



A Level

History

Session: 1984 June

Type: Report

Code: 9020

Paper 9020/1 (English History to c.1500)

Most candidates had adequate factual knowledge for this paper but did not think carefully enough about the questions set and so omitted consideration of key words. These candidates seemed to recast the question to suit either the information they had learnt or an essay previously written. Redundant introductory paragraphs abounded. These often attempted to narrate the antecedents of the topic. Average and below average candidates also included information which was not aimed at supporting the argument. Regrettably, there are schools which pay insufficient attention to clear English, style and presentation.

On the other hand, there were candidates who answered the questions succinctly. These tended to indicate the point of the question in a brief introductory paragraph which sought to define key terms and indicate the general thrust of the answer. There followed a clear, pointed argument with appropriate evidence.

Q.1. Few answers to this question went beyond the narration of the history of Roman Britain. A good answer distinguished between the frontier areas and the South and East.

Q.2. 'Reconciling' was the crucial word in this question. For example, the harsh break suggested by Gildas contrasts with the continuity of British settlement demonstrated by archaeologists.

Q.4. Most candidates catalogued Alfred's achievements. It was encouraging to note that the better candidates were familiar with the recently published *Life* by Asser.

Q.6. Answers assumed the worst to be true and set out to prove it! Stigand's career was considered typical of the pre-Conquest church.

Q.7 was the most popular question. Only the better answers put the battle of Hastings in the context of the Norman Conquest and then put forward evidence to show that the Conquest was or was not (a) accomplished by chance and (b) the result of a single battle. The biggest pitfall was failure to distinguish between the battle and the conquest and so many candidates were content to argue that the battle of Hastings was the inevitable conclusion to a chapter of accidents.

Others adopted axioms like 'Normandy was a duchy geared to war', a generalisation to be wary of.

Q.8. Several reasonable answers defined anarchy and then analysed the troubles in Stephen's reign in the light of their definitions in geographical and temporal respects. But many candidates assumed what they were required to prove. Others chose to explain why there was civil war. The candidates who characterised the barons as 'carpet baggers and turncoats' and the period 1135-9 as a 'Honeymoon period' generally failed to explain how people and events fitted their descriptions or how these related to the question.

Q.9. Analysis and explanation of the term 'gravedigger of feudalism' was required. Very good candidates examined Henry II's policies towards the barons and compared them with attempts by William Rufus and Henry I to strengthen royal authority against baronial authority.

Q.10. Answers offered a critique of the justiciarships of Longchamp, Glanvill and Hubert Walter. More effectively, criteria were established by which government could be judged.

Q.11 was answered by a very small number of candidates who wrote about the Cistercians. Excellent summaries of the material are to be found in the writings of Gradsden and Dom David Knowles.

Q.12. Few analysed the quotation and so there were few successful answers to this question. For many candidates the key to dealing with this question was sought in the repetition of unexplained shorthands like: 'King John was his own worst enemy'; 'King John has always come down through history as the bad guy'; 'King John lacked charisma'.

Q.14. Narrative answers abounded here, often without any attempt to summarise the conclusions reached.

Q.15. Closer analysis of the question was required. The candidates who attempted this one paraphrased the question as 'Did Thomas of Lancaster copy Simon de Montfort?' A useful start might have been a comparison of the aims of the Provisions of Oxford with those of the Ordinances of 1311.

Q.16. There was a number of successful answers to this question. Candidates attempted to measure the increased importance of the Commons by looking at impeachment and taxation. They might have looked further at statutes and the increase in summonses of burgesses to parliament after 1350. Weaker candidates asked why the Commons grew in importance during the reign of Edward III.

Q.17. A weakness of successful answers to this question was a failure to explain adequately the points made. Many candidates were content to state that Papal Provisions and the teachings of Wyclif intensified an already existing state. Few explained why. None explored the effect of the papacy's sojourn at Avignon and current Anglo-French relations on the topic.

Q.18. Only the more able appeared to know how Richard II did lose his throne. These candidates too were dissatisfied with the alternatives posed by the question and suggested that the death of John of Gaunt removed a sobering influence on the king and that had Gaunt lived, Richard would not have ill-treated Henry Bolingbroke.

Q.19. Candidates did not read the question closely enough, ignoring the significant word 'intermittent'.

Q.21. The tendency was to answer this question by describing the effects of the Black Death.

Q.22. Answers to this question were general summaries of the reign.

Papers 9020/2-5 (English History, 1450-1964)

(N.B. The questions are numbered as in Paper 5, and from 1 to 20 as in Paper 2. The numbers of questions in Paper 3 are given in brackets *before* Paper 5 numbers. Numbers of questions in Paper 4 are given in brackets *after* Paper 5 numbers.)

General Comments

Work on the earlier part of the period, which is tackled by over half the candidates, illustrated the importance of careful choice of questions. Good candidates who chose Qs. 3, 9, 10 and 12 were able to do very well indeed, while more moderate ones also found that these questions provided ample material and enabled them to make a satisfactory showing. These were rightly, the most popular questions. On the other hand, Qs. 6 and 8, which were also popular, produced rather slight answers from the majority of candidates.

Comments on questions

Q.1. This offered well-informed candidates plenty of scope, but it did require fairly detailed knowledge of the 1450s and the crisis of 1460-1 which many were unable to produce.

Q.2. This produced a very small response, perhaps unsurprisingly, but some candidates were unwise enough to think they could produce an adequate answer from their knowledge of the events leading up to the Treaty of Etaples.

Q.3. This produced many very well informed answers, but many candidates also ignored the last two words of the question. Examiners were looking for reference to the executions of Warwick and Warbeck, and this ought to have led candidates to recognise the relevance of the pretenders and the succession, issues which were surprisingly often neglected. On the other hand, there were some very useful discussions of the question how secure the succession was after 1499, with detailed reference to the conversation at Calais, c.1503.

Q.4. Answers often suffered from not being sufficiently wide-ranging. All aspects of Wolsey's career are relevant and the good answers were those which struck a balance between them instead of getting side-tracked into a detailed account of one aspect, most commonly foreign policy.

Q.5. Many candidates found the wide-ranging nature of this taxing. The question was really intended to give an opportunity to show knowledge of academic debate about the Neale view of Parliament, and there were a few very good answers on these lines. Most answers, however, simply gave an account of the candidate's knowledge of events in which the Commons were involved in this period, and often they only covered part of the period.

Q.6. Many candidates were unable to make much of the quotation, and answers were therefore often slight and shapeless. What was expected was, first, a discussion of the reasons for the dissolution. Was it needless or necessary, and, if necessary, why? Secondly, there should have been discussion of the consequences. Was the dissolution wholly destructive? Was there much of value to destroy? Better candidates noted that destruction could be social or spiritual as well as physical.

Q.7. This produced few good responses. Most answers discussed the causes of social problems in general with little or no reference to population and even less discussion of the possible connections between population growth and, for example, inflation, enclosures or vagrancy.

Q.8. This was popular but answers were often limited, though an encouraging number did try to identify advantages or – more often – disadvantages. The question was intended to encourage candidates to reflect on the situation in 1553 – the unpopularity of Northumberland, Mary's success in ousting Lady Jane Grey and her initial popularity – and from this a sound answer could be constructed from the standard material on religion, the Spanish marriage and foreign policy. Some candidates made good use of the idea that Mary's failure arose primarily from the shortness of her reign.

Q.9. This produced many good answers. The commonest weaknesses were excessive concentration on the settlements (the question is really about the defence of the settlement *throughout* the reign) and lack of understanding of Elizabeth's motives.

Q.10. This also produced many good answers, though for some candidates the temptation to write a narrative was too great and the result was that their answers became overburdened with detail which was not properly utilised.

Q.11. This produced very few answers, to the disappointment but not the surprise of the examiners.

Q.12. This was another very popular question which also produced many good answers. Some candidates, rightly identifying relations with parliament as an important aspect of the answer, tended to get side-tracked into irrelevance, but generally candidates had more than enough relevant material and their difficulty was to organise it convincingly.

Q.13. This was not just a question on the Eleven Years' "Tyranny", as some candidates thought. The first part of the question required some discussion of Charles's relations with parliament from the beginning of the reign as well as the events of 1629. Candidates who concentrated on Wentworth and Laud and ignored Charles's financial measures missed the most obvious answer to the second part of the question.

Q.14. This required detailed knowledge of a complicated period. A few answers handled this material with great skill, producing an analysis of the problem clearly based on a firm grasp of the facts, but most took the form of semi-accurate narratives.

Q.15. The response was disappointing. Candidates preparing this period seem to fight shy of foreign policy. A sound mark could have been obtained by a straightforward discussion of the basic facts, particularly what England gained from the Dutch and Spanish wars. Examiners expected candidates to find difficulty with "cost" but did not expect more than a brief discussion of the financial problems of the Protectorate (though they hoped good candidates might consider the political/diplomatic cost of Cromwellian foreign policy – the idea that he contributed to the rise of French power).

Q.16. There were very few answers, despite the importance of the topic.

Q.(1) 17. This was popular but not often well attempted. It was, admittedly, a difficult question in its range. On the other hand material is abundant and a good answer could be written round the Convention of 1660, the fall of Clarendon, the 1673 sessions and the "Exclusion" parliaments, all of which should be well known. The "Exclusion" crisis was ignored by a surprising number of candidates.

Q.(2) 18. There were comparatively few answers and those candidates who attempted it found difficulty in producing sufficient detail for a satisfactory answer.

Q.(3) 19. This, though not an easy question, was attempted with fair success by a limited number of candidates, though they often concentrated on the war to the exclusion of the Partition Treaties.

Q.(4) 20. Some very good answers were seen. Many candidates had obviously been taught Anglo-Scottish relations from 1689 to 1707 very well, though not all were successful in adapting this material to the precise terms of the question.

Paper 9020/3 (English History, 1660–1832)

Candidates appeared to find no difficulty in selecting questions since most questions concerned major topics.

Q.(5) 21. Not many answers, perhaps because the question demanded more than an account of the 1715 Jacobite Rebellion.

Q.(6) 22. A popular question. Weaker candidates tended to put down in narrative form all they knew about Walpole.

Q.(7) 23. Few answers and only very few candidates considered economic factors.

Q.(8) 24. Some good and interesting answers well argued. Most answers were, on the whole, accurate accounts of the causes of the War of American Independence.

Q.(9) 25. Fewer answers than might have been expected. These were adequate, but the concept of an evolutionary process was discussed with varying degrees of success.

Q.(10) 26. Hardly any answers and these not very good.

Paper 9020/4 (English History, 1783–1964)

General Comments

A feature of 'A' level assessment that has excited interest (and controversy) of late is the narrowness of some of the grade bands. To examiners, however, an equally prominent feature is the enormous range of ability illustrated by candidates' scripts. While there is regret at the long 'tail' of overall failures, the very good scripts reveal an extraordinary quality of understanding and argument and are expressed in a most fluent literary style. The grasp of detail in these scripts is admirable and the deftness with which these candidates handle the variety of arguments is highly commendable.

As an example of what was achieved this year, the following answer to Q.(13) 39 was written. ['A politician of immense influence but only slight achievement.' How far do you agree with this view of Joseph Chamberlain?]

Joseph Chamberlain's influence far exceeds his material achievements; he was one of the greatest "might have beens" in English history not unlike Charles James Fox. His influence can be traced in several directions: his years in Birmingham, his impact on Radical politics and democracy, his imperialist influence, his impact on the Unionist coalition, and his last fling – tariff reform. Richard Jay sums up Chamberlain's career as one of failure and paraphrases Gladstone "although destined to play a great historical part, he lacked the material on which to work his will". Chamberlain's influence was immense compared to his slight achievement.

As the mayor of Birmingham (1873-1876) Chamberlain did achieve much for his party through his policy of "civic gospel" and "gas and water socialism". The practical benefits for his city were great, he did manage to "pave, park, light and improve" his city. He applied with full effect Disraeli's social reform legislation: the effect of this was that the mortality rate in Birmingham fell from 56 per 1000 to 23½. His achievements: Corporation Street, the public libraries, museums and buildings were important, but not unique. Other cities – Sheffield, Cardiff and Newcastle, for example had applied Disraeli's work, but it was Chamberlain's dynamism that gave local government new vigour and energy; he proved what radical liberalism could do at a local level and this would prove to be the inspiration for further reform among other local councils. He brought a professionalism to local government (note the symbolic change from "The Woodman" to the City Hall) which proved an enduring influence.

Chamberlain was the leading figure in radical liberalism, which he so successfully applied in Birmingham. Chamberlain was the first politician to come to terms with democracy and popular politics: his creation, the Birmingham Liberal Federation of 1869 proved to be the model for democratic political machines. His "caucus" politics, although despised by Establishment politicians came to the forefront of English politics after the departure of Salisbury and Gladstone. The National Liberal Federation introduced party conventions, conferences and congresses into British politics and was the blueprint for party organizations in the democratic age. Chamberlainite literature revealed the inadequacies of Gladstonian Liberalism, it was concerned with the people that were left out of the pale of Gladstone's society: the "Unauthorised Programme" advocated the creation of peasant proprietors, "three acres and a cow", pensions and social reform, and free, compulsory secular education. It failed to convert many contemporaries but it is important that Gladstone sought to imitate it with the Newcastle Programme of 1892. It is also important for its influence on later "New Liberals" like Churchill and Lloyd George, and the reforms they promoted. Lloyd George once said that there would have been little work for the Liberal party to do in 1906 had Chamberlain not been driven out. Chamberlain's influence on the rise of the collectivist state is very significant, however his practical achievements were slight. At the Board of Trade, 1880-1885, he passed minor administrative reforms; his role in the 1884 Reform Campaign was mainly that of whipping up anti-Lords feeling and was not particularly useful. Under the Unionists the appeal of Old Age Pensions diminished before the splendour of Empire, the 1897 Workmen's Compensation act is the only important piece of social legislation passed while Chamberlain was in the Cabinet.

Chamberlain's importance as an imperialist was immense: his desertion in 1886 from the Government benches has been over rated. The Whigs under Hartington composed most of those that went to join the Tories, John Bright, the elder statesman of Liberalism, probably had more influence over the Radicals than had Chamberlain in advocating secession. Chamberlain helped destroy Home Rule in 1886 and ensured that the Liberals were not in the position to reintroduce it until 1906. As Colonial Secretary his influence was most extensive and his achievement least impressive: he believed that the Empire was an estate to be developed for the benefit of the colonists and the natives. He invested Treasury capital into steamship lines for Empire, into telegraphs in South Africa, into irrigation schemes, road building and agricultural improvements; he established the School of Tropical Medicine in London. His view of Empire was to be more influential after the Boer War when Empire was in decline, his influence on Lord Minto, the Liberal Viceroy

of India in 1906 is significant. Chamberlain's ideas of Imperial unity through an Imperial Parliament and through Imperial defence came to nothing because the dominions did not want to become part of a new Empire: indeed Chamberlain's activities 1899-1902 were taken up with the Boer War and "methods of Barbarism" which did so much to destroy the spirit of Empire. Chamberlain's ideas about Imperial unity had only a romantic interest for Conservatives, and did not play a part in practical policy.

Chamberlain had several significant influences on the Tory party: Richard Jay describes how he was the man largely responsible for converting the party from being a landed, aristocratic, unimaginative party under the Cecil family to the middle-class, big business party of Bonar Law. Chamberlain did give the Unionists a dynamic that Salisbury or Balfour could not provide, he was the man who made Imperialism a feature of popular Toryism, and who was Disraeli's heir. Even after his stroke his influence in the party was considerable, his supporters constituted two thirds of the parliamentary party in 1906. In 1909 tariff reform was the official programme of the Unionists; Bonar Law was a Chamberlainite; Austen and Neville Chamberlain both led the Conservative party in the 1920s and 1930s.

Tariff reform was Chamberlain's last crusade, he achieved nothing practical before his death in 1914. Chamberlain created the Tariff Reform League to promote Imperial preference, to draw the empire together, and to protect British industry from American and German competition and to provide the finances for social reform. He achieved a split in the Tory party which allowed the Liberals to take office, ensure the continuance of free trade and divide the Union with Ireland. However, the Unionists did adapt free trade and the Colonial Conference of 1932 did adapt it in a modified form; protection became part of Baldwin's economic strategy during the 1920s and 1930s.

Chamberlain was a political failure, he had a great insight into the long term problems facing Britain, but was unable to translate his ideas into practice, in that respect he was like Cassandra. Chamberlain's achievements are unimpressive on a national level, on a personal level and in Birmingham they are considerable: the fact remains that Chamberlain was more important for what he was than for what he did.

At the other end of the scale the number of candidates who fail outright gives cause for concern. In many, if not most, cases these are candidates who have already gained a satisfactory grade at 'O' level in this subject. Often the candidate's lack of historical skill is evident in the failure to present an argument of any kind, relevant or otherwise. Sometimes scripts show that even after two years' study the candidate is deficient in both basic knowledge and literary skills. It should be emphasized that, while an 'A' level pass does not require a great mass of detailed knowledge, it does assume sufficient command of the basic material of the main topics around which the question papers are constructed.

The importance of a clear literary style cannot be repeated too frequently. Too often potentially good candidates fail to make the most of their knowledge, simply because their expression is either too vague or too long-winded. It is almost ritual for History teachers to urge wide reading upon their candidates, not only for the development of arguments but also to help in the acquisition of a wider vocabulary. Teachers of History are as important as any others in improving essay writing and in teaching essay technique. It is not the prerogative of the best candidates to write clearly and effectively. The average candidate ought to aim at writing essays with

nicely judged generalisations, sustained by well chosen vocabulary and organised into coherent paragraphs.

