



A Level

History

Session: 2000 June
Type: Report
Code: 9020

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations

A LEVEL
(former Cambridge linear syllabus)

A 9020

HISTORY

REPORT ON COMPONENTS
TAKEN IN JUNE 2000



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

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 syllabus 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 2000

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

Publications
OCR
Mill Wharf
Mill Street
BIRMINGHAM
B6 4BU

HISTORY

GCE Advanced Level 9020

Components	Content	Page
9020/01	English History to 1500	1
9020/02	English History 1450-1714	6
9020/03	English History 1603-1832	13
9020/04	English History 1783-1974	15
9020/05	English History 1450-1974	22
9020/06	The Social & Economic History of Britain	23
9020/07	History of USA 1783-1945	24
9020/10	European History 337-c.1500	29
9020/11-14	European History 1450-1973	32
9020/15	World Affairs Since 1945	50
9020/16	The Normans in England	58
9020/17	Mid-Tudor Crises	61
9020/18	British Society 1815-1850	64
9020/21	Origins of the Second World War	67
9020/25	Individual Study	73
9444	History: Special Paper	77
*	Grade Threshold	

9020/01 English History to 1500

General Comments

The work on this paper was well up to the standard of previous years and there were only one or two really weak scripts. A number of questions saw no attempts and most candidates concentrated on the tenth to the thirteenth centuries. The standard of English was satisfactory, but vulgarisms stood out. One candidate wrote: 'Document D is authored by Alexander IV'. Question-begging words and phrases 'Undoubtedly', 'clearly', 'It could be argued' and similar expressions do not help the candidates but alert the examiner to the approach of unexplained or merely asserted generalisations.

Some candidates do not think hard enough about what the questions are asking and a small number seemed to use the questions as a trigger for a learned response. Candidates should be assured that each word in the question needs to be taken in to account; even intelligent and well-informed candidates dropped a band or two by ignoring the force of 'priority' (Q.14) and 'only' (Q.15). There was evidence of wide reading in the range of ideas reflected in the essays. A few persist in the juvenile habit of littering their answers with the names of historians. The candidate who cited Bede's Ecclesiastical History as a source for the tenth century would be embarrassed to see it in the cold light of day.

Comments on Individual Questions

1. Some candidates wrote out the questions thus depriving themselves of time, and those who did seemed to be just the candidates who needed to spend as much time as they could in thinking out their answers.

Candidates should be prepared to substantiate the points they make from the texts or their own knowledge and should quote a word or phrase from the Document rather than merely give line numbers. There was often incorrect spelling of words given in the question. Candidates often assumed that the date of the extract was the date when the author wrote.

- (a) More than identification of names was required: all parts of this sub-question needed a sentence of explanation rather than a bald statement. Some candidates thought that the man who was to be king of Sicily was Edward. Others exercised little control over what they wrote in answer to Q (a); one wrote a whole page.
- (b) Some interpreted the Document rather than evaluated it, and naïve sub-GCSE evaluation abounded: 'it is also written a long time after the event so I don't think it is a great deal of value except to show the power of the pope at this time'; that the Document was useless because it was 'biased'; useful because it was 'near the date'; 'it is a primary source'.

Most weaker evaluation tended to make a single point: 'it does display what the ecclesiastical community thought about the troubles in England.' However, the biggest weakness was the tendency to summarise the Document without any evaluation. Candidates ignore the fact that the Document can be useful in what it omits, as much as in what it includes. Some interpreted 'how useful' to mean 'in

what ways is it useful?' and thus produced a list of what the Document said. For evaluation of the Document's usefulness, candidates needed to look at the strengths and weaknesses of the Document as an historical source rather than whether it was useful to the king or the barons.

- (c) A few candidates did not know about the thrust of the Wykes Chronicle, a deficiency that might have been remedied perhaps by reading Antonia Gransden's Historical Writing in England. More seriously, there was evidence in the scripts of much careless reading of the Document: candidates wrote that Document A was only against the fifth article of Document C. Others assumed that the sentence 'The first four articles seemed the more lawful' meant that Wykes accepted that the Provisions of Oxford were lawful.

Others took what the barons said of themselves (A) 'that the 24 would rule the king and the kingdom etc. more fairly', rather than the whole of the Document, as a criticism of the baronial party. There was a tendency to write out general material: 'Document A was written by Thomas Wyke (sic), it was also a chronicle often written by monks.' The question was about the attitudes to the Provisions of Oxford while the answers often concentrated on the general circumstances, the barons or the troubles in general. Many thought that the question wanted a general comparison rather than a specific one – about attitudes to the Provisions of Oxford. Some compared A and B, a simple but all too common example of misreading the question. Others summarised Documents A and D and then expected the reader to make up his own mind. Yet others sought to explain why the Documents disagreed or agreed.

- (d) There was some misunderstanding about the meaning of the question: it was about the Documents and not about whether the hostility to the baronial party grew quickly. And there was much summarising of the Documents and making assertions about what they showed, without reference to the evidence contained in them. A minority of candidates made no attempt to structure an argument while some of the more thoughtful candidates omitted to consider the question of timing, despite the key word quickly in the question. Many candidates were uncritical of the documents, except to remark that 'bias could be an issue'.
- (e) Some candidates offered very general answers dependent on the assumption that the viewpoint put forward for discussion was correct. The work of others often lacked 'other evidence', with explanations vaguely referring to baronial concern based on 'Englishness'. Candidates mentioned the concern with foreigners as if this was the same as the concern over foreign advisers. There were many paragraphs about xenophobia but these were not linked to the issue of advisers or any other aspect of the Baronial Reform Movement. One candidate wrote: 'The native Anglo-Saxons still resented the presence of those whom they regarded as aliens'. Such a view would have been anachronistic in 1158.

Candidates would help their case by making a clear distinction between views which depend on the Documents and those on other evidence. But there was a tendency to cite evidence from whatever source without relating it to an argument. Many candidates lost sight of the question.

Essay Questions
General Points

Weaker answers tended to emerge without that pointing which is the indicator of high quality work: the candidate points out how this or that piece of evidence bears on the argument and how the argument itself answers the question. Some candidates spend the first paragraph restating the question and then getting it wrong e.g. an answer to Q.10 began by stating that the purpose of the essay was 'to look at why William the Conqueror was able to subdue England.' A good rule of thumb for constructing first paragraphs is to ensure that each word of the question is present in the paragraph, which either sketches out the answer in brief or indicated how the candidate proposes to tackle the question; in the first case, the rest of the answer would be the proof of what is contained in the first paragraph. Sometimes sensible plans promised rather more than the essays gave. Candidates need to be more careful in their use of words: baronage is a technical word which is not transferable to the pre-Conquest nobility. They should try to avoid the inclusion of material unrelated to precise aims of the question: 'Like all medieval kings Henry II etc.'

3. This question produced only a few answers and these were limited to discussion of Anglo-Saxon tribes, their provenance, religion and burial customs. They might have looked further at tribal organisation, place names and the names of the days of the week. Some candidates were unable to say any more than that the evidence for the maintenance of Germanic institutions was 'overwhelming', but then gave no support for this.
4. The few answers to this question tended to be general accounts of the conversion of England, with only occasional references to the methods used. One candidate asserted that Augustine was no diplomat, but produced no evidence for the point and then did not link it to any kind of argument.
6. There was a full range of answers to this question. The weakest tended to be incomplete narratives of the reigns of Edward and Athelstan with little sense of argument. Other main weaknesses were: some candidates took no notice of the reasons/success division in the question; others concentrated on the methods used; many tended to assert the aims without arguing or explaining them: 'The advance in to the Danelaw was a piece of consolidation.' Others adopted an intentionalist approach: that somehow it was always intended that the Danes would be thrown out of England by a victorious Wessex.
8. This question was answered by a large number of candidates and there was a complete range of answers to it. Some tended to concentrate on the general features of Cnut's reign and mentioned that he secured peace and prosperity for England, but this was hardly relevant to 'reign as an English king' since Athelred II had produced neither and he was undoubtedly an English king. Many described at great length what Cnut did but did not explain how his actions bore on the question. There was much discussion of the role of Wulfstan of York as a 'tutor in the ways of English kingship', but there was seldom any attention to the effectiveness of Wulfstan's tuition, apart from assertions that he had influenced the Law Codes.

Some candidates mentioned continuity with the reigns of Edgar and Ethelred, though only the best answers began with a statement of what 'rule like an English king' amounted to. Comparisons with the conquest of 1066 needed to be more carefully related to the question. Some argued rather naively that, because the transfer of land was more complete in 1066, therefore Cnut was less of a conqueror and therefore more of an English king.

10. This was another question which was answered by a large number of candidates and produced answers over the whole range. The main fault of the less successful answers was misinterpretation of the question, with description of the methods of conquest, or examinations whether William overcame English resistance. Some seemed to recycle past questions: those from one centre wrote about how the Conquest was/not 'the chance outcome of a single battle.' 'Harrowing of the north' appeared frequently. Even the better candidates did not make enough of a distinction between 'suppress English resistance' and 'take control of England after the battle of Hastings'.
12. There were few answers and these repeated the Norman propaganda that the 'English church was in complete disarray' in 1066. Two candidates wrote about 'Dominican Chapels'.
13. A single answer was received on this, and it competently examined the continuity with the developments under Rufus.
14. Better candidates saw that the word 'priority' in the question meant that they needed to balance 'independence of the baronage' against other factors. Such answers hinted how they intended to show this in the first paragraph. Less successful answers tended to write an 'introduction' which was often based on the reign of King Stephen or perhaps that of Henry I.

Answers tended to be based on the assumption that royal control had slackened in the reign of Stephen, and therefore Henry II had to take a firm hand. One candidate wrote that Henry II's 'priority was to re-impose royal control rather than limit the independence of the barons'. Others identified other priorities without balancing them against limiting the independence of the barons.

15. A starting point for a good essay was the aims of the baronial rebels, perhaps relying on the terms of Magna Carta. But most began with a general discussion of the reign of John or description of what was wrong with royal government in England during the reign, rather than balancing feudal privileges against other factors. Privileges appeared misspelled in as many different ways as it was possible to misspell it. Candidates failed to explain why the loss of Normandy should have made the barons bring John to heel.
17. This was answered by one candidate who wrote about the individual college foundations at Oxford and Cambridge rather than the general reasons demanded by the question.

Report on the Components taken in June 2000

18. The death of Piers Gaveston was regarded as the overriding factor which began the process of alienation of Thomas from his supporters. Candidates needed to examine more general factors and the best looked carefully at the components of the next question: extent; responsible for his own fall and weighed his own impetuous nature against the circumstances which applied after the failure of the Ordinances.
19. The main focus of the answers was on the dotage and weakness of Edward III. Less one-dimensional answers looked at other factors like the failure of finance following the desertion of the Florentine bankers and the developing expertise of Charles V.
20. This was a popular question which was tackled less adroitly than some other questions. Candidates failed to take account of 'far outweighed' in planning their answers, most of which either listed the effects of the Black Death and left the reader to draw the conclusions or made points which were left unexplained. Candidates failed to show why the Black Death: was a 'total disaster for the church'; 'put a considerable strain on the government'; 'caused the Peasants' Revolt'.
21. This was answered by a few candidates and the essays produced were mostly at least competent. One candidate began: 'This essay shall explain how and why the magnates controlled Richard II and why ultimately they were not successful shown by his final disposition.' In fact, the candidate did not go off the rails by explaining the reasons for the restraints placed on Richard and produced a good essay. Another stated that the Merciless Parliament was successful because Richard was easy to control, but offered no evidence of his restricted activity.
22. There was a single misguided attempt at this question which elicited no more than a general account of the development of the Gothic art. It was therefore irrelevant.
23. Another single answer to this attempted a mini-biography of Wyclif.
24. There were few answers to this. They were very general assessments of Henry V without any attempt to assess his military leadership.

There were no answers to the other essay question. Indicative content for these (and the other questions) will be found in the markscheme.

9020/02 English History 1450-1714

General Comments

The overall standard of the work was good. There was a further decline in the number of very weak candidates, and a good deal of solid work was presented which earned marks in the middle ranges. As usual, relevance was the key differentiator. Candidates who focused on the words 'effective', 'luck', 'judgement', 'consistency', 'success', 'threat' and 'importance' (which are all taken from popular questions in this year's paper) did well and those who did not did less well.

One of the most pleasing features of the work in recent years has been the increasing awareness of the need for an analytical approach. This trend was repeated this year. Comparatively few candidates answer questions in a purely narrative or descriptive fashion, though many find it harder to sustain an analytical approach throughout and they often lapse into descriptive passages.

To be convincing, analysis needs sound factual support. This does not mean that essays have to be overloaded with facts, but they do need appropriately selected factual support and this needs to be precise and detailed. It is this aspect which let many candidates down this year. There was a tendency to vagueness and lack of precise supporting detail; this to some degree counterbalanced the continuing trend towards a more analytical approach. As one examiner commented, there seemed to be more unsubstantial assertion than there used to be. *Candidates need to be reminded that avoiding a narrative or descriptive approach does not mean that factual knowledge is unnecessary.* Particularly noticeable was the frequent absence of a sense of chronology, even in answers to questions such as Qs. 3, 9, 13, 15 and 18 where knowledge of a developing and changing situation was crucial to a proper answer.

Previous reports have commented on the issue of essay plans. The examiners are always glad to see evidence that candidates have devoted some time and thought to planning their answers. Undoubtedly the increasing analytical approach already noted owes something to this. Nevertheless, a balance needs to be struck between the time allowed for the plan and the time devoted to the essay itself. Some candidates produce plans which are half as long as the final essay – perhaps one page of plan followed by two pages of essay. The inevitable result is too slight an essay.

Choice of questions followed a predictable pattern. Questions on social, economic or cultural history were almost universally ignored. The Yorkist and early Tudor periods continued to attract most candidates, followed by the reign of Elizabeth and then the early seventeenth century. Very few Centres study the later Stuarts. The most popular questions were Qs. 3, 4, 5, 9 and 11.

Standards of written communication were very similar to previous years. Some candidates wrote very well indeed, and the majority made no more errors than one might expect when writing under pressure. Some answers, however, were marred by standards of spelling, punctuation and grammar which were markedly poorer than one might expect from candidates studying a humanities subject at this level.

The document – based questions were soundly answered on the whole. Both Q.1 and Q.2 differentiated well and they proved comparable in difficulty. Most candidates answered the document-based question first, but a fair number left it until the end, often with the result that they were unable to gain many, or in some cases any, of the 8 marks allocated to sub-question (d). It was evident that some candidates did not read the texts carefully enough, resulting in some unexpected misunderstandings. In Q.2, for example, a number of candidates misread Document E. Some candidates are still not paying sufficient attention to the demands of the question. In both Q.1 and Q.2 part (c) asked for evaluation rather than paraphrase. Part (d) questions *always* ask candidates to use their own knowledge as well as the documents - to ignore either part of this instruction means forfeiting half the marks.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question numbers in brackets refer to Paper 5.

Document-based Questions

1. [1.] *The Reign of Henry VIII*

Most candidates gained at least one mark for each part of (a). Surprisingly few, however, named any of the most popular places of pilgrimage or explained why people went on pilgrimage. A common error was to suggest that the reference was to the pilgrimage of Grace. Similarly, in (a)(ii) a fair number of candidates simply explained in general terms the role of the Archbishop of Canterbury in the Church in England and did not identify Cranmer as the Archbishop referred to in Document E. Most candidates obtained good marks for part (b) and it was pleasing to note that a good proportion attempted a comparison rather than simply explaining the reasons for reducing the number of holy days given in each document separately. Part (c) puzzled many candidates. It was hoped that they would realise that the practices condemned by the documents were presumably widespread or there would have been no need to attack them. Many, however, simply explained the view expressed in the documents, pointed out that they came from the civil and religious authorities and claimed that they were therefore not useful for revealing ordinary people's attitudes. Some credit was given for such answers on the grounds that it is true that some people held the views expressed in the documents, but candidates who read between the lines were more perceptive. Most candidates were unable in part (d) to identify points in the documents which indicated Henry's use of his powers as Supreme Head to eradicate superstition. Some noted that not all of this activity necessarily reflected the real views of Henry himself, e.g. Documents A and D showed the aims of two reforming bishops, who may have been pursuing their own agendas. Documents B and D, however, were certainly issued in Henry's name and Document E may well have shown his views when relieved of the political pressures of the 1530s. The word 'superstition' caused difficulty for some candidates. As happens every year, many answers made little or no reference to evidence from the candidate's

own knowledge. Others saw that the words 'the main aim' in the question gave them the opportunity to refer to other aims such as securing the succession and making financial gains, e.g. from the dissolution.

2. [2.] *The English Civil War, 1637-49*

Most candidates gained at least one mark for each part of (a), though some wrote in rather vague terms about the 'division between the two kingdoms', failing to refer specifically to the Bishops' Wars. In part (b) some candidates were confused about what was meant by 'reform of the Church of England', identifying Arminianism as reform and therefore suggesting Document A was against reform. Most, however, saw that Documents A and E took opposite lines on the crucial issue of episcopacy, though some misinterpreted E as being in favour of root and branch reform – an example of failure to read the documents carefully. Document B caused more uncertainty. Many candidates thought that D'Ewes supported the bishops, whereas the real point of the extract was that he was anxious to shelve discussion because the issue was so controversial. In part (c) many candidates gained 3 or 4 marks by comparing the documents. For higher marks comment was needed on the point of view from which Documents A, D and F were written. This would lead to a conclusion that the support given by A and D to Document C merely shows that all three represent only one point of view on a hotly disputed issue, while Document F represents the opposite view. Few answers followed this route. Answers to (d) were rather disappointing. This was sometimes because candidates were short of time by this stage and wrote too little. More importantly, however, many candidates responded by a rather mechanical examination of the documents to see if there was any reference to political issues. This earned credit, of course, but it missed the real point, which was to examine the political importance of the issue of church government. This is highlighted in Document F but also referred to in Documents A (penultimate sentence) and B (lines 16-17). Candidates' own knowledge, e.g. of the division of the Long Parliament into two parties and, later in the 1640s, of the growth of the influence of the sectaries, was also important in the construction of a good answer.

3. [8.] The key issue is the reasons for the disturbances of the 1450s.

Answers which were confined to the reason suggested in the question – the weakness of Henry VI – were rather limited. It was important to compare this reason with others such as the roles of Richard of York, Warwick and Margaret of Anjou and the structural problems of fifteenth century society. The examiners were encouraged to find that many candidates realised this – some even giving less attention than was desirable to Henry VI. This points to the real problem presented by the question: achieving an appropriate balance between the various factors. The best answers did this very successfully, and the majority made a reasonable attempt at it. A fair number gave too much attention to the 1440s and too little to the 1450s.

4. [9.] The problem this presented was appropriate selection of material from the whole reign. To make good use of their knowledge candidates had to adopt

an explicitly analytical approach, focusing on the word 'effective', and to ensure that their answers were balanced. Some did this very well, but many answers were too limited in their range of reference. Some ignored the evidence of Edward's failings as king in his first reign. More seriously, others concentrated too heavily on his first reign and failed to examine the comparative success of his rule in his second reign in sufficient depth to produce a convincing answer. On the other hand there were good answers which distinguished carefully between the first and second reigns and recognised the potential threat posed by Richard of Gloucester in the north. Candidates tended to be very critical of Edward and to give him little credit for building up a Yorkist and crown-controlled group of magnates.

5. [10.] This was perhaps the most popular question on the paper and most candidates produced reasonably sound answers. Most were able to provide a good deal of relevant information, though a surprising number gave relatively attention to the pretenders, a matter of central importance. Some answers gave very full coverage to Henry's policies but comprehensive treatment was not a requirement for good marks. What was needed was relevant analysis of a range of issues, and this was achieved by a good number of candidates. The best answers were distinguished by close attention to the wording of the question, which was not simply a request for an analysis of the reasons for Henry's success in strengthening the crown. Predictably, most candidates attributed his success in retaining the throne mainly to his judgement, but many made only a cursory attempt to assess the element of luck. Some dismissed 'luck' as an explanation in the first sentence or two. The better answers usually reached the same conclusion but with more understanding of the element of luck, e.g. in the victories at Bosworth and Stoke, the French campaign of 1492 and the storm that blew Philip of Burgundy shore in 1506. Many answers ignored the last years of the reign.
8. [13.] This question attracted very few answers, despite being on a central issue of cultural history. Those who attempted it lacked the necessary basic knowledge, often confusing the New Learning with Protestantism.
9. [14.] Questions on Wolsey are always popular and this was no exception. Most candidates produced sound answers which showed knowledge of the main aspects of his foreign policy. The key issue of consistency was often approached by simply accepting the view offered in the question. Many candidates demonstrated familiarity with the various theories which have been put forward to explain Wolsey's foreign policy, but only the better answers discussed reasons for rejecting them in favour of the view expressed in the quotation. The approach was usually analytical, but often the analysis was limited to using factual knowledge to illustrate Wolsey's desire to please the king. Some candidates took the question as simply about relations between Wolsey and the king in general rather than in the specific area of foreign policy. Candidates were generally much more at home with the period 1514-21 than the later 1520s. The period 1525-26 was often muddled, though the best answers made good use of knowledge of these years to demonstrate Wolsey's and Henry's aims.

