

HISTORY

Paper 9769/11

British History Outlines c. 300–1547

Key Messages

- It is very important that answers respond very specifically to the exact wording of the question and deal fully with its demands.
- A knowledge of historiography may be very useful, but indiscriminating introduction of reference to historians and their views regardless of the actual question is not helpful in offering a focused response.
- Rehearsed 'lists of factors' are unlikely to demonstrate the higher level skills of analysis and discrimination required for the top levels.

General Comments

The variety of questions tackled over the three papers is tribute to the range of interests pursued by Centres who have taken advantage of the wide variety of choice available in Cambridge Pre-U History. The Themes sections were answered only by a small number of candidates, and this report can only encourage Centres to promote these interesting and rewarding topics. The knowledge displayed, the understanding shown and the fluency of much of the writing all supported the best answers. Where there is most room for improvement is in the expression of greater supported judgement and engagement with the implications of questions which invite a personal view. Many answers offered sustained explanations but did not present arguments at the higher-level skill of assessing factors and sustaining criticism of different ways of explaining the past. This is not a call for historiographical surveys, but an encouragement for answers to address the requirements of the questions for clear personal views and judgements. 'What best explains...' is not the same as 'Give a series of possible explanations...' The provocative 'Did it?' or the more restrained 'How valid is this judgement?' questions really do mean that candidates should be confident and offer their reasoned and supported personal views. The development of those views should be a key element in the courses which lead to the examinations. Knowledge for its own sake is secondary to the use of that knowledge in discussion and argument. However, without adequate knowledge, arguments can degenerate into assertions and judgements can become facile. The best responses kept a good balance and offered mature and convincing views which explained the past in a living and meaningful way. Where model answers were reproduced and stereotyped judgements merely repeated, the opposite was true. Cambridge Pre-U questions are set to stimulate a reasoned and supported personal response.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

There was some good knowledge of some of the archaeological and numismatic evidence, which was used to argue that there was both stability and instability. Some answers recognised that there was considerable change over the century but others were less discriminatory, or suggested that the whole period was unstable.

Question 2

There was insufficient focus on the terms of the question and the arrival of the Anglo-Saxons was described rather than assessed, with a broader area than that specified being considered. Gildas was well utilised along with cemetery evidence.

Question 4

Answers focused well on the brutal and pagan aspects of Penda's rule and his killing of Christian kings was used in evidence. There was also good discussion of the attitude of Bede towards Penda and hence the

limited nature of Bede as a source. Answers were less strong when trying to take a more positive view of Penda and needed to make deductions from the available evidence about his administrative and other talents.

Question 5

Some answers used the achievements of the Celtic missionaries as an alternative explanation but the question was focused on the Roman mission and ended in 660, so that the Synod of Whitby was outside its remit. Answers needed more specific knowledge of the work of missionaries apart from Augustine and the work of Paulinus in Northumbria could have been more fully assessed. Most answers agreed that the influence of rulers was paramount and were not very strong in suggesting any other possible reasons.

Question 7

Knowledge about the contribution of Bede showed considerable improvement compared to some previous years, with answers analysing the importance of his contribution. There was also good reference to artefacts and clear attempts to assess their significance along with analysis of the influences behind works such as *The Dream of the Rood*. There was some description, though less than in past years. Answers were aware of the derivative nature of some of the work, but took this as further evidence of its significance and made a strong case for the achievements in Northumbria.

Question 8

Answers were well-informed about the achievements of Offa and divided in their assessments. Some argued persuasively that he was largely responsible, while others considered he was fortunate in his inheritance. Some of the knowledge about the state of Mercia when he became king could have been more fully developed. The letter he received from Charlemagne figured strongly in most answers and in some cases formed the greater part of the evidence quoted. Other answers were able to use coinage and substantial knowledge about the Dyke to develop their arguments, while a comparison between Offa and Aethelbald could be made to indicate the extent of Offa's achievements.

Question 11

Most answers picked up the point that *unraed* means ill-advised, but some were less successful in identifying specific examples of Ethelred receiving poor advice. Others quoted the case of Archbishop Sigeric suggesting Ethelred should pay Danegeld or other advisers supporting the St Brice's Day massacre of the Danes. There was reference to treacherous generals such as Aelfric and Eadric in some responses, and they could be seen as bad advisers or taken as showing Ethelred's shortcomings in that he did not punish them. Some responses took a kinder view of Ethelred and made the point that the circumstances he faced were challenging and the reckless behaviour of nobles like Eadric Streona difficult to curb. Other rulers such as Alfred had paid the Danes to go away so it was not necessarily a doomed policy. A variety of conclusions were drawn here.