Two points about examination technique, though mentioned in previous reports, need to be repeated. A small number of candidates continue to mismanage their time and to complete only three answers. It is obvious that they are penalising themselves. A rushed final answer is more understandable, especially when three good answers have been written already. But this is also a practice to be avoided since all questions are marked out of 25. The other point concerns essay plans. Given that candidates are often seeing a particular problem for the first time, planning an answer is essential. Most candidates do not commit their plans to paper and probably do not need to do so. Some write at length, and it is the length of these plans that examiners consider counter-productive. Some plans continue for a whole page and others are nearly as long as the essay that follows. A plan based on four of five themes would seem to be ample.

Comments on Questions

Q.(11)27(1). Widely answered. Pitt is the first political personality included in the period covered by Paper 4 and it is to be expected that candidates will have a sound grasp of his term of office. The period, however, is a long one, and the narrative approach to this question led many candidates into problems of timing and relevance. Generally, Pitt's peacetime policies were well known, but the period after 1793 was often neglected. Good answers went beyond policies to examine Pitt's relationship with the Crown and the weaknesses of the Whigs.

Q.(12)28(2). Few answers. Given the length of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars questions on Britain's involvement in the campaigns on land and sea can be anticipated. There were, however, few answers on this relatively straightforward question. Good answers concentrated not only on the fluctuations of the battlefield but also stressed the assistance of the Spanish and Portuguese guerrilla forces and the importance of the navy.

Q.(13)29(3). Few answers. This question seemed to encourage vague and unsubstantiated generalisation and examiners wondered why this question was so poorly done. Very few answers attempted to make the link between improved transport and the development of industrialisation in Britain. What was looked for was a discussion of the effects of canals, turnpikes, shipping and the start of railways.

Q.(14)30(4). A popular question. Good candidates immediately realised that this question required an assessment of Liverpool's policies and leadership. Weaker candidates, who were prepared for a 'distress and discontent' question, were rather baffled and were determined to use their material anyway. The many good answers usually balanced the government's record in the post-war period against the period of Liberal Toryism. The best discussed Liverpool's managerial role and put his leadership into the context of the period. Some candidates were unsure about 'Arch-Mediocrity' but by assuming this was a hostile verdict coped with the question quite sensibly.

Q.31(5). A popular question. The prepared answer was quite noticeable in many scripts, where candidates wished to turn this question into a comparison between the Chartists and Anti-Corn Law League. While some credit could be gained from this approach, it also involved much irrelevance. The scope of the question was intended to include the whole range of popular political movements from 1830 to 1848. Those who included the Reform actions of 1831-2, the Factory Reform movement, the early trade unions and the reaction to the New Poor Law were given the higher marks. The best answers were those that differentiated between 'understandable' and 'futile'.

Q.32(6). Not many answers. While this period appears to be confused as far as the parties are concerned, the question is a fairly obvious one to be asked. Most candidates were quite competent on its starting point – the split in the Tories in 1846. Few, however, were able to offer any analysis of party politics after that, or even to discuss the major political personalities of the period.

Q.33(7). Not many answers. Few candidates were prepared for an analysis in depth of the causes of the Crimean War. Details of the immediate causes were usually sparse, although Anglo-Russian relations from 1833 were generally well known.

Q.34(8). Not many answers. The long period covered by the question and the request for a discussion of 'attitudes' probably persuaded most candidates to steer clear of this problem. Those that tackled it rarely produced good answers. It was expected that some of the following themes would be examined: the process of self-government for white colonies, the maintenance of strategic possessions for the purpose of trade, the increasing value of colonies for Britain's trade and the popular interest in Imperialism from the 1870s. Some candidates tried to work out an answer from their knowledge of foreign policy, notably Palmerston's, but relevance was often lost.

Q.35(9). Widely answered. Gladstone's First Ministry was well known but the mass of material available meant that candidates had to be discriminating in their selection of detail. Since the question called for assessment, it was not necessary for answers to explain the origins and background of all Gladstone's reforms. The catalogue approach took its toll when some answers omitted reference to foreign affairs, an aspect especially relevant in the case of the Second Ministry. Although the importance of Irish affairs was evident, some answers petered out in 1885.

Q.36(10). Very few answers.

Q.37(11). Few answers, and those few not well done. While most candidates seem more at home with politicians, there are grounds for examining the effect of their reforms, in this case in terms of living conditions. Legislation, especially on housing, was passed after 1870 but the problem is that assessment of its effectiveness depended on a candidate's understanding of local government.

Q.38(12). Not many answers. This appeared to be a fairly challenging quotation, but candidates who provided a relevant examination of the more usual material on the rise of the Labour Party were on the right lines.

Q.39(13). A popular question. The basic details of Chamberlain's career were well known. It was possible to tackle the question in a chronological manner as long as some form of judgment was included at appropriate points. Differing views of his influence and achievement emerged, but some answers were strangely reticent about the least controversial aspect of his career, his period as Mayor of Birmingham.

Q.40(14). Widely answered. The main lines of the crisis period of 1909 to 1911 were quite well covered. What gave the better candidates a chance to show their quality was their discussion of the underlying causes of the constitutional clash. The role of Asquith in the crisis period seems to have become devalued in the eyes of many candidates. Frequently, answers were expressed entirely in terms of Lloyd George and without mention of Asquith.

Q.41(15). Not many answers, even though the development of British foreign policy before 1914 is a fairly standard theme. Good answers succeeded in examining the decision-making in July and August 1914 and placed this in the context of Anglo-German hostility and the making of the Ententes. Those who set out to provide an account of British policy from 1900 rarely provided any worthwhile relevant analysis.

Q.42(16). Few answers. Chronological treatment of this problem was impossible, but few candidates succeeded in sorting out the relevant themes.

Q.43(17). Very few answers.

Q.44(18). Few answers. This was a straightforward question. Some candidates tended to see it in terms of unemployment and little more. The essentials were an assessment of industries (old and new) and an examination of the contrasting performance of the country's different regions.

Q.45(19). Not many answers. The nature of appeasement was quite well understood and a variety of interpretations was possible. Few candidates, however, were willing to come to any conclusion on how 'realistic' the alternatives to Chamberlain's policy were.

Q.46(20). Few answers. This was perhaps the enthusiast's question. A number of candidates coped with this exceptionally well, providing both meticulous detail and impressive argument.

Qs.47(21), 48(22), 49(23). Very few answers. The post-1945 section of the paper has attracted fewer answers this year.

Papers 9072/4, 9073/3 and 9020/6 (English Social and Economic History, c.1815–1973)

In some respects, the work of many candidates was disappointing because they failed to tackle the challenges posed by the questions. Cautious and conventional answers; narrative at the expense of analysis; most responses displayed these characteristics.

As on previous occasions, the majority of candidates tackled questions from Section A of the paper – over 90% of answers related to this period – c.1815 to 1914. Answers to questions on the 20th century (Section B), however, often showed rather more independent judgement and perspective, qualities that were sometimes missing in responses to 19th century topics. It also has to be stated that candidates were inclined to reproduce material unselectively in the answers on this period, as if the paper required them to write all they knew about their chosen topics.

On a more positive note, style and presentation were, with very few exceptions, wholly acceptable as were grammar and spelling, though perennial errors had a habit of reappearing, e.g. Beverage, Bessant and Poor Law Amendment Act (sic).

The most popular question was *Q.1*, which invited comment on and analysis of the early years of industrialisation. The context of the quotation encouraged some candidates to contrast the Hammonds' interpretation with that of historians who have taken an opposing view; otherwise answers were frequently inflated with accounts of the evils of the early industrial town, factory and mill.

Q.2 on Chartism produced a crop of answers that seldom rose above a straight narrative of the movement. *Qs. 8, 9 and 10* were next in order of popularity and frequently evoked conventional responses; there were some knowledgeable accounts of the Great Depression (*Q.8 (b)*), though these often lacked any reference to agriculture. Most candidates had a good grasp of the evolution of school education in the 19th century (*Q.9*), but only those with analytical skill rose to the challenge of the word 'why' which prefaced the question. *Q.10* gave rise to much unselective treatment, and there was a frequent tendency to refer to both legal decisions and legislation.

The rest of Section A generated a variable response – answers to *Q.5* on world trade evoked reflections that later reappeared in answers to *Q.8*.

Attempts at interpretation of the two tables, *Qs. 4* and very infrequently, *Q.18*, seldom rose above a mere description of the figures. *Qs. 3* and *6* were largely avoided, whilst candidates attempting to discuss the emergence of self-help (*Q.6*) were frequently out of their depth. Few answers were received on the remainder of this section (A) though there were some competent accounts of public health (if not medical care) in *Q.12*.

As already noted, answers to questions in Section B were in short supply and tended to be related to topics dealing with the inter-war years. Answers to the most popular themes, especially *Qs. 13* and *14*, were competently presented but few contrived references to the ever-growing amount of literature on this period. Housing and education (*Qs. 22* and *23*) when tackled, produced some knowledgeable answers but the rest of the section was studiously avoided except by a small minority.

Paper 9020/7

The great majority of candidates were able to answer four questions. The number of incomplete scripts was few. *Qs. 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 11* and *15* were the most popular and there was a tendency for candidates to concentrate upon the questions from the first half of the paper. Certain questions attracted few answers, e.g. *Qs. 3 (a)* and *(b)*, *6, 9, 12, 13, 14* and *16*. There were no attempts at all at *Q.9 (b)*.

Most candidates demonstrated a good knowledge of the subject and seemed to have been well prepared, even when they were unable to make much use of what they had learnt. The general standard of literacy was high. The examiner was impressed with the standard of achievement and would like to congratulate schools on the quality of the work. There were a number of really excellent scripts.

Various weaknesses did however spoil the performances of many candidates. Too many students seemed to have memorised class notes and repeated them verbatim. While this method may have the merit of ensuring a low failure rate it hardly does justice to the potential of brighter students, since it prevents them from demonstrating an ability to organise information for themselves and to display originality. What was often lacking was any evidence of independent reading, especially of specialist works, in the answers of the better candidates. Many candidates lacked examination technique. 'A' level students must be trained to interpret the question accurately. It seems an obvious point to make that pupils should look at the question carefully and organise their answers accordingly, but it is remarkable how many candidates simply neglected to answer the question. Also, intellectual questions, such as *Q.1*, seem to highlight the difficulty many candidates have in thinking in conceptual terms. Most candidates were reasonably armed with facts but again a large number learnt interpretations as if they, too, were facts. The highest marks were awarded to candidates who made sensible use of what they had learnt. Some centres presented good candidates who threw away marks by 'fading' after attempting only two questions, usually from a limited field of study.

Answers to *Q.1* too often tempted candidates to unload all they knew about the Constitution and many were unsure about the definition of 'conservative' and 'radical'. The best ones looked analytically at the key features of the document and there were some genuinely thoughtful answers, especially from those centres which have been familiarised with recent scholarship on the subject. Narrative tended to predominate in answers to *Q.2*, and the common failure here was an

inability to place the dispute in the wider context of domestic policies. *Q.3* was unpopular. The first choice was competently tackled, on the whole, although many merely looked at the 1837 crisis, ignoring earlier and later panics. Answers to *Q.3 (b)* lacked balance; the first part was generally satisfactory but the social and economic consequences were poorly dealt with. *Q.4* proved to be the most popular question on the paper and was well answered; most candidates were strong on factual information and many centres seem to be familiar with recent research on Jackson. A common problem was for the candidate to be too eulogistic about Jackson and to ascribe his election success merely to personal popularity. The more perceptive candidates avoided an old-fashioned approach and looked closely at both elections, also at the nature and strength of opposition to him. Answers to *Q.5* were quite thorough, with candidates showing good knowledge of the circumstances under which slaves lived. To make their point, stronger candidates cited specific revolts and explored the social and more subtle methods of slave control as well as the physical. Credit was given to those candidates who showed evidence of reading even a fraction of the enormous literature available on this theme. *Q.6* attracted few candidates. Scarcely anyone attempted *Q.6 (i)*, while *Q.6 (ii)* offered a challenge to astute candidates. Some gave a hazy account of frontier life, while others recognised the potential of the question and explored the full ramifications of the frontier on American life. *Q.7* elicited some thoughtful answers although many abandoned critical analysis for a narrative account of the broad political developments in the 1850s. This is the kind of question which demands a more disciplined approach than some candidates were able to give. Weaker candidates were insufficiently briefed on the problems of the Whig and later Democratic parties and simply did not understand the new political alignments. This question called for far more than a consideration of the 1854 Kansas-Nebraska Act. Of the questions which produced confusion, it was *Q.8* that was the most misunderstood. Weak candidates could not explain in what way the war created strains amongst white Southerners and almost defensively emphasised Southern solidarity. Most were knowledgeable on the second part. *Q.9* generated very few responses and it is interesting to note that not one candidate looked at the Supreme Court after the Civil War. Far too many gave a potted narrative of the careers of Chief Justices Marshall and Taney, without addressing themselves to the question. Surprisingly few referred to the Dred Scott case. Only the better prepared candidates were able to focus closely on the problems of the 'new immigrants' and black Americans in *Q.10*. In the time-honoured tradition of comparative questions, this question produced in the main unbalanced answers. The problems of black Americans were sketchily dealt with. It was not unreasonable to expect candidates to have heard of Booker T. Washington and Du Bois. Strongly recommended reading on this subject is Marcus Lee Hanson's "The Immigrant in America" (Harper & Row) and "The Underside of American History" (second edition, vol. II - publ. H.B.J.) edited by Thomas Frazier. *Q.11* was a popular question and generally well done. Many candidates were well briefed on the subject but did not address themselves to each part of the question. Some glossed over the problems of the farmers, while others looked at the populist and other movements without considering the practicality of their solutions. The question of currency reform was not thoroughly grasped by many candidates. Progressivism in *Q.12* was generally well understood by those who attempted it. Some could not avoid succumbing to narrative but there were many high quality answers here, and invariably from those who had taken account of recent scholarship on the subject. *Qs. 13 and 14* were unpopular.

With a few notable exceptions, many were unable to rise above prepared answers on Wilson's foreign policy and made little concession to the precise needs of the question. A common fault was to equate Wilson's foreign policy with Europe and to neglect its wider dimension, particularly with regard to Latin America. Stronger candidates took up the invitation offered by the question and presented a cogent, well-argued case. There were few sound answers to *Q.14*. It was taken by some as an opportunity to unload notes on the 1920s. There were few genuine attempts to explain why America turned to conservatism, which was the nub of the question. Good answers also identified the fear of communism and anarchism as the main consequence together with the growth of laissez-faire in economic matters. On this specific topic candidates could profitably look at "Twentieth Century America - Recent Interpretations on the 1920s and 1930s" (second edition, edited by B. J. Bernstein and A. J. Matuson. H.B.J. Press).

Q.15 was a popular question but approached by many in an out-of-date way. They failed to see the possibilities in the question and ignored the word 'most'. There was also little evidence of personal reading on the wealth of new material on the subject. *Q.16* attracted few candidates. The answers showed a reasonably thorough knowledge of the United States in the Second World War but were unable to adapt their material relevantly.

Many candidates produced too much factual detail with insufficient analysis and awareness of recent scholarship. Having said that, it is also to be noted that a substantial minority performed extremely well and showed ability to organise, assess and interpret with a maturity of style and finesse. The overall impression formed from the marking of scripts was a favourable one, suggestive of sound and enthusiastic teaching of a syllabus covering an extensive chronological range.

Paper 9020/10

Range of questions attempted: *Qs. 1-7, 9-15, 17, 18.*

Essays on Rome (*Q.1*) and Gregory I (*Q.2*) were very much stock essays. Some candidates had difficulty in deciding the point at which to pick up Roman history: a few played for safety and started with the monarchy. Most candidates saw Gregory I's career in a short perspective: few saw him as the founder of the medieval papacy.

The Merovingians (*Q.3*) were handled very confidently. There was some confusion between the 'strong' kings of the early years of the dynasty and the 'weak' kings of the latter part of the story. The role of the dowager queens in the age of conflict is now well-known, and more could be made of the stability provided by nobility and church, and especially by wealthy and well-connected bishops. The supportive role of the Carolingians until the mid-8th century was discussed in very sensible terms.

Louis the Pious produced a number of stock narratives. It was rare to find his experience in Aquitaine discussed. Too often, schemes for eventual division of his possessions were discussed as if they were actual partitions.

Q.4 - the Vikings attracted a few candidates who had clearly been affected by Viking exhibitions and by developments at York. I had expected more on the homeland of the Scandinavians, largely because of the emphasis on that aspect in the London exhibition, but it was good to see York so well understood. I feel that the candidates had escaped from the class-room and the 'notes'.

Otto I (*Q.6*) retains his popularity. Barraclough's views are the orthodoxy with

little recognition of the attempts since his day to scale down the vision of the dynasty and the range over which they could think politically.

With Gregory VII (Q.7) there were essays on 'famous last words' and some realistic assessments of his involvement in secular politics. There were fewer straight narratives than might have been expected.

With the Capetians and Angevins (Q.9) geographical factors proved difficult. Candidates do not work with maps, and are vague about the general lie of the land. Major details of anything beyond Normandy are likely to be a problem. Would more use of Elizabeth Hallam on the Capetians or, when it appears, Gillingham on the Angevins, be helpful? His book on *Richard the Lionheart* is a good example of how the historical problems and the geographical factors can be handled in harness. Qs. 10 and 11 seemed to open up familiar material in unfamiliar ways, but the few candidates who attempted them were not thinking imaginatively.

Essays on the Fourth Crusade (Q.12) produced some narrative, and often a brief ascription of success (for the Venetians) and loss (for everyone else), with the papacy taking first innings points for gaining control of the eastern church.

Essays on the thirteenth century were rarely of high standard. Innocent III (Q.13) was allowed vigour, but defining his vision was more difficult. There was a disappointing lack of definition and understanding for Frederick II (Q.14).

The friars (Q.15) were badly served. Their commitment in society was noted. There was nothing on their purpose, their flexibility, their organisation, or their functions in universities and the 'Holy Office'. The positive aspect of this question is that recent work on the Cistercians is filtering through, and they are being seen as forerunners in the early 13th century of the friars as missionary preachers in southern France.

Q.18 deserves comment because candidates were well informed on the 14th century, included passing references to Henry V but knew nothing about Joan of Arc and the rehabilitation of the French monarchy. With such a broad question, allowance for that kind of problem must clearly be made. There does seem to be a need to see the period of warfare from Edward III to Henry VI as a whole, and not piecemeal.

Papers 9020/11-14

(N.B. The questions are numbered as in Paper 14, and from 1 to 20 as in Paper 11. The numbers of questions in Paper 12 are given in brackets *before* Paper 14 numbers. Numbers of questions in Paper 13 are given in brackets *after* Paper 14 numbers.)

Paper 9020/11 (European History, 1450-1715)

The overall standard was a little higher at the Pass level although there was not so much evidence of the accomplished standards which merited the highest grades. It was heartening to read answers which were relevant and in which convincing arguments were supported by adequate and appropriate factual knowledge. Some examiners, however, pointed to evidence of weakness in literacy in some centres. Even taking into account the demands of writing under pressure in an examination, there is no excuse for mis-spelling even basic words, including names and historical terms frequently found in the most available textbooks.

There was often a satisfactory balance in answers to Q.1, although some of the weaker candidates were unsure about the extent to which the Ottoman Empire expanded. The quality of discussions of Spain in the late fifteenth and early six-

teenth centuries has improved recently and there were perceptive answers to Q.2, although some concentrated too much on Ferdinand and Isabella to the exclusion of any consideration of their respective states. Q.3 produced answers on the Renaissance which were as varied as ever. There were also signs of an imbalance in answers to Qs. 5 and 6. In the first, many candidates did not seem to understand the significance of Burgundy in the Habsburg-Valois quarrel and, in the second, a few neglected to examine "the magnificent facade" of Francis I's reign.

Both Lutheranism and Catholicism were explained well in Qs. 7 and 8, although some of those who discussed Luther could have been clearer in their analysis of his doctrines. Answers to Qs. 9 and 10 were often convincing but candidates sometimes assumed one side of an argument without considering any alternatives. Some were too willing to condemn Philip II whilst others failed to discuss the religious issues at stake in the French civil wars. After this sequence of good answers, the essays on Qs. 11-15 were less successful. The discussion of Calvinism in the Netherlands was often vague, whilst few even attempted to consider whether the (authentic) quotation about seventeenth-century Spain contained any element of truth. Virtually all concentrated only on signs of Spanish decline.

The more competent answers to Q.14 showed detailed knowledge of the Treaty of Westphalia on which arguments could be based and related this knowledge to the issues at stake in the War. In Q.15, the essays were more convincing when explaining the restoration of the fortunes of the Orange family in 1672 than when discussing its fall in 1651. Many answers to Q.16 were confident although some would have been improved if they had considered explicitly the situation in France and Europe in 1659.

Paper 9020/12 (European History, 1610-1815)

The overall approach to the paper was rather uneven. Candidates seemed to concentrate on some familiar aspects of the syllabus to the exclusion of others which were also significant areas of study. If one were to offer advice to centres, it would be to avoid too narrow a concentration on stock topics. This tends to lead to a narrow focus and often to the reproduction of "pre-packed" answers.

Answers to Q.(1)/17, on Colbert, were often knowledgeable but descriptive, with insufficient consideration of the "revolutionary" aspects of his work. Similarly, answers to Q.(2)/18, although sometimes full of facts, tended to ignore the more precise aspect of the role of the rulers in the Baltic struggle. The better answers to Q.(4)/20 showed a particular knowledge of the Treaty of Utrecht which made specific the general argument about the balance of power at the end of the War of Spanish Succession. Those who answered Q.(5)/21, on criticisms of the Catholic Church and the Jesuits, also earned marks by references to individual people and states; the less convincing essays tended to be characterised by vague assertions. Most answers to Q.(6)/22 were well balanced as candidates disentangled the reasons for, and results of, rivalry over commerce and overseas empire in the mid-eighteenth century.

The quality of answers to Q.(7)/23 was very variable. Convincing arguments needed to show some real understanding of the reign of Louis XV and little credit could be given to those who provided only a superficial survey of conditions in France. There were intelligent appraisals of Frederick the Great in Q.(8)/24 and answers to Q.(9)/25 were usually well informed, although some neglected a critical appraisal of Maria Theresa, confining themselves to a descriptive narrative. This

contrasted with answers to *Q.(10)26*, in which there were incisive discussions of Catherine II's domestic policies.

Unfortunately, there were few well-informed discussions of *Q.(11)27*, on the philosophes, and of *Q.(12)28*, on enlightened rulers in the lesser states. This leads to the suggestion that there should be a wider study of countries in this century and a greater concentration on the ideas which were propagated in this period.

Paper 9020/13 (European History, 1789–1964)

There was generally a reasonable spread of answers in this option but it was noticeable again that very few study the period after 1939. This is perfectly allowable within the syllabus but would be a matter of regret to those who believe in the value of studying more recent history. Some examiners commented on the indifferent standard of literacy in some centres (and not a few on the difficulty of reading scripts which had been written in cheap ballpoint pens which had smeared their ink over the sheets by the time that they were read).

In *Q.(14)30(1)*, there were signs that some recent, but readily available, work on the lower orders in the French Revolution had been studied by candidates, although some were not able to differentiate between attitudes in the towns and the countryside. Answers to *Q.(15)31(2)* were usually sufficiently full of factual detail but candidates varied in the extent to which they concentrated on an argument in an attempt to assess Napoleon I's alleged policy of self-defence. On the whole, answers to *Q.32(3)* were crisply argued. This was in contrast to the paucity of convincing answers to *Qs.33(4)*, *34(5)* and *38(9)*. These again revealed that few candidates attempt questions which lie outside political history and that, even in political history, their studies are often pre-packed into certain periods so that, for example, the study of Russian history begins with Alexander II. Similarly, in *Qs.42(13)* and *43(14)*, the answers again indicated that studies of Germany and France tend to end with Bismarck and with the downfall of Napoleon III until they are resumed after the First World War. In particular, the approaches to *Q.42(13)*, on the Third Republic in France, were often episodic and lacked an underlying argument.

Qs.35(6), *37(8)* and *39(10)* on the Ottoman Empire, the 1848 Revolutions and Cavour, were usually well informed and well argued but some answers to *Q.35(6)* could have explained the condition of the Ottoman Empire more convincingly. Answers to *Q.40(11)* were usually relevant but some candidates would have gained more credit if they had attempted to define more explicitly Napoleon III's alleged liberalism. *Q.41(12)* showed the danger of trying to reproduce a prepared answer when the essays sometimes failed to delineate the tensions between France and Germany before 1914. Many preferred to write a general account of the causes of the War; some even omitted any reference to Alsace-Lorraine.

The essays written on *Q.44(15)* were usually well balanced and some dealt perceptively with the reforms introduced in Russia after 1905. There were fewer answers than expected to *Q.45(16)*, on the First World War, and some of these few provided only a narrative. The quality of discussion in *Qs.46(17)* and *47(18)*, on the Bolshevik regime and the Weimar Republic, was better but some who answered *Q.47(18)* could have attempted to examine the strides to success which the new regime in Germany had taken by 1929. Answers to *Qs. 48(19)* and *49(20)* could have been more relevant. In *Q.48(19)*, too many were content to explain only why Mussolini came to power, neglecting the later years referred to specifically in the question. In *Q.49(20)*, a significant number failed to examine Hitler's objectives in

foreign policy, simply dealing with various crises in turn or producing a pastiche of their reading by asserting that he had no objectives.

Overall, whilst the better candidates were able to write relevant and well supported answers, the less able candidates often showed an inability to apply their knowledge to the best advantage. Those who gained low grades usually did so for two reasons: first, insufficient knowledge which made it impossible to frame a substantiated answer and, secondly, an inability to show that flexibility in handling material which is a necessary condition of success at this level. This contrasted with the more able who showed a real, and often refreshing, understanding and an ability to display their historical skills.

Paper 9020/14 (European History, 1450–1964)

Those who study this syllabus are pointed also to the Reports on 9020/11-13 because many of the comments in these apply to the performance of candidates in this option. This Report will therefore raise those points which are in general not mentioned elsewhere or to which more particular attention should be drawn.

The first is a general comment about the plans which candidates sometimes write at the beginning of their answers. Whilst such plans may be useful as a framework for answers, they were unnecessarily long in some instances and may well have taken too much time to write. In most cases, a few brief comments or phrases are sufficient as a guide. Occasionally, candidates spent so long writing a plan that it was almost better than the completed answer.

As for more detailed comments on answers, those essays on the first half of the sixteenth century tended to be more secure than those on the second half. For example, few could explain satisfactorily the role of Calvinism in the Dutch revolt, referred to in *Q.11* and many confined their discussion of *Q.8*, on the "Counter-Reformation", to the Council of Trent. On the other hand, there were convincing essays on *Q.6*, on Francis I, and on *Q.7*, on Luther, although some did not spend enough time examining the specific issue of the rapid spread of his teachings. *Q.13* showed a tendency in many candidates to assume a very general and uncritical view of a situation, in this case the condition of Spain in the seventeenth century. Most assumed a complete decline and did not even begin to consider why Spain could still have been one of the major powers in Europe, as she clearly was during the years at issue. Other questions called for a more precise approach and candidates who answered *Q.14* gained credit when they related in a detailed and appropriate way the terms of the Treaty of Westphalia to the issues at stake in the Thirty Years' War. Similarly, the more successful discussions of *Q.16* succeeded in considering the situation in 1659 whereas the weaker answers often provided only a general survey of the policies of Richelieu and Mazarin.

There was a tendency in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to concentrate on a few familiar topics, which were usually biographical and political. Consequently, whilst discussions of Frederick the Great, Maria Theresa and Catherine II were often confident and perceptive, those of the Catholic Church, the "philosophes" and the minor powers of Europe were not as convincing. As has been pointed out in the comments on 9020/11-13, centres might well be advised not to concentrate on a few problems. It is often noticeable that some candidates tend to reproduce answers on the popular topics without attempting to frame a suitably designed argument. This comment can be applied particularly this year to answers on *Q.32*, on the intervention in revolutionary movements, *Q.35*, on the Ottoman

Empire, and Q.37, on the 1848 Revolutions.

There were convincing arguments written in the answers to many of the questions on the nineteenth century, and particularly to Q.31, on Napoleon I, and Q.39, on Cavour. Happily, there were also some convincing analyses of the Zollverein, in Q.36, a topic which does not often appear on the paper. Answers on the French Third Republic were variable because some candidates did not appreciate whether the forces involved in a series of crises represented the right or the left and were content to describe the various crises without any analysis of their significance. Two questions on Russia in the early twentieth century, Qs.44 and 46, revealed a close study of the fall of Tsarism and of the establishment of the Bolshevik regime. After this, however, the general quality was very variable and, as has been pointed out in the Report on 9020/13, there are still few centres who seem to study the period after 1939.

Comments on 9020/11-14

1. The general standard was satisfactory and that in 9020/11 showed an improvement at the Pass level, although there seemed to be fewer candidates who gained the higher grades by incisive, complete and well written answers.

2. The concentration on political history is still noticeable, apart from particular topics such as the Reformation. An effort is made when setting the papers to encourage a wider range of study, often by composing questions which are actually more straightforward than those on familiar topics, but they usually attract only a slight response, and many of these attempts are by the more desperate candidates.

3. The quality of literacy was satisfactory on the whole. The problem, and it can be a problem, is usually confined to certain centres. In such cases, it is not only a question of spelling and punctuation but of the more general issues of paragraph and essay structure.

4. The lack of answers on the period after 1939 was apparent again.

Papers 9020/15, 9072/3, 9073/2 (World Affairs since c.1960)

This report seeks to summarise the strengths and weaknesses of the work of candidates: it begins with questions which proved popular and moves on to the questions attempted by only a small number of candidates.

The two most popular questions were Qs. 12 and 33: they were answered by the majority in competent fashion. Most candidates had a good knowledge of the weaknesses and successes of either President Kennedy or President Johnson. Most answers rightly started with J.F.K.'s stirring Inaugural Address (Jan. 20, 1961) and went on to review the 'Bay of Pigs', the Alliance for Progress, the Vienna meeting with Khrushchev, the Cuban crisis (Oct. '62), the 'Hot-line' agreement of 1963. Many were less sure about Kennedy's domestic record but accurately indicated his difficulties in getting the cooperation of Congress. Candidates writing about Johnson concentrated rightly on the successes he had with Congress (Civil Rights, social welfare, etc.) and his dramatic efforts to bring the Vietnam war to an end. The second most popular question was on "Gaullism". There were some very good answers about the nature of Gaullism. The most surprising failure was that many candidates wrote about Pompidou and Giscard d'Estaing but offered little (or even nothing at all) on the most interesting aspect of the legacy of de Gaulle in terms of the record of President Mitterand since 1981.

Many candidates wrote answers to Q.1: the weakness of most answers was that they seized on the word 'aid' and decided to write everything they could think of simply about the nature and origins of this issue. Some went on reiterating very simple propositions such as the fact that in their view, the west has a moral duty to provide aid and that failure to do so is scandalous and iniquitous. Nothing therefore in these scripts about the question asked; often they crudely regurgitated Brandt. Whether such aid is 'crucial' for the industrialised countries often received no mention at all beyond saying that it must continue and be constantly increased. Nothing in such answers therefore about the pattern of international trade, the changing pattern of commodity prices, terms of trade, the nature of capital flows, etc.

Q.6 on NATO was also fairly popular: many candidates pointed out the important consequences for the Treaty of de Gaulle's 1966 decision to take France out of the military organisation but only a few candidates managed to write about the difficulties over Portugal from 1974, the problems for the alliance over hostilities between Greece and Turkey since the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in 1974, or (surprisingly) the growing difficulties in the 1980s over divisions between Western European governments and Washington over the whole basic strategy for NATO, including the difficulties of some governments (Netherlands, for example) of persuading their citizens to accept the stationing of Cruise missiles on their territory.

Q.14 was answered by many candidates who were unable to understand the meaning of the concept of 'national interest': such answers only gave summaries of nationality problems either in the USSR itself or in the satellite regions of Eastern Europe.

Q.35 on the difficulties of widening the membership of the European Community was tackled by many candidates but few seemed aware of the basic issue which stems from Article 233 of the Rome Treaty (establishing the EEC): it makes it necessary for applications from states wishing to join to secure the unanimous support of existing members. Many candidates did not know of the history of the UK application - Macmillan applied to explore terms for the UK to become a member in July 1961. The application met with a refusal from de Gaulle in January 1963 and Wilson's efforts to secure entry were also turned down in 1967. The result of these basic problems of admitting new members was that it was only on Jan. 1 1973 that the UK, Denmark and the Republic of Ireland were able to join - Norway sought to join but a referendum resulted in the withdrawal of its application. Because so many candidates were unaware of this, many answers concentrated on difficulty over the Common Agricultural Policy, Common Fisheries Policy, even the European Monetary system. Many wrote about widespread suspicion of moving to a united Europe.

Q.31 (on Vietnam threatening S.E. Asia). Those who attempted this question rightly surveyed the invasion of Cambodia (Kampuchea) but few referred to the fears of ASEAN (Association of S.E. Asian Nations), and fewer still raised the issue of Vietnam as a Soviet ally being a factor in the making of policy in S.E. Asia.

Qs. 22 and 27: the majority of candidates lost marks because they only tackled half the question: in the case of Q.22, there were some good answers which dealt with Angola (the problems of the MPLA since independence, the challenge of UNITA and the activities of SWAPO and the interventions of South Africa, etc.) but many answers could not offer a single useful sentence on Mozambique - not even the recent agreement between the Mozambique government and S. Africa over the African National Congress activities and S. African support for resistance groups in Mozambique.

Q.24. Many good answers on the foreign policy story of Egypt – Nasser and Sadat and the latter's efforts to end the war with Israel, but surprisingly little on Egypt's internal problems – especially the growing population problem (an annual addition to its total of 1.2m) and the implications of this for employment and the economy. No-one looked at the High Dam story!

An encouraging feature again this year is the decline in the number of poor and very poor candidates.

Paper 9020/16 (The Normans in England, c.1051–1100)

There was a distinctly more organised approach to the documents and many more candidates gave the impression that they could tackle that question in the hope of scoring well.

Candidates are well-grounded on the reign of Edward the Confessor and on the Scandinavian problem (Qs. 1 and 2). Criticism would be a matter of refinement. There is a constant undercurrent in the Confessor's reign, with occasional raids on the coast and expulsion of potentially dangerous figures; there is room for comment on a threat from different quarters, from Ireland as well as Denmark and Norway.

Q.3 produced more on the making of Domesday Book than was necessary, but there was a firm basis for a discussion of the peasantry. The 'depression' of English social classes was handled in rather crude terms. Within the limits of the Special Subject it could be seen that thegn became sub-tenants, but not peasants, and that this process continued throughout the Conqueror's reign. In a wider context, the slow process of applying tests of villeinage and reducing the legal freedom of villeins would give some corrective to overstatement about what happened in the Conqueror's reign.

Q.6 was a precise question on the king's reaction to two rebellions. One or two candidates dodged 1095; the conflict with Anselm was raised, so was the king's campaign in Wales, but these were not acceptable alternatives. 1088 and its repercussions are particularly well known.

Q.7. Not many attempted this question on Odo. It can be done on a limited range of information, e.g. his work as a vicegerent, foreshadowing the justiciar of the early twelfth century, and his double role as bishop and earl. At greater depth, his connection with the ruling dynasty was not unusual in Normandy, but much rarer in an English context. His work as a builder and reorganiser of his cathedral and its community is part of a trend in Normandy in the 11th century. His patronage of the arts is probably exceptional. His suspected ambition to be pope would be exceptional. This question requires some understanding of the Norman background.

Q.8. Regional differences did not attract candidates. The obvious case would be the Danelaw, and a basic group of Tostig's problems a few years earlier would open up issues about Northumbrian traditions – these were made explicit in answers about the rebellion of 1095. Marcher territory, with the 'palatine' earldoms of Hereford, Shrewsbury and Chester are well within the grasp of the average candidate.

Q.9. Normandy produced a wide range of approaches and some very sensible assessments: pre-conquest Norman history as a background; the problems of links between Normandy and England after 1087; the need to know what William's policy was towards the magnates and the church in order to explain his policy in England. It was a question which candidates had to ask and answer in the examination room, and the essays were lively as a result.

Paper 9020/17 (Mid-Tudor Crises, 1536–1569)

Although there was a different slant on one or two of the questions this year there was none which presented hidden difficulties of interpretation. Those candidates who took careful note of exactly what was asked for scored well, but there are still too many candidates who use questions merely as a framework within which to write down all they know, regardless of structure, balance and direct relevance.

Q.1. This proved to be the second most popular question and it gave plenty of scope to those who had read widely on the subject and were able to assess the short term and long term importance of the dissolution. There were candidates unfortunately who saw the question only with reference to the Pilgrimage of Grace, taking all that was said by Aske at face value and referring to monasteries as "social centres", "schools for poor children", etc.

The candidates were not expected to write either on the causes of the dissolution nor to offer a rather unbalanced list of consequences but they were expected to be able to spell "monasteries"!

Q.2. It was a pity that so few answered this question on a major figure in the crisis, but those who did, offered an interesting appraisal.

Q.3. This was the most popular question and there were a large number of lengthy yet thin and generalised answers. There was not enough awareness of the attacks by the Tudor government on the northern franchises nor was there sufficient stress on the particular reasons why rebellion occurred in the North as distinct from elsewhere.

Q.4. The level of answer to this type of question was of a higher standard than previously. There was plenty of scope for those who can think widely but care must be taken to discriminate between government policies and other causes.

Q.5. This question resulted in several very pleasing answers but we were hoping for more awareness of the term "qualities of leadership" from some who merely told the story of each leader's exploits.

Q.6. Very few candidates took this as it was asked, and wrote in the first person. We shall endeavour to word such questions more definitely in the future. Some candidates wrote well if they tried to differentiate between the types of opponents Somerset had to face. This question attracted the largest proportion of narrative-type answers.

Q.7. Generally good answers offered by the few who answered it.

Q.8. Perhaps the question which caused most trouble. Since everything centred on Mary, the answer needed to be carefully constructed; few managed it well. There was less need for judgements to be made than for discussion to be thorough.

Q.9. The wording of this question should have made clear the line of thought required and some wrote well. Others resorted to a narrative of events with brief comment at the end, or took the line that since the settlement was a 'via media' gains matched losses which was not what the question asked. The Catholic supporters, the Queen, Parliament and the various shades of protestant opinion should all have been considered.

Q.10(a). Not a difficult question and well done by those who had the confidence to have a go at it.

Q.10(b). It is no good just paraphrasing or giving plenty of 'before and after' information. Many candidates fell into these pits. We are looking for an

awareness of the slant of the source, the reasons for it at a particular time and what historical explanation can be given for some of the expressions.

In general we would advise candidates to get to grips with the question immediately, to develop a theme, to offer plenty of nicely balanced evidence and not to write at excessive length.

Paper 9020/18 (British Society, 1815-1850)

General Remarks

Candidates were usually well-prepared, but often found difficulty in applying knowledge relevantly to the questions set. In a paper with a closely detailed syllabus the topics contain a predictable element which means that high marks cannot be awarded for knowledge alone. A thoughtful and relevant answer, even if the content is a little thin, is preferable to regurgitated notes or an answer to last year's question.

The general standard of writing, expression and spelling was good, though punctuation was frequently poor. Each year I draw attention to commonly misspelt words (separate, benefiting), and the fact that this year these were not the worst words gives me hope. The most troublesome word in 1984 was argument (spelt arguement), although everyone who referred to Middlesbrough wrote it as Middlesborough.

In many cases a poor answer conveys a sense that the candidate has been learning historical facts, not enjoying an historical experience in his/her history lessons. Too seldom do candidates appear interested in asking (and answering) 'why?' questions - i.e. questions which demand explanation rather than recall. History seems for some candidates to be an object (or an obstacle) not an intellectually challenging activity. The next two points relate to this problem.

Some schools quite clearly encourage candidates to make connections between the general syllabus and local studies. For this topic many local examples can be relevant. When local material is used it appears that the interest and examination performance of both poor and good candidates is enhanced.

The lack of interest in *Q.10* suggests that teachers are already turning their attention to the new form of source questions which will be examined from 1985. It is to be hoped that the approach required for the new source-based questions will infuse all topics, so that candidates will be much more aware that history is not about facts but about interpreting sources. In *Q.4* this year most candidates ably discussed the problem of evidence but did not even begin to take the same approach with *Q.7* which also required a discussion of evidence.

Very few candidates take the opportunity of introducing gender dimensions into their interpretations - or, at least, a male view is assumed. This is understandable, given the nature of the standard books, but there is scope with such topics as class, standards of living, education and religion for new perspectives to be gained by appreciating what these topics meant for women.

Comments on Individual Questions

Q.1 (62 answers) This was a straightforward question about which most candidates had something useful to say. A number know of, or even appeared to have read, *Rural Rides*. Enclosure and the Poor Law were the features more frequently noted, together with changing relationships between farmers and labourers. There was a tendency towards blanket generalisation and exaggeration. Fewer candidates

thought that railways ran through the countryside and changed it (though they knew this in *Q.6*), and very few candidates used ideas familiar in answers to *Q.7* and *Q.8* about changes in the provision of schools and in the changing position of the Church with the rise of, for example, Primitive Methodism.

Q.2 (86 answers) Answers here showed that candidates have been well-prepared on the origins of working-class consciousness and are willing to challenge the kind of bold statements embodied in this question. But few seemed able to sit back and see how far class had permeated the structures of society in all its aspects. As in *Q.1* it was not lack of knowledge, but an inability to transfer knowledge from one compartment to another which caused the problems. Most candidates were, however, able to discuss the relationship between class and political activity, though not class and education or religion.

Q.3 (106 answers) All who answered this question about revolution decided the answer was no. Some candidates showed an ability to range over the whole period and to think in generalities as well as in particularities about the possibilities of revolution. Others took the opportunity to write about one crisis only - usually the Post-War discontents or the Reform Bill, without explaining why other periods, such as 1839, 1842 or 1848 could be discounted. Although most candidates recognised that theirs was not the view of the time, few were prepared to discuss the evidence (e.g. of spies) and say why they did not believe it. (See general comments).

Q.4 (112 answers) Candidates were well-versed in the controversy, but many simply answered a question on 'What was happening to the standard of living?'. A pleasing number, though, did actually answer the question for the most part by showing the ambiguous nature of the evidence. But surprisingly few candidates were willing to go beyond this to suggest the ideological motives (both contemporary and recent) behind the arguments which derive from the evidence.

Q.5 (178 answers) Insofar as this question asked about the failure of Chartism, candidates were happy and did well. Insofar as it was about leadership, they had problems. So far as most candidates were concerned there were only two leaders (Lovett and O'Connor), who split along moral/physical force lines and hence provided poor leadership. There was practically no examination of leadership in particular crises: Lovett's failure to mobilise London in 1838-9; the general lack of guidance after the rejection of the Petitions; the bungled response to the Plug Riots; the differences over the 1841 General Election strategy; and, above all, the disarray after 10 April 1848, with O'Connor promoting the Little Charter, Jones wanting a National Assembly, and Harney attacking Jones for the folly of this.

Q.6 (139 answers) Candidates clearly like this kind of question, although the request for 'principal' consequences went unheeded: everything which could be remembered about railways during the whole century was usually tipped in. Such knowledge was impressive, if sometimes a little tedious and ill-judged.