10. [15.] A small number of candidates who had answered the Civil War document-based question attempted this. The key issue was the consequences of the dissolution and little credit could be given for discussion of the motives for it. Answers were generally well informed, though often rather narrow in focus.
11. [16.] Candidates were well informed and almost all were aware of the revisionist view that Northumberland was a much more successful ruler than Somerset. Indeed many simply claimed that Northumberland was successful without addressing the issue of 'how far'. The main weakness was lack of balance. The question focused on Northumberland, though of course it also required explanation of the problems which Somerset had failed to solve. Some candidates, however, spent more time on Somerset than Northumberland, including lengthy discussions of the problems he inherited from Henry VIII. Others described the policies of the two, sometimes in two separate narratives, without properly focusing on the comparative aspect of the question. Nevertheless there were many good or very good answers. One surprising aspect of answers on the reign of Edward VI in recent years is the tendency to forget religion. This was again the case. Presumably it results from candidates' anxiety to demonstrate knowledge of revisionist views on the importance of the wars with France and Scotland and their financial consequences. A pleasing aspect of the answers received was the number who drew attention to the question of relations with the Council.
13. [18.] There was general agreement that the answer is that Mary was more of a threat after her flight to England than before. Some candidates, however, having made this decision, simply recounted the dangers which she presented after 1568 and failed to consider how much of a threat she was before then. A good answer required this comparative aspect. There were signs that many candidates knew little about Mary in France and Scotland. Another common weakness was to provide detail about her life and the ways in which she presented dangers to Elizabeth, without giving attention to the underlying factors – her religion and her claim to the throne.
14. [19.] This question was less well answered than the others on the reign of Elizabeth. Many candidates who answered it were not equipped with the detailed knowledge of the careers of Parker and Whitgift (which was a prerequisite for success.) Comparatively few were able to offer specific information other than the Vestiarian Controversy and the Three Articles. The Court of High Commission and the repression of separatists were frequently omitted. Some attempted to compensate for lack of knowledge of the two archbishops by devoting most of their time to analysing the problems faced by the Elizabethan Church and concluded with a few general remarks about the archbishops. This gained some credit but did not constitute a properly focused response to the demands of the question. Those who were able to explain the main features of the work of the two archbishops and relate them to the consolidation of the Elizabethan settlement, especially in the face of challenges from the puritans, did well, but such answers were a

minority. Considering that there were two other questions on the reign of Elizabeth, it was surprising how many answers linked detailed knowledge.

15. [20.] This was a variant on a familiar question. It was pleasing to note that many candidates attempted an analytical approach rather than a narrative of Elizabeth's policy towards the Netherlands from 1567 to 1585. This approach produced some very good answers which tackled both parts of the question in a balanced and effective way. Analysis, however, needs to be supported by a factual reference over an adequate range of material and this proved to be a problem for some. Ideally, candidates should have explained the underlying reasons for Elizabeth's reluctance to intervene directly and then related these to the main points at which intervention was an option (e.g. 1567, 1572). They should also have discussed policies designed to achieve her objectives without direct intervention (e.g. the Anjou courtship, covert support for John Casimir). Many examined Elizabeth's motives but then provided vague and patchy reference to the development of her policies. Explanations of her change of policy in 1585 were also often lacking in specific detail, though in some cases the opposite weakness occurred – detailed explanation of intervention in 1585 but little discussion of reasons for not intervening before. Some candidates focused on Elizabeth's relations with Spain and gave inadequate attention to the Netherlands.
16. [21.] Most candidates saw the answer largely in terms of the Spanish marriage proposal. Good explanations of the case for and against this policy scored well. Many candidates showed sound understanding of the reasons for James's desire to avoid war. Often, however, the answers needed to provide more detail about the development of foreign relations in the second half of the reign and the opposition to it in the 1621 and 1624 parliaments. The best answers examined other aspects of his foreign policy to establish the context within which he pursued the Spanish marriage. Some noted also that, even though parliament approved the change of policy in 1624, there was still disagreement over whether war should be fought on land or at sea – an argument in which James probably had the better case.
18. [23.] Most candidates adopted an analytical approach, as the question required, and there were some excellent answers. The weaker answers were shorter on detailed support. The question focused on a short but important period. To answer it well candidates need to examine in some detail the development of relations between Charles I and his parliaments, as well as considering broader issues such as the clash between royal prerogative and growing parliamentary pretensions. Some candidates needed to give more attention to the precise issues which came up in specific sessions of Parliament. For high marks answers also needed to be more balanced and comprehensive in their coverage of the issues. It was not uncommon, for instance, for candidates to produce good discussion of developments in foreign affairs as issues but ignore Arminianism. Such answers could gain good marks but did not reach the highest marks bands. Some candidates omitted Buckingham.

19. [24.] This question, too, produced many relevant analytical answers which nevertheless lacked balance and detail. The main causes of Laud's unpopularity were well understood and many candidates provided good explanations of the impact of his enforcement of ecclesiastical discipline on the puritans. Coverage of other issues was more patchy. Some candidates omitted Laud's attempt to impose a new liturgy in Scotland. Others ignored his role in Charles's government and his relationship with Wentworth. Interestingly, some candidates argued that the policies for which Laud was hated were not really his but Charles's.
21. [26.] There were some very good answers to this – well informed, analytical and fluent. Weaker candidates, however, had difficulty with the term 'military dictatorship'. Most succeeded in identifying some appropriate evidence to establish the importance of the army in politics, e.g. the ejection of the Rump, the establishment of the Major Generals, the rejection of the crown by Cromwell. Analysis of Cromwell's ambiguous relationship with the army – dependent on it for the power which enabled him to pursue his aim of 'godly rule', yet anxious to establish a civilian basis for the Protectorate – eluded many.
22. [27.] There were some good responses to this from candidates who set their knowledge of foreign relations in the reign of Charles II in the context of an analysis of the differing views of Charles himself, his ministers and his parliaments about 'English interests'. Most answers focused, as one would expect, on the Treaty of Dover, though there were one or two who omitted this central piece of evidence. Weaker candidates generally displayed little knowledge of any other aspects of foreign affairs. Some well-informed candidates failed to identify English interests.
24. [29.] This was a straightforward question on a familiar theme and produced some very clear and scholarly answers. Most candidates adopted an appropriately analytical approach. Weaker candidates failed to give sufficient detail, e.g. of specific parliamentary sessions, to substantiate their answers.

Questions 6 [11.], 7 [12.], 12 [17.], 17 [22.], 20 [25.], 23 [28.], 25 [30.] and 26 [31.] attracted too few answers for comment to be possible. Indicative content for all questions will be found in the markscheme.

9020/03 English History 1603-1832

Comments on Individual Questions.

Question numbers in brackets refer to Paper 5.

1. [2.] *THE ENGLISH CIVIL WAR – Reform on the Church of England.* See Paper 2 Q.2.

2. [3.] *BRITAIN AND THE AMERICAN COLONIES – Independence.*

There were very few answers to this question. Although the particular topic should have proved familiar, answers to part (d) often indicated limited background evidence from other sources. The answers to part (a) provided basic information about the references, but some did not provide sufficient explanation for the second mark. The documents for part (b) provided clearly contrasting views and all answers picked up on the more straightforward points. The best answers analysed such themes as war, trade and 'blood' to make an effective analytical contrast. For part (c) good answers identified key themes in Document E and showed, for example, how the 'patience' of the colonists, as described in Document B, and the 'haughtiness' of the British government, referred to in Document D, led to the failure of reconciliation. For part (d) too many commented on the quotation by assessing the whole period from 1763 to 1776. This marginally relevant approach left little time for developing an argument on 1775-76.

3-13[21-31] See Paper 2 Q.15-25.

14. [32.] Most answers were based on a narrative account of foreign policy from 1713 to 1740 and offered an occasional comment on the motives for the development of policies. Answers which reached the top two bands, however, were based more directly on 'British interests'. In this respect it was important to give some assessment of the importance of trade, and some consideration to the different states of Europe in respect of possible hostility, in order to explain the changing diplomacy of Stanhope, Townshend and Walpole.

15. [33.] This was a question on the causes of the Jacobite revolts of 1715 and 1745 rather than a question on why they failed. Some candidates had prepared for the latter and drifted all too easily in to an account of the events. It was possible to employ such ideas as the hope for French military support, but details of the decision to retreat from Derby, for example, were irrelevant. For good answers it was important to examine the impact of the Hanoverian succession on the political classes and on the divisions it produced among the Tories. Emphasis on Scotland was to be expected but good answers also considered the English aspects of the risings, even if the military actions did not mount to much in practice.

Report on the Components taken in June 2000

16. [34.] Questions on Walpole are usually well prepared for and this one was no exception. There were some excellent answers which gave due attention to royal favour and which emphasised the many other aspects of this question. Walpole's many skills as a politician were analysed in some depth and comment on this aspect was balanced nicely against the role of the Hanoverian monarchs. The less successful answers were those that provided an account of Walpole's period of government with an occasional relevant sentence of argument.
17. [35.] There were no answers to this question.
18. [36.] The tendency for some candidates to write narrative accounts was evident for this question on the fall of Pitt and Newcastle in 1761-62 and its consequences. Answers were not required to illustrate the political and diplomatic events of these years in great depth. The key theme was the determination of George III to break the hold of the Whig factions over policy making. Pitt's desire to extend the war to Spain was his opportunity to break the Pitt-Newcastle coalition and bring them down in turn. The consequence was the king's difficulties for nearly ten years in attempting to find a minister who could control Parliament and also represent his wishes.
19. [37.] There were very few answers to this question as it was set against Q.2 [3.].
20. [38.] This should have been a straightforward question but answers required some organisation of both ideas and detail. For the 'improving landlord' almost any examples of improvement could be made relevant. They could range from marling and draining to enclosure and animal husbandry. However, it was also essential to comment on how important these advances were, and this involved not only an element of comparison but also some consideration of other forces behind the agrarian revolution. In practice, there were few answers which managed to achieve this, while too many answers were based on a limited knowledge of basic detail.
21. [39.] Although there were only a few answers on Methodism, the overall quality was high. Candidates were well equipped in terms of detail and used a wide range of ideas to produce relevant answers. Naturally, the personality of John Wesley was given much emphasis, but few fell in to writing a biographical account. Comment was made not only on the forcefulness of his preaching and on his appeal to the lower classes but also on the organisation of Methodism and the system of classes in local chapels. Good answers also included the relevant deficiencies of the Church of England and, in particular, its failure to make much headway in the expanding industrial areas of the country.

22-26[40-44] See Paper 4 Q.5-Q.9.

Indicative content for questions will be found in the published markscheme.

9020/04 English History 1783-1974

General Comments

Those scripts earning the top two grades demonstrated considerable knowledge of detail, an understanding of the context of the period and skill in applying their knowledge to the particular questions set. Scripts which did not exhibit these characteristics quite so clearly were placed in the C grade. One group of such scripts is worthy of comment in this respect, and these were scripts which indicated skill in handling ideas but which lacked the evidence of enough accurate detail. Although the importance of argument has been stressed in these reports over many years, it is worth repeating that good argument needs the support of factual evidence if it is to be convincing.

The relevance of a candidate's argument also involves appreciating what is required for particular questions set. In two or three minutes set aside for the planning of an answer, candidates should look for the demands of a question and be prepared to shape their material accordingly. Understanding the significance of the dates which limit some questions is important. In Q.8 the period specified for the discussion of foreign policy was 1815 to 1830, but the last three years were often ignored. In Q.9 on Liverpool the period was identified as 1812 to 1827. Some answers used the period to 1815 to good effect, but many omitted it. In Q.18 the period specified for explaining the development of Anglo-German hostility started in 1890, but many answers opened with the Kruger Telegram. Q.24 on appeasement covered the years from 1929 to 1939 and this meant that the scope of the question included Japan and the Manchuria crisis.

In the same way key phrases point to the focus of a question and represent guidance for an analytical approach. In Q.8 'British interests' were specified and answers built around this term were the most successful. In Q.12 'personalities rather than principles' provided the basis for a relevant analysis in discussing the politics of 1846-65. In Q.15 it was important for candidates to realise that discussion was required on 'Gladstone and his party' rather than on Ireland and the Irish. In Q.19 the question on the Liberal welfare reforms required comment on 'major and successful innovation'. The importance of the time given to planning the strategy of an answer cannot be emphasised too much.

Comments on Individual Questions

1. [4.] *The Age of Reform 1832-46 The 1844 Factory Act*

In general, candidates who read the documents thoroughly acquired high marks. However, misunderstandings were apparent in the interpretation of Documents B and E, and lack of external evidence reduced marks for parts (a) and (d). The references in part (a) were not always identified accurately. Some credit was allowed for factory inspectors and for the 1832 Reform Act, but for full marks explanations needed to include comment on the 1833 Act and the Chartist petitions. For part (b) many answers indicated mistakenly that Roebuck in Document D agreed with the Vicar of Leeds in Document A. There was also a tendency to paraphrase document B and to comment on its second paragraph. For part (c) some answers demonstrated difficulty in drawing out the motives of the speakers concerned. Knight in Document F

was rightly dealt with in terms of the priority trade, although his second point about the domestic effects of a depression was often missed. In Document E Howick's sympathy for working class families was often misunderstood, although his attitude could have been compared quite effectively with the comments of Roebuck in Document B on 'agricultural nobles'. For the final part, good answers included comments on Peel's policies of improving conditions for the lower classes through lower prices of necessities rather than through social reform. Less successful answers repeated details from earlier answers without coming to grips with the question.

2. [5.] *City and Society C. 1840-C. 1880 – Public Health Reforms.* In part (a) there was no problem in the basic identification of the references, but some additional explanation or comment was necessary to secure the second mark. The essential point of the comparison in part (b) was to contrast the speed with which attempts were made to implement the 1848 Act. Answers were more effective when this point was made at the start of the answer rather than in the final sentence. Dr Piper in Document A provided a variety of examples which demonstrated the impact of the action taken in Darlington, whereas the slow pace of implementation by those responsible for Garston was clearly apparent in the Minutes of their Board in Document B. For part (c) some answers implied difficulty in assessing the usefulness of the documents by relying on mere paraphrase. Good answers, however, showed how well by the 1870s the big boroughs coped under their own efforts (Document C), how the legislation of 30 years had produced elements of confusion (Document E) and how pockets of great poverty still existed in a metropolis like London. For the final part comments on the set documents produced the basis for good marks, although few took the opportunity to use external evidence on aspects like the disappearance of epidemics, Gladstone's Local Government Act or Disraeli's attempt to clear up the legislative confusion.

3. [6.] *The Edwardian Age 1901-14 – The Condition of England.*

In part (a) the first reference was explained quite well, but examiners were surprised at the large number of candidates who misunderstood 'the artisan classes'. Answers to part (b) were usually effective. The three documents supplied considerable evidence, but care was needed to use it relevantly. Rowntree in Document A showed that provincial towns had poverty in line with the country's capital. Masterman in Document B focused on child poverty and the lack of protection for children, while Churchill argued in moral terms that the suffering of the poor required remedy. Part (c) required some assessment of reliability. Rowntree's work was generally well known and most answers used the details of his methods to suggest a degree of reliability. Masterman's style was felt by many candidates to be exaggerated, but the document did include some reliable evidence from the Factory Inspectors' reports. Answers to the final part were not quite so effective. A run through of the set documents was not particularly helpful, as some distinction was required between the poor and the working class. Only a minority of answers pointed to the measures of the Liberals which

might have offered some hope to groups like the old and 'the sweated worker', as identified by Churchill in Document D.

4. [7.] *Economy and Society in Britain 1919-39 – The Impact of Motor Transport on British Society.*

This question was answered by only a small number of candidates. For the references in part (a) most answers provided a basic explanation, but few added further explanation or detail to gain the second mark. The answers to part (b) on changing leisure pursuits for the lower classes were generally relevant and supported with evidence from all three documents. Document C indicated day trips at the sea by 'antiquated car', while the others emphasised the use of bicycles and coaches. Weaker answers tended to use excessive amounts of Priestley's description. There were also good answers for part (c) where most candidates found no difficulty in relating the statistics of Document E in revealing the different responses towards road casualties. Answers to the final part were not so effective. The ideas suggested in Document A were not developed and most answers depended on repeating the road accident evidence. Little external evidence was introduced.

5. [40.] A breadth of approach was necessary for a good mark and the analytical approach was useful in producing a direct assessment of Pitt's domination of politics. Royal support was a key factor in the first years, as the Regency crisis demonstrated. In the later part of the period, however, the success of Pitt's policies and the occupation of the middle ground in the political situation at the expense of Fox and the Whigs were significant factors. Most answers followed a chronological approach, introducing key factors when appropriate. Although this was not so economical as a straight analysis, it was capable of earning high marks. Some answers, however, allowed the narrative of Pitt's economic policies to predominate with the result that argument was stifled.

6. [41.] There were relatively few answers to this question on industrialisation and some of these indicated problems in handling knowledge relevantly. The key phrase in the question was 'every class', and an analysis of the effects of industrialisation on each class was required. However, answers often focused on the working class almost to the exclusion of other groups and some devoted far too much space to the standard of living controversy. 'Benefit' also required a little care in interpretation, as more than purely economic considerations could be included.

7. [42.] There were also few answers to this question on the Peninsular War. Attempts at a narrative were usually avoided and candidates realised that an analysis of the wider perspective was required to assess the question. Good answers tended to reject the sense of the quotation. Although Wellington's leadership and skills were accepted, other aspects of the problem were given, in some cases, greater consideration. These included the role of Royal Navy

in supplying the army, the distractions offered to the French armies of occupation by the Spanish forces and guerrillas and the errors made by both Napoleon and his generals in underestimating the 'Spanish Ulcer'.

8. [43.] The focus for this question was 'British interests' and a good answer had to be built around these. Some answers paid lip service to the term by not analysing the particular interests. Others identified the interests, but then turned the answer in to a comparison of Castlereagh and Canning. The best approach was to identify the key interests of restraining France, the balance of power and the importance of trade, as they were evident in the Vienna settlement, and then to follow each in turn to 1830. Few answers were quite so analytical, but many succeeded in discussing the interests under the handling of Castlereagh, Canning and the usually unnamed foreign secretaries from 1827-30. Some answers required rather more emphasis on the Vienna settlement but both policies and detail were usually well known.
9. [44.] This was probably the most popular question of the paper. Interpretations of Liverpool varied widely. At one level he was given credit for ensuring stability during the difficult years of 1815-20 and for a continuity of policy which can be seen running from his Pittite predecessors to the Liberal Tories. At the opposite end he was seen as oppressive to the lower classes and slow to introduce reform. Few agreed with Disraeli's comment that he was 'The Arch-Mediocrity'. The view that Liverpool could not be successful because he was repressive is not only rather dated but difficult to sustain. Some answers would not even give credit for the reforms of the Liberal Tories, since they had been produced by Peel, Huskisson and Robinson. Some answers omitted the years from 1812-15, or saw these years as only relevant for mentioning the Luddites. In terms of approach, it was important to avoid detailed examination of the causes of distress or of events involving discontent. A whole page devoted to 'Peterloo' was self-defeating, as it prevented balanced coverage of the period.
10. [45.] Although this appeared to many candidates to be a two-part question, good answers treated Peel and his ideas as the common denominator of both revival and split. Indeed, it was argued by some that Peel had not really reformed his party after 1834 and that the ideas behind the Tamworth manifesto were not acceptable to the Ultras. Although credit was given to Peel for the revival during the 1830s, it is interesting that Peel was seen by many as the author of his own downfall in 1846 through both his policies and his attitudes. The most widely used approach was to assess Peel's actions during the period to 1841 alongside Whig failures and then examine Peel's policies and legislation from 1842 to the abolition of the Corn Laws. This was capable of earning high marks and, although the question was set against a documents question, the general standard was good.
11. [46.] Many answers indicated that candidates had difficulty in using their undoubted knowledge of foreign policy from 1830 to 1865 for an assessment of success. Although the name of Palmerston did not figure in the question, many candidates seemed determined to construct their answers

around his policies. At the lower end of the mark range long accounts of Don Pacifico and the Spanish marriages appeared, but without context or assessment. Some answers omitted the Crimean war entirely and many ran out of time before reaching the 1860s. At the top end high quality answers identified the underlying principles of British foreign policy and selected appropriate examples from the whole period from 1830 to 1865 to illustrate them. In terms of success good answers doubted the 'almost unbroken success' of the quotation and pointed to the changing European balance after 1865 which led to the failures for Palmerston in 1863 and 1864.

12. [47.] This question on the politics of 1846 to 1865 proved quite popular and there were many good answers which succeeded in balancing the key terms of 'personalities' and 'principle'. For all answers the role of leading politicians was explained quite effectively, with Disraeli, Palmerston and Gladstone featuring strongly. In many answers the weakness of the Tories was emphasised and the link between Whigs, Peelites and Radicals from 1859 developed successfully. However, the principles that divided the parties were often not recognised in the weaker answers, while the relevant context of the advantageous economic conditions of mid-Victorian prosperity were not mentioned.
13. [48.] Answers to this question were few and often weak. The range of relevant material was broad, since it included both living and working conditions. However, knowledge of basic detail was limited and relevant argument was expressed only in general terms. There were few references to the considerable number of Factory Acts from 1833 to 1878, or to the concern for public health in the wake of epidemics which led to many local initiatives and to local Acts. The extent of success might have been limited in the first part of the period, but the measures associated with Disraeli's second ministry were more comprehensive and should have been well known.
14. [49.] There were no answers to this question.
15. [50.] This question demonstrates how important it is for candidates to identify the focus of a question. In this case the question required an assessment of the effect of Gladstone's mission to pacify Ireland himself and on the Liberal party. However, many answers were based on the problems of Ireland and outlined how Gladstone tackled each problem in turn. This oblique approach usually produced enough comment on Gladstone himself, but little attention was given to the effects on the Liberal party. In addition, answers which included descriptive detail involved in aspects such as the land problem ran out of time. The crucial events of 1885-86 were then only squeezed in at the end or, in the case of weak answers, omitted entirely. With an analytical approach good answers, and there were many of them, examined the state of the Liberal party at all stages from 1868, when Ireland was a unifying focus, to 1886 when the party split with the loss of the Liberal Unionists.
16. [51.] This question on the Scramble for Africa required an examination of the underlying causes of British expansion and it was important for answers to

offer a variety of explanation. Some tackled the question through personalities like Goldie, Rhodes and Gordon. This was quite successful if they were used as examples of the economic, patriotic and humanitarian aspects of the topic. However, the government attitude to colonies, summed up by the term 'Reluctant Imperialism', also required some discussion, especially when dealing with the 1870s and 1880s. Less successful answers dealt with particular areas of Africa in too much detail and failed to emphasise the motives adequately.

17. [52.] The later part of the period of Conservative rule in the years from 1886 to 1905 was usually discussed quite well. Good use was made of the weaknesses of Conservative policies from 1902 and especially of the effect of Chamberlain's campaign for Tariff Reform. As the Conservatives appeared increasingly divided, the Liberals were starting on the road to recovery. Comments on the leadership of Balfour were also relevant, most notably in the decision to resign in 1905. The earlier period from 1886 to 1892, however, was understated in many answers. Important measures in terms of local government reform and education were seriously neglected, while the government's Irish policy also deserved some comment.
18. [53.] This question on Anglo-German was usually well answered. The more analytical answers, which focused on underlying themes like colonial and naval rivalry, and eventually the role of public opinion and the European balance of power, were especially effective. Surveys of the period with comment on German hostility sometimes suffered from a lack of balance, since too much was written on the earlier years. Nevertheless, a controlled narrative with clear argument at key stages was able to gain quite high marks. Weaker answers provided patchy coverage, sometimes starting with 1896.
19. [54.] Questions on the Liberal reforms are usually popular, although this question was set against the documents question on the Edwardian Age. While there were some well argued answers based on a good knowledge of the reforms, other answers showed that some candidates had difficulty in focusing on 'major and successful innovation'. A general approach to the question, commenting on the background to the reforms, together with limited reference to particular reforms, was not really adequate. The best answers adapted their knowledge by carefully examining the welfare reforms in turn to assess how much was new about them and how successful they were. Measure like Old Age pensions, National Insurance and the Children's Charter fell into the innovative category, although many answers rightly pointed out how much was learned from German practice.
20. [55.] This question on the First World War required a variety of ideas in just the same way as other questions. In practice, some answers focused narrowly on little more than a couple of battles and contrived to lay the blame on the generals. This kind of argument has been superseded, although perhaps not in popular literature. The breadth of good answers was shown by the examination of major themes concerning the nature of battlefield weapons,

like artillery, machine guns and (eventually) tanks, and the effects of a long war between evenly balanced forces on the relatively narrow Western Front. Good answers also examined the naval war and especially submarine warfare, the consequences of which contributed so much to the material cost of the war.

21. [56.] This was a popular question and candidates seemed well prepared for a question on the Conservatives between the wars. Outline surveys of Baldwin's second ministry, with some comment and with plenty of information about policies, produced competent essays. The best answers identified some sensible criteria in order to explain what success amounted to. This was not necessarily in terms of them winning the next election and tended to be based on how far the government's policies and reforms were useful in the long run. The 1929 Local Government Act, Chamberlain's pensions policies, the National Grid and the BBC were in that category. There was no consensus over the General Strike, some answers suggesting that Baldwin failed to restrain the more vindictive members of his party and some viewing his planning as important to keep the country going.
22. [57.] This was another popular question, although the outcome was not so successful as the previous question. The period to be covered was much longer and argument was required to explain the 'fluctuating success' of the Labour party. Many answers were heavily based on the two ministries and restricted to discussion of MacDonald's policies. This was satisfactory, but the problem was that, with little success in any of Labour's domestic policies, fluctuations were difficult to identify. The longer view, starting from 1918, however, enabled the better answers to discuss the emergence of Labour both as the largest party of the centre-left of the political spectrum and as the official opposition. Even during the 1930s, which was neglected in many answers, Labour retained much of its popular support, especially in local government.
23. [58.] There were relatively few answers to this question on unemployment between the wars. Although there were some answers which indicated an understanding of the different causes of unemployment, too many attempts dealt with unemployment in general terms. Apart from the National Government's attempts to help Special Areas, the assessment of government policy was often unsatisfactory. Good answers examined the regional incidence of structural unemployment and the reliance of governments, Coalition, Conservative, Labour and National, on a revival in the trade cycle to restore employment levels. Most of these answers followed a sensible chronological structure and this enabled them to examine the two notable economic decisions of the period: the return to the Gold Standard in 1925 and the reaction to the Wall St. Crash in the years 1929-31.
24. [59.] This was a very popular question and it produced a large number of essays with high marks. These succeeded in managing the three major themes involved, notably the underlying causes of appeasement derived from the 1920s, the particular policies of Baldwin and Chamberlain in reaction to

aggression and the need to examine not only Germany but also Japan and Italy. An analytical approach helped to focus the argument, while a blow by blow account of the diplomacy and military actions of the 1930s tended to produce a narrative. It was important to include some comment on Japan and Italy, but it was quite legitimate to give the main emphasis to Britain's relationship with Nazi Germany. The importance of public opinion was rightly discussed, but it is worth pointing out that the term 'pacifism' should have been used with rather more care by some candidates, especially in respect of the Peace Ballot.

25-29[60-64] The period after 1939 attracted so few candidates and the range of answers was so small that useful comments are not possible.

Indicative content for all questions will be found in the published markscheme.

9020/05 English History 1450-1974

The entry for this paper remains fairly constant and the pass rate is similar to that of Paper 4. In most cases candidates and centres make use of questions which cross the boundary lines of Papers 2, 3, and 4.

For general comments on particular questions, see the reports on Papers 2, 3 and 4 as listed below:

For Questions 1-2 and 8-31 see Paper 2.

For Questions 3 and 32-39 see Paper 3.

For questions 4-7 and 40-64 see Paper 4.

Question numbers in square brackets refer to Paper 5.

9020/06 The Social and Economic History of Britain

General Comments

The entry rates were down compared with last year, although pass rates were comparable. There were a number of sound scripts, which showed a good level of understanding and knowledge of syllabus topics. However, factual material was not always used to provide support for focused, analytical answers. This was especially true of the questions on living standards (Q.4), public health reformers (Q.8) and nineteenth century trade unions (Q.11).

The planning of questions had improved compared with previous years. This led to better question analysis and answers displaying a fair degree of relevance. Some candidates failed to focus on key words and terms, and failed to cover all parts of some questions. This led to unbalanced answers and the subsequent loss of a significant number of marks.

There was a continuation of the tendency for candidatures from some centres to answer the same questions (based on standardised material) from a narrow chronological timeframe. A broader approach to studying the syllabus would probably reap dividends.

Comments on Individual Questions

1. Parts (a) and (b) were covered reasonable well. A number of candidates struggled with (c), describing rather than evaluating the documents. There were some very competent responses to (d) combining sensible analysis with supporting detail.
4. Many candidates had obviously studied this topic in depth and clearly understood the differences between the Optimists and Pessimists. The best answers focused on the motives behind the stances taken by various historians. There were a number of candidates, however, who simply described what historians disagree about.
6. A significant number of candidates overlooked the need to cover both parts of this question. Generally, 'problems faced by farmers' was dealt with adequately with some sound material on the effects of the French Wars and the Corn Laws. The success of farmers in their attempts to deal with problems tended to be neglected.
8. There were some excellent (if somewhat unbalanced) discussion of achievements. The role of Chadwick tended to be overemphasised. The main part of the question was dealt with less impressively with vague reference to economic efficiency. Many argued that attempts to reform occurred simply because living conditions were bad.
11. Most candidates clearly understood the requirements of the question, although there was a stronger knowledge and understanding of New Model Unions than of the older forms of union organisation. The best answers adopted a clear, coherent compare and contrast approach. Narrative approaches, although detailed, gained less credit.

There were too few answers to questions 3, 5, 7, 9, 10 and 21-22 to allow for meaningful comments. Indicative content for all questions will be found in the markscheme.

9020/07 History of USA 1783-1945

General Comments

The general standard of responses was comparable with last year. The introduction of the revised generic mark bands schemes has had the positive effect of producing more analytically based essays, with less emphasis on straight or predominantly narrative approaches. Relevance however remains a problem for many candidates with terminal dates being ignored and attempts to force pre-learnt material into the mould of a question. Choice of question topics remains somewhat predictable and unadverturous; while candidates will of course adopt whatever strategy they believe will maximise their marks, this at times means questions were answered with which many were not at ease, while some questions remained largely ignored. There was less awareness of the relevant literature than one would have liked and this at times led to candidates missing the main thrust of a question, as in Q.9. The best answers were a pleasure to read: well organised, with clear themes and direction, always relevant and showing skill, imagination, displaying good quality material i.e. a relevant analytical manner. There seems to be no significant progress towards improving the fourth answer problem. This usually takes one of two forms. In the first, candidates seem to have only prepared three topics, hence are left with an uncongenial question at the end. In the second, time allocation is weak, leading to a hurried, relatively brief last answer, which in extreme cases takes the form of note answers.

The document based question is compulsory and it is desirable that it should be answered first, so as to provide a platform on which the candidate can gain confidence on shorter answers. Surprisingly often this was not done and, where this was the case, the quality was at the lower end of the mark range.

Comments on Individual Questions

1. The documentary sources this year broke new ground, focusing on the issues put before the American people by the political parties in the 1860 Presidential elections. Candidates met this challenge well and marks were comparable with those in previous years. However, as in the past, understanding was stronger on the earlier factually based questions, rather than the later ones requiring more discussion and awareness of non-given sources. Candidates need reminding that repetition of the documents, as distinct from quotations to illustrate a point being made, will earn few marks.
 - (a)(i) Nearly all got this right. The Republicans are making it clear that the Union has to be preserved, and therefore secession is opposed; the second mark is earned by pointing out that states rights are to be preserved, i.e. slavery where it already exists is protected.
 - (ii) This refers to the controversial majority ruling of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case. Most candidates got this right, but some failed to earn the second mark by explaining what the decision was, and why it was so controversial.

- (iii) This refers to the policy of extending slavery in viable conditions, by acquiring through purchase the then Spanish Colony of Cuba. This was a favourite suggestion of the slave states.
- (b) Reasonably well answered by most candidates. The key question was on extension of slavery into the territories. Whereas the breakaway Breckinridge faction of Democrats regarded it as an unassailable right to have slaves in any territory of the United States, and asserted that it was for the voting population of any territory to decide whether it should enter as a free or slave state, the mainstream of the Party fudged this issue by stating that these issues were for the Supreme Court and for Congress to determine.
- (c) Nearly all candidates made the obvious point that the documents had to be reliable in so far as they were official statements of policy, but many did not go on to consider the extent to which divisions of view were stifled; in the case of the Republicans in B, only the threat of a walk-out caused the extract from the Declaration on Independence to be inserted, and while the integrity and permanence of the Union is stated, there is no indication of what measures should be adopted if secession were to take place. In the case of Document C, the underlying issue which had already split the Democrats (and which was to cost Douglas the Presidency) is ignored, even though the southern radical wing had walked out. There was no mention at all of possible secession of some states and what should be done about this. To that extent, neither Document B nor C was completely reliable on the question of 'the permanent and indissoluble nature' of the union, more so in the case of the mainstream Democrats in C.
- (d) This question was indifferently tackled by most candidates, and is clearly of a type which causes difficulties. While time constraints were often a factor, too many candidates simply summarised the documents. The reference to 'any other evidence' was usually ignored. Conclusions were too often hesitant, and did not follow from argument, analysis and evidence. The key was to identify accurately the key events of the 1850s; the 1850 compromise and its breakdown, the growing hostility in the south, the Kansas-Nebraska Act, failure to enforce effectively the Fugitive Slave Laws, the formation of the Republican Party, the Dred Scott judgement, and John Brown's raid. These all had the effect of widening and deepening sectioned antagonisms. Only after confronting some of these factors could candidates realistically assess the extent to which the Parties did confront them. Few candidates paid much attention to the Constitutional Union platform, which could well be attacked on the grounds that it simply evaded discussion of real differences, whereas both Republicans and to a less extent Democrats did attempt to confront them.
2. A popular question with carefully prepared material. However a common weakness was to fail to define clearly terms such as "radical" and "conservative" in their contemporary context. Radicals favoured a wider franchise, direct popular accountability, and the ideals of the 1776 Declaration; Conservatives favoured property rights, a strong executive, a strong federal government and stability of existing hierarchies in society. Most scripts showed how the new system was clearly practical and workable.

3. The most popular question and one for which candidates were clearly prepared. The only common criticism to make was that the dire state of US finances at the time of Hamilton's appointment needed more attention. While accounts of Hamilton's main measures were at most competent, at best excellent, the second part of the question often received inadequate or perfunctory attention. A point that needed greater attention was the emergence of a party system, which Washington had strongly opposed. The joint effect of Hamilton's conservative and elitist policies and the French Revolution led to Jefferson and Madison breaking away from the Federalists.
4. A popular question but not particularly well answered. Factual knowledge was variable, with some candidates seemingly unaware of the time period being covered i.e. 1817-25 (some answers dealt with the war of 1812). Better scripts were more balanced and focused with due regard for the sectional conflicts as shown by the Missouri Compromise and arguments over tariffs. Foreign policy such as the famous Monroe Doctrine was outside the cope of the question.
5. A very popular question but standards were very patchy, leading only too often to a standard Jackson answer, with the variable being the quality of material deployed. The key starting point had to be that Jackson in effect created the modern Democratic Party, now the oldest in the world, and in his person and policies embodied the authentic voice of American democracy. But while most scripts highlighted such policies as his strong nationalism and belief in majority rule and social egalitarianism as being democratic; his disregard for minorities and his policies towards Indian nations were less so, unless one were to adopt the typically Jacksonian robust view that if the majority of white men wanted something, it must be democratic. Very few scripts mentioned the Van Buren presidency, which was within the time period of the question.
6. Very popular among some overseas centres, but very few answers from UK centres. The factual basis of answers was weak, with no data on how many slaves there were, what they did and their distribution. Changing attitudes needed to be spelt out and the social and economic basis of slavery to be outlined before the question could be tackled well.
7. The quality was good though some candidates misread the question to include transportation and economic development. By and large responses were relevant, well written and with a good balance displayed between the different kinds of movement. Possibly too little attention was paid to the reasons for the emergence of so many reformist bodies, and few emphasised the interlocking connections that existed frequently. Curiously, the various forms of abolitionism received less attention than one would expect.
8. A large number of answers of highly variable standard. The central point was grasped by most candidates that the spectacular success of American troops, while leading to a huge expansion of US territory, reopened in an acute form the sectional conflicts that had lain dominant. Too little attention was paid to The Compromise of 1850 and why, unlike the Missouri Compromise, it proved to be unviable. Accounts of the various events of the 1850s which worsened sectional conflict were usually competent.

9. A popular question, usually well answered. Stronger candidates included references to histographical material and were thematic and analytical; others had broad and unfocused narratives. A common theme analysed was that the war, while being 'unnecessary', was in some sense 'inevitable'. It was clear that that some candidates did not grasp the reference in the question to the 'revisionist' argument on the causes of the conflict.
10. A very popular question but not particularly well answered. The biggest fault was a tendency to write a general response on the reasons for the Confederate defeat without focusing sufficiently on the States' rights and slavery components. Even weaker scripts had often good solid knowledge on the disparity in human and material resources and on the qualities of leadership on both sides. Some answers had far too much on individual campaigns and battles.
11. The key here was to show insight on the link between different Reconstruction policies and President Johnson's impeachment. Most answers devoted themselves to accounts of the rival Presidential Congressional schemes of Reconstruction and then tacked on a descriptive account of the attempt to remove Johnson. The best approach was to take the unprecedented clash as an example of the failure of the separation of powers doctrine. The President had consistently obstructed the legislative function, and in turn congress had passed Acts encroaching on his powers as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive. The immediate cause of impeachment was Johnson's dismissal, as Secretary for War, of Stanton in violation of the Tenure of Office Act. No answers drew the conclusion that though the President survived, there followed a period of Congressional dominance and weak Presidents.
12. Very few candidates answered this question.
13. The only answers came from overseas centres and all contained more passion than reason or analysis. No scripts distinguished between State and Federal governments and how the latter shifted from hostility and indifference at the start of the period to an ineffective paternalism by the end.
14. Not a popular question and answered only in general terms by those who tackled it. What one was looking for was lots of specific, detailed material on the steady advance of female emancipation, starting with education, entry in to the professions, acquiring the vote in western states, increasing participation in the whole work force and in 1919 the Constitutional amendment conferring the vote as a right.
15. No candidates answered this question.
16. A popular question but too many candidates adopted an exclusively narrative approach instead of the thematic, analytical one that the question demanded. Few pointed out that, in practice, the US had always been expansionist, as The Manifest Destiny movement indicated; only Canada remained immune from mainland expansion and then only because the US in practice recoiled from war with Britain. The imperialism of the later period was directed to annexation of overseas colonies in the first instance and then in the first decade of the 20th century to acquiring hegemony

in the smaller central American states and the creation of the US Canal Zone in Panama. One looked in vain for analysis of the causes of this new wave of expansionism.

17. Few candidates answered this question, as Taft has always been regarded as the least important of the Progressive triumvirate. The biggest weakness was a failure to confront and define the term 'progressive'. Without this answers were inevitably little more than descriptive narratives. Some responses did, however, have very good material which, when skilfully used, earned high marks.
18. A popular question, where answers were often poorly focused and with uncertain grasp of what was required. Too much attention was paid on World War I and far too little to The Versailles Treaty and the negative Senate and public response to this. Domestic issues such as rationing, conscription, nationalisation and restrictions on civil liberties were ignored almost totally.
19. Many responses were too often unfocused, being a list of events of the decade with at best an implicit argument. Some good material was produced, often well presented with a concentration on the new, progressive features such as the impact of the automobile revolution, but relatively little on more negative features such as growing xenophobia, censorship and intolerance, most famously depicted in the notorious Tennessee 'monkey trial'. Conclusions, when drawn, were tentative and appended to the end rather than argued throughout from relevant evidence.
20. Much less popular than usual. Candidates were reluctant to examine the thinking behind the New Deal but took refuge in factual argument which failed to address the question. Few addressed the sharp break in policy leading to the Second New Deal and the reasons for this, not the reasons for FDR difficulties with Congress, following his overwhelming 1936 re-election.
21. Not many responses; those that did answer had some good points and material quite skilfully used, but with too sharp a concentration of the 1920s, showing in some detail how, in spite of isolationist rhetoric, the decade was characterised by active diplomacy of a constructive and internationalist kind. However, possibly because of time pressures, responses neglected the 1930s where different and more serious problems confronted the Administration.
22. No candidates answered this question.

Indicative content for all questions will be found in the markscheme.

9020/10 European History 337-c.1500

General Comments

A range of abilities was seen, but with a strong top end. Many good or very good answers were read, meriting Band 1's range of marks. Interestingly, the Document Question delivered less assured answers than in 1999; this was less the result of the nature of the question material, more a product of uneven, underdeveloped techniques. Essays fared better, indeed much better, for many. Pleasingly, candidates usually delivered an even profile of marks, though a few found it difficult to sustain performance across three essays. As ever, the key qualities were strong question focus, utmost relevance of answers, good use of supporting evidence, analysis and evaluation based around cohesion, coherence and cogency. Clear, focused, well-directed answers, exploring a range of core issues and themes, will always score well or very well, according to the Mark Banding Definitions, both generic and topic-specific.

Comments on those Questions attempted follow below.

Comments on Individual Questions

- Q1 (a) answers often needed a little more identification, development, contextualisation; some answers were not that secure as to identifications in (i) and (ii). (b) answers were decent, often strong in paraphrases and use of textual content (though language and tone could have been stronger in commentary), but not always achieving strong, direct, close comparisons. It was important to deliver the latter, rather than simply outline content details. (c) needed strong and assured focus on 'objectives' and a good sense of utility (testing authorship, standpoint, dates and especially relationship to context). Such was not always delivered that confidently. (d) is an overview question and does require a sensible, balanced engagement with all the documents and their contents and, importantly, good use of topic knowledge. There remains a tendency to deliver one or the other, but not both. 'Religious zeal and inspiration' needed good development, set against (e.g.) military skills, leadership, strategy and tactics, determination, Muslim weaknesses. Overall, careful consideration of evaluative techniques would be helpful: utility, comparison, contrast, the interactions of texts and contexts.
- Q3 There were some decent and good answers. It was important to address and illustrate both military and governmental weaknesses and to put such into a wider contextual focus (social, economic, barbarian activity). Common faults tended to be an imbalance of coverage and an over-generalisation of remarks; better answers tried to provide such balance and to support argument, though knowledge levels were often not as extensive as they should have been.
- Q4 Quite a popular question and there were some good answers but a number lacked appropriate focus and development. Clearly, range was important; so, too, sharpness of evaluation as to 'how successful'. Candidates might have made more of the political and military arenas, the balance of Western and Eastern activities, levels of control, the nature of the legacy.

- Q5 A small number were seen. Knowledge of Gregory I's activities was decently sound but a better focus on the contributions to the development of the Papacy, its powers, claims, rights, administration was needed. The issues of his uniqueness (or otherwise) and the limitations to his power and authority (via compromise as well as contextual factors) needed more assessment.
- Q6 Balance was important here. Both Charles Martel and Pepin III needed coverage, even if there was to be argument in favour of one or the other. Comparison and evaluation could have been sharper in many instances and much more made of military activity, leadership, mayoral roles and powers, the eventual assumption of kingship. On balance, candidates probably knew more about Charles Martel than Pepin.
- Q7 This was popular and was done well or very well in many instances. Question focus was good, often sharp; range of knowledge often impressive; appraisal of internal and external factors judicious, even shrewd. Perhaps some answers could have dwelt a little more on the growth of local power, the feudal arena, the growing differences between the kingdoms and the effects of weakened leadership. The best answers did all such – and more – putting events and features into the context of Charlemagne's legacy.
- Q8 Again, quite popular and some very good answers, with evident erudition on display. The key to successful answer was a balanced coverage of actions, events, outcomes in respect of both Eastern Europe and Italy. Some answers, no matter how good, devoted themselves too much to Italy and fell into Bands 3 or Lower 2 at best. The best sustained focus, range, detailed development, bringing in all the rulers and assessing strategic, political, commercial, territorial and religious factors within a context of authority, claims, power, overlordship, both German and Italian.
- Q9 Some good answers were seen here. Knowledge levels were good, often impressive, and there was balance of coverage between Leo and Nicholas, with such put into the wider contexts of the reform movement and of papal developments. Relations with rulers and churches, with the Eastern Church, primacy issues, monasteries, synods and legates, administration and leadership, all featured strongly. The very best answers considered the situation before and after their activities.
- Q10 A few answers were seen. This question needed answers of suitable chronological range and analytical assessment of the kings and their leading vassals, all within the royal and feudal arenas. It would be fair to say that not enough exploration of such themes occurred. More needed to be said, more demonstrated, about the respective positions, power(s) and wealth, the overlord-vassal relationship, the degrees of independence exhibited but also the opportunities presented to the kings. Survival was all important. Answers lacked good evaluative scope in respect of the terms of the question.
- Q11 This question had some take-up. In many ways, it was very straightforward, provided the candidate had good knowledge. But it required good focus on 'remarkably vigorous and constructive' in the title; such was not always achieved. Detail levels could have been stronger in places and more should have been made of features such

Report on the Components taken in June 2000

as the developments in government, administration and finance, the exploitation of feudal rights and of the 'pull' of kingship, the extent of controls exerted.

- Q18 This had a small take-up. Answers had some focus but needed greater sharpness on seriousness and the Church; the levels of threat, their character, their support, all required good assessment so to evaluate significance and scale.
- Q21 This question needed range and scope, good detail levels, a certain balance between demographic features, urban and rural, commercial-industrial and agrarian, and patterns of economic activity, social response, crisis and then recovery. The tendency was for answers to lack such balance, and to lack appropriate development in detail levels, no matter the breadth of topic arena.
- Q24 Answers here tended to be too descriptive and often general at that; not enough focus was given to the recovery of France, and Joan's activities needed to be set into a context of changing French and English fortunes so to evaluate her importance. After all, her career was brief and it is possible to argue that it was more symbolic than anything else. Argument was not engaged enough.

The Mark Scheme provides indicative content for the above Questions and those that were not attempted.

9020/11–14 European History 1450-1973

This is a report on four components, 9020 / 11, 9020/12, 9020/13 and 9020/14 because some questions were common to several question papers. Comments on the components can be identified as follows:

9020/11 European History 1450 - 1715: *Q.1, Q.2, Q.3 etc.*

9020/12 European History 1610 - 1815: *{Q.1}, {Q.2}, {Q.3} etc.*

9020/13 European History 1789 - 1973: *[Q.1], [Q.2], [Q.3] etc.*

9020/14 European History 1450 - 1973: *(Q.1), (Q.2), (Q.3) etc.*

General Comments

All of the assistant examiners agreed that the overall standard of the scripts was sound and represented another improvement in candidates' achievement. This was confirmed by senior examiners who, in addition to marking their own allocation of scripts, reviewed the work of assistant examiners, and by the Award and Grade Review Meetings. Most candidates wrote answers which were relevant and which attempted to pursue historical arguments supported by appropriate knowledge. There were comparatively few very weak scripts which lacked relevance, argument and knowledge. All examiners read some excellent scripts and, although they were few, the really outstanding scripts were the remarkable products of candidates who showed a maturity and judgement far beyond what might be expected for A level. The scripts which gained the highest grades demonstrated the ability to deal with a variety of problems and to display diverse historical skills in a limited time. Their common ingredient, which marked them out from very sound but less impressive scripts, was usually the ability to focus on a question and to harness material in an organised and persuasive manner. They showed a flexible response. Although candidates are guaranteed a question on each of the specified topics in the syllabus, the questions are framed to present the problem in a different way from year to year, although not in such an unusual manner as to be unfairly difficult. The most successful candidates adapted their material to the questions whereas the less successful often reproduced answers which had been learned.

The largest entry was for 9020/13, then 9020/11. The number of candidates studying the later seventeenth century and the eighteenth century is now very small, reflected in the size of the entry for 9020/12. Some centres study a wider range of topics and therefore enter 9020/14. In 9020/13, the largest proportion of candidates studied the period from the Vienna settlement to the outbreak of the First World War. Very few answered questions on the post-Second World War years. In 9020/11, the emphasis was on the sixteenth century. In all components, answers showed a concentration of study on political and foreign policy topics and, in 9020/11, on religious topics. Individual centres studied some cultural topics such as the Renaissance and the eighteenth-century *philosophes* but generally cultural, economic, social and scientific questions were avoided by candidates. It is worth noting that candidates who tackled the questions on the Renaissance and the *philosophes* usually wrote very successful answers.

The Award meeting confirmed that the results in these different components were similar; there is no evidence that any one of the components is more, or less, demanding than the others. (The Award Meeting includes representatives from other OCR History syllabuses to ensure comparability between all of the Board's four syllabuses.) The judgement of the

examiners and the results of the candidates did not show any significant difference in the difficulty of individual document-based and essay questions.

The assessment criteria are published in the mark schemes, which are available to centres. A brief summary would point out that the higher mark bands require analysis and/ or explanation of the stated problems. The middle mark bands are usually appropriate for answers which are mostly narrative or descriptive. The story is understood but candidates are less able to analyse and assess the issues which are involved. Answers which are just acceptable show poor degree of knowledge or argument and limited success in combining the two.

The current standard of writing does not indicate universal problems. There is not a correlation between less able candidates and poor writing, and skilled candidates and accurate writing. Examiners read some scripts which show a sound degree of understanding and knowledge but which are written carelessly. However, some scripts were prone to carelessness. Some of the errors are easily avoidable, for example the misspelling of notable names. Other problems relate to basic points of grammar and punctuation. Good practice needs to be developed before the examination. Even with the pressures of time in an examination, candidates should avoid abbreviations such as 'Cav' for Cavour. Examiners received some scripts which were difficult to read. Every effort is made to read these fully but poor handwriting does not serve candidates well.

Most candidates completed the required four questions and used their time sensibly. Whilst the majority answered the document-based question first, some adopted a different strategy. There is no evidence that this led to different results, except that some candidates who answered the document-based question last were sometimes prone to give short weight to the final sub-question, which carried the highest tariff of marks. If the document-based question is answered last and if time is short, candidates would be advised to answer the sub-questions in reverse order to accumulate the highest possible total. Most candidates who wrote plans for the essays did so sensibly - that is they highlighted the main issues to be discussed but did not waste time writing unnecessary details at this point. Introductions were usually appropriately brief and crisp. References to historians are rewarded when they are appropriate but examiners do not expect such detailed knowledge of A level candidates. Many of the most successful answers lacked direct quotations but showed an understanding of historians' attitudes to problems. This comment should not dissuade candidates from including quotations, but underlines the point that more credit is given when answers show that they understand what historians are saying. It is helpful to add a brief comment when writing a quotation: why is it important? how does it link to the argument in the answer?

The mark schemes are available from OCR and centres will note that the guidance on individual essay questions usually begins with the identification of the key issue. This is also how candidates should begin. Each question is based on a key issue. For example, it might be analytical ('Why did...?') or comparative ('Compare the importance of ...') or explanatory ('Explain the importance of...'). It might involve the assessment of a quotation. This key issue gives the candidates guidance about the best way to organise an answer and the necessary areas on which to concentrate. The analytical question requires a series of points which the most successful answers provide in a hierarchy of priorities. Comparative questions are best answered when they show the ability to link different

elements. Explanatory questions usually require candidates to examine the causes or effects of an historical development.

The comments below on the individual document-based questions show that most candidates showed the necessary skills in using primary sources. The less successful answers tended to paraphrase the extracts instead of using them to answer the questions. Whilst examiners expect candidates to refer to the extracts to support their arguments, this does not require long summaries. The least successful answers were usually those which asked candidates to assess the usefulness or reliability of the documents, and the final questions which stipulated that the questions should be answered 'Using these documents, and any other evidence known to you'. Approximately half of the marks for this sub-question are allocated to each of these elements. Less successful answers to questions about usefulness or reliability often rely on general assertions about bias these gain few marks. In the final questions there was a tendency in the weaker answers only to summarise the printed documents.

Comments on Individual Questions

Document-based Questions

Q.1,(Q.1)

The Protestant Reformation, 1517 - 1563.

The topic was 'Luther and the Papacy' and the answers represented sound levels of understanding and relevance. Most of the answers to (ai) were able to explain briefly the reference to Eck, mentioning the decisive debate with Luther. Candidates were not expected to have detailed knowledge of Huss in (aii) but most were aware of his reputation as a heretic, with which Luther was associated. The responses to (b) were usually sound but some should have emphasised Luther's appeal to German national feelings. The key issue in (c) was whether Capito's advice in Document B was realistic. The most successful answers noted the extreme tone of Document A. Although Capito advised moderation, it is difficult to envisage that Luther would take his advice. (d) asked candidates to assess the usefulness and reliability of Document C. Candidates were given credit when they noted briefly the humanist beliefs of Erasmus, the writer of the extract, and some pointed out the importance of the document as a letter to the Archbishop Elector of Mainz. Whilst most agreed that Erasmus was trying to defend Luther, very good answers also appreciated that Erasmus was seeking to divert blame from the papacy; he saw the friars as more responsible for the quarrel. This point is useful because it represents the stance of a moderate Catholic who was aware of the faults in the Church and who was willing to criticise the papacy. The answers to (e) usually used the printed documents effectively to judge the balance of responsibility between Luther and the papacy for the failure to reach a settlement. The quality of the references to other evidence was more variable – for high marks it is essential.

Q.2, {Q.1}, (Q.2) Louis XIV, 1661 - 1715
The question was based on the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Satisfactory answers to (ai) included brief references to the Edict of Nantes. The reference in (aii) was to the general foreign situation which gave security to Louis XIV in 1684-85, but candidates were not required to demonstrate exact knowledge of foreign affairs. The responses to (aiii), the reference to Geneva, were variable in accuracy. Whereas the less successful answers to (b) only summarised Documents D and E, the better answers made a deliberate effort to compare them and to explain the differences. The key issue in (c) was the usefulness of Documents F and G; again summaries were given little credit but the most successful answers were particularly convincing in assessing Saint-Simon's views in Document G. In the answers to (d), most candidates were able to explain the development in Louis XIV's policy in Documents B and C, but some saw Document A as evidence of his tolerance whereas the extract states that he wished to weaken the Huguenots and 'interpret concessions as strictly as justice and propriety allowed'. Most of the answers to (e) were sound and balanced. There were some useful references to Colbert, although some candidates forgot that he was dead in 1685 when the Edict of Nantes was revoked.

{Q.2},{Q.1}, (Q.3) France, 1787 - 1799
The question was based on the fall of the Jacobins. The explanations of the Festival of the Supreme Being in (ai) and Marat in (aii) were usually clear and correct. Answering (b), candidates focused on the growing unpopularity of Robespierre in Documents A and B, but some should have emphasised more the significance of the hostility of 'a real *sans-culotte*'. Answers to (c) were given credit when they considered the purpose of Robespierre's speech in Document C, as well as its content. This dramatic extract gave the opportunity for comments on its tone. The assessments of Documents D and E in (d) were usually well-judged, although the comparative element should have been stronger in some answers. Most of the answers to (e) were well-informed about the fall of the Jacobins.

{Q.2}, (Q.4) The Unification of Germany, 1848 - 1871
The question was based on the meeting at Ems of the King of Prussia and the French Ambassador. Examiners were pleased with the explanations in (ai - ii). The responses to (b) were also usually sound. The quality of answers to (c) was more variable. Candidates tended to make judgements about *The Times* and *The Manchester Guardian* without looking sufficiently at the text of Documents B and D. For example, *The Times* may (or may not) be more reliable today than *The Guardian* but this does not necessarily apply to the late nineteenth century. Answers could have noted that *The Manchester Guardian* mentions its source, a German newspaper, and points out the difficulty of knowing exactly what had gone on between the King and the Ambassador. The assessment of Ems in (d) allowed candidates to

put the fateful meeting in the context of other developments which led to war between Prussia and France.

[Q.3], (Q.5)

Hitler and Germany, 1933 - 1945

The question was based on the Nazis' use of the legal system. Almost all of the candidates explained 'the folk community' correctly in (ai) and the moves against the SA ('The Night of the Long Knives') referred to in (aii), but a number of answers could not identify *Der Stürmer* as a leading Nazi publication in (aiii). The views of judicial independence in (bi) were usually interpreted correctly and were followed by clear comparisons of Documents A, B and E in (bii). Some worthwhile answers noted the date of publication of Document E, which might have represented hindsight by the author. The most successful answers to (d) gave other examples of the ways in which the Nazis used, or misused, the legal system; the interpretations of the printed documents were usually satisfactory.

Essay Questions

Q.3, (Q.6)

The key issue was the new features in the Italian Renaissance. Some answers pointed out the new influence of secular patrons, such as the Medici in Florence. The Italian city states also represented a new economic system. The subject matter of paintings tended to be different, although good answers stated that traditional religious subjects were still popular. Architecture broke away from the Gothic to embrace new styles, as in the work of Brunelleschi. The most successful answers supported their arguments with appropriate examples. The overall standard was sound and demonstrated a real interest by these candidates in the cultural history of this period.

Q.4, (Q.7)

The key issue was whether Ivan III and Ivan IV were 'Ruthless but effective'. The highest mark bands were awarded to answers which were reasonably balanced in the attention given to each of these rulers of Muscovy. Such answers were also analytical and concentrated on assessments rather than descriptive narratives.

Q.5 (Q.8)

The most successful answers concentrated on the arguments for and against the claim that Spain was a nation state during the reigns of Ferdinand and Isabella. Candidates were given credit when they attempted a definition of this concept, as it applied to the sixteenth century. It was very relevant to discuss the aims of the rulers. Most of the answers showed an understanding of the differences between the states, especially Aragon and Castile. Less successful answers tended to see Spain as a homogeneous unit and were unable to distinguish between policies and developments in the regions.

Q.6, (Q.9)

Although this question, on the fall of Burgundy, was answered by comparatively few candidates, the standard of the answers that were written was good. In explaining why Burgundy failed to survive as an independent state, most candidates focused effectively on analysis

and explanation, providing a series of reasons. This was given more credit than mere narratives of developments.

Q.7, (Q.10)

The question was centred on Francis I's power in France and, although it was relevant to examine the impact of foreign policy, the answers needed to concentrate on domestic issues. Candidates were not required to provide examples of historians' views, but some answers were given credit when they explained the different interpretations of developments in this reign, examining the extent to which Francis I became an 'absolute' monarch. Good answers examined his efforts to centralise power, for example through the Royal Council and his attempts to exert more control over the Paris and provincial parlements. It was useful to discuss the King's relations with the nobility. Very successful answers pointed out the considerable powers which the nobility enjoyed, for example as provincial governors. There were creditable references to Francis I's relations with the Church and papacy. Some included the use made of propaganda, ceremonial and Renaissance patronage.

Q.8, (Q.11)

The quality of answers to this question was variable. The key issue was the strength and weaknesses of Charles V at the time of his election as Holy Roman Emperor in 1519 but the less successful answers devoted much attention to peripheral, or even irrelevant, issues such as the later development of the Reformation. The highest mark bands were awarded to answers which were narrowly focused on the situation in 1519, although the explanation still allowed for background to show how it had developed.

Q.9, (Q.12)

The key issue was the reasons why Charles V and Francis I had conflicting interests in Italy. It was relevant to examine strategic, political, dynastic and personal issues. Some answers also referred to religious and cultural interests, although the extent to which these were directly a cause of war is arguable. The most successful answers supported such points by appropriate historical knowledge. The lesser answers deserved lower marks because they made vague claims unsupported by evidence, or they contained only narratives of the Italian Wars which did not explain reasons for the conflict.

Q.10, (Q.13)

There were comparatively few answers to this question because most candidates who had studied the sixteenth century answered the document-based question on Luther. The key issue was Luther's aims from 1517 to 1530. Answers were given credit when they examined the intentions behind the 95 Theses in 1517 and developments to the Augsburg Confession of 1530. Answers made reference to the 1519 debate with Eck at Leipzig, Luther's reaction to the bull of excommunication in 1520, the Diet of Worms and the writings of the 1520s. Some very good answers considered how far Luther's aims changed whereas the less creditable essays were limited to narratives.

- Q.11, (Q.14)* The question presented two quotations about the Ottoman empire during the reign of Suleiman the Magnificent and asked candidates to assess and compare them. The most successful essays were balanced in their discussion of 'a formidable war machine' and an 'overstretched' empire, coming to a clear conclusion. The argument was supported by appropriate historical knowledge. The lower mark bands were awarded to answers which were unbalanced. Some essays were too general, lacking the examples to illustrate general claims. Most of the answers were sound and demonstrated a good level of understanding of the reign.
- Q.12, (Q.15)* There were few answers to this question, continuing the trend of previous years which has seen very limited study of economic and social history. The standard of the answers was disappointing. They were usually unsure about the nature of inflation and uncertain about the effects on social groups. General accounts of the sixteenth-century economy but these could not be given high credit.
- Q.13, (Q.16)* The key issue was the contribution of the Council of Trent to the reform of the Roman Catholic Church. The most successful answers combined an explanation of the measures which were implemented in the Council with some assessment of their consequences. Answers in the middle mark bands were often able to describe the decisions of the Council but assumed, rather than demonstrated, their importance. The lowest mark bands were awarded to answers which discussed in general terms of the problems of the Church but which were vague, and sometimes, incorrect, about the Council. It was relevant to discuss other aspects of reform or counter-reformation, such as the Jesuits, but the focus had to be on the Council itself.
- Q.14, (Q.17)* The key issue was whether it is possible to justify Philip II's policies in the Spanish Netherlands. The question did not imply that candidates had to take sides when examining the issues in the Dutch revolt but they had to consider them from the Spanish side. Good answers referred to the King's orthodox religious views and his wish to centralise government, both of which were laudable in the sixteenth century. They discussed his economic problems, which prompted his wish to raise more money from the Netherlands, and also examined the difficulties which he faced during the course of the revolt. The most successful essays showed flexibility in perceiving, assessing and evaluating Philip II's policies. They were still able to criticise the way in which the King tried to deal with his problems throughout his reign. This represented a properly historical approach whereas the less successful answers usually rehearsed Philip II's mistakes without attempting to understand them.
- Q.15, (Q.18)* The key issue was whether Philip II's foreign policy was more defensive than aggressive and the question specified relations with England, France and the Ottoman Empire. The standard of the

answers was usually encouraging. The most successful answers dealt convincingly with each of the three regions of policy and also provided overall judgements. They examined the Spanish interests which seemed to be at stake. The middle mark bands were appropriate for answers which were relevant but unbalanced in their treatment. Answers which were just acceptable tended to include narratives which showed little judgement; the candidates could not decide whether Spanish policy was either defensive or aggressive. Because the answers had to deal with three regions, although there was a connecting theme, examiners did not require detailed knowledge of each. More important was the ability to highlight salient issues and developments. For example, candidates were given credit when they discussed how far Spanish foreign policy changed during the reign of Philip II. They considered the extent to which a common approach can be perceived in his dealings with other powers.

Q.16 (Q.19)

The key issue was whether the French Wars of Religion were fought more for 'selfish ambition' than for principles. Examiners read many thoughtful studies. Credit was given when the answers referred to particular examples rather than being limited to general statements about nobles or monarchs. The description of events was used to support the argument. For example, the motives of those involved in the Massacre of St. Bartholomew were discussed. The less creditable essays tended only to describe it.

Q.17, (Q.20)

The answers to this question were very satisfactory. The most successful essays focused on the effectiveness of Henry IV's efforts to restore order to France. They also appreciated the limits of the King's success. Although much had been done to restore order, the problems had not been fully resolved by 1610. Credit was given when the essays explained how he ended the civil wars. Religious peace came through the Edict of Nantes but the best answers pointed out its limitations. The Treaty of Vervins ended the immediate threat from Spain. Most essays referred to the work of Sully but some did not explain how it contributed to the restoration of order; the link with the question was implicit rather than explicit. The discriminating factor in many answers was the extent to which they were able to examine the political and administrative reforms, especially in Henry IV's handling of the nobility and institutions such as the parlements.

Q.18, {Q.3}, (Q.21)

There were comparatively few answers to this question on the scientific revolution. The key issue was whether the changes were truly revolutionary. Some candidates made the useful point that traditional institutions such as the Roman Catholic Church believed that science was revolutionary, as was proved by the efforts to suppress changes. Examiners did not require comprehensive accounts of forms of science; this would be unrealistic in the available time. Candidates were given credit when they assessed the significance of changes in certain areas such as mathematics, astronomy, biology and

chemistry. Some explained the growing respect for reason; other emphasised the importance of new scientific methods of enquiry.

- Q.19, {Q.4}, (Q.22)* The two linked key issues were the extent to which, and the reasons why, Dutch prosperity in the seventeenth century depended on foreign trade. Most of the answers were successful in explaining the first; the second proved to be more testing. The moderately successful answers gave accurate and relevant descriptions of Dutch trade, but the answers which deserved the highest mark bands examined the structure of the Dutch economy and society. The limitations of the domestic economy were noted. The social structure, which afforded influence to the merchant classes, was considered. The priority of foreign trade was evident in the development of institutions which were specially designed to support it, such as the overseas trading companies and the Bank of Amsterdam. There were ready markets elsewhere in Europe for the products of Dutch trade which were efficiently, even ruthlessly, exploited. Reference to rivals was relevant.
- Q.20, {Q.5}, (Q.23)* The answers to this question on the decline of Spain continued the improvement in understanding this topic which has been noted in previous reports. Many candidates were able to examine critically the claim that Spain's decline was sudden, and complete by the middle of the seventeenth century. Signs of decline were understood, for example the military defeats and the effects of the growing power of France. There were domestic rebellions and the economy caused greater problems. Many of these difficulties were exposed by schemes for reform such as those attempted by Olivares. However, the better answers were aware of the continuing greatness of Spain and noted that most of the problems were not new. The debate about the effects of lower bullion imports was known. On the whole, Spain's control of its empire remained secure.
- Q.21, {Q.6}, (Q.24)* The question asked candidates to explain why other continental countries were concerned about the outcome of the Thirty Years' War. The answers usually dealt confidently with the interests of Denmark, France, Spain and Sweden. Although they were often organised chronologically, the most successful answers avoided narrative but used the events to underpin arguments and discussion, concentrating on the explanation of motives. For example, they showed how the early developments in the war provoked Denmark and why the Edict of Restitution began another period of foreign intervention. There were some sound assessments of Westphalia, showing how concerns were resolved in the peace settlement.
- Q.22, {Q.7}, (Q.25)* The key issue was an assessment of Richelieu. It was relevant to consider both domestic and foreign policies. The best answers considered the extent of his failure, as well as his success, and came to clear conclusions. Most candidates were able to explain his aims; weaker essays were limited by their inability to assess his

achievements, although most candidates were able to provide convincing explanations of his relations with the Huguenots. The most successful answers considered the significance of noble faction and plots against Richelieu. Reference was made to his attempts to bring the provinces under control, for example by the use of the intendants. Answers were given credit when they showed how propaganda and censorship were used to enhance the prestige and power of the crown. Externally, he laid the foundations for the later success of Mazarin. Some essays, usually the most accomplished, were aware of his limited success in improving the economy.

Q.23, {Q.8}, (Q.26) Although there were comparatively few answers to this question about the role of the Orange family, the standard of most of the essays was sound. Candidates explained the reasons why war provided a platform for the Orange to exercise power. They examined the threats to the United Provinces, first from Spain and then from France. It was relevant to consider the tensions between the Orange family and other groups, for example the Regents, and some essays pointed out that Orange family were partly responsible for their demise in the middle of the seventeenth century. William II's attempted coup (and his untimely death) opened the way for the regents. The monarchist tendencies of the Orange family aroused suspicions. However, the threat to security and the apparent failure of de Witt's policies were enough to restore the Orange family to power in the person of William III.

Q.24, {Q.9}, (Q.27) The key issue was the extent to which the Hohenzollerns unified Brandenburg-Prussia. Whilst the essays were usually able to demonstrate an adequate understanding of the policies of Frederick I, the moderately successful answers and particularly the weak responses showed limited ability to discuss the issue of unity. Policies were described but with the assumption that they represented a growing unity. The most successful candidates examined the differences between the provinces, they explained the policies of Frederick William, the Great Elector, and his successor and showed how far they overcame the disparate nature of their possessions.

Q.25, {Q.10}, (Q.28) Although the key issue was an assessment of Charles XI, the question allowed candidates to put his reign into the context of other developments in Swedish history. The general standard of the answers was sound. Most could explain clearly the causes of Swedish decline and showed at least a basic understanding of the reign of Charles XI. The most successful candidates focused on his reign and summarised the contextual issues more quickly. They examined the crucial years of his majority when he took personal control and attempted to reassert royal control, for example through the Reduktion. The problems caused by Sweden's dwindling resources and the growing power of rivals were assessed.

- Q.26, {Q.11}, (Q.29) There were comparatively few answers to this question because most candidates who had studied the seventeenth century answered the document-based question on Louis XIV. The key issue was the lack of significant opposition to the King's absolute power. Good answers mentioned the memories of the Frondes and examined the King's commitment to hard work as well as to absolutism. Nobles were controlled effectively, although they remained influential in the provinces. Potentially obstructive institutions such as the parlements were brought to heel. Candidates could have put more emphasis on the theoretical support given by Bossuet and others. The most successful answers considered the extent of opposition. For example, there was the criticism of nobles such as Saint-Simon. The views of Fénelon were relevant. The last years of the reign saw dissent which was sparked by economic distress. However, this criticism was outweighed by the considerable support for Louis' absolutism.
- Q.27, {Q.12}, (Q.30) The question asked candidates to assess the overall balance of gains and losses in Louis XIV's foreign policy. It discriminated effectively between those who had memorised the narrative and the better candidates who understood and could explain the significance of developments. Their answers used historical knowledge effectively to support relevant arguments. Some of the most creditable essays used the Treaty of Utrecht as a starting point, examining its significance for France. Another successful approach was to outline France's position at the beginning of Louis XIV's majority after the Treaties of Westphalia and the Pyrenees, then contrasting it with the situation in 1715. In both cases, the essays deserved credit because the assessment was very apparent to examiners.
- Q.28, {Q.13}, (Q.31) The key issue was the aims of Peter the Great: why was he determined to reform Russia? It was necessary to explain his reforms and associated policies but this alone could not merit a high mark because description without direct explanation limits the value of answers. The most successful answers were analytical and considered a range of reasons. Some of the best essays considered the extent to which he wished to westernise Russia.
- {Q.14}, (Q.32) The key issue was the importance of the *philosophes*. Candidates came to different conclusions, some claiming that the *philosophes* were influential because they undermined the authority of important sections of the *ancien régime*, such as the Church, whilst others saw them as appealing only to a small audience. In each case, the most successful essays supported their claims with specific references to such thinkers as Diderot, Rousseau and Voltaire. Although there were comparatively few answers to this question, most of them were very creditable.

- {Q.15}, (Q.33) There were too few answers on which to base general comments.
- {Q.16}, (Q.34) The question provided a quotation by which candidates could assess Louis XV's qualities; 'Timid, selfish and above all lazy'. The most successful answers examined each of these attributes, considering their validity when applied to the French king. Marks in lower bands were awarded to answers which contained only general descriptions of Louis XV and which did not assess the truth of the quotation. A few answers neglected the King and were limited to general descriptions of the *ancien régime*; these could be given little credit.
- {Q.17}, (Q.35) There were sound answers to this question about Frederick the Great. Most candidates agreed that 'He devoted his entire life to the interests of his subjects' but the most successful concentrated on arguments rather than description. For example, they considered his aims and the costs to Prussia of his policies; they assessed the problems at the end of his reign. These more complex essays were worth more credit than the straightforward accounts of the reign.
- {Q.18}, (Q.36) The key issue was the reasons why Maria Theresa's accession in 1740 ended almost thirty years of peace in Europe. The better essays explained the reasons for this comparatively peaceful period in European history and examined the crucial diplomatic importance of the succession problem in the Austrian Empire, with the coincidental accession of Frederick the Great in Prussia. Some weaker essays deserved less credit because they were more concerned to explain why there was a prolonged period of war after 1740; they did not focus sufficiently on the key issue.
- {Q.19}, (Q.37) Examiners were pleased by the general standard of answers to this question about the Diplomatic Revolution. Most candidates explained the aims and priorities of the major states and analysed international tensions in the middle of the eighteenth century.
- {Q.20}, (Q.38) The question included two quotations about Catherine the Great: 'At the mercy of circumstances beyond her control' and 'a wise mother of her people'. The least successful answers made only occasional references to these descriptions and provided general accounts of her reign. Answers in the middle mark bands usually opted to examine one of the claims and neglected the other. The most successful answers compared the validity of the two views and sometimes tried to reconcile them. They contained a clear argument, showing which was the more justified.
- {Q.21},(Q.39) The key issue was the extent to which Joseph II's policies differed from those of Maria Theresa. Most of the essays were relevant and well-organised, analysing and assessing the salient points of policy.

The most successful considered areas of agreement, arguing that aims were sometimes similar although methods were different.

{Q.22}, (Q.40)

The question asked 'Why was Poland partitioned..?' and examiners were looking for a series of reasons, supported by appropriate historical knowledge. It was relevant to consider the condition of Poland but the better answers also considered the motives of the major powers which participated in the partitions. Credit was given when answers showed an understanding of the stages by which Poland was partitioned and were able to refer to attempts at reform.

{Q.23},[Q.4], (Q.41) To gain one the high mark bands, the answers needed to show some understanding and knowledge of developments in France throughout the period 1789 - 99 and to focus on the issues of 'liberty and equality'. The least successful contained only vague assertions and some were limited to the outbreak of Revolution. Most took the argument to about 1793. The most successful answers were usually distinguished by ability to deal with the period of the Directory.

{Q.24}, [Q.5],(Q.42) The key issue was the extent to which the revolutionary French threatened other countries. A few answers went beyond 1799, focusing on the rule of Napoleon, whilst some devoted too much space to Britain. The question specified continental Europe; Britain was relevant as a brief reference but could not be part of the mainstream answer. Answers were given credit when they referred to specific countries such as Austria, Prussia and Russia. In good answers, the effects of specific developments such as the Declaration of Rights and the Civil Constitution were assessed. The role of the émigrés was relevant. It was also very relevant to explain the Declaration of Pillnitz, the Brunswick Manifesto and the ensuing war.

{Q.25},[Q.6], (Q.43) Examiners read very sound assessments of Napoleon's foreign policy. Comparatively few answers were too limited in their treatment of the topic, sometimes discussing only the Continental System and the Moscow campaign. Almost all of the essays accepted the claim that he preferred conquest to peace but the better answers concentrated on arguments and discussion rather than being content to relate narratives. High credit was given when candidates were able to consider the significance of successive treaties which Napoleon made, and tended to break. The most successful candidates also examined what French interests seemed to involve.

[Q.7], (Q.44)

The key issue was an assessment of the Treaty of Vienna. To reach a basically acceptable standard, the answers had to demonstrate an adequate understanding of the terms of the settlement and some of the reasons why they were adopted. The better answers explained the particular interests of the major powers whereas the more limited responses dealt with these generally. The Treaty was the outcome of negotiations between states which had different interests. The

developments to 1830 provided a context to judge the Treaty. A few candidates applied twentieth-century standards to the settlement (Was it realistic to support nationalism in 1815?) but the more thoughtful answers showed an understanding of the priorities of the early nineteenth century.

[Q.8], (Q.45)

The most successful answers to this question were balanced between the discussions of Louis XVIII and Charles X. They analysed the policies of the Bourbon kings, the problems facing them and the change of circumstances from 1814 to 1830. Most of the essays explained clearly the political issues. The more thoughtful answers examined showed a broader outlook, pointing out the worsening economic and social problems faced by Charles X. Some could have showed more detailed understanding of the 1830 revolution.

[Q.9], (Q.46)

The question gave candidates the opportunity to consider a more sympathetic view of Metternich: did he pursue the most sensible policies to govern Austria? This prompted the most successful answers to examine his problems and they also noted that he favoured some measure of reform, which was opposed by others in the Austrian government, whereas some saw him as a complete reactionary. Credit was given when the answers considered the complex nature of the difficulties which Metternich faced.

[Q.10], (Q.47)

The key issue was the continuing problems posed by the Eastern Question. The least successful answers tended to make general assertions, and answers in the middle bands were given credit for accurate narrative. The best essays focused on the conflicting interests of the major powers and also examined reasons why the condition of the Ottoman Empire sparked international disorder.

[Q.11], (Q.48)

The two linked key issues in this question about Louis Napoleon were his autocracy and popular policies. Successful candidates explained the nature and extent of his autocracy from 1848; the moderate essays usually assumed this aspect. It was relevant to consider the 'Liberal Empire' of the 1860s but the best answers showed a wider understanding of his political career. When discussing popular policies, candidates were given credit when they referred to plebiscites and the skilful propaganda which he used. These supplemented his attempts to implement policies which would appeal to different sections of the populace. Thoughtful answers avoided long descriptions of foreign policies but highlighted the ways in which this aspect reflected either autocracy or the search for popularity.

[Q.12], (Q.49)

The chronological period covered by this question about Cavour's debt to Mazzini was long, and the most successful answers avoided extended narrative accounts of Italian unification but concentrated on a comparison of the two leaders. The conclusions varied; some essays emphasised the differences between the two men whilst others saw

Mazzini as laying the foundations for a united Italy and also noted his link with Garibaldi. The weaker essays either dismissed Mazzini too quickly and wrote almost entirely about Cavour or conversely concentrated on an assessment of Mazzini. The material in these answers was relevant but was insufficiently directed at the key issue to deserve a high mark.

[Q.13], (Q.50)

The question asked candidates to consider whether Alexander II was 'More a tsar than a liberator'. Most candidates could describe a satisfactory range of reforms. They showed how Alexander II can be described as a liberator. The distinguishing factor in the most successful answers was their discussion of Alexander as tsar. For example, they examined the aims of his reforms, which were adopted to safeguard rather than weaken autocracy. They considered the significance of the more reactionary measures which were introduced later in the reign. Some thoughtful candidates pointed out that, in spite of this, Alexander II was a more reforming tsar than the others of the period and the impact of the measures which he introduced should not be underestimated.

[Q.14], (Q.51)

The key issue was Bismarck's success in asserting Prussian power over the other German states. A satisfactory mark could be gained by accurate narratives of unification under Bismarck, but these did not consider the key issue sufficiently narrowly to merit a high mark. Credit was given to discussions to the relative positions of Prussia and Austria in Germany in about 1860. For example, reference was made to the Zollverein and to Prussia's role since 1815. It was very relevant to show how Bismarck's policies to Austria were designed to avoid alienating German states which were suspicious of Prussian power; he later had the same intentions in dealing with the southern states after the formation of the North German Confederation and before the crucial conflict with France. Brief discussions of the constitution and Prussia's importance in the new German Empire were useful.

[Q.15], (Q.52)

There were too few answers on which to base general comments.

[Q.16], (Q.53)

There were too few on which to base general comments.

[Q.17], (Q.54)

The topic was studied by a few centres. Most of the answers were able to focus effectively on assessments of Francis Joseph I. However, the discussions of the fall of the Habsburg monarchy in Austria-Hungary were less successful.

[Q.18], (Q.55)

The standard of answers to this question showed that the understanding and knowledge of the domestic history of Germany under William II is improving. Most of the answers were still more confident about Bismarck's later career, and the moderately successful answers were unbalanced, but examiners read some sound answers which dealt with the period to 1914.

[Q.19], (Q.56) The quality of the answers was pleasing as most candidates discussed convincingly the economic motives for imperialism. Some essays considered the extent to which hopes of economic advantage were fulfilled, but this was a side issue. More important was the necessity to support general arguments with specific examples of imperial enterprise. However, because the imperial enterprise was so extensive, examiners did not expect comprehensive examples.

[Q.20], (Q.57) The French Third Republic in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is not a widely studied topic but examiners were pleased by the standard of the essays which were written. The moderate answers tended to include relevant but imprecise discussions of the problems facing the regime and some were content to narrate the successive crises without explanation. However, there were also very successful analyses of right and left-wing forces in France. These groups were identified and the extent to which they represented destabilising forces was assessed. Such issues were combined with creditable accounts of the underlying support for the Republic.

[Q.21], (Q.58) To merit an acceptable mark, the answers had to demonstrate a basic understanding and knowledge of German foreign policy from 1890 to 1914. An assessment of the danger of this policy to international relations took the answers to a higher mark band. The most successful essays compared the danger from Germany with other reasons for diplomatic tension in the period, such as the Balkans problem. Some wide-ranging discussions examined the responsibility of the powers in the Triple Entente.

[Q.22], (Q.59) The key issue was the extent to which the 1905 Revolution was an important turning point in the reign of Nicholas II. The quality of most of the essays was pleasing. Answers were given a high mark when they were able to assess the importance of 1905, weighing the strength of support for the Revolution and the resources on which the Tsar depended. They also put 1905 into the context of Russian history to examine how far it resulted in significant changes. A few weak answers ignored 1905 and concentrated on the 1917 Revolution; this deserved little credit because it did not deal with the key issue in the question. Although it was possible to argue that 1905 was not very significant, the events and their consequences had to be explained in this question. Some answers in the middle mark bands showed satisfactory knowledge of 1905 but lacked the contextual understanding to provide a full assessment.

[Q.23], (Q.60) Answers to this question about the First World War were given credit when they explained why it was first believed that the war would be short; a number of answers assumed this. The reasons for the prolonged fighting were explained convincingly by many candidates who considered methods of warfare, strategy, military and political

organisation, leadership and resources. Whereas the moderately successful answers were highly descriptive, the best essays were analytical and weighed the importance of the respective factors.

[Q.24], (Q.61) There were too few answers on which to base general comments.

[Q.25], (Q.62) There were too few answers on which to base general comments.

[Q.26], (Q.63) Few centres studied the French Third Republic between the two world wars but examiners were pleased by the quality of the answers which were written. Candidates were given high credit when they examined the reasons for frequent changes in government and the uncertain policies which were adopted. They defined the differences between the right, the centre / radicals and the left. The roles of important politicians, such as Blum, Briand and Daladier, were examined. Although some answers focused on the direction of foreign policy, there were thoughtful essays which showed an understanding of the tensions about domestic policy.

[Q.27], (Q.64) The question asked candidates to consider whether Mussolini's rule was 'an inefficient dictatorship'. Most candidates were successful in assessing its efficiency, especially in terms of economic and social policy. The most successful answers were usually characterised by their ability to examine Mussolini's 'dictatorship', showing the extent and limits of his power and that of his government. Some distinguished between the theoretical and practical powers of the regime. There were useful comparisons with Hitler and Stalin, and most kept these comparisons appropriately brief.

[Q.28], (Q.65) The question asked candidates to assess the success of the League of Nations by 1929. Answers which were acceptable, but which were limited to the lower mark bands, showed a general understanding of international developments but, apart from its establishment, showed limited insight. Some of these answers were uncertain about the chronology and went beyond the specified period. Answers in the middle bands were often highly descriptive, accurate in their references, but with thin assessments. The highest marks were awarded to answers which tried to evaluate the weaknesses and the achievements of the League to 1929 and used appropriate examples to support their claims.

[Q.29], (Q.66) The key issue was Stalin's personal dominance in Russia from 1924 to 1941. A few answers dealt only with the economic and social policies of the late 1920s and 1930s, but most of the essays showed commendable understanding and knowledge of a range of relevant issues. The discussions of the ways in which Stalin seized power were often well-informed whilst the purges were examined convincingly. More time should have been given to the use of propaganda in this period which enhanced Stalin's position.

[Q.30], (Q.67) The key issue was the condition of the Weimar Republic in 1929. The question discriminated between candidates who had a general knowledge of Weimar and those who could give a focused assessment. Answers were given credit when they considered a range of issues, such as political, economic and diplomatic factors. There were some good studies of the Stresemann era. However, thoughtful candidates did not ignore the deep-rooted problems of Weimar. The Wall Street Crash was particularly damaging to Germany because of its reliance on American loans and investment. Very successful answers avoided assumptions about the inevitability of the Nazi regime. Whilst it was relevant to examine the rise of the Nazis, this alone could not merit a good mark.

[Q.31], (Q.68) Most candidates wrote satisfactory accounts of German foreign policy in the 1930s although the weaker essays were limited to narratives. The highest marks were given to the answers which considered specifically whether 'Germany alone' was responsible for the outbreak of the Second World War. There were some sound assessments of appeasement. Although historiography is not a required criterion in A level History, credit is given to relevant and accurate references to historians' views; this question produced some worthwhile discussions of the debate about the causes of the war.

[Q.32], (Q.69) As in previous years, the period after the Second World War was studied by few centres. There were some creditable studies of the tensions in the anti-Nazi alliance which were already apparent by the end of the Second World War. Most answers dealt with the post-war period in a very descriptive manner.

[Q.33], (Q.70) There were too few answers on which to base general comments.

[Q.34], (Q.71) There were too few answers on which to base general comments.

Indicative content for all these questions will be found in the markscheme.

9020/15 World Affairs Since 1945

General Comments

This examination paper is now taken only by a small number of centres which have studied it for a number of years and thus have become reasonably well attuned to its unique demands. On the evidence of candidates' scripts, this year's paper was a little more challenging than in previous years.

Question 1 was one problem. The marks awarded for the compulsory question were often lower than the marks given to the essays on the same scripts (and not just by a mark or two). The Cold War in Asia is less well known than the Cold War in Europe. However, the basis of success with regard to question 1 is the ability to understand and interpret unseen documents, an important historical skill. The very best candidates had those skills and thus did as well on question 1 as on the essays.

Question 16 was the other problem. Traditionally the question on decolonisation, this year provided it had a narrower focus – the role of communist groups – which confused many of those who were relying on question 16 being familiar. Those who could not risk answering question 16 did not have a 'reserve' question from Section 3, one which they could use if question 16 was not to their liking. Thus they either wrote the usual general essay in answering question 16 or used the material they had learnt on decolonisation to answer another question to which it might apply, e.g. question 20. In neither case could they receive much credit. Those who had prepared material on either economic aid or the role of multi-national corporations, however, found Section 3 very much to their liking. Some of the answers to these questions were most impressive in their range of knowledge and understanding.

Neither Section 1 nor Section 2 posed the same problems as either question 1 or question 16 for those who relied on it too much. All but the weakest candidates were able to choose a question from both Sections about which they could write at some length, if not always with great relevance.

Though candidates found some specific problems, overall the standard of work was normally sound and often very competent. Given the range of topics which had to be covered, this is a compliment to both students and their teachers.

As the number of home centres studying this paper is small, the comments on individual questions that follow are based on answers from both home and overseas candidates. This enables a wider range of responses to be considered.

Comments on Individual Questions

1 *Sino-Soviet relations and the Korean War 1950-3*

(a) (i) *'All their strength lies in air power and the atomic bomb'*

The full point of Stalin's comment was rarely explained, namely that the US army was not good at more traditional land warfare.

(ii) *'China will never capture Taiwan'*

This was usually well done, candidates explaining both that Taiwan was nationalist and that it was protected by the USA.

(b) *How useful is Document B as evidence of Soviet attitudes towards Communist China during the Korean War?*

Most mentioned the support Stalin showed towards Mao and China. Few mentioned the rather critical tone of Stalin, illustrated both by his questioning of the delay in submitting new orders for arms and his comments about the manoeuvres of the Chinese army. And even fewer commented on the source itself, as they should have done for a question about the usefulness of a source.

(c) *Compare Mao Zedong's view of peace negotiations as found in Documents C and E.*

The key point of Document C was usually understood, namely that Mao was not afraid of dragging out negotiations. Document E proved more challenging. This was mainly because candidates failed to notice that Mao was writing after the armistice had been agreed. Mao identifies three reasons why the USA agreed to end the war, one of which – the military – provides some justification for Mao's strategy as identified in Document E. Very few made this connection.

(d) *How far is the explanation for the limited US military success found in Document D supported by Documents A and E?*

A surprising number of candidates failed to summarise the relevant points of Document D before considering the other two sources. This weakens their argument as examiners cannot be sure with what parts of D the others are being compared. Document E was easily understood, Document A less so. The phrase 'while we improve our military power' in the second sentence can refer either to the Korean War itself or to the struggle against communism. Some used the very last sentence of all, about the wrong war in the wrong place, but this clearly refers to a direct confrontation with China rather than the indirect conflict that was the Korean War. Thus Document A is not much support for Document D, which does not mean that it is redundant. It was useful in indicating candidates' analytical skills.

- (e) *'The disunity between the USSR and Communist China was the key factor in determining the outcome of the Korean War.'*

This was not well answered by most candidates. Either the sources were ignored almost completely or they were used to dismiss the assertion before moving on to consider other more probable causes of the outcome of the war. The best answers, of which there were a few, explained how Sino-Soviet disunity might have caused the war to end as it did, analysed the documents for evidence of communist disunity which helped explain the eventual stalemate and finally considered other evidence for and against the quotation.

- 2 *'As Congress has become increasingly assertive so the Presidency has become increasingly ineffective.'* Discuss with regard to the period since 1970.

This was one of the most popular questions in Section 1 on the three superpowers. Most answers were sound, some impressively so. They showed an understanding of the point of the quotation and the ability to provide relevant evidence to test the validity of the assertion. Nixon and Reagan were the presidents usually covered, with Ford and Carter receiving honourable mentions. Few considered the Clinton presidency, which was a pity because it contains some nice examples, especially concerning Gingrich's Contract with America.

- 3 *The changing role in US politics of (a) interest groups or (b) the mass media.*

A few attempted this question, usually with disappointing results. All chose to write about interest groups and all focused on either the NAACP, the only group they could think of, or the civil rights movement in general. It was hard not to conclude that these candidates had prepared for a question on race relations.

- 4 *Why did economic difficulties for the USA in the 1960s and 70s give way to relative economic success in the 1980s and 90s.*

Also attempted by a small number of candidates, this question was better answered than question 3. The difference was only marginal, however, as most essays were general descriptions of the US economy with particular reference to the set of politics usually labelled Reaganomics.

- 5 *'The main feature of Stalinism persisted in the USSR until 1985.'*

This was the second most popular question from Section 1. Most provided a hurried description of the policies of the main leaders between 1945 (or 1953) and 1985, with the occasional references to Stalin. Few defined Stalinism with the care that was needed to ensure the highest marks. The cult of personality was usually omitted completely and the persecution of dissidents, though mentioned, revealed limited awareness of the actual policies of Khrushchev and Brezhnev.

6 *How far was Gorbachev's main preoccupation the consolidation of his power as CPSU leader?*

Fewer attempted the question on Gorbachev than in recent years, presumably discouraged by the focus of the question. Those who did choose it provided the familiar account of glasnost and perestroika, sometimes with a brief reference to the question. A full answer would have explained how Gorbachev trimmed between radicals and conservatives for most of his six years in power, with disastrous consequences for the CPSU. And when the power of the CPSU was eroded in 1989-91, Gorbachev established himself as the Soviet President, maintaining his power to the very end.

7 *Assess Yeltsin's achievements as leader of Russia.*

There were only a couple of answers to this question, which was rather surprising given Yeltsin's retirement during the past year. Both showed a limited knowledge of Yeltsin's presidency and an even more limited awareness of his achievements and failures.

8 *How communist was Chinese government and society by 1976?*

The third of the three popular Section 1 questions, this usually resulted in a narrative of Communist China from 1949 to 1976 and then a final paragraph which answered the question. An approach which would have brought greater rewards would have been to focus on 1976, considering how far the various elements of communism could be found in government and society. No one distinguished between these two elements of modern China; the government might have been communist when the society was not. Thus few wrote relevant analytical answer needed to maximise marks.

9 *The consequences for the Chinese people of rapid economic growth since the 1970s.*

This was reasonably popular and reasonably well answered. Candidates knew the consequences of the economic reforms of Deng Xiao-ping. The trouble was that they knew the reforms as well, which they insisted on describing often at length, before considering their consequences. Only the latter was fully rewarded.

10 *The role of the PLA in China since 1949.*

The handful of candidates who chose this question lacked detailed knowledge of the role of the PLA since 1949. They usually wrote in general terms about the achievements of the PLA before 1949. The key reference points for the PLA's post-1949 role are the Cultural Revolution and Tiananmen Square; on both occasions the PLA intervened in Chinese politics to uphold the power of the CCP.

11 *'The economic gap between the USA and the USSR already wide in the 1950s, became steadily wider.' How far does this statement explain the eventual outcome of the Cold War?*

Quite a few candidates were attracted by this question. Almost all of them concentrated on the quotation and overlooked the question. Thus they described US-

USSR relations from the 1950s, making occasional references to the economic state of the two powers as they did so. They gave very little attention to the end of the Cold War between the two states. If the increasing economic superiority of the USA did not cause the Cold War to end, what did? This should have been the focus of answers to this question. It rarely was.

- 12 *'That the Sino-Soviet split lasted for so long is evidence of how deep-rooted the quarrel between the two powers was.'*

Most answers concentrated on the origins of the Sino-Soviet split, neglecting questions of its durability. And the majority of these answers failed to consider whether the split was deep-rooted in nature. In fact they were standard essays on the causes of the Sino-Soviet split, a survey of the many factors which came together in the late 1950s to provoke a formal rift between the two leading Communist states. Had they tried to identify which of those causes could be defined as deep-rooted, the answers would have been stronger. For instance it is possible that the split was provoked by personal quarrels between vain leaders, first Stalin and Mao, and then Khrushchev and Mao, which would suggest that the causes hardly had deep roots.

And had the answer considered why the rift lasted into the 1990s, and the relationship between cause and effect, they would have done all that the question required.

- 13 *How far do you agree that, in the 1970s, it was economic interests that caused China and the USA to set aside their ideological quarrel?*

The many who chose this question were familiar with the topic of Sino-American relations and were able to write answers which were relevant and thoughtful. They were able also to explain economic factors and to mention other possible reasons why relations between the two states improved in the early 1970s, the favourite being the desire to put pressure on the USSR and thus on North Vietnam.

- 14 *'The nuclear arms race made a Third World War impossible.'*

This proved a struggle for those who thought they could answer this question. They usually describe the Cuban Missile Crisis at some length before drawing some general conclusions about the lessons of the Crisis for superpower relations. A few mentioned the deterrence doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD). No one focused on the nuclear arms race in particular. The view at the time was that this arms race made a world war more likely because it destabilised relations, because one power might gain a clear advantage, using the opportunity to launch a nuclear attack on its main rival. Some American military leaders advocated such a policy in the late 1940s. Thus to assert that the arms race made a general war impossible is to contradict Cold War orthodoxy. Is it a valid assertion? Why was a Third World War avoided in the second half of the 20th century? These were the issues that candidates should have considered.

- 15 *'The UN has been an effective peacekeeper only when keeping the peace has coincided with the interests of the USA.'*

Answers to this question referred to the Korean and Gulf Wars, as was to be expected. More knowledgeable candidates also considered the significance of Somalia in 1993 and Rwanda in 1994. Such examples usually meant that candidates agreed with the quotation. They should have been considering examples of peacekeeping (rather than peace enforcing) that can be seen as effective, even though the US was not directly involved. Cyprus might be one such example. Perhaps it is the only example. However, it throws some doubt in the validity of the quotation.

- 16 *How important were Communist groups to the ending of imperial rule in (a) Africa or (b) Asia?*

Traditionally, question 16 has been a question on decolonisation, usually rather broader in scope. This more focused question proved too demanding for many who had prepared for the more familiar type. Some took refuge in other questions, e.g. question 17 and question 20. There were some who stayed with question 16 and who made a reasonable attempt at answering it.

With regard to Communist groups in Asia, mention of the Vietminh and the insurgency in Malaya would have scored highly. Other more familiar explanations could then be considered. In Africa examples of Communist groups are fewer – Angola is perhaps the clearest – but here again, the question could be turned round, following an initial survey of the limited role of communist forces. And had anyone explored the role of communist groups external to colonies, such as the CPSU or the CCP, they would have been credited with answering the question.

- 17 *'Religious zeal and ethnic rivalry have become stronger forces during the past half-century.'* Discuss with regard to (a) the Middle East or (b) the Indian subcontinent.

This was chosen by a few in preference to question 16, but they wrote about the process of decolonisation rather than religious and ethnic relations in the fifty years since decolonisation. For this they could receive only limited credit.

- 18 *How far in the 1990s did Africa witness the end of one-party rule?*

No one attempted this question.

- 19 *'The seizure of political power by the military is always proclaimed as temporary but usually becomes permanent.'* Discuss with regard to Africa.

The few answers to this question showed no more than a general understanding of some issues concerning military rule in Africa. They lacked the detailed knowledge needed to develop a convincing analysis.

- 20 *Compare and contrast the relationships of Britain and France with their former colonies in Africa and Asia.*

As with question 17, this was chosen as an alternative to question 16, candidates writing about the relationships before and during decolonisation rather than after. Answers should have compared the Commonwealth with the Francophone community. None did.

- 21 *How far have the newly independent states of (a) Africa or (b) Asia played any independent role in international affairs?*

Avoided by all candidates.

- 22 *How far do you agree that, in most cases, economic aid is provided more for the gains it brings to the donor organisation than the advantages it provides for the recipient state?*

Questions on economic aid are usually popular and this was no exception. Candidates had a range of examples which they used to develop an analysis of the successes and failures of economic aid to developing countries. The only slight disappointment was that no-one appreciated the significance of the term 'donor-organisations' which could include non-governmental organisations as well as government departments and international bodies such as the World Bank.

- 23 *How far have developing countries benefited from the growth of regional trading blocs?*

No one answered this question.

- 24 *Why has the Third World debt crisis proved so long lasting?*

The few answers to this question described in very general terms the problems of Third World debt. They failed to provide any detailed explanation of the crisis, which first emerged in 1982, or why it has lasted so long. The plight of the Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) could have formed the basis of a sound answer and yet no one mentioned this continuing problem.

- 25 *Assess the impact of the enlargement of the EU on the poorer states which have joined and are hoping to join.*

Another question which no one answered.

- 26 *'The record of multi-national corporations in developing countries is nowhere near as bad as is portrayed by their critics.'*

This was very popular and usually well answered. The question was an attempt to make candidates review their usual hostility towards the role of multi-national corporations in the Third World. It worked in that candidates did mention the benefits

which these corporations might bring to developing countries. It did not, however, result in candidates taking a different view about the subject; most remained critical.

27 Why did the success of the Tiger economies end so abruptly in the late 1990s?

The final question was avoided by all candidates.

Indicative content for all these questions will be found in the markscheme.

UCLES

9020/16 The Normans in England

General Comments

The overall performance of the few candidates who attempt this option was good. They appeared to be well prepared in both the material and the techniques of tackling such a paper. Only one candidate failed to complete all four questions, though there were several whose final answer was significantly rushed. More worryingly, one candidate did not follow the rubric of the paper correctly. At the highest level, there were scripts that displayed historical sophistication throughout while others displayed elements of such excellence to varying degrees. Such answers were well informed, well organised and well directed and left not doubt that the candidate was in full command of the argument. At a more general level, there were signs that a real effort had been made by candidates of all abilities to get to grips with the subject matter. There were only a few responses that displayed significant illustrative weakness. More common – in weaker scripts – was a desire to narrate or simply to avoid aspects of questions with which candidates were either uncomfortable or unfamiliar.

The general standard of English was good, although in one or two cases poor handwriting made it difficult to decipher the intricacies of analysis.

Comments on Individual Questions

- 1 This was generally well done and generally done first. The latter tendency did not seem to cause too many difficulties with timing, though – inevitably – one or two candidates did write reams on the early sections and so found themselves running out of time by the end.
 - (a) (i) Most candidates were able to identify that a 'liege lord' held 'overlord' status and was someone to whom fealty would have been sworn.
 - (a) (ii) Once again, most were able to point out that Senlac was the name given to the hill on which Harold's army was formed up on the 14th October 1066.
 - (a) (iii) Most were able to point out who held the power to 'license' castles, though there was less clarity over the implications of the existence of such castles for the stability of Normandy.
 - (b) On the whole candidates performed well on this question. Most were able to point out the similarities and differences between the documents. Much less convincing was the handling of the 'extent' of the support offered by Doc. D for Doc. C. Although some at the top end were confident and were able to manipulate the text, its tone and context well, others were content with simple paraphrase of the relevant sections of the two document. A number of candidates cost themselves easy marks here by not reading the question carefully.
 - (c) Most used the various sources well here to give a secure picture of both Robert and William Rufus. At the top end answers drew on the content, tone and implications of the sources to suggest a subtle and balanced assessment of the characters of the

two men. Such candidates also acknowledged difficulties with reliability and relevant contextual knowledge to qualify their assessment, and were rewarded very highly for doing so. Others were content to paraphrase the contents of the sources. A few candidates displayed a tendency to discuss 'reliability' at length, which is only – at most – a minor part of the answer to this question.

- (d) This was generally well done. Candidates often used the sources well to point out how 'unwise' William's decision to split the kingdom was and then supplemented this from their own knowledge. There were several answers of the highest standard, while many scored very well. However, there was a small minority who did not go beyond the Documents and who therefore did not score as well as they might. It was good to see that few candidates were content merely to list the Documents and their contents: almost all structured their answer as a 'mini-essay'.
- 2 This was an extremely popular question that produced a wide variety of responses, though in many cases it was the weakest of candidates' three essays. Edward the Confessor is always a favourite but this question required the candidate to assess the Confessor's reign in the light of events in 1051-2. At the top end this was done well and rewarded accordingly; many – however – interpreted this as a 'how effective was the reign of Edward the Confessor' question and, although the material offered was implicitly relevant, they were unable to address the question with sufficient clarity.
- 3 This was a popular and relatively easy question on which the candidates often scored highly. All were able to discuss the claims of both Harold and William at length, and many were able to offer detailed and effective assessments of the primary materials involved.
- 4 This was a popular question and it was often well done. There were some outstanding responses that were well focused on the concept of 'need' throughout, and were able to distinguish between Norman propaganda and the real state of the English Church pre-1066. The less effective tended to lack knowledge of the Church pre-1066 and based their answers on post-1066 period. In extreme cases the material offered was almost completely based on the actions of Lanfranc and William I, and therefore of only the most marginal relevance.
- 5 This was attempted by many candidates; most did well. All were able to adopt an analytical approach and identify the various difficulties facing Anglo-Saxon rebels in this period. Marks generally varied on the extent of candidates' illustrative material; most were able to identify the key areas of analysis.
- 6 A few attempts were made at this, most wanting to write about feudalism generally, rather than focussing their answers on 'landholding'. This meant that there was often material offered that was either of only implicit relevance or – alternatively – of very little relevance. Overall, the question was not well done.
- 7 This was quite a popular question though some were unable to offer plausible material on both 'law' and 'administration'. Once again, there were some excellent

Report on the Components taken in June 2000

analytical answers that were clearly directed at the question and displayed often superb mastery of the material, but these were in the minority.

- 8 Several candidates attempted this question and coped well with presenting Domesday in a number of different lights ('Geld Book', 'feudal document', 'political necessity' etc...). Sadly, few really got to grips with the quotation before they moved on to other explanations. Many candidates lost marks as a result of this.
- 9 This was attempted by a few candidates and was often well done. Most were able to identify aims and extent of success, though not all were able to give achieve a sensible balance between the two. The best were able to offer subtle answers that allowed for an altering degree of success over time.
- 10 A popular question, and often done well. Good answers displayed a secure knowledge of the reign of William Rufus and were able to identify several factors that caused disagreement between Rufus and Anselm. The very best answers revolved around the reputation of Rufus being derived from church chroniclers and found 'fault' on both sides as well as in the political situation they had both inherited.

Indicative content for all these questions will be found in the markscheme.

9020/17 Mid-Tudor Crises

General Comments

The range of the questions answered by the three centres entering this special subject was narrow; most candidates chose the questions on the central rebellions. Those who chose outside these, questions 2, 4 and 8, usually seemed to have done so out of desperation and had little or no knowledge of the subjects. Questions 6 and 9 were not attempted.

However, not all the questions on the rebellions were from a familiar angle. Some candidates rose to the occasion, did their thinking on the spot and used their knowledge to write pleasing, relevant answers.

Others too often wrote an all-purpose piece, mainly concerned to include as many quotations from secondary authorities as they could muster. These appeared, irrespective of their relevance or profundity. For example, when there is not a great deal of time in the exam, it is doubtful how much this sentence (which appeared several times) advances the argument for question 5: *'The year 1549 was described by Dawson as 'the year of rebellions''*.

Comments on Individual Questions

- 1 (a) The short references were generally well known. Candidates who saw that two points were necessary to earn two marks usually scored the full five.
- (b) *How consistent is the picture of the personality and role of Lady Jane Grey presented in Documents C and F?*
This was well done by those who read the documents carefully. Some discussion of their provenance usually proved helpful.
- (c) *How useful are Documents E and F in explaining the changes in the religious position of the Duke of Northumberland?*
There were some good answers to this from candidates who saw that there are two opinions represented in Document F and weighed them both up in relation to the evidence in E.
- (d) *Using these documents and any other evidence known to you, examiner the view that it was primarily religion which led people to support either Mary or Jane in the succession crisis.*
There is plenty of evidence to be cited from these documents; strangely Document C was often omitted when it provided a number of points to be discussed. Some candidates set the Documents into the context of other evidence to good effect.

- 2 *Why were so few English people prepared to make a stand on the issues, such as the authority of the Papacy, for which Sir Thomas More gave his life?*

There were not many takers for this question and it was not well done. It is necessary to expound something of Sir Thomas More's stand. It is not really a general question on the prevalence of Catholic practice and piety.

- 3 *To what extent can the Pilgrimage of Grace be explained in terms of the resistance of the North to centralisation by government situated in the South?*

This was not just an invitation to write on 'The causes of the Pilgrimage of Grace'. The North versus South centralisation issue needs to be carefully explored. Those candidates who did so realise that it is not a case of this explanation as opposed to say, religious feeling. Many of the government's measures towards the Church can be seen in this context. Successful answers quoted the Articles and Aske's statements to good effect here. Poor answers ignored the North: South issue altogether after dismissing it in their introduction as unworthy of notice and went on to recite half-digested views of various historians.

Cromwell's attack on the franchises and Palatinate powers in the North was not well known.

- 4 *How far did Tudor governments and their advisors in the 1530s and 1540s show that they understood the nature of social and economic problems in that period?*

The few candidates who attempted this seemed unaware of what social and economic problems are.

- 5 *Which was the greater danger to authority in 1549, Ket's Rebellion or the Western Rebellion?*

There were some good, well argued answers to this question and high marks were obtained by candidates coming down on either side in their conclusion. Some less successful candidates failed to realise that 'authority' does not just mean Somerset's government but includes the authority of local gentry.

- 7 *Mary I said of Wyatt and his followers that 'they arrogantly and traitorously demanded to have the governance of our person, the keeping of the Tower and the placing of our councillors'. How much light does this throw on the aims of the rebellion?*

This proved a difficult question for most who attempted it. The best answers examined and interpreted the quotation and kept it central. Others just indicated that Mary did not know what she was talking about and wrote a general, unfocussed answer on Wyatt's Rebellion.

- 10 *To what extent was the Northern Rebellion of 1569 a religious rising?*

This is a straightforward question, very well done by some. Other candidates presented a puzzle. In questions 3 and 7, they had ignored the focus of the question asked and

insisted on emphasising religion. So, did they welcome this central theme in Question 10? No.

There were no answers to questions 6, 8 and 9.

Indicative content for all these questions will be found in the markscheme.

UCLES

9020/18 British Society 1815 - 1850

General Comments

The standard this year was commensurate with previous years with a pleasing number of scripts of a high standard. Some of the candidates had developed a genuine historical feeling for the period in question and clearly they mostly appreciated the historiography in the context of the history of the period rather than as an esoteric study divorced from events. Unusually this year the ideas of Clapham surfaced, a harking back to the past. It was only in the context of question three that rote learnt theories surfaced, when some of the less able candidates felt obliged to deal with Lenin's theories on the conditions for revolution. At times this was an aid to the argument, but sometimes the concepts were produced without relation to the theme of the question. However it was rare for candidates in the standard of living debate for instance to muddle historians' views and this was encouraging. The range of questions responded to was again rather narrow and no-one was prepared to tackle the plight of women. Most of the candidates attempted an analytical approach but there was, as usual, a wide gap between those with subtle argument and fine evidential detail and the candidates who aspired merely to hopeful generalisation. Most tackled the document first and one or two were of outstanding quality. No-one this year produced full page essay plans which detracted from the time available to write the essay and almost all candidates managed to complete the answers in the time offered, without resorting to note form at the end of the final question. Illegibility occasionally presented the examiner with a problem and a challenge. That said, the overall quality of answers was most satisfying.

Comments on Individual Questions

Q.1(a) (i)

Making up wages was understood but not that the scale was related to the price of bread.

Q.1(a) (ii)

The best were aware of the involvement of the Chartists and the attempt to rescue John Vincent.

Q.1.(b)

Some candidates drifted into a comparison of the documents rather than of labouring conditions. Not all drew out the essential difference between agricultural seasonal working conditions and the impact of the 'cessation in demand for labour' because of the interruption of the American Trade. Some candidates moved towards supposition in trying to say that the conditions were better in Kent than in the north, which was not called for. Document A, however, was better understood than Document E and many made the point about even a day's wages being made up etc..

Q.1(c)

There was a very mixed response to this question, with excess emphasis being given to the question of reliability, sometimes in a GCSE mode. Even then there were some extraordinary claims, of which the most notable was that because J. R. Stepehns was a member of the clergy his evidence must be reliable. Stephens would have been delighted with that response, though he might have wished candidates had noted his emotive language. The weakest aspect of the answers was the response to the question of usefulness on the impact of the New Poor Law. Ironically, the item that was most often ignored was the comment in both C and D that families were 'separated and dungeoned'.

Q.1(d)

It is still the case that some candidates will launch into mini essays in response to this question when what the question required was a disciplined use of four or five relevant documents and the crisp presentation of 'other evidence'. The documents were well used this year in this question and some better answers made the point that at least in Maldon 'the habits and behaviour of the labouring classes are certainly improving', which did not sound as if they were a threat to law and order in that part of Essex. More could have been made of the emotive words in D and from G the comments about the manufacture of pikes, but good use was made of Document F. With respect to other evidence, some read the question too hastily and in referring to Peterloo etc. went outside the period covered by the documents. More use should have been made of the Chartist movement and of the government's counter measures.

Q.2.

This was very a popular question which called for a particular approach in respect of legislation. The best candidates pointed out that the legislation was a combination of the old and the new, the Combination Laws and the Riot Act, the suspension of Habeus Corpus and the Six Acts. Many made the valid point that much of the legislation was reactive rather than proactive. All candidates argued firmly that other measures were vital in dealing with radical outbursts, such as the use of force and the use of spies. Most pleasing of all were those who also looked at the radical press and the impact on that of stamp duty. Some were aware of Cobden's flight to America.

Q.3.

This question was very popular but it was not a question on the nature of the old system and the changes which the 1832 Act produced, although of course comments such as 'reform to preserve' were given due credit. Nor was there a need to go in depth back to the issue of Catholic Emancipation or the Test and Corporation Acts. However most candidates homed in on the quote eventually, although some proved unable to handle that smoothly whilst also attempting to bring in rote learnt material on Lenin's conditions for revolution. There was a tendency for the historiography to supplant events totally, and it was notable that the Bristol riots were muddled with 'The Days of May'. Few candidates quite grasped what the latter were, though the best did pick up Place's call 'Stop the Duke, go for gold.' The European revolutionary background was understood and the differences in England. The Birmingham Political Union seemed the only representative of its kind whilst the radical press was notably often ignored. Middle class sympathies, and divisions, with the working class were often well utilised.

Q.4.

This was tackled by very few despite the wealth of material available from the Ten Hours movement, where the increasing restrictions of the factory legislation were available as illustrations of the conditions in the factories. Some braver souls developed the theme that factory work was not yet typical of the conditions of the working classes.

Q.5.

This was tackled by very few, usually in the form of a narrative from the 1820's to the late 1830's. The government's attitude to the unions was well understood as was the impact of the case of the Tolpuddle Martyrs on the G. N.C.T.U. Limitations on the unions in terms of 'the Document' were made use of but limitations on funding, organisation, trade specialisms and general illiteracy and poverty were not.

Q.6.

This essay topic led to many ingenious definitions of propaganda, which included amongst others Cobden's 'tea parties', forty-shilling freeholders et al. Some credited the League with

founding 'The Economist', which it merely helped to fund, for its own paper was 'The League'. Candidates argued clearly enough that without Peel serving the nation and not the party, and the Irish famine, the Corn Laws might not have been repealed. The better candidates were appreciative of the Free Trade ethos of the time, some dealt briefly with Peel's budgets of 1842 and 1845, and the best understood that the Corn Law of 1841 was not the Corn Law of 1815. Many liked to use the impact of Cobden's speeches in Parliament and one or two excellent answers made the point that, without the conversion of Russell and some of the Whigs, the measure might not have been passed.

Q.7.

This question did not have the wide response of previous years and the historiography, though well rehearsed, was not illuminated much by other material, although some local studies in Oldham were utilised. Some candidates attacked this question as a matter of public health and factory legislation - an approach which was broadly acceptable.

Q.8.

This was not a popular question although for those who were interested in this aspect of the period there was great scope and some stretched their range from Twopenny Trash through to the Northern Star, and such an informed approach was well rewarded. The lack of uniformity in the working class was understood, though more might have been made of the diversity of support which Chartism had. Some of the best answers used Briggs' point about small master/ apprentice workshops to illustrate the diversity of 'the working class'.

Q.9.

There was no radical feminist nor male champion to be found to tackle this one.

Q.10.

This is a not unfamiliar question which is still answered mainly in terms of the popularity of the Non-Conformist and sectarian faiths. The impact of Catholic Emancipation, of the beginning of state involvement in education, of legislation on Births, Marriages and Deaths were all used sensibly. The fact that the Church of England's parish structure belonged to an older agricultural society was not fully exploited. Above all it was the internal 'danger' to the church which was not sufficiently explored, namely the Oxford Movement and of course, as well, the enthusiasm of the Evangelicals.

Indicative content for all these questions will be found in the markscheme.

9020/21 Origins of the Second World War

General Comments

As in previous years, most candidates performed competently but almost all of them could have improved in their performance. For no less than four of this year's essay questions, the specific comments which follow refer to the tendency to write standard responses rather than to answer the specific question set. This means that essay technique is not as good as it needs to be. Candidates need to ask themselves as they write 'am I answering the question?' Too often they are not. It could be that they do not know about the specific point raised by the question and so prefer to write about the topic. This defence might be possible in the case of question 7, on the economic factors which caused Germany to provoke war (though the subject has been the focus of a historical debate for many years). However, it is hard to find similar defences with regard to the other three questions which provoked too many standard-cum-marginal responses. Questions 2 and 3 both asked why; candidates preferred to explain how. Questions 2 and 9 both provided specific periods on which candidates should concentrate; in both cases they preferred to write about a longer and earlier period. Such general answers gain some credit, probably to the maximum of band 4 of the generic mark bands. To reach band 3 and higher, however, a more focused approach is essential.

Essays count for only 75% of the total marks, the source-based question providing the rest. Here the main weakness is a tendency to rush the last sub-question, presumably because too long has been spent on the earlier sub-questions. Candidates need to allocate their time to each of these questions very carefully. If they cannot quickly work out the answer to one of the first questions, for which there are relatively few marks, then they would do better to leave it and move on to the later questions, which received more marks. (They must return to make some attempt at the earlier questions as blank spaces can be awarded no marks at all.)

This year's document question did result in responses to the question on pacifism in 1935 which, though explained below, are worth highlighting because they can affect essays as well. Candidates' grasp of central concepts of the subject is often not as firm as it ought to be. Many see pacifism as meaning not a refusal to fight but a reluctance to do so. Thus the difference between pacifism and both appeasement and collective security can become blurred. Such misunderstanding is bound to affect candidate's understanding of, for example, the evolution of British foreign policy in the 1930s.

This paper imposes considerable demands on candidates. The topic itself, though only nine years or so in length, required understanding of different types of history, economic and political as well as diplomatic. The historiography of the period becomes ever more complex. And once the content has been mastered then the challenges of the examination have to be met. The main general point to be made is that almost all candidates could have improved their marks and grades had they paid more attention to the specific demands of the essay questions they chose and to the unique demands of the source-based question. Knowledge and understanding of the content of the subject, however good, will result in less reward than might be expected if the demands of the examination have not also been mastered.

Comments on Individual Questions

1 *Source based question: the Peace Ballot, Public Opinion and the Defence of Britain 1935.*

(a) *'The Collective Peace System'*

Too many wrote too generally about keeping peace in the interwar period. The full two marks were awarded to those who mentioned both the League of Nations and the several types of sanctions by which collective security would be achieved. Only a few mentioned both.

'The Simon attitude on the Manchurian business'

This caused problems for most because they did not know what the Simon attitude was. Some looked at the rest of the document, saw a reference to Simon-MacDonald anti-Leaguers and assumed that Simon-MacDonald was an opponent of the League of Nations.

In reality Simon, who was British Foreign Secretary at the time of the Manchurian crisis, accepted the reality of Japanese occupation without condoning the use of force.

(b) *What does Document D indicate about the nature of the defence policy of the Labour party?*

This was only the second time that a cartoon has been used as a source anywhere on the 9020 syllabus (and the first time on Paper 21). Candidates rose to the challenge of a visual source with some success. Though most received two or three marks, few were awarded the full four marks. This was because they considered either the cartoon or its provenance but rarely both together. The following answer did cover both and, though not perfect, was awarded full marks.

'Document C makes some interesting points about Britain's international position and it a reaction of the times. However, it must be taken into account that it is a cartoon designed to appeal to readers of the Evening Standard and that Low is a cartoonist looking to exaggerate and entertain as well as prompt debate. The picture depicts Hoare and Eden on the Collective Security raft. Due to their bare chests and the shirt being used as the sail it seems to indicate that they have 'given the shirt from their backs' for collective security, leaving them exposed. They are looking for the end of troubled times but it appears that Britain's position on collective security looks to be swept away in the tide of the cut-throat arms race. This is true of Britain's position at the time as other countries re-armed and collective security and the League continually failed. Colonel Blimp (pompous and reactionary) is on the raft, showing how Britains (sic) wanted tot be a part of collective security. However, as times started to look dangerous Britain's attitude (as the public) is to consider jumping out of collective security as soon as possible. This shows how duplicitous and rocky Britain's international position was in 1935.'

It makes a brief but sound comment on the source of the cartoon. Many commented on the cartoon, but often they asserted that it was not very useful because it was one man's view and a cartoonist's at that. It is hard to give much credit to such assertions. Some candidates knew that the Evening Standard was a right-wing newspaper, others that David Low had left-wing views. Each drew conclusions about the 'bias' of the source from their incomplete knowledge. No one had the full picture.

This answer also makes several solid points about the content of the cartoon, one of which is checked against the candidate's own knowledge. For some reason, and despite information supplied on the exam paper to the contrary, several candidates insisted that the two people at the front of the mast were the British and French foreign ministers. Few referred to Colonel Blimp's comment which suggests that Low saw the right wing as abandoning collective security even if the government was trying to hang on. And no one mentioned that the raft was intended to portray Low's belief that, by the middle of 1935, the policy of collective security had all but sunk without trace.

This candidate's greater confidence with the content of the cartoon than with its provenance is typical of the vast majority of answers. A considerable minority said nothing at all about the source of the cartoon, which inevitably limited the marks they could receive.

But, overall, on the evidence of candidate's work, the cartoon caused no greater problems than the more familiar written source.

- (d) *How far is the view of the significance of the Peace Ballot found in Document B supported by Documents E and F?*

Some misread Document B, asserting that it showed support for pacifism. This was probably because they read the source too quickly. Most, however, saw the main point of B, that it strengthened support for a government committed to collective security. Interpreting Document E posed few problems. Document F was more problematical. Most seized on the reference to the Peace Vote, which was valid. However, they ignored Baldwin's first statement about the need for a larger air force. No one considered the source as an entity and not one realised that Baldwin was being quoted to condemn him for being inconsistent and opportunistic.

Thus although most scored reasonably well on this question, hardly anyone was awarded full marks.

- (e) *Consider Churchill's view that, in 1935, Britain was 'lost in a pacifist dream'.*

The main problem here was the term 'pacifist'. Most candidates equated being pacifist with being in favour of peace and opposed to war, for whatever reason. Some confused it with either collective security or appeasement. Few were as muddled as the candidate who wrote

Churchill was right. It was a dream that Britain could avoid war through pacifist policies, whether through collective security or appeasement.

However, many lacked a clear understanding of these central concepts. This confusion often affected their essays as well.

One minor problem was the very common tendency to overlook 'in 1935'. Candidates wrote in general about British attitudes towards developments in Europe in the 1930s. The few who focused on 1935 did better than those who tried to cover the whole decade.

The final problem was that which occurs every year; a tendency to consider either the documents or other sources 'known to you' but rarely both. The oversight was as common this year as it ever has been.

Many answers showed evidence of all three problems. This meant that many did not do very well on this final sub-question, worth almost a third of the total marks.

2 Why did the Nazi dictatorship emerge so quickly in 1933-4?

The focus of the question was the establishment of the Nazi dictatorship within some eighteen months in 1933-4. Many candidates decided it was the rise of Hitler to government office in January 1933, which was to concentrate on the wrong period. Unless the pre-1933 material was related to the emergence of the Nazi dictatorship in 1933-4 it could be awarded little credit.

Even those who focused on the relevant period tended to describe how the dictatorship was established rather than why. Though 'how' and 'why' are sometimes hard to tell apart, the better candidates did attempt to separate the two.

3 'French foreign policy failed in the 1930s not because French governments lacked the power but because they lacked the will to use it.'

A popular question and usually well answered. Candidates did distinguish between power in terms of military forces and will in terms of the attitude of governments and the public, both of whom were reluctant to follow an aggressive foreign policy. However, candidates equated power with military power; they overlooked the power of French governments inside France as well as outside. French governments might theoretically have had enough military force to threaten Germany and yet have been unable to use it because they failed to gain the support of the French people for doing so. In other words, they lacked (political) power rather than the will to use French military power. This is where the frequent changes of government become directly relevant. Too often the number of French governments in the 1930s were mentioned without being related explicitly to the question.

4 Why was the League of Nations so unsuccessful in dealing with the Manchurian crisis?

Answers to this question tended to concentrate on either the League of Nations or the Manchurian crisis. In both cases they took a narrative approach, describing either how the League developed in the 1920s and 1930s or how the Manchurian crisis developed and mixing the two. As with question 2, in taking this approach, they implicitly

explained why the League was unsuccessful. Very few wrote an explicitly relevant answer, identifying four or five key reasons and writing a paragraph on each.

5 *How fascist was Mussolini's foreign policy?*

Mussolini's foreign policy is normally a popular topic. Fewer answered this particular question on the subject than equivalent questions in previous years, which usually asked about relations with Germany. Those who did attempt the question realised the need to define 'fascist', a task which has proved difficult for professional historians. Candidates usually equated fascism with aggressive nationalism, which was sufficient to write a sound answer to the question. Most concluded that Mussolini's foreign was not very fascist. However, the ideological nature of fascism was rarely, if ever, mentioned, its hostility to all other kinds of political belief ever discussed.

6 *How far did Stalin achieve the main goal of his foreign policy since 1933 when he signed a non-aggression policy pact with Germany in 1939?*

Virtually all those who chose this question knew and understood the main aims and features of Stalin's foreign policy. Thus they usually wrote a sound answer to the question. Again, as with the previous question, candidates rarely considered the ideological dimension of the subject. Even the point about the USSR being the only Marxist state in a capitalist world, and therefore wanting to defend its special security interests, was overlooked.

The only point about interpretation of the question worth mentioning was the tendency of most candidates to see a pact with Germany as being Stalin's main goal and never to consider the importance of a non-aggression pact with whichever capitalist power was willing to agree acceptable terms. The very best answers considered both possibilities.

7 *How valid is the view that the main reason why Germany provoked war in 1939 was economic?*

The focus of this question was intended to be the historical debate about whether Hitler went to war in 1939 because the German economy was overheating. The resources offered by Poland would help ease these economic problems, as those of Austria and Czechoslovakia had done in part. Those who challenge this thesis do so on one of two grounds: either that German economic problems in 1938-9 were not that serious or that Hitler went to war for other reasons.

Candidates usually took the second approach. Economic issues were covered quickly, often too quickly, before other factors were explained. The impression given by most answers was that candidates were uncomfortable when it came to analysing the economic causes of Germany's going to war. They had their standard response to a question on Germany and the origins of the Second World War which they wanted to write, whatever the question. A few tried to deflect attention from their unease by spending some time arguing that Germany did not provoke war in 1939, which was to address a different question.

8 *The Impact of the Spanish Civil War on European great power relations 1936-9.*

This was more popular than had been expected and also better answered. Weaker candidates concentrated in the Spanish Civil War but they were very much in the minority. Most explained how various great power relations were affected by developments in Spain. They also placed the impact of the civil war in context by mentioning other developments of the time which affected great power relations. Some concentrated too much on 1936 but the best covered the impact of all three years of the war.

9 *How far, in the period from May 1937 to September 1939, was British policy towards Germany determined solely by the Prime Minister?*

The responses to this question were similar to responses to question 7 in that candidates had a standard response which they wrote with little regard to the question. This response answered the question 'why appeasement' or, getting closer to the question, 'who was responsible for appeasement'. Thus most answers ranged over the 1930s. Many argued that Chamberlain was not solely responsible for appeasement because the policy had been followed by Baldwin as well.

Note the dates of the question, the first of which is the date when Chamberlain became Prime Minister. Also note that the question does not include the word appeasement, which is a protean term subject to much debate. If not solely Chamberlain, then who else? The Cabinet? The Foreign Office? Parliament? The press? The public? The first three, together with Chamberlain, should have been the focus of debate. It very rarely was.

The other main point about this topic is that Chamberlain's influence changed during the course of sixteen months. With his flights to Germany in September 1938, he did determine British policy. A year later he had to give way to Cabinet colleagues and even to Parliament.

10 *'The media enabled dictatorships to be more aggressive in their foreign policies while ensuring that democracies were less aggressive.'* Discuss with regard to newspapers, radio and the cinema.

Just one candidate attempted this question the essay showed some understanding of cinema of the 1930s. However, it never addressed the question.

Indicative content for all these questions will be found in the markscheme.

9020/25 Individual Study

Most of those who examined this year's crop of History Individual Studies commented on their reports that they recognised and valued the special nature of this examination. It is an examination that provides a splendid opportunity for candidates to experience both the excitement of undertaking extensive and detailed historical research on topics of their own choice and the challenge of presenting their conclusions in clear and coherent ways. The exceptional nature of the examination, however, does not make it immune from trends in the teaching and examination of history in schools in the United Kingdom. This is illustrated by the fact that the most popular topics chosen by candidates this year were from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Many candidates wrote studies on topics like Hitler, Stalin, the history of the First and Second World Wars, Martin Luther King and the Vietnam War. Yet it is pleasing to report that many other candidates tackled a wider range of subjects from medieval chivalry, the reputation of the Vikings, the Medici's use of patronage and the disappearance of the Mayan civilisation to the early history of jazz, Victorian prostitution, the Cultural Revolution in China and the religious significance of the works of Hieronymous Bosch.

Yet what candidates chose to write about was relatively unimportant in determining the quality of the Studies they eventually produced. Much more crucial was whether or not they had defined specific questions about their topics. It was much more difficult to meet the assessment objectives in this examination's Mark Scheme for candidates who had picked questions like 'How important was the role of the suffragettes in securing votes for women?' than for those who had a more specific question like 'Why was the Representation of the People Act passed in 1918?'. This year's Studies showed that it was hard to answer broad questions like the first one without writing a general essay; whereas the second question invited detailed historical investigation of the political context at the end of the First World War and of the motives and aspirations of those who voted for the Act. Many candidates had been advised by comments made on their Outline Proposal Forms to narrow the focus of their topics in this kind of way. The importance of candidates following the advice given on the forms cannot be over-emphasised. Major changes of title from those approved on Outline Proposal Forms are, of course, not allowed and approval for these changes must be sought by submitting new proposals. Some teachers also played a crucial part this year in helping candidates shape their topics in ways that gave them good opportunities to meet the Mark Scheme's assessment objectives. The limits on the amount of help that teachers can legitimately give their students are set out in the *Notes of Guidance for Teachers*, but these limits generally only apply once candidates have begun their research. Some teachers this year clearly had put a lot of effort into helping their students define their research topics, ensuring that they had copies of the *Notes for the Guidance for Candidates*, making them aware of the kind of work that they must do in order to reach the higher bands in the major assessment objectives set out in the Mark Scheme. This kind of guidance at the planning stage was reflected in the high quality of many of their students' Studies.

In this examination (as the *Notes of Guidance for Candidates* and Mark Scheme make clear) it is important that, once candidates have begun their research, they make and keep full notes of everything that they read. This year some candidates had not done that. Consequently, the folders of notes they brought to their interviews consisted only of a few pages on which they had noted down one or two scattered pieces of relevant information

or quotations from books that they thought might be useful when writing their studies. Usually this indicated that they had not carried out systematic and detailed research. On the other hand, as many examiners commented, there was absolutely no doubt not only that the opposite was the case with candidates who had kept folders of well-organised notes on all sources they had consulted, but also that they made better use of what they had read. This was the case since the process of making notes had allowed them to digest and evaluate the information they had collected before making use of it to construct their own historical analyses and arguments.

What also distinguished those candidates who produced better Studies from others was the extent of the research that they had undertaken. The vast majority of candidates showed commendable initiative and thought in searching for information. It is true that some were content to go no further than consulting a few general books, thus missing the opportunity to become directly familiar with debates and ideas in specialist secondary sources and with primary sources. Others, however, had worked hard locating relevant source material. Some found journals like *History Today* and *History Review* excellent for bibliographical help. Others had approached libraries before or very soon after having their proposals approved and had consulted catalogues and bibliographies, and then had made good use of the inter-library loans service to acquire books and articles not in their local libraries. Many also had trawled not just their school and local libraries but had gone further afield, contacting specialist societies, visiting museums and sites, and using archive repositories like the newspaper archive at Colindale and record offices. Many had also used the Internet. This year's candidates seemed to have heeded warning given in recent reports on this examination to use information from that extraordinary repository with critical care. Even last year most candidates accepted uncritically what they read on the Internet; this year many were much more sophisticated, using the Internet to find helpful ideas for additional sources and for historiographical information. It is to be hoped that future candidates will follow this example.

There were also some signs this year that more candidates than in the past had made a determined effort to meet assessment objective a (ii) of the Mark Scheme, regarding the evaluation of evidence. As one examiner's report notes, 'there were some good examples of cross-referencing between sources, thus integrating the evaluation of evidence in to the text of the study'. This is what candidates ought to be aiming to do. But it has to be admitted that most candidates still failed to meet this aim. Many candidates, if they discussed sources at all, did so in a sentence or two; and some also failed to refer to previous work done by historians on the topics they tackled. It is true that some subjects more obviously lend themselves to an historical treatment and to an explicit evaluation of sources than others. But all historical topics that are worth investigating in detail relate to issues that have been debated by historians in the past and these ought to be taken account of in studies. Candidates in this examination, like all writers of history, should discuss what work has been done on their topics in the past. The introduction is an appropriate (though not the only place) where this can be done. It is equally important that candidates should refer to different historians' interpretations throughout their studies. This is also true of their treatment of primary sources. All candidates should try to become aware of what are the major sources for studying their topics, even if they have not consulted any of these primary sources directly. They should also demonstrate that they have not accepted sources at face value but that they have questioned their validity. Much the most effective way of doing this is not by including a separate chapter/section on

Report on the Components taken in June 2000

'evaluation of sources' but by making such evaluative comments an integral part of the central themes or arguments of Individual Studies.

The assessment objective that was met most successfully by all candidates this year was the one that assesses the ability to formulate and present clear, coherent, logical and relevant arguments. (This is assessment objective b in the Mark Scheme). Not surprisingly in a total entry of 1014 candidates, the extent of this success varied. But the substantial percentage gaining grades of A and B (15.6% A, 21.2% B) is a reflection of the large number of candidates who wrote carefully structured Studies with high quality analytical answers that were a delight to read. A handful were outstanding, revealing mature and independent-minded qualities and historical skills of the highest order. Some candidates, however, did not apparently realise their full potential. Many presented excellent introductions which explained the aims and scope of their Studies by defining clearly the 'problem' they were about to investigate (following the advice on this aspect given in last year's report on this examination), but then failed to keep to the promised structure. Many started with an interesting idea but then strayed from the focus of their title questions, often providing too much of a narrative answer. Often such candidates, because they were exploring an area new to them which they found fascinating, were keen to relate the factual background to the reader, forgetting that a major aim ought to have been to meet assessment objective b (and, of course the other assessment objectives as well). Another common fault that blunted the effectiveness of the arguments in many Studies was a tendency to allow the text to degenerate in to extensive description, only coming back to the central theme in the conclusion. In Studies that focused on causation there was also a tendency simply to describe different 'causes' without attempting to assess their relative importance.

As in previous years, the candidates who avoided these kinds of criticisms were those who had put a lot of thought in to planning their Individual Studies. Such Studies had structures that ensured that they focused on the questions in their titles throughout the text and not just in the introductions and conclusion, that prevented their authors from being side-tracked in to lengthy, irrelevant descriptive passages, and that gave them full opportunity to explore all the analytical implications of their questions. The best way of constructing such a structure was by dividing Studies in to chapters or sections, and by devising chapter/section headings that bore directly on the questions being tackled.

It might be useful for future candidates if this report ends by emphasising some of the criticisms that were made of the ways some of this year's candidates presented their Studies. Most attempted to provide footnotes but some had little idea what purpose they served and seemed simply to have scattered them around the Studies so as to meet the requirement of the Mark Scheme. Future candidates might usefully read the relevant section on footnoting in the *Notes of Guidance for Candidates*. They should do this at an early stage in their work, since an essential precondition of the ability to produce full and accurate footnotes is to make notes on sources that include page references and full bibliographical details. This will also, of course, allow candidates to produce paper bibliographies, with details of authors, full titles of books and articles and dates of publication, in the way prescribed in the *Notes of Guidance*. Many candidates failed to include with their Studies copies of Outline Proposal Forms and a note of the word-length of their Studies, as required by the regulations for this examination. A significant minority of Studies this year lacked pagination, making it difficult for examiners to discuss aspects

of candidates' work at interviews. The most widespread weakness in presentation was poor proof-reading. Too many candidates relied only on the spell-check functions of their PCs and failed to realise that this is not a guarantee of an error-free text. Finally, the misuse of *its/it's* is now rampant. This is a pity, because it can lead to ambiguities and its extermination is no mere pedantry. *Its* means 'of it'. The simplest advice for future candidates is that, since *it's* is an abbreviation for 'it is' and since one should not use abbreviated forms in written English in formal pieces of work like an Individual Study, no-one should ever write *it's*.

UCLES

9444 Special Paper

This year's entry, though still small overall, showed an increase of the order of 15% over 1999. Whether this increase represented increased interest in advance of the introduction of the Advanced Extension paper in 2002 it is impossible to say. The extra candidates did not, however, bring extra marks with them. At the top of the range, as ever, candidates both delighted and beguiled with their insight, understanding and informed confidence. This year's paper, however, saw rather too many candidates depending on evidently 'learned responses', often drawing their examples from a painfully narrow range – either thematically or chronologically – and expressing their ideas in painfully restricted English. The Special Paper aims to draw from able candidates fresh reflections either on the nature of history as a discipline or about key historical concepts and phenomena. In either case, they should be able to illustrate their arguments with appropriately chosen examples, preferably from a range of periods and / or states. Questions are set which aim to discriminate between candidates who can work within this framework and those who clearly cannot.

It would be too harsh to conclude that too many of this year's candidates did not understand what skills a Special Paper is designed to test. Certainly, however, too many tried to get by on threadbare generalities, what appeared to be learned notes about 'the lessons of history' and a few ill-digested quotations. Ranke's famous dictum 'Wie es eigentlich gewesen', whether rendered in German or English, is far more quoted than understood. Indeed, it even threatens to rival Gladstone's famous tree-felling reflection from 1868 as the historical cliché most likely to be used, not because it is apposite but because it has been memorised, often (one suspects) through substantial, but quite redundant effort. This year, more candidates had clearly heard of post-modernism, though very few showed any signs of actually having read any historical works informed by the 'linguistic turn'. They knew, or partly knew, only at a distance. Too many generalisations about post-modernism read as if through a thick scrim. Direct, informed engagement was very rare; portentous, but unsatisfying, generalities all too common.

The early questions on the paper tended to ensnare the less able by prompting routine, prepared answers. Far too many candidates turned question 1, 2 and 3 towards prepared work, weak on specifics on 'Why study History?', on 'How historians work?' and on 'What historians try to do?'. All three discriminated well, though not necessarily in the way examiners would have wished. They tended to attract more weak candidates than they should have done. Only able candidates in question 1 were able to discuss what attributes of history politicians specifically might find valuable. Some illustrated their argument with key 'lessons' which might be drawn through knowledge of Irish or Balkan history. A few sceptics drew an 'anti-lesson' from Suez and the fallibility of Hitlerian analogies. Overall, too few candidates reflected either on politicians or on 'compulsory', though a number of valid liberal caveats were offered about 'compulsory'.

Answers to question 2 were, in general, a severe disappointment. Very few candidates reflected on what narrative history actually is. True, a few argued that 'narrative history' was a contradiction in terms since historians telling a story were nevertheless inevitably making judgements, if only those of selection, but such reflections were rare. Likewise, a handful of good candidates were able to make legitimate analogies to 'schools' of history, notably the Annales school. Too many, however, digressed into 'What is history?' These responses, practised as many all too obviously were, missed the central focus of the question, which concerned possible 'alternatives' to a narrative approach. Few candidates understood how, or why, the question cuts to the heart of current debates about historical methods and approach.

Better candidates answered question 3 constructively on the diverse ways in which 'documents' could be defined. For some, 'documents' meant the official record; for others it connoted any written source. The precise definition mattered less than the use to which the definition was then put. Only abler candidates offered comment on whether sources other than the written could be sufficiently diverse and representative to permit recognisably 'historical' explanations. Candidates could legitimately relate the issue of documentary availability and reliability to the wider issue of how history is constructed, and examiners did not find it difficult to differentiate between methodological discussion grounded in debate about how histories are constructed from pre-packaged responses heavily weighted towards statements about historical method.

Few candidates attempted question 4 but many of those who did so were very able. They reflected on the aspects of society which could be fostered and developed more effectively in towns – where communication is generally easier and where professional groups with access to specialist knowledge tend to concentrate – than in rural areas. Examples used were commendably diverse. Many candidates offered comment on progress in the ancient world.

Answers to question 5 were numerous and diverse in quality. The phrasing of the question should have alerted students to the recognition that it was easier to answer it by interpreting revolutions in the context of sudden (and probably violent) political change than by taking much broader definitions. Some responses were far too general; others were insufficiently precise in their understanding of 'intellectuals' and their role. A good number, however, achieved a balance of understanding between the roles of leaders and led. It was commonly argued that revolutionary leaders could only achieve their aims when clear ground for discontent existed. Better answers developed this theme from a variety of revolutionary situations, most commonly the English, French and Russian.

Question 6 proved testing for many candidates. Most broadly accepted the proposition, some arguing that there was solid merit in 'dullness' which reflected stability and order. The main problem, however, was the lack of understanding of what aristocracies were. Far too many tackled the question as if 'aristocracies' operated as a kind of collective synonym for monarchies. Few candidates grasped the potential for 'glittering' in inherited land wealth, the time which such wealth afforded for luxurious, if not self-indulgent expenditure, and ostentation was a means of drawing admiring attention to a select and privileged group.

Answers to question 7 were adequate, but few were specially enlightening. Candidates tended to accept the proposition – some with immature and unreflective criticism – and sought to illustrate it. Few made use of the word 'sanctioned'. Few either seemed familiar with Theodore Roosevelt's all-American dictum from 1901: 'Speak softly and carry a big stick; you will go far'. Most of the examples cited to sustain answers to this question came from the nineteenth or twentieth centuries, perhaps not surprisingly.

By contrast, question 8 attracted early modern specialists. Reflective and interesting answers were seen which attempted to explain why what for some were the non-negotiable certainties of faith brooked no compromise. Weaker answers tended either to downplay, or even to ignore totally, the phrase 'bitter political dissension'. Some would clearly have been happier with the question 'What has religion provoked so much conflict?' since they answered it thus.

Report on the Components taken in June 2000

Question 9 was neither popular nor well done. For almost all candidates who interpreted it appropriately, 'genocide' meant 'holocaust'. Too many narrowly focused answers resulted. Some misunderstood the term and talked vaguely about politically inspired mass murders. Almost no one attempted the 'disease' variant.

Many candidates attempted question 10. Some very lively and wide-ranging answers were seen, mostly from candidates who inclined to the view that, although the situation might have been different even fifty years ago, the degree of commonality between English-speaking peoples was now very restricted indeed. Most candidates used the British (sic) Empire as their point of reference. A few took a much more contemporary perspective, arguing imaginatively about the commonality of US (usually rendered as American) culture as a unifying force within which the 'English-speaking' element was little more than accidental. Good answers offered a range of perspectives which spanned institutions, practices, democratic forms of government and the like.

Question 11 was popular. It produced some outstanding answers from intelligent candidates who had clearly thought about the importance of sport as a culturally unifying factor, especially in societies within which orthodox politics no longer engage a democratic majority. Too many weak candidates attempted this, however, and they tended to produce unreflective justifications for sport which lacked any proper sense of either historical or cultural context.

Question 12 was a minority choice but it tended to attract abler candidates with an appropriate frame of cultural reference. In general, references to music tended to be better than those to art, although some medievalists made much of visual representations in largely pre-literate age. Some very good answers were seen which attempted to show how music, popular or classical, might effectively represent the 'spirit of the age'. Music as protest was as effectively illustrated through jazz in the 1920s and through the popular music explosion of the 1950s and 1960s as through classical artists seeking liberation without victimisation within the confining context of a totalitarian regime. Interestingly, more than one candidate wrote tellingly about what the music of Shostakovich can reveal about life in Stalin's USSR. The best candidates linked their cultural knowledge effectively to a political context.

Question 13 was quite well managed on the whole. Some became too empirical, forsaking a Special Paper approach for a detailed 'cause and consequence' answer about the fate of specific empires, usually the Roman and the British. Most candidates sought for more than the merely political in their explanations. Economic and strategic factors featured prominently in many explanations of 'fall'. Somewhat surprisingly, although candidates were in part drawing on their insights, the names of Edward Gibbon and Paul Kennedy featured only rarely in answers.

Most candidates who attempted question 14 – including the minority who handled it with confidence and range – rushed to agree with the proposition. What one might term 'informed euro-scepticism' characterised a number of answers. A number of weak candidates (some of whom also attempted question 11 without much success) dragged football hooligans – usually English – into answers. Clearly Euro 2000 continued to exert a pull. Better answers tended to discuss the problems of leaders such as Charlemagne, Charles V or Napoleon in attempting to fashion pan-European identity. Some candidates argued that 'Europe' was a political weapon as well as a geographical expression and it never found much resonance among ordinary individuals. Many candidates pointed to the massive linguistic hurdle in the way of wider European integration.

Question 15 was popular but not, in general, well done. Far too few investigated what might be meant by 'monarchical systems of government' and resorted to potted biography of well-known monarchs. A surprising number of candidates saw twentieth-century Britain as having a 'monarchical system of government', though the justification for so doing was rarely present. It was, of course, possible to argue that the personality and abilities of, say, Elizabeth II mattered far less than did that of Elizabeth, but few candidates had either the confidence or the breadth of knowledge to span the centuries. It was also very noticeable that candidates were much more effective in their discussion of 'personality' than of 'ability'. Too many merely elided what are two quite distinct attributes. This question probably looked a deal easier than it actually was. A large number of very 'flat' answers were seen.

Question 16 was not popular and few of those who attempted it avoided the obvious pitfalls. Very few compared the relative importance of industrialisation with other seismic social or cultural changes. Too often, also, industrialisation defaulted purely to urbanisation. Very few candidates played with concepts like 'self-sustained economic growth' or the ability to counteract the malign effects of natural phenomena such as deficient harvests by stimulating much more diverse dietary patterns.

9020

Paper Thresholds (Raw Marks)

The maximum mark for each paper is 99.

	Total Candidates	A	B	C	D	E	N
9020/1	63	76	68	59	50	42	34
9020/2	952	76	67	58	50	42	34
9020/3	42	76	67	58	50	42	34
9020/4	1505	76	67	58	50	42	34
9020/5	234	76	67	58	50	42	34
9020/6	1	76	67	58	50	42	34
9020/7	297	78	69	58	50	43	34
9020/10	33	76	67	59	52	45	38
9020/11	768	76	69	60	53	46	39
9020/12	84	76	67	59	52	45	38
9020/13	1517	76	69	60	52	45	38
9020/14	346	76	69	60	52	45	38
9020/15	27	76	67	59	52	45	38
9020/16	38	77	67	59	52	45	38
9020/17	26	75	65	57	49	42	35
9020/18	65	76	67	59	51	44	37
9020/21	111	76	66	59	52	46	40
9020/25	1010	80	70	60	50	40	30
9020/85	1	80	70	60	50	40	30

The Paper 25 and 85 thresholds (in line with QCA's Code of Practice for Coursework) remain constant from year to year.

Standardisation of Marks

Each Paper's raw marks were mapped onto a uniform mark scale (UMS) as follows:

Paper	A	B	C	D	E	N
1-21	80	70	60	50	40	30

Overall Threshold Marks (UMS)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	N
2-Paper Combination	198	156	139	119	99	80	61
2 Papers & 9020/25 or 9020/85	297	236	209	179	149	120	91

Syllabus Results

There were 3055 candidates. The percentage awarded each grade was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	N
Cumulative	18.76	40.97	65.74	82.27	90.47	95.35
Change on June 1999	-0.48	+3.65	+5.30	+6.37	+3.34	+0.47

Special Paper (9444)

(shared with OCR's other three A Level History Syllabuses)

Raw Mark Threshold

Total Number of Candidates	Maximum Mark	Distinction	Merit	Unclassified
248	90	68	58	0

The percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	Distinction	Merit	Unclassified
Cumulative Percentage	27.02	63.71	100
Candidates	67	91	90