Question 12

Better answers were able to isolate and explain the key element of the question and compare it with other elements, but some offered general accounts of Cnut's reign.

Question 13

Most candidates were able to identify a number of reasons as to why Harold lost, such as having to fight at Stamford Bridge first, giving up patrolling the southern coast, the march south, some of Harold's soldiers falling from the feigned Norman retreat and the lack of archers. Candidates provided some analysis as to whether or not Harold was unlucky or was incompetent, although few answers took analysis to a particularly sophisticated level. Most answers tended to focus on one reason and then another, rather than providing explanation of how reasons combined together to contribute to Harold's defeat.

Question 14

Many candidates were able to provide some assessment of William's achievements such as the role of the Book, suppression of rebellions and imposing his rule on the country, the building of castles and reform of the Church. However many answers suffered from not defining in the Introduction what criteria could be used to evaluate an achievement. Moreover, a large number of answers focused on William winning the Battle of

Hastings which was not in the remit of the question. Evaluation of the significance of Domesday Book was also often rather cursory. Better answers focused on the legacy of the Book and how it was used by subsequent kings to raise taxation and govern. This was supplemented by a detailed knowledge of the content of the Book and specific ways in which it was used.

Question 16

The answers needed to cover a wider range of rulers as some focused largely on Northumbria and Wessex. They also needed to be aware that it was unlikely that there would be no change over a 300 year period and so were expected to identify changes. Some recognised that the administrative role of kings altered as their kingdoms increased in size and complexity and that their law-giving responded to such changes. Advisers were seen as coming to prominence so that kings were no longer simply served by military leaders. The factors that changed less, such as the links with the Church and the need to lead in battle were usually well analysed.

Question 18

The responses were able to discuss religious benefits in some detail but needed greater knowledge of other contacts such as trade, even if simply to say there is not much evidence to consider, but some deductions can be made. Some answers were more concerned with the benefits conferred on the Continent by England and spent time assessing the contribution of Alcuin at Charlemagne's court, which was not the focus of the terms of the question.

Question 22

Answers needed to give due consideration to the barons and their role and preferably to name some of the most influential. Better responses did this before moving on to assess the responsibility of the two protagonists and that of the Church. Some were able to identify barons whose lack of loyalty and changing of allegiance contributed to the outcome of the War. While the length of the War could be viewed as one outcome, the final settlement needed to be assessed.

Question 23

Many candidates provided some sound explanation as to the core reasons why Henry and Becket fell out with each other. Most candidates were able to provide some good evidence for both sides of the question from Henry's argument that he was returning to the traditions of his father and concerns over clerical exemptions to Becket's role as Chancellor, and then perceived volte face. Some candidates were also able to draw on the personality of the French King and Becket's excommunication of those who had crowned the Young King. Some answers needed to develop the alternative argument more fully and often missed the corrosive nature of the relationship between Becket and Henry II. But there was some understanding that when former friends fall out, it can be impossible to rebuild a relationship.

Question 24

Too many responses showed that the terms of the question had not been studied with sufficient care. The focus was on John's efforts to recover his lost lands. Thus, the process by which he lost them was not relevant to the question and some answers spent too long on events prior to 1204. Most answers argued well that John's financial expedients showed his commitment only too clearly, but were less confident in judging how far he was half-hearted and how far let down by his allies or the victim of unfortunate circumstances in his military campaigns in 1206 and 1214.

Question 27

Answers needed to define some aims in order to evaluate the degree of Edward's success and some covered a range of his intentions, going beyond legal and administrative reforms. There was generally good knowledge of the actual reforms, but the extent to which they enhanced royal power after the difficulties of the previous reign was less well assessed. Edward's expeditions to Wales and Scotland could not be easily assimilated in this question and some answers spent too long trying to do so instead of focusing more specifically.

Question 30

The problems facing Edward III were identified, including local disorder, financial shortfalls and relations with Parliament. His success was not always fully evaluated and there was some description of his methods. It was pointed out that the Black Death was an issue for which he could not have been prepared and about which he could do little.

Question 31

The focus of this question was on the deposition of Richard II so answers needed to be directed at events in 1399. Some responses were well informed about problems with Richard's advisers from earlier in the reign and tried to make this relevant by showing how Richard remained extremely resentful after being deprived of his friends and advisers. Some needed more specific knowledge about advice he received in his later years. The alternative explanations, especially his notion of kingship and his rash exiling of Bolingbroