or how long it took for the weight of the North's resources to have an impact. There were a number who did not have specific details about the South's army and this led to sweeping comments and unsupported assertions. A few missed the point and reproduced pre-learnt answers on why the North won, but these were a minority.

**10 To what extent were the generals to blame for the massive casualties on the Western Front in the First World War?**

As with question 2 military history here produced some very low level explanations which in some cases seemed closer to KS3 than AS. Many answers were very generalised, with Haigh the only general who was often mentioned and most did not name a general at all. Many seemed to think that the key explanation for casualties was the blowing of whistles to announce the attacks and some wrote in an indiscriminating way about Gallipoli and Jutland. There was also considerable generalised discussion about the development of technology, but again specific developments were lacking. There were also some candidates who argued that it was allied generals who were so poor and did not consider German at all. Some were anxious to write pre-prepared material on the failure of the Schlieffen Plan and some could not relate knowledge of trenches to the casualties inflicted in trying to capture them. Knowledge of generalship seldom went further than 'Blackadder' and tired untruths predominated.

**11 Assess the reasons why there were no major wars in the 1920s.**

There were encouraging signs of candidates trying to use material flexibly here and thinking for themselves – the 'list of factors' was less in evidence. Weaker answers just reproduced essays on the League of Nations. However, it was encouraging to see an increasing number go beyond this and show at least some knowledge of Locarno and the Locarno spirit and the Kellogg Briand pact. However, there were a number of answers that went down the route of war weariness and the impact of the First World War on the economies without providing detailed supporting evidence. Most stayed in the 1920s, though some strayed further and wanted to write in detail about the work of the League in the 1930s.

**12 Assess the impact of the Great Depression on International Relations in Europe in the 1930s.**

There were a number of candidates who did not notice 'Europe' in the title and spent a long time writing about the Manchurian affair. There were also some who were tempted to write mainly about the causes and course of the Depression. However, there were some very strong analyses which did see the manifold ramifications of the Depression on international relations and went considerably further than the basic argument that unemployment caused the rise of Hitler who caused war. There were some answers which were quite sound on describing the economic effects of the Depression in each country, but were less good at relating it to international relations. There were also attempts to link the Depression to the policy of appeasement, but although this could have been a good approach there were very few who were able to establish a link.

**13 To what extent was Nicholas II responsible for his own downfall in the revolution of March 1917?**

This very popular question produced a wide range of answers, but there were many candidates who did not identify this question as being focused on the cause of the March 1917 revolution. Although most candidates offered a judgement, some were very general and weaker responses did not go beyond a character assassination. Relatively few seemed aware of any developments in February and March and some did not go beyond 1914, despite the wording of the question. Better answers attempted a balance between arguments which blamed Nicholas and arguments which looked at the wider context. There were many who wrote at length about the impact of the First World War, but this was often generalised and not well linked to the question. Some

candidates were confused about its impact and stated that the declaration of war was unpopular and that this was the fault of Nicholas. There was some consideration of the impact of the Tsarina and Rasputin, but few linked this to the Tsar. However, many weaker answers spent far too long considering events of 1905 or writing generally about the social and economic issues. Weaker candidates also frequently confused the 1905 revolution, the March revolution and the November revolution.

**14 To what extent was Trotsky responsible for the victory of the Red Army in the Civil War?**

Although many answers provided a list of reasons there were too many candidates whose knowledge was either basic or superficial. In this sort of question, the discussion must centre round the key factor in the question and there were many who lacked the specific knowledge to do this. For others this was a chance to reproduce a list of reasons for the Red victory in the Civil War. Knowledge of Trotsky was generally rather patchy but some did make use of what they knew and offered some evaluation of the different explanations. There was a great deal of variation in the knowledge available to candidates of Trotsky and this did limit the level of some of the responses. Many were often left to offer sweeping generalisations about his leadership and morale boosting visits, or his use of the railways. In many instances there was more specific knowledge displayed about the weakness of the White army and the divisions in both leadership and aims.

**15 'The benefits of Stalin's rule in the USSR in the 1930s outweighed the costs.' How far do you agree?**

The quality of both analysis and knowledge varied greatly on this question. The key to top level answers was an ability to consistently focus on the issue of 'benefit' and this many were unable to do. For a significant number the idea of benefit was interchangeable with success and that could lead to some very different answers. Knowledge was also an issue. There were a number who had detailed knowledge about his economic policies and the Purges, but for others it was generalised and vague. Some candidates managed to attempt the question without any reference to collectivisation or the purges. This encouraged quite a lot of judgement and answers did not follow a given pattern as candidates seemed to grapple with the issue. Some of the approaches were very interesting and much depended upon how candidates decided to judge the issue of benefit. There were some who argued that all the costs in human life were worth it because the USSR was able to defeat Germany in the Second World War and others who argued it was worth it because it allowed the country to modernise. However, there were also some interesting approaches that argued it was beneficial for Stalin as it allowed him to consolidate his rule and achieve his goals. Some wrote more about 'success' than benefits, but were generally better about 'costs'. There were some excellent and well-balanced discussions and few relied on narrative alone.

**16 'Loss of faith in the government was the main effect of the First World War on Italy from 1915.' How far do you agree?**

This was quite a popular question and after many observations in previous reports that there was some lack of knowledge about Italian political history before Mussolini, it was encouraging to see less generalization and many attempts to get to grips with the question. At the top levels there were answers which included depth, using statistical knowledge to support their arguments. However, there were also answers that ignored the dates in the question and simply discussed the impact of the First World War, omitting 1915-1918. If there was a gap in knowledge, it was usually on the 1919 election and how, because the PPP and PSI could not coalesce, the Liberals artificially remained in power. There were some answers that focused on the problems themselves rather than the effects and this limited the level that could be achieved. Some produced a sort of 'causes of the rise of Mussolini' essay, but many did consider the effects of the war and there was some very good supporting knowledge.

**17 'Mussolini's economic and social policies had only limited success.' How far do you agree?**

This was a very popular question and produced some good detail and some balanced assessment from many candidates. Many were able to write confidently about the 'Battles', education, youth and women. Few relied just on description and there were some excellent answers. As usual the Corporate State was not dealt with by some or not well-grasped; but some did bring this into their answers effectively, which was encouraging. The issue of Public Works was also largely ignored, which was a surprising omission. However, the question also encouraged many list like responses, with candidates simply providing a list of successes and failures, with little judgement either overall or of individual policies. This prevented many from rising beyond Level III, whereas those who were willing to assess did reach the higher levels.

**18 To what extent did the aims of Mussolini's foreign policy change from 1922 to 1940?**

This was the least popular of the questions in this section, but also drew the widest range of responses. However, rather than the narrative approach that often characterises foreign policy questions, a surprising number of answers did deal firmly with change and looked at similarities and differences between the 1920s and 1930s. However, weaker answers were unbalanced and descriptive, but most tried to address the question. Many found it more problematic to identify the aims of Mussolini's foreign policy and this obviously had a significant impact on the levels that were achieved. Candidates were much more confident in writing about the earlier period than the later and there were answers that did not go beyond Abyssinia, or if they did mention the Second World War did so in very general terms.

**19 To what extent were Jiang Jieshi's (Chiang Kai Shek's) domestic policies successful?**

The Study Topic on China is still only studied by a few Centres and therefore the comments on all three questions are very restricted. This question was quite straightforward and the responses suggest that candidates had a sound understanding of the topic. There was some over concentration on the Warlords in some answers, but others ignored them. The more able candidates were usually aware that Jiang was at war all the time and that this had a significant impact on his policies. However, there were weaker candidates who were not able to put his policies into context and ignored not only the War Lords, but also the Japanese occupation of Manchuria.

**20 Assess the reasons for the Cultural Revolution in the 1960s.**

The weaker candidates simply narrated the story of the Cultural Revolution, whereas the more able at least produced a list of the reasons. As with a question requiring an assessment those who simply listed the causes did not score above Level III on AO1b, but where assessment was attempted the higher levels were achieved. There was usually a good understanding of Mao and his motives and many were quite knowledgeable and able to support their arguments with precise details.

**21 'The only significant changes after the death of Mao were economic.' How far do you agree?**

There were a number of good answers to this question. Many candidates were able to discuss both political and social change as well as economic. However, weaker candidates often focused solely on economic changes and did not consider issues such as the end of the cult of personality and surprisingly also omitted the one-child family policy. Most agreed with the assertion in the question and were usually able to defend it with some force.



**22 'The impact of the Great Depression was the main reason for Hitler's rise to power by January 1933.' How far do you agree?**

This topic continues to draw the largest number of responses and as this question is among the more obvious that could be set, it attracted a very wide range of responses. At the lower end the responses were predictable with some unable to see the difference between the inflation of the 1920s and the deflation of the depression. There were many who spent an excessive amount of time considering the period before the Depression and wrote at length about the unrest in the period from 1919 to 1923. There was also a great deal of descriptive detail about the Treaty of Versailles without any attempt to link it to the question. Many candidates did find it difficult to write precisely about the impact of the Depression and even candidates who wrote well on other issues were often reduced to sweeping generalisations. Knowledge of the policies of the coalition governments in the period after the Depression continues to be absent and there are still many candidates who show little understanding about the political intrigue of the end of 1932. Candidates should be expected to have a sound knowledge of both the election results for the Nazis in the period and the growth in unemployment rates and, properly used, this would give them an ideal starting point. Weaker explanations did not make the necessary links between unemployment and political extremism. As usual some strayed into the 1930s and wrote a great deal about events up to 1934, particularly on the Reichstag Fire and the Night of the Long Knives. However there were impressive surveys which weighed different factors without losing the focus on the key issue. Not very many made any link between the intrigues of the ruling elite and Hitler's popular following partly brought about by the depression.

**23 To what extent did the Nazis achieve the aims of their social policies?**

As with the previous question this was very popular. However, while Mussolini answers were much better on this topic, this was answered in many cases in a very weak and generalised way which did not show significant advance on GCSE. There were many who did not understand what was meant by social policies and therefore wrote a very wide ranging answer which, by its very nature, did not have the required depth on social policies. Some could not see the distinction between social and political policies and there was a low level of factual support by many. The range of issues considered was often very narrow and some wanted to write about economic policies. It was surprising to see some of the judgements that were reached as candidates considered whether Nazi racial policies were a success. The better answers were usually those that established criteria against which to judge success and this involved a clear setting out of the aims in the introduction. There were also some good answers which saw the changing fortunes of the policies and their success; this was very noticeable on issues such as women and the Youth. There were some excellent analyses of the strengths and limitations of key social policies, but for too many this seemed a chance to dump information on various aspects of Nazi internal policy.

**24 How successful was Adenauer's foreign policy?**

It was probably not surprising that this was the least popular of the questions in this option and many candidates simply did not know enough to write a good and wide ranging answer. There were a significant number who drifted into detailed comments about domestic policy, although some were able to link the rebuilding of the economy to his ability to win foreign support. However, the best answers had a very clear idea of what Adenauer achieved and there were some excellent answers with the quality of analysis far greater than that shown on the Nazi questions. Most attempted some sort of judgement, but the level of supporting knowledge was very variable and there was limited understanding of Adenauer's attitude to unification. Candidates needed to know more and this was reflected in the omission of issues such as the visit to Moscow in 1956, the Elysee Agreement of 1963 and even, in some instances the Berlin Wall. However, knowledge of relationships with the EEC (or formerly the ECSC) and NATO were much better.

**25 'America's main aim was to stop the spread of Communism in Europe.' How far do you agree with this view of American foreign policy in Europe from 1945 to 1948?**

This question produced a significant number of disappointing responses. There were many candidates whose chronological knowledge was very poor, some started with the Marshall Plan, then went to the Truman Doctrine, on to the blockade and then back to Yalta and Potsdam, but this was better than the number who chose to ignore 1945 altogether. There were a lot of very descriptive answers which ran through the main events of the Cold War. Knowledge of Yalta and Potsdam was sometimes insecure and few seemed aware of the debates about US policy and the justifications for the alternative explanations. However there were some strongly analytical and balanced arguments which used rather than related knowledge. The better answers were able to discuss concepts such as 'dollar imperialism' and often offered an alternative perspective to that in the question statement.

**26 To what extent did relations between East and West improve in Europe from 1948 to the mid 1980s?**

This proved a very challenging question for many who simply found the scale of the question too demanding. Knowledge across the period was weak and many answers just petered out as candidates knew less and less as the period progressed. There were very few who had a grasp of events from 1945 to 1985. There were many who simply linked everything to Gorbachev as they had no idea when he came to power and there were others whose geography was weak and wrote about Cuba and Afghanistan, failing to realise that the question was about Europe. It is important that candidates who study this topic study the whole period if they answer questions on this topic area. There were very few who were able to take an overview of the period and reach a conclusion. Where analysis was present it was usually of individual events.

**27 To what extent were economic problems the main reason for the collapse of Soviet power in Eastern Europe?**

This was a straightforward question and many candidates were able to answer it competently. Too many focused just on the USSR and produced accounts of Gorbachev's policies or devoted undue time to events after 1989, and associated factors and therefore paid less attention than required to aspects of Europe and the USA. However, not all responses failed in this way and those who did look at Eastern Europe were able to produce different explanations and there were some, if not many, good analyses. Most agreed with the statement and argued that economic issues forced Gorbachev's hand, but others did credit Reagan and SDI, although they did not always link this to the economic costs for the Soviet Union.

**28 To what extent were the actions of the Zionist movement the main reason for the creation of the state of Israel in 1948?**

As with questions on China, there are still very centres who follow this Study Topic and therefore the comments are very cursory. The responses were often polarised between those who really could focus on Zionism and those who could only offer very basic and sometimes inaccurate accounts of the formation of Israel. It is important that candidates have a much more detailed awareness of the reasons for the formation of the state of Israel if they are to study this topic.

**29 How successful was Nasser as leader of Egypt?**

The answers to this question were often encouraging. There were some impressive answers which ranged through Nasser's domestic and foreign policies and produces supported judgements. Some answers were too descriptive, but there were some supported assessments and some impressive detail. The quality of answers to this question should encourage candidates that, with the detailed knowledge, it is possible to score well on this topic.

**30 Assess the reasons why the Iran-Iraq War (1980-88) lasted so long?**

This question produced a mixed response. There were some impressive surveys which offered realistic analyses and displayed a high level of supporting material. However, it was difficult for weaker candidates to sustain answers on the war itself as opposed to its general causes and consequences. Again, military history is not always a strong point and this was clearly reflected in a number of answers that relied on sweeping assertions or generalisations. It was also difficult for some, too, to go beyond a list of reasons and to consider the relative importance and links between them.

UCLES

## F963 and F964 AS History Enquiries

**General Comments.** (Please note that for June 2010 question-specific comments for these Units will be published in an accompanying report on the OCR website. Our focus here is on the application of the mark scheme in general terms.)

This session saw a mixture of candidates. Some approached the sources with confidence, using historical terminology and knowledge with ease. At the lower end there was evidence that some candidates had made little progress since GCSE, with their failure to integrate content and evaluation particularly noticeable. There was a good range of marks, certainly up to the 80s, but many found it difficult to get into the 90s. The 01 versions (the earlier periods) saw some of these very high marks, especially on the Crusades and the Normans, but overall the answers on F963/01 did less well than their more modern, 02, equivalents. Candidates at most levels were trying to do the right thing, although it seemed that many, having grouped their sources, proceeded to discuss them sequentially (and often in random order). More disappointing were those in the middle and top ends who preferred to argue their points by source reference and well used stand-alone own knowledge. They knew that they had to evaluate but preferred to do so in 'bolt-on' and discrete sections that did little or nothing to move the argument on in relation to the question.

It is worth considering the demands of the part (a) and (b) sub-questions now that a new mark scheme has been in operation. Many candidates appear to underperform or lose marks unnecessarily through a lack of understanding of the demands of the questions.

***In the new Mark Scheme, the A01(a) and (b) strands are combined, as are those of the A02 (a) and (b). This gives two marks for Q(a), combining to a total out of 30, assessing A01a and b and A02a; and two marks for Q(b), combining to a total out of 70, assessing A01a and b, and A02 a and b. Please also note that Level 1 is no longer divided into L1A and B. They too have been combined.***

The remainder of this report will outline key points about the application of the mark scheme for part (a) and part (b) sub-questions in turn, and how they relate to the demands of the questions.

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

It is worth remembering that the question asks the candidate to compare two sources '**as evidence**'. This means assess them in relation to each other, not extract information from them about the focus of the question. Equally, a *general* analysis is not what is required. There should be links to, and focus on, the key issue in the question. Candidates frequently ignore the key issue and would be well advised to underline it on the paper as an aide memoire. The judgement reached should be about the Sources themselves as evidence, not about the key issue itself in the question.

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

With regard to part (a) questions, it is important for centres to be aware of the following demands of the question, categorised below according to how marks are awarded under the mark scheme:

*AO1a: recall select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner*

Descriptors relating to appropriate use of knowledge are to be found in the second bullet point of the AO1 levels in the new mark scheme; clarity of expression is the third bullet point. There is no longer a stand-alone mark for AO1a, however the overall weightings remain the same. Therefore it is still the case that:

- There are **no** marks for extraneous knowledge.
- Candidates need to demonstrate a concise and clear understanding of the **context of an issue**. We are looking for a **light touch** here; say a sub clausal reference or at most one or two sentences.

*AO1b: demonstrate their understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements[...]*

For part (a) questions this assessment objective requires candidates to compare the contribution of two sources to the issue and arrive at a judgement on which may be the more useful. This strand is to be found in the first bullet point of the levels for AO1, and it drives the overall AO1 mark. Centres should be aware of the following, not uncommon, pitfalls in this area:

- Many candidates simply focus on the topic (eg Youth and education in Germany or Luther's theology), instead of the **specific issue** (the success of Nazi and GDR educational policy; the conduct of a Christian). They refer to the sources to extract information for a general answer to the topic, rather than **comparing them as evidence** for a key issue. The consequence is a sequenced approach, a level IV.
- Many candidates, at some point in their answer, resort to randomly juxtaposing dissimilar points. They do not **compare like with like** or point to the fact that one source may make a point which is absent from the other.
- Some are satisfied with **basic or undeveloped cross references**, often losing the question in the process.
- In weaker answers, **judgement** is often just asserted at the end, whereas it should arise from an evaluation of the quality of the content, either throughout or in a developed concluding paragraph. Failure to consider this will confine a candidate to level III and below. **Judgement is all too frequently on the issue itself, rather than on the evidence for it.**
- It is vital that candidates **identify the relevant issues** arising in the two sources and use these as their comparative focus. Failure to do so leads to description, paraphrase or at worst copying out what is there, word for word.

*AO2a: as part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination*

Thus for part (a) questions, in order to have marks awarded for AO2a, candidates are required to analyse and evaluate the two sources as evidence. This has the **higher mark weighting** and should focus the candidate on the sources as evidence. Again, the following points (and pitfalls) are to be aware of:

- The need is to compare provenance, integrating it into an explanation of similarity and difference and arriving at developed judgement. However some centres still use the list in the old Level 1A and 1B (or the Legacy Level 1) mark schemes as the basis for an answer here. **You will note that we have deliberately removed this from the new generic mark scheme.** This is because such a **formulaic approach** diverts the candidate from both the issue in the question (and the appropriate content), while instead candidates seek

qualities on their 'list' that are simply not there or are of minor or tangential significance. The result may be, for example, a paragraph being added on 'completeness' which turns into a wish list of sources that were not used in the comparison.

- The key to an effective comparison of provenance is to **ask questions about the authors, their likely purpose, the different audiences and the respective tone**. For example, many candidates will devote whole sections of their answer here, and on Q(b), to reliability. This leads to discrete comment. For historians all evidence can be used. Issues such as reliability are factored in and only then are conclusions drawn from it and other factors. It is a part of considering purpose, tone and audience. Simply to comment in isolation on reliability is not evaluation, only a relatively minor part of it.
- Another point for centres to watch for when evaluating candidates' work throughout the year, is that frequently candidates, having effectively compared content, proceed to **sequence their comments on provenance**. Candidates are more likely to comment discretely on authorship, tone or purpose, but without effective comparison on this they find an informed judgement difficult.
- Candidates need to read the material very carefully, and it should ring bells in terms of their own understanding of the issue. There is a danger for candidates to take sources at **face value** (e.g. The GDR Law in Source C in F964 02 Q4). Relatedly, examiners this June reported that **misinterpretation of the Sources** seemed to be on the increase.
- Candidates should continue to be warned against assertion, which was prevalent. Candidates claim that something is useful or reliable, or biased, without explanation, development or example. Examiners are faced with much 'stock' comment as a result. Stating that the author of a primary source 'has an agenda so is unreliable' is as uninformative as asserting a modern historian to be reliable due to his research.

The following section of this report now considers sub-question (b).

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

This remains a challenge for many. It is a great pity that many know to attempt a grouping based on the assertion in the question but then proceed sequentially, often in two halves. This approach results in a discussion of each source, entirely discrete, and then a bolt-on section where the provenance of each is discussed, again discretely. This divorces the material from the question. Such an approach prevents candidates from integrating their points into the wider discussion of an interpretation and they fail to make the appropriate links. So, **candidates need to sustain their grouping by linking and cross referencing within it**, establishing why two or three sources contribute to a particular interpretation or challenge it, and their relative merits as evidence. It is better to integrate issues of provenance (authorship, purpose and audience) into this as it establishes the relative weight to be given to the evidence of a group of sources. It is, perhaps, instinctive for candidates to proceed source by source, even within an established grouping, but they need to bear in mind the need to compare within and across their grouping at key points. This needs to be done both in terms of the issues and content discussed and on issues of provenance which may affect the relative weighting given to their points.

Generally, candidates would be well advised –

1. To read the sources with care in relation to the question.
2. Plan, using grouping, cross-referencing those sources that can support two or more views.
3. Then assess the value of their grouping (evaluation) building in any relevant knowledge at this point.
4. Thinking about their judgement and conclusion before starting to write and planning accordingly.

There were two key areas where candidates underperformed –

## Reports on the Units taken in June 2010

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

As with part (a) discussed above, we will now consider points relating to the assessment objectives as targeted in the generic mark scheme.

*AO1a: recall select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner*

To score highly here, candidates integrate knowledge selectively and appropriately to assess the interpretation of the Sources in a clear manner. This is the second and third bullet points in the new AO1 levels. In a source based paper it does not bear the main burden (that is carried by the first bullet point); the following points are therefore important to take on board:

- Some candidates simply wrote an **answer based on their knowledge** with the sources used for illustration or reference. Others knew that they needed to keep the focus on the sources, so dealt with this requirement by **bolting on their own knowledge**, either at the end, or scattered through the answer.
- In many cases candidates seemed to have little beyond a **general contextual underpinning**. In some cases it was simply inappropriate and led the candidate away from the focus of the question. It is important to realise what the **role of knowledge is in this question**. It is there *as a means of evaluating the sources*, extending, confirming or questioning what they say. It is **particularly important in evaluation**. Selection and use of the most appropriate evidence in evaluating the Sources was the key to a high level mark for AO1a and b.
- Many candidates missed key opportunities for **evaluating views within the Sources by use of knowledge**. This resulted in a lack of balance, where candidates rarely spotted the counter-arguments within the Sources.

*A01b: demonstrate their understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements[...]*

This is carried by the first bullet point in the levels and carries the main weighting; it requires analysis and explanation of the question with substantiated judgement, and centres need to be aware that:

- Candidates need to **explain, develop, use and cross reference** the points for or against a particular interpretation in the sources. In so doing they will analyse the material to answer the question and arrive at a well thought through and argued judgement. Many manage to do this only through a discrete discussion of the content of an individual source. Often effective points are made in isolation of the question and argument.
- Many answers drifted out of focus on the key issue in the question. The **sharpness of focus was highly significant in marking out the best answers**. For example on the 01 versions: whether *military skills* rather than any other factor was the reason for the capture of Jerusalem; the *relative importance of William's leadership* in victory at Hastings; *how far* Luther's beliefs were *revolutionary*, whether *Tudor government* was the *main cause* of socio-economic problems. On the 02 versions: the *extent of difference* between Gladstone and Disraeli's *imperial policy*; whether *Labour was best placed* to deal with *post war problems*; or whether the Nazis and the GDR pursued the *same aims* towards youth and education.
- **The structure of the argument** was often seriously flawed. Many answers were of two halves - the first, attempting to analyse and use the Sources, but the second merely a resort to an essay style answer, with little or no further reference to the Sources. Some made no attempt to drive the answer using Sources, which became an essay with brief nods to the Sources by letter only, often in brackets.

- **Judgements and conclusions were often divorced from the sources.** Even candidates who had attempted a reasonable focus on the sources could forget that they were **assessing them as evidence** in their judgements. Instead they resorted to knowledge points **on the issue in general**. The answer would become topic based rather than what the sources have to say about a particular issue.

*AO2a: as part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination*

Marks for AO2a thus require analysis and evaluation of the four or (the majority of the time) five Sources set. The descriptor for AO2a is the first two bullet points in the AO2 column, and carries the main weighting of the marks. Centres should bear the following in mind:

- **Most marks** are given for AO2a.
- In order to access Levels I and II the source must be given relative 'value' in its contribution to the question. As identified above this was a key area for underperformance. Candidates should not confine their discussions on provenance to Q(a). Many candidates who did discuss provenance in Q(b) did so discretely, failing to link their discussions to the grouping and the key issue in the question. The danger is that having fallen down on analytical skills in AO1b they compound this by **failing to evaluate the source's relative contribution to the debate**. This confines them to Level III and below.
- By tackling the sources **sequentially and discretely** candidates almost inevitably move into Levels IV, and below, as it prevents them making the necessary links within and between sources and with the question.
- Weaker answers will often simply **describe the introductions and attributions**, but this of course does not constitute evaluation.
- At **Level V and below** there were those answers which blatantly copied out Source content sequentially with merely an uninformative, often repetitive, assertion.
- Many low level answers expressed **general comments about the topic** rather than focusing on the question itself or analysing the detail of the Sources. Again many Sources were taken at face value. At the lower levels, several answers stated that the author 'had an agenda' without elaborating. **At the highest levels**, however, there were perceptive answers with impressive awareness of detail and the use of well chosen evidence in evaluation of provenance as well as content. Other clearly able candidates lost marks for using Sources at face value and not considering their provenance, reliability or use.
- A number of candidates from some Centres attempted to use modern historians' views as a means of evaluating primary Sources. Candidates on the 01 versions of the paper were more prone to this than their 02 counterparts. **Historians' debate is not the focus of this Unit** (though is a part of the Investigations and Interpretations Unit at A2). **The Enquiries Unit needs historical evidence used for evaluation of linked Sources.**
- **Evaluation** is best achieved as part of the grouping, either within it, in terms of establishing relative importance, or as part of the grouping (all Presidential or Nazi views; all pre- or post-war etc). It should always be related to establishing its value in relation to the question.

*AO2b: analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways*

Unlike for Q(a), marks are awarded for AO2b for Q(b). It requires synthesis of grouped Sources and integrated knowledge in evaluation of the interpretation. This is the third bullet point in the AO2 levels in the mark scheme, and it carries a lower weighting; nonetheless centres should be aware that:



- This is about **bringing together, in a successful synthesis, all the above skills.** In particular this is where we reward not so much the knowledge used per se but its integration and relative balance (unevenness and then imbalance).
- Many candidates seemed not to realise the need to group Sources for analysis according to their view to create an argument of two or more sides for the 'assess how far' element. Many seemed to think that because the question begins with 'use your own knowledge' they should begin 'essay style' instead of using the Sources to drive their answers to Q(b). But this will lead them to underachieve on AO2b by failing to achieve sufficient synthesis.
- There are some candidates who persist in **adding a bolt on** - 'and from my own knowledge, I know that . . .' This undermines synthesis and evidence is not linked or active in assessing 'how far *the Sources* support . . .'
- Some answers **failed to find more than one view** in the Sources. There were obvious internal clues which might have been used as a springboard for argument. The most successful answers made impressive use of all these clues and saw that some Sources might be used for more than one side to an argument.
- **Knowledge** needs to be selected for its relevance and pertinent use in integration into the argument and there were some excellent answers which did achieve this with clarity and control. Those in the middle range of the Mark Scheme were able to analyse the interpretation in the question, but less likely to balance it with an alternative view in judgement.
- Often some better answers **lost sight of the Sources in the final page or so**, meaning that the conclusion and judgement were limited, undermining synthesis.

## F965 Historical Interpretations and Investigations

This was the first time that large numbers of candidates had been entered for this unit and the first time that most centres had submitted centre-assessed coursework in OCR A level History. There was an on-line consultancy service which offered guidance and gave centres the opportunity to submit examples of marked work to gain feedback on marking style and whether marking was being related to assessment objectives. There had also been a substantial inset programme. However, it was obviously a substantial change to go from examiner assessed papers (2587-9) and an externally marked coursework essay (2591-2) to the present Unit F965 which has two exercises internally marked and externally moderated. The standard of centre marking was high, with few markers not offering marginal comments or using the OCR mark scheme. In many cases there was very detailed marking which showed considerable commitment by the centres. In general moderators were impressed by the fairness and care with which the marking was carried out and the understanding shown by both candidates and teachers of the nature of the tasks and the assessment criteria. The majority of centre marks were in line with nationally agreed standards. This meant that there was no need to change the marks, that candidates had been put in the right order of ability and that there was clear evidence of OCR criteria being applied. Where there was some variation, this was conveyed to the centres in the reports sent by moderators, but this was not, generally, enough to bring about major changes in centre marks or to require centres to reconsider their marking. This was a substantial achievement by centres which generally did their best to ensure that candidates were marked appropriately and to help the moderators to understand the rationale behind marking decisions. Moderators overwhelmingly commented on the hard work and professionalism of centre marking and also on the high standards reached by top candidates who deserved the high marks awarded by centres. So the real cooperation between centres and OCR resulted in some very pleasing results and showed that the new examination is working well to differentiate between candidates to give opportunities for much worthwhile historical writing. It is in this context that any suggestions for improvement and critical comments must be seen.

### General observations

1. The most important trend to emerge from moderators' reports was the greater difficulty centres found in identifying key assessment elements in Investigations than in Interpretations. Where there were significant differences between centre and moderator marks it was usually in Investigations. In most cases candidates showed more awareness of how to approach the Interpretations than the Investigations, and where there were poor marks it was often in the Investigations. It is therefore important that centres do take action if their moderator has drawn attention to weaknesses in candidates' performances in the Investigation task and if there has been more of a problem in marking this part of the coursework.
2. In the Interpretations, though most candidates did focus on the passages, there were some who gave the texts insufficient attention. These are substantial and carefully-chosen passages, but some work seemed not to go far beyond a brief description of the interpretation or refer to any more than a few words. It must be very firmly stressed that what is required is not a general essay which makes a few references to the passages (or in extreme cases, none at all) but to a sustained evaluation of all of the passages both individually and as a set.
3. As the questions make clear reference to contextual knowledge, then it was disappointing to find some answers which just used the passages in the interpretations questions. This cannot score highly and it would be very helpful if both marginal comment and final comments referred to the scope and quality of contextual knowledge and how far it had been used evaluatively. If there has been no reference to 'OK' (own knowledge) or 'context' or 'factual support' then it is difficult to see how the candidate is actually offering

any supported evaluation. This is straightforward to mark and must be an important part of the assessment of AO2 as well as AO1a.

4. Investigations must be assessed on the basis of how well evidence is selected and used, not on general argument. This is not an A level essay with some references to sources; rather, sources are at the heart of the assessment. Marking must show whether the evidence is merely illustrating points or whether it is driving the answer and is being evaluated throughout. Again, it should not be difficult for marking to pick out when sources are used and to comment on how they are being used.
5. Having said that, both pieces of coursework must be about what they are supposed to be about. Skills of evaluating interpretations and evidence are not being tested *in vacuo* but in the context of a specific problem. It was very helpful when marking noted a drift away from the question or commented on how well focus had been maintained. This is no different from any other marking in History – candidates must answer the question – especially if it one that they themselves have chosen or devised.
6. The task is to answer the questions using sustained evaluative analysis within the limit of 2000 words for each exercise. Centres have asked about this as if it were a problem outside their control. It is not. Coursework of more than 2000 words should not be submitted. Certainly centres should not collude to evade this. In at least one case the centre allowed a false word limit to be put on the pieces of work which far exceeded the 2000 word limit. This is the equivalent of colluding to allow examination candidates unauthorised extra time and should not recur. Editing is a vital skill in the world of work and candidates should not be indulged and should be made aware of the non-negotiable nature of the word limit. Many universities are unyielding here about dissertations and theses, so this is good training. In the world of work, if the MD requires a sheet of foolscap with key ideas and the eager trainee produces 10 pages, the result is not usually reward for hard work but irritation that instructions cannot be followed.
7. It was frankly tiresome and time consuming for moderators to have to request the very important Centre Declaration form and the candidate record forms, and, in some cases the samples even after a request had been made for them. Even more time-consuming for all concerned were cases where the centre had not added up the marks correctly and or recorded the marks incorrectly on the MS1. As work sometimes had to be sent back via DHL, the cost and waste of time which could have been avoided by checking by the centre was disproportionate. Basic mistakes in administration are avoidable and it is hoped that there will be far fewer next year.
8. There were cases when an adjustment of marks by the moderator could not be done because it would involve changing the rank order of candidates. There were some, though not many relative to the number of centres who submitted work, requests for re-marking. It is never pleasant to be contacted and to be asked to reconsider marking, but it was a tribute to the professionalism of colleagues that this was done with the understanding that the concern of moderators was to be fair to the candidates. A great deal of discussion preceded any request for remarking and it is hoped that centres which were contacted understood the need to keep the rank order of merit to protect the interests of all candidates. Moderators were impressed by the highly responsible attitude taken and anticipate that there will be less need for this re-marking in future.
9. In many cases there was evidence of internal moderation and this was very helpful and very much to be encouraged. Comments in the margin in red (or green if the work is being read a second time by an internal moderator) are very important and were generally helpful. Ticks are to be discouraged and a 'tick free zone' would be ideal. Also, all marking should be done in ink not pencil which is hard to read.

10. Finally a plea that all samples have the centre name, number and the candidate number and that work is joined together with a staple. There is no need for a plastic wallet or bulky packaging. Moderators will be helped by having the right paper work and samples merely stapled. Please put the two pieces work of candidates together rather than separate piles of Investigations and Interpretations, as this is one unit and will be considered as such in moderation.

It is not possible to offer detailed comments on every question, but a report will be published to consider key skills in both parts of the unit and give examples to help to clarify. Before this, however, it may be helpful to comment on whether there were significant differences in performance between candidates who offered an investigation from the board-set list and those who offered their own question on a topic not based on the Investigations topic studied. This was not often commented on by moderators except when the topic did not easily yield sustained discussion and critical evaluation of evidence. As many weaker answers who did choose a board set question did not display key skills at a high level, the conclusion must be that it is not so much the topic but the grasp of the need to demonstrate critical evaluation of evidenced that is the vital determinant. So while it may seem easier to do a another exercise on, say, Philip II which has been studied than, say, Viking settlements which have not, it is really the approach taken to evidence rather than familiarity with the topic that probably makes the most difference to the final mark.

## F966 Historical Themes

### General Comments

This was the first full session of the Historical Themes unit and the outcome was very encouraging. There were no letters of complaint although several Centres expressed surprise that they did not receive an Insert containing dates and events for each topic, which was a feature of the legacy exam. The quality of scripts was varied but on balance very sound. There appeared to be a significant increase in the number of candidates who were able to analyse and explain reasons. The majority of candidates understood that a synoptic judgement was needed but there appeared to be fewer who were able to achieve a synthesis and thus reach the higher levels. At the top end there were many outstanding performances and several candidates scored maximum marks. These candidates not only showed an ability to organise and express their ideas in a cogent and mature style but also displayed excellent historical skills. Synthesis as well as analysis featured strongly in their essays, and their arguments were supported with accurate factual details relevant to the question set.

At the middle and lower end of performances, candidates often analysed and produced sound evaluative comparisons but only at the very end (hence the value of an extended conclusion); while some offered a bolt-on synthesis almost as an after-thought to a paragraph. Many however still follow too descriptive (or indeed chronological) a route, sequencing rulers/ leaders/ events but without synthesis or argument. Often they signposted the poverty of their analysis by including words like: 'clearly', 'obviously' and 'thus it has been argued', when it most certainly had not. Other candidates confidently proclaimed that they were about to explain 'why', when the question wanted to know 'how far'. At the bottom end, candidates frequently misunderstood the needs of the question, had insufficient relevant knowledge or failed to synthesise developments. The command stem of questions was also frequently ignored presumably due to either a lack of understanding or a determination to answer a question that had been revised and written before. But overall, there was less of a feeling that past questions were being answered, which is a very encouraging development. Weaker candidates, however, frequently included few or no dates in their essays; this impaired any synoptic assessment that was attempted as these candidates, unsure of the sequence of major events, found it hard to make connections between them. Similarly very weak responses often had a high incidence of factual errors of both dates and events.

As in the January session, most candidates seem to have benefited from having more time to answer two questions. Very few essays were unfinished and most reflected careful organisation and a depth of knowledge not generally found in the legacy assessments. The extra time allowed did certainly produce some very long answers but not always to the candidates' benefit. There was a danger of candidates putting in anything and everything that might seem relevant and so losing control of the material. Often more time meant an opportunity to show even more of 'what I know' rather than 'what I think about...' These candidates seemed to lose sight of one of the main objectives of the paper, which is to provide a synoptic assessment of historical evidence. It would have been more advantageous if longer had been spent planning the answer and thinking about the best examples rather than writing down everything.

Overview introductions were less prevalent, though the best did give an immediate comparison between the start and end of a period, so introducing change or continuity. Some candidates wanted to begin their essay by 'setting the scene' and, while this has merit if it is relevant to the question set and relatively brief, it can often entail merely re-stating the question. In general, candidates would benefit from giving a brief consideration of words that appear in essay titles, such as 'effective', in their introductions and to define any relevant historical concepts. If some introductions were too long, in contrast some endings were too short, thereby negating attempts at real judgements. In some cases, candidates were a little too concerned with identifying

change or continuity and, as a result, their answers were somewhat forced in the desire to label everything change or continuity. These concepts were sometimes used as if they could stand as statements independently and did not require any evidence to back them up. Questions that feature a turning point continue to pose problems. Some candidates either saw everything as a turning point or simply thought that change equalled a turning point and wrote their essay accordingly. They often elicited a simple listing of examples and alternatives without an attempt to cross-reference and cross-evaluate. Where the latter was done, answers usually worked well. The quality of English was generally sound although abbreviations of proper names, places and events continue to appear. Some candidates wanted to use (for example) 'HVII' for 'Henry VII', 'AoC' for 'Archbishop of Canterbury', 'PoG' for 'Pilgrimage of Grace', 'NA' for 'Native Americans', 'AIII' for 'Alexander III' or 'PG' for 'Provisional Government' all the way through (and there were many others). In some cases, the frequency of abbreviations mixed with a text messaging approach made responses almost indecipherable. This practice is totally inappropriate. Spelling and punctuation were generally acceptable but there were frequent grammatical errors: commas instead of full stops, the wrong use of apostrophes, a lack of capital letters for proper nouns, and various misspellings of common words.

## F966/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1066-1715

### Individual Questions

#### English Government and the Church 1066-1216

- 1 The key to a good answer was to balance 'absence abroad' against other factors. Among the latter were the costs of warfare, the need to control local government, especially sheriffs and the Anglo-Saxon legacy. Some weaker candidates focused too much on the effects of having continental possessions and set these against the kings' absences abroad. Others believed the question was about the effects of being abroad and the changes that resulted from them, whereas the question was actually about the development of English central government. Surprisingly many better candidates also ignored the command stem 'most important factor' and failed to compare or reach a judgement in their conclusion. The weakest responses wrote a narrative of general developments in government over the period, omitted reference to Stephen and John, and showed little knowledge of specific features such as the emergence of the Chief Justiciar and Chancellor. Some candidates ran together as one reason the kings' absences abroad, need for money and continental possessions, when they could have more profitably been examined as three separate factors.
- 2 This question produced a range of responses from the well informed to the minimalist. At the top end candidates combined an analytical approach, clear focus on 'dependent on the work of Henry II', excellent understanding of change and continuity and well supported synoptic judgements. Many weaker candidates, however, knew little about the common law and instead described the main changes in government. Some seemed confused about the definition of common law. There was a lack of focus on 'dependent on the work of Henry II' with his contribution being treated as another important factor. Many answers tended to concentrate on the work of Henry I and Henry II with very little on either the earlier period and often little precise knowledge of anything after Henry II. Misunderstandings abounded: some claimed that Henry I invented the shire and hundred courts; that the first law code in England was Glanvill's treatise; that justices in eyre were different from itinerant justices; that during the reign of Stephen the entire country was plunged into disorder. Of the three questions in this set, this was the least popular and the least well done.
- 3 The question was poorly answered by many candidates. Often little was known about the relationship between the Papacy and Canterbury and even the better answers frequently fudged this element. Surprisingly only a few candidates seemed to have any idea about the relationship between John and Stephen Langton. Several candidates showed little precise knowledge of Becket's relations with the pope or Anselm's relations with either William II or Henry I. Some candidates thought that Anselm and William I had a poor relationship and that the former broke with Rufus because he was a Gregorian reformer. They even categorised Lanfranc as a Gregorian archbishop. A small minority of candidates misread the question and focused instead on a comparison of relations between the king and Papacy and the archbishops and Papacy. Most of the answers gave a simplistic analysis stemming from a chronological account: thus good relations with one party resulted in bad relations with the other. There was therefore comparatively little subtlety of analysis of changing relationships over time. On the other hand, the best answers showed a sophisticated understanding of change and continuity in relationships, even between the same archbishop and king, or archbishop and pope. Here there was clear synthesis and synoptic assessment at a very high level.

### **Rebellion and Disorder under the Tudors 1485-1603**

- 4 This was a very popular question and produced many very strong answers. Most candidates argued that foreign backed rebellions did not necessarily present a dangerous threat and cited Irish rebellions as good examples of this argument. In fact, they suggested, factors such as the location, size, support among the English nobility and, above all, the main objectives were more significant criteria. Many candidates claimed that Ireland was a foreign country and used Simnel's rebellion as supporting evidence. Better answers set up the criteria against which to judge what possibly made a rebellion a serious threat. The best responses compared a wide range of rebellions and attempted to define 'dangerous threat'. They assessed cases where foreign aid did not materialise, noted the Irish dimension, and pointed out that Spanish aid in the Elizabethan rebellions produced little real threat to the security of governments in England. Weaker essays assumed that support, either foreign or domestic, allied to a dynastic cause was the most dangerous type of rebellion, even if it was poorly led or located a long way from the seat of government. Greater thought generally needed to be given as to when and how a rebellion actually became dangerous, and what exactly constituted 'Tudor governments'. There were many who, with better planning and structure to their answers, could have improved their result considerably. They approached it by rebellion or monarch, rather than looking at the themes suggested above.
- 5 A poorly answered question and the least popular in this set. Candidates tended to take a narrow view of how the Tudors maintained order and obedience. For many candidates there was only one way: rebels were executed and reprisals taken to ensure there was no further trouble. These candidates tended to deflect the question to how governments dealt with rebellions or to the maintenance of stability. Some referred to a particular agency in the introduction or at the start of the paragraph, and then ignored it in the ensuing section. This suggests mechanical learning of headings and little else. There was also a persistent view held by many that the influence of the Church as a tool to maintain obedience declined after the break from Rome. Better essays examined the many ways in which Tudor monarchs enforced their rule and acknowledged that most methods occurred when there were no rebellions. Some candidates looked at the personal role of the monarch, the use of propaganda, the role of the clergy, nobility and gentry, and how government policies helped to maintain obedience. Other candidates assessed how central and local government machinery kept order in the provinces. The key to a good answer was to look for continuity and change in methods from ruler to ruler, and several good candidates for instance contrasted Henry VII's methods and circumstances with those of Elizabeth I later in the period. Above all they were able to cite specific examples to support generalised statements whereas weaker answers asserted generalisations and offered little by way of synthesis.
- 6 This was the most popular question in the set and generally well answered. Most candidates realised that disputes over the succession could be found in many English rebellions although only the best acknowledged that rebellions, such as the Pilgrimage of Grace, Wyatt and Essex, had subsidiary articles concerning such issues. Some weaker answers viewed the Yorkist pretenders and Northumberland's advocacy of Lady Jane Grey as the only relevant dynastic rebellions, while others found succession disputes in every rebellion. Only the best candidates saw the change in character from accession to succession. There were also some good answers that contrasted 'common' in England with Ireland and this again provided some interesting variations. Although candidates did not have to discuss rebellions in Ireland, those who did usually made the point that none of their uprisings concerned the succession to the English throne. Most essays discussed the premise in the title before moving on to assess other causes. The most common to be considered were social/economic, religious and political. The best essays organised their argument thematically and defined 'most common cause' usually in terms of frequency across the period but also at specific times within the period. Religious rebellions were



thus seen as occurring between 1536 and 1569 in England and from 1534 to 1603 in Ireland, whereas social and economic disturbances took place mainly in the first half of the Tudor period and faction-led rebellions predominated in the later years. They then had a more general overview of the whole period.

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

- 7 A number of factors influenced foreign policy making and better candidates reflected this understanding in their answers. Economic, trade and finance had a bearing as did political considerations and good candidates emphasised the need to safeguard national security as a consistent influence across the period. Religious factors became increasingly important after the Reformation and some essays stressed their importance to several Elizabethan ministers. 'Personal ambition' lay at the heart of the question, and how candidates defined this concept often determined the quality of their essay. The better responses recognised how each of the Tudors was affected by ambition. Henry VIII's quest to emulate Henry V figured in most essays and some saw a change, albeit temporary, in the 1530s but good analyses of the personal aims of Henry VII, Mary and Elizabeth also proved a fruitful line of argument. Weaker candidates had difficulty discriminating between personal ambition and other motives. Many found personal ambition hard to define and as a result virtually anything was classified under it. They also gave less attention to the mid-Tudor period in general and Edward VI's administration in particular, although some attempted to argue, quite successfully that Somerset and Mary did have personal ambitions. What was most noticeable was the lack of a thematic approach in weaker responses. Most answers went through monarch by monarch and failed to display the synthesis expected.
- 8 This question produced some very good essays and was the best answered in the set. Candidates generally argued that Anglo-French relations were characterised more by continuity than by change but acknowledged the early years of Elizabeth I as a critical turning point. Events in France, the Netherlands and Scotland were evaluated by better candidates to show how England's foreign relations changed at this time but from 1572 relations became more stable again. The key to a successful essay was to produce a thematic analysis of Anglo-French relations throughout the period to point to continuing trends such as their respective friendship/enmity with Scotland and Spain, as well as changing perspectives such as the personal aims of various Tudor and Valois kings. Surprisingly few essays commented on the personal rivalry between Henry VIII and Francis I. The best candidates argued that though there were underlying features of continuity throughout the period, there were also numerous examples of change as if to prove the point. They avoided a narrative chronological account, which was the hallmark of weaker candidates, and instead organised their essays synoptically.
- 9 The changing nature of England's relations with the Burgundian and Spanish Habsburgs was well understood by many candidates and the question consequently produced several very good answers. The best essays focused on the importance of the Netherlands in this relationship and evaluated its political and economic significance to England and to Spain across the period. Most answers saw the accession of Charles I as King of Spain, Archduke of Burgundy and Holy Roman Emperor as a pivotal moment but also understood the growing importance of the Netherlands to England as relations with France and Spain changed under Elizabeth I. Several candidates wrote too much on the later Tudors and not enough on developments under Henry VIII. Weaker responses were often confused about the relationship between Burgundy and Spain and either gave only limited attention to the importance of the Netherlands or wrote about how England was affected domestically rather than in the context of Anglo-Spanish and Anglo-Burgundian relations. Some candidates wrote general answers about Anglo-Spanish relations without analysis or assessment. Many simply did not know what was required and there was little focus on the

Netherlands as against other factors in relations with the Habsburgs. This was the weakest of the foreign policy answers and the least popular.

### **The Catholic Reformation 1492-1610**

- 10 This question produced several very thoughtful responses and was the most popular of the three in this set. Most candidates defined 'Catholic Church' as not solely the Papacy but Catholic institutions and members as well; they also recognised that 'Catholic Reformation' entailed more than just the Catholic Church. Better essays examined what early Catholic reformers aimed to achieve and cited Ximenes, Etaples, Briçonnet, Savonarola and Erasmus as examples; some assessed the aims of the new secular orders and reformed spiritual orders. Most candidates argued that defending doctrine replaced reforms of clerical abuses as the main aim after 1517 but that not until the Council of Trent was doctrine defined, and a Counter Reformation given papal leadership. Weaker responses mistook the question by interpreting it to be about the Papacy or rather surprisingly they said little about the aims until the conclusion. They also tended to suggest that combating Lutheranism was a main aim but said nothing about the challenges presented by Zwingli and Calvin. Some candidates ignored the need to contain Protestantism or confined their arguments to European developments only. Many, particularly weaker candidates, lacked specific knowledge of the earlier period and resorted to sweeping generalisations.
- 11 This question elicited a wide range of responses, including several outstanding essays. A good evaluation of Erasmus' legacy was required, and better candidates went on to compare his contributions with each of their selected alternative individuals. Some argued that Erasmus was vital to the revival; others, often due to a lack of knowledge, claimed he was comparatively insignificant. Weaker responses tended to be able to name some of his works but were unaware of his influence on other European religious figures or the international scholarly community. Thus the majority of candidates placed Erasmus in second place behind Paul III. Candidates who assessed the work of individual Jesuits and popes scored well; those who treated the Jesuits and Papacy as an institution or focused on the Council of Trent, fared less well. A minority of candidates made a valid case for Luther, principally arguing that he had a longer impact and affected more countries than Erasmus. Weaker candidates had little difficulty describing what individuals did, but many found it hard to assess their contributions.
- 12 This was the least popular in the set but handled quite well. The best answers assessed a range of reasons and illustrated their essay with examples from across the whole period. Most approached the question country by country, and focused on Italy, Spain and Germany, which often led to descriptive answers, but some answers drifted outside Europe or the period in question. Weaker candidates tended to give too much attention to England or had a weak grasp of geography. Some claimed that Italy was a united country ruled by the pope. Some ignored the first half of the period when many reformers and new orders were very active. Several candidates insisted that Elizabeth I burned Catholic missionaries at the stake or claimed that the Inquisition was first introduced into Spain by Philip II. Middling responses often had good reasons but asserted rather than assessed their explanations. These candidates usually compared a range of factors such as the Papacy and Jesuits and illustrated the varied impact with some assertions at the end about their relative importance.

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

- 13 This question produced some good answers though candidates generally handled issues concerning Protestantism better than humanism. Indeed some weaker responses ignored humanism altogether or saw no link between the two developments. Louis XII was thus overlooked by many candidates or dismissed by others because allegedly he did not have to deal with heretics. The majority of candidates focused on how the crown handled

Protestantism during the wars of religion and concluded that most rulers did so unsuccessfully. Weaker answers gave far too much attention to the St Bartholomew's Day massacre and knowledge of the later Valois kings was often quite thin although the views of Catherine de Medici and Henry IV were often better known. The problem here was in focusing on 'effectively'. There were many who could say what the crown did, but linking it to anything more than assertion was often limited. The best essays presented an even coverage of the French monarchy, acknowledged the problems stored up by Francis I and Henry II, and concluded that Henry IV dealt with Protestant issues most effectively. They also avoided a chronological approach which was the favoured approach of weaker responses.

- 14 This was the best answered question in the set and, on balance, candidates were torn between Francis I and Henry IV as their champion. Levels of support, and comparative evaluation between these two monarchs and the rest often differentiated between candidates. The best responses recognised the limitations as well as the strengths of each ruler, both domestically and internationally. They also defined 'nation state', which enabled a comparison of French kings to be sustained across the period. The better answers looked at issues such as territorial unity, legal or linguistic unity, and made conclusions on each issue before coming to an overall judgement. Weaker essays usually presented a chronological survey monarch by monarch, and left any comparative evaluation until the conclusion. Some candidates included material about the importance of the economy but forgot to explain how a sound economy contributed to the development of the nation state. The weak kings of the early period were soon dismissed and discussion largely focused on Francis I, Henry II and Henry IV.
- 15 Overall there were several outstanding essays. A comparison of France and the condition of its 'nation state' before and after the wars of religion was expected and indeed supplied by better candidates. They assessed the nation state thematically, often in terms of geo-political, monarchical, social, economic, judicial, religious and administrative developments. Knowledge of how the wars affected France varied considerably. Good candidates assessed details and examples of continuity and change; weaker responses wrote generalised and asserted statements without analysis or assessment. Some candidates produced three mini-essays: the first examined developments between 1498 and 1562; the second described the main effects of the wars; and the third cited Henry IV as the saviour of France. Often there was little attempt to link these developments together or to focus on the key issues in the question. However, there were some who were able to take a more balanced approach and argued that either the quick recovery after or the lack of development before meant that the impact of the wars was limited.