Q.7 (109 answers) Candidates clearly know why popular education expanded and what the arguments were for and against this. They are less certain about what literacy is, how it is measured and what the trends were. The more wily candidates said that the extension of literacy was produced by more schooling (such faith) and proceeded to write essays on the growth of schooling. It did not seem to have occurred to candidates that, in a society with very little compulsory education, one might have to consider the motives of pupils (or their parents) for going to school. In other words, candidates wrote wholly about supply and not about demand. Candidates also failed to note the evidential problem that, since literacy measure-

ment comes from marriage signatures and therefore records the state of education 10-15 years before the record, Kay-Shuttleworth's reforms after 1839 are really irrelevant in explaining trends established well before 1850.

Q.8 (89 answers) After several years of complaints about the low quality of religious history answers, I am pleased to report that many candidates now have a sound working knowledge of the institutional history of the Anglican Church and the Methodist Connexions. This question on religion, however, was broader in scope. It did not occur to most candidates that religion might flow beyond the confines of institutions and what happened on 30 March 1851. Sunday schools, which are frequently mentioned in education essays, made scarcely an appearance; popular anti-Catholicism was not noticed; millenarianism received no comment; adherence to folk rituals and the rites of passage was totally ignored, despite the presence of document 10(b)iii on the paper complaining about such superstition. Candidates have very secular minds: religion means the Church, and you either go there or you don't. A little more empathy is needed to get back beyond the confines of modern secularity.

Q.9 (37 answers) This was the only question for which candidates did not seem well-prepared. Some knew about artisan trade societies, the attempts of Doherty and Owen at a General Union, and the New Model Unions of the 1850s. Few mentioned the miners' unions (no Tommy Hepburn), or the NAUTPL of 1845 onwards and its associations with Chartism. Very few thought about the relationship between the development first of spinners' and then of miners' unions to agitate for and enforce protective legislation. Above all, very few had any idea at all about the possible significance of these developments.

Q.10 (a) (no answers); (b) (26 answers) No-one answered Q.10(b)iii, and few (iv), despite the popularity of Chartism as an essay topic. Document (i) was usually well done, candidates recognising who Fielden was and noting the uncharacteristic nature of Cobbett's remarks. Document (ii) caused some confusion for those candidates who could not work out on whose side O'Brien stood. Document (v) was moderately well done, but most candidates were impelled to write about the relevance of this document for Manchester and did not appear to notice the significance of Inverness being described in terms usually applied by 'pessimists' to Manchester.

Paper 9020/19 (France in the Age of Louis XIV)

Whilst average standards of work were maintained, a number of good candidates failed to complete a satisfactory fourth question; mere length does not gain marks. Many made a genuine attempt to give a balanced assessment of the topics on which they chose to write.

Q.1. A popular question requiring a brief discussion of 'absolutism' at the start.

Q.2. Several candidates made a good attempt at this question.

Q.3. Wide variations in the incidence of taxation in the various parts of France did not always receive sufficient emphasis.

Q.4. Generally done competently.

Q.5. The most popular question, with good candidates discussing the meaning of 'rash' and giving a balanced, up-to-date view of the economic effects of the Revocation.

Q.6. Few candidates knew much about the work of Louis's later ministers in detail but a few made good attempts.

Q.7. The increased efficiency of the French army and the defensive value of Vauban's fortresses were not always stressed.

Qs. 8 and 9. As usual few answers on these cultural questions.

Q.10(b) Whilst many more candidates than in past years attempted the documents question some did not explain the words or phrases needing further elucidation.

Paper 9020/20 (The Russian Revolution, 1917-1921)

As usual the major problem was that few candidates could substantiate generalisations with detail, except in the sphere of diplomatic history. In precisely this sphere, however, most 'answers' were in fact a narrative of diplomatic incidents, rather than structured responses to the actual questions. In particular the question as to whether Bismarck 'planned' war was normally met with unsubstantiated assertion and on occasion downright illogicality.

The inability to present evidence was especially apparent in the economic and social sphere. Thus in attempting to explain Prussia's economic superiority (Q.6) only the best candidates avoided a narrative of the development of the *Zollverein* and pointed to territorial and demographic expansion, agricultural reform, the demolition of the guild system, improvements in communications, Prussia's role as a market for goods from Saxony (how many know that this was the first industrial state in Germany), her geographical dominance of German trade routes (especially to the ports), etc.

It is also clear that many candidates pre-date the industrial revolution in the German states. In 1848 only 4% of the Prussian labour force were employed in factories. Even at the end of the period most people lived in rural communities or small towns. This is important, of course, for political movements too and explains a phenomenon which few candidates grasped in the explanation of Bismarck's triumph over liberal opposition (Q.3); namely the isolation and numerical insignificance of the liberal movement, which for the most part even the industrial bourgeoisie and that of the provinces shunned, and the strength of the old landed elite, which could mobilise peasant and artisan discontent *against* the liberals.

Few candidates had a firm grasp of regional differences (Q.4). Only the best answers realised that Baden's position was quite different from that of Bavaria or that anti-Prussian sentiment was very strong in Saxony. Even fewer dealt with different attitudes *within* the individual states (divisions that ran along political, social and confessional lines). No-one realised that southern industrialists were *not* necessarily in favour of unification, fearing Prussian competition.

In the case of the socialist movement (Q.9), candidates had some idea about Lasalle's position, but were hopelessly confused about the position of Bebel and Liebknecht, overlooking the fact that their party was fuelled by powerful (Saxon) anti-Prussian elements. Nor did candidates realise that both parties recruited not from an industrial proletariat but from dependent, wage-earning artisans.

Paper 9020/21 (The Origins of the Second World War, 1929-1939)

The overall standard of work was comparable to that in previous years, though the discrepancy in standards between centres was perhaps a little more marked. It might be helpful first to emphasise that, while Special Subject papers demand a

more detailed look at the trees, they also expect the ability to see the wood. Far too many moderate candidates disqualify themselves from the highest grades by a concentration on the one to the exclusion of the other. Secondly, good candidates do not treat the questions as mere pegs on which to hang prepared answers; nor do they keep repeating the phraseology of the question in the hope that an answer will be self-evident. Thirdly, what is demanded of the documentary goblets is not a series of precis. It is important that this should be widely understood in view of the introduction of the new style Question 1 next year. Explanation of content and context, together with comment, are required – as the rubric makes clear.

While Q.1 produced many prepared answers on the rise of Hitler, there were many who were able to isolate the KPD and the ambivalent role of Hindenburg, Schleicher and Papen. The reaction of the SPD and the Centre Party were less well-known, as was Groener's short-lived ban on the SA. On the other hand, there were several who were able to discuss the fissures within the Nazi Party.

Q.2 was very popular and straightforward. Japan, Italy, Britain and France were all offered plausibly. Weaker candidates limited their discussion to only one power, usually Italy. The role of Italy (Q.3) was similarly popular. Acceptable answers covered the whole range of the 1930s, while others did not. The continued appeasement of Italy in 1938 and 1939 deserves to be better known. Several answers would have been assisted by consideration of the concept of Italy's *strategic importance*.

Answers on the Rhineland Crisis (Q.4) were also numerous, and an improvement in the quality of writing on French Foreign Policy was noted. Good candidates offered several alternative 'turning points', including the ineffectiveness of the invasion of the Ruhr, the building of the Maginot Line, the assassination of Barthou and the declaration of Belgian neutrality.

Q.5 was not popular, though a few excellent answers on Poland were received. In contrast, Q.6 led several candidates to question the sanity of the question setter. In fact, the quotation was from Lord Dacre discussing the significance of *Mein Kampf*. Since few candidates had culled much more than a few catch phrases from the latter, it was not surprising that the suggestion of an irrational element in Hitler's ideology made no sense to many. This is not to say that high marks were not scored by those who disagreed with the statement; but a discussion of the significance of the underlying ideology was essential.

As with Q.3, the many candidates answering Qs. 7, 8 and 9 would have benefited from considering 'realities behind diplomacy' – strategic, military and ideological in particular. Q.7 was not just a question on the Nazi-Soviet Pact, nor was Q.8 just a question on Munich. Very few who answered Q.9 knew any military facts, despite the clear table in Adamthwaite pp 227-8. On all these questions much rambling narrative was received with little attention to basic concepts such as the *balance of power*. A common gap in the narrative approach was discussion of the USSR's 'popular Front' policies. Nevertheless, plenty of excellent scripts were received, and the general quality of writing on Chamberlain was distinctly good.

The quality of the answers submitted in 1984 was frankly very disappointing. I do not think, however, that the decline can be attributed to inadequate teaching or preparation; it is, alas, a reflection of the actual level of the candidates' academic ability and/or application to the subject of the examination.

The questions set were on a par with those of many previous years, and even poor answers often indicated that the questions were not of a completely unexpected type.

Question 2, which called for an analysis of the defences and internal arrangement of standard Roman forts and fortresses was misinterpreted by several candidates, despite the fact that the same terminology has been used many times in past question papers. Some ambiguity in the wording could be argued, and so answers based on the assumption that 'laid out' meant 'sited' were accepted.