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

- 16 This was the least popular of the three questions. A minority produced a synoptic assessment in a thematic format but most candidates tended to give a narrative/descriptive account of the period, centred around the careers of Richelieu, Mazarin and Colbert. These essays were often generalised and insufficiently supported, and the question was left unanswered until the final paragraph. It was surprising that the words 'more weaknesses than strengths' did not appear in many essays. Answers were often weak, lacking in detail and focused more on finance.
- 17 This was the least well done of these questions, with candidates finding more difficulty focusing on the key issue. 'Royal authority' was seldom defined and few said what they meant by 'personality'. Preliminary definitions might well have resulted in more coherent essays. Less was generally known about Louis XIII than his successor, and weaker candidates found it easier to concentrate on the cardinals. The weakest answers frequently resorted to generalised assertions such as 'Louis XIV in particular has been

depicted as a snob'. Sometimes the same sentence would award Louis XIII a 'strong personality' because he took to the battlefield with his troops and a 'weak personality' because he allowed himself to be dominated by Richelieu. Candidates were able to examine a range of factors that affected royal authority. However, they often found it difficult to link the idea of personality to the question. Once again the answer was almost invariably tackled chronologically whereas a thematic answer would have brought out the required contrasts.

- 18 On the whole this question produced the best responses with some outstanding answers. The range and depth of supporting knowledge was often astonishing. The best candidates established a comparative and thematic format, which was focused on the Thirty Years' War, but embraced several other factors in satisfying their criteria of analysing France's development as a European power. Some candidates shifted the focus of the essay onto why France stopped being a major power after the Peace of Ratisbon. This question also produced many very long answers, but very few got to grips with the actual question. It often resulted in a lengthy run through of foreign policy and attempts to link the material to the question. Weaker responses tended to produce narratives often of all the treaties through to the War of the Spanish Succession.

## F966/02 Modern 1789-1997

### Individual questions

#### The Challenge of German Nationalism 1789-1919

- 1 Ideas and aims usually merged and not enough sense of real change (extent, nature, character) was conveyed. More could have been made of the contrasts pre-1815 and pre-1871 and later developments, especially after 1890. The best answers did synthesise, argue, apply knowledge well and cross-reference events, issues, personalities with effective argument levels. Weaker responses adopted a chronological approach and, missing the importance of the word 'significantly' in the question, described changes in German nationalism. There was often a lack of knowledge of the 1848 revolutions and how these fitted into the context of German nationalism, and while Wilhelmine Germany was usually well covered, knowledge of Bismarck was often neglected and that of the early period glossed over.
- 2 This was the most popular question in the set and was competently answered. Most wrote well enough about 1866 but few made much of contrasts. Occasionally 1866 dominated too much or else the alternatives were few. For instance, little was made of 1890 or 1914, although occasionally a case was made for the outcome of World War One. Weaker essays dismissed the importance of the Prussian victory over the Austrians in a few sentences before turning to other significant events. Many candidates seemed to know a great deal about the topic but failed to link their information to the question set and so left the examiner to make his/her mind up as to its relative importance. Time management was often an issue in that many candidates tried to cram the last thirty years into one brief paragraph. A simplistic approach was quite common with events being either highly important or unimportant with little shading in between. Only the best candidates adopted a fully comparative approach and so demonstrated synthesis throughout the essay.
- 3 This was the least popular and the least well done of the three in the set. Trying to assess 'mass appeal' proved difficult for many candidates who were drawn into a narrative and fell back on simple judgements such as low appeal, reasonable appeal and mass appeal. Some responses ignored the concept of 'mass appeal' and focused more generally on 'appeal' instead. Others offered extensive descriptions of the changes that German nationalism went through rather than analysing its mass appeal. Its popularity, or lack of it, was often asserted rather than demonstrated. There were nevertheless many very good essays that made a genuine attempt to define 'mass appeal' and link it to such factors as geography, class, religious identity, states' particularism and sectional groups. Better candidates identified Wilhelmine Germany as the most likely era for mass appeal and explained about Weltpolitik and the various pressure groups.

#### The Changing Nature of Warfare 1792-1945

- 4 Better candidates realised the value of defining 'total war' and argued that the concept could be applied to more than just the world wars. They used twentieth century features as criteria by which to assess the earlier period with the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars as the usual contrasts but several asserted that the term was particularly applicable to the Napoleonic era because features such as mass mobilisation began then. Some essays also evaluated the European Wars of Unification, the Crimean War and the Russo-Japanese War, although most candidates downgraded them in respect of 'total wars'. Relatively few answers included the American Civil War which was both disappointing and surprising. Factors considered included: levels of mobilisation and of civilian involvement;

impact on civilians; sheer scale, costs, demands from the state; curtailment of liberties in the needs of all-out war; economic and military output levels. Some answers were too generalised or became overly descriptive, often looking at wars in turn. Weaker essays made little attempt to analyse or synthesise developments across the period and instead tended to describe events in various wars. A minority of candidates had some misconceptions as to the meaning of 'total war'; some for instance decided that the role of women was the deciding factor and judged the various conflicts on that basis alone.

- 5 The majority of candidates agreed that developments in transport did revolutionise warfare but only the better responses defined their terms. The best essays evaluated how transport affected warfare, supplied a wide range of appropriate examples, and compared its impact with other factors such as conscription, communications and the industrial revolution, before reaching a conclusion. Plenty of knowledge was shown and a good range of transport types was examined, with railways and steam and combustion engines being favoured. Impact levels were considered, often linking to mobilisation, destructive capacity, movement of troops, generalship, strategy and tactics. Most essays adopted a broader framework and argued that transport was not the only key development affecting warfare. Indeed many candidates argued that technological inventions had a far more significant impact. Weaker essays described changes, often chronologically, and asserted that, as a result of these changes, warfare had been revolutionised. Some focused too much on railways while others did not really engage alternative factors. The First World War was often described as 'static' with no reference to other fronts and a surprising number knew very little about the Second World War.
- 6 This was the least popular question in the set and not well answered. How effectively candidates marshalled their knowledge of 'superior economic power' to demonstrate 'victory in war' usually determined their mark. Better candidates defined their terms, examined the reasons for success in war and concluded that superior economic resources did not always result in victory. Other factors such as the quality of generals and soldiers, applied strategies and tactics, planning and preparation, and the possession of the latest weaponry were equally if not more important. Indeed the best candidates identified the Crimean War, the Wars of Unification and the Russo-Japanese War among others as examples when economic power had only a minimum impact. The Napoleonic era was usually cited and did allow some, by their handling of the material, to make useful comparisons with twentieth century wars. The best answers cross-evaluated economic with other factors and drew in a good range of examples. Some had impressive knowledge of economic power, output levels, and mobilised resources. Weaker answers wrote much about economic power and let this dominate or else the reverse applied. In both cases there was no attempt to interweave the alternative factors in with superior economic power. Some described the economic conditions of various states, usually Germany, France, Britain, Russia and the USA, and linked their relative strength to particular wars. Overall too many candidates treated each war as a separate event and failed to apply their knowledge synoptically.

### **Britain and Ireland 1798-1921**

- 7 This question was the most popular of the set and generally well answered. Most candidates agreed with the proposition although some made a strong case for Parnell. Better candidates also assessed Redmond, and a minority considered Butt and Dillon but several weaker responses also included De Valera and Collins. A number of candidates got confused over the role of Sinn Féin within the context of the question. The best essays evaluated O'Connell and then compared him directly with other leaders in respect of their effectiveness as leaders of constitutional nationalism. Some candidates broke their essay down into themes such as leadership, support and achievements. Most argued that each leader had strengths and limitations and none achieved all of their objectives. Some

candidates only wrote of O'Connell and Parnell, often full of knowledge but without comparative analysis and evaluation. In general Redmond received limited assessment and knowledge of the later period was often the weakest section but O'Connell's work in the 1830s was also often overlooked. Many candidates preferred severely chronological and sequential routes to answering the question, which militated against evaluative comparisons and often led to simple extended descriptions. Indeed some wrote three mini essays held together by the conclusion.

- 8 Candidates who stayed focused on the 'maintenance of the Act of Union' scored well although weaker responses failed to examine how successive governments interpreted the Act amid changing circumstances. Some candidates wrote a narrative account of how British governments treated Ireland and the weakest essays simply did not understand the relationship between the British government and the Act of Union. The developments over Home Rule after 1912 and the complex situation of 1918-21 might also have been used rather more although some essays did not get beyond Gladstone. Similarly more could have been made of the mixture of coercion and conciliation that was practised for so long. Indeed some better candidates split their thematic approach between governments that adopted coercive and concessionary approaches, both suggesting a desire to maintain the Union. Some candidates suggested patterns whereby Conservative governments supported the Union and Liberal governments were willing to sacrifice the Union. Most essays viewed Gladstone's ministries as major turning points in terms of political, religious and economic developments but better answers contrasted Pitt and Peel, and gave due attention to Asquith's and Lloyd George's administrations. While a thematic approach worked well, several first class essays presented a chronological and synoptic evaluation.
- 9 This question usually produced two alternative approaches. Some candidates focused on economic factors and assessed issues such as trade, industry and agriculture, and relations between landlords and tenants. Often these answers did not get much further than a discussion of the 3 Fs and only a minority assessed North-South economic issues, industry, trade, developments in Ulster. Generally there was not enough cross-evaluation and period range was uneven. For instance, the importance of economic factors in the development of Ulster Unionism was ignored by many candidates. Others, having relegated economic issues to a minor role, focused on political, religious, social and cultural factors. It would seem that far too many candidates did not understand what 'economic factors' entailed and aspects of the Famine was the sum total of their knowledge. The key to a good answer was to try to link economic and other factors to the development of Irish nationalism. Good candidates assessed both constitutional and revolutionary nationalist movements and concluded that economic factors had political and social consequences for Irish nationalism but overall was the least important factor in its development.

### **Russia and its Rulers 1855-1964**

- 10 Candidates needed to focus on October 1917 as a turning point in the development of Russian government. While some viewed the October Revolution as just one of several turning points, many regarded 'government' to be anything of significance that happened in Russia. This was a common weakness in many essays and resulted in candidates assessing government policies, focusing a great deal on economic and social developments, and seriously unbalancing their essays. Thus there were many detailed accounts of Stalin's economic policies but without any explanation to link them to the question. The better ones kept such coverage brief and linked it to a salient feature of government (e.g. centralisation or the power and directing authority of the state). A surprisingly large number confused the February and October Revolutions and often conflated the two events. Where candidates did struggle was in setting up a comparative analysis and evaluation of turning points. Often this vital area got lost or was reduced to a

highly sequential, at times chronological, approach. The best candidates assessed the ideology, structure, organisation and tools of government across the period, and were aware of major changes as well as continuity within and between Tsarist and Communist regimes. Institutions, personnel, support for rulers, opposition and its fate, nationalities, sources of authority and power were often handled with some considerable skill.

- 11 Candidates frequently turned this question into one about the treatment of the Russian peasantry and while many peasants did indeed become 'working class', living in towns and working in factories, many candidates knew little about how industrial developments affected the lives of Russians. Others made perfunctory references to the industrial workers, relying on assertions and generalisations. The better candidates were clearly able to make the necessary distinctions and focus on the question at hand. Several candidates were very well informed on employment statistics in the Stalinist period and housing and working conditions. The best answers examined living and working conditions, personal freedom, civil rights and electoral opportunities, social and cultural changes, especially in health and educational opportunities, how the lives of women improved over the period, and made effective contrasts between the Tsarist and Communist periods. Such answers were often detailed, using good illustrative knowledge about living and working conditions, prices and wages, working hours and practices, trade unions, factories and the demands of the state. Many gave good assessments of life under Stalin and Khrushchev but knowledge of developments under Alexander III and Nicholas II was less assured and, surprisingly, few analysed changes under the Provisional Government. Strong essays organised ideas thematically; weaker responses tended to adopt a chronological and descriptive approach.
- 12 This question was generally well answered. Not everyone agreed with the premise and cited February and October 1917 as prime examples when opposition groups overthrew the ruling government. Some answers made good use of the successes (1881, 1905, 1917 and the Civil War for the Communists) to evaluate why, nevertheless, so often, opposition failed. Most candidates did address the heart of the question, assessing the occasional successes and setting them against the very frequent failures. The best candidates examined a range of opposition groups and parties, assessed their aims, organisation and following, and set any limitations in the context of their subsequent failure. Most attributed their failure to government pre-emptive methods but also noted that there were opposition factions within governing administrations, notably those of Lenin and Stalin. Weaker candidates tended to describe rather than assess their ineffectiveness, focused too much on government repression and presented a limited range of examples and explanations. Some wrote about the actual effects of opposition on rulers, making links to issues of motives and aims (a past recent question area). Such answers needed something at the very least about the fate of opposition to secure a reasonable reward. Surprisingly, many did not actually identify opposition groups that much – although some unwisely included opposition from foreign powers in particular the Hungarian uprising – and more could have been made of the importance of the Civil War.

### **Civil Rights in the USA 1865-1992**

- 13 This was a very popular question and produced a wide variety of responses. Most candidates acknowledged the importance of Federal institutions, in particular the President and Congress but were less assured in their knowledge and understanding of the role of the Supreme Court. Better essays pointed out the contradictions in each of the three elements, sometimes helping and sometimes impeding the advancement of civil rights. Surprisingly the contribution of African American organisations and individuals was often downplayed although some candidates focused most of their answer on their role. The best essays integrated each of the key Federal elements, had a good range of examples and concluded that most advancement occurred when the President, Congress and



Supreme Court worked in unison and, in the 1950s and 1960s, this was in response to pressure from African American activists. Some answers spent too much time on the various Federal areas, especially Supreme Court rulings, and did not cross-evaluate with other factors, above all the African American contributions. This produced some imbalance. Also, as so often in this topic, a good number of answers stopped around 1968 or the early 1970s; and some spent too much time on Martin Luther King and his role. Candidates who did engage other factors often used the changing social context linked to cultural developments, with a focus on the role of the media and the effects of the Cold War.

- 14 This question worked well and produced some really good answers. Better candidates had much to say on the issue and wrote at length and mainly in an analytical manner. Some tended to look at the late nineteenth century, the New Deal era and then the 1960s onwards, often reaching 1992, and so were too episodic in their use of knowledge and, on balance, the post-1945 period was well-known by better candidates. As ever, a distinguishing feature was the ability to engage such areas as social, cultural, economic and political. The role of the Federal government featured in most essays but only the better candidates were able to link this to Native American activities. At times, weaker candidates drifted into actual achievements and successes and the reasons for such at the expense of the real thrust of the question. There were some confused answers which asserted that Native Americans harmed their advancement through their negative actions, whilst advancing their civil rights by adopting 'Red Power'. What was less evident in several essays, however, was how the campaign of civil rights for Native Americans fitted into the overall pattern of civil rights activity from 1950 onwards and the extent to which Native Americans gained from civil rights legislation of the 1960s. There was some simplistic analysis in these essays. For instance, it was claimed that Native American involvement in the Plains Wars provoked an inevitable backlash from the Federal government and so demonstrated that they were not interested in advancing their civil rights. Many tended to agree with the question and then write an essay focused wholly on the role of the Federal government with the assumption that the Native Americans were totally passive.
- 15 This question produced many high quality essays. Most candidates were aware of divisions within and between women's groups and attributed this to conflicting aims, methods and attitudes of supporters. The best essays showed how such divisions existed throughout the period in question and that social, economic and political developments also hindered the attainment of gender equality. The main phases covered were the run-up to and period of both the gaining of the vote and Prohibition, the New Deal era and World War Two, the 1960s onwards reaching into the 1980s. Surprisingly many essays omitted the impact of racial and class prejudices and persistent male opposition exemplified by the Trade Unions. Weaker responses, and there were quite a lot, revealed shallow knowledge and understanding of the topic in general and the question in particular. They offered much generalised comment about sexism and 'separate spheres', and drifted into making a comparison with other social groups, including Native Americans, thereby resulting in a lack of focus.

### **The Development of Democracy in Britain 1868-1997**

- 16 This topic was studied by a very small number of Centres. Most candidates understood why the 1918 Act was important although the depth of their knowledge varied and not many appreciated the significance of the Act for men. However, not many essays linked changes affecting women's and men's voting rights to the development of democracy. Some candidates looked at other electoral and parliamentary changes, citing the Parliament Act of 1911 and extensions to the franchise in 1928 and 1969 as alternative factors. The best answers compared each of these developments. Some candidates, who

knew little about the 1918 Act, considered factors such as the rise of the Labour party, the influence of suffragettes, the emergence of Trade Unions and a better informed and educated electorate to be more important. A balanced assessment was required and achieved by good candidates. Generally this question produced the best answers in the set.

- 17 This was a very popular question. There was a tendency to catalogue changes and factors rather than assess the reasons. The better essays looked at a range of explanations and assessed party leaders, especially Disraeli, Churchill and Thatcher, party organisation, splits in opposition, and support of the print media, but surprisingly few noted the support of 'big business' and the financial backing this gave the Conservatives at elections. Weaker responses merely described British political history from 1868 and rarely got beyond 1945. Most of these essays lacked direction and focus on the question. Few had detailed knowledge and the arguments fell well short of a sustained comparison necessary for a synoptic assessment.
- 18 This question was answered by a small minority of candidates and elicited a poor response. Some essays were balanced in their argument: the advantages trade unions have brought to the development of democracy were therefore as widely known as their shortcomings. The vast majority of candidates, however, were unable to draw examples from across the extended period or direct them to a thesis of their own structure. Factual knowledge was limited, and often inaccurate, or thrown together without evaluation. Some candidates saw this question, incorrectly, as 'How far did Trade Unions as opposed to other groups, events and movements hold back the development of democracy?', and wrote rather irrelevantly about education and the media.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**14 – 19 Qualifications (General)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

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



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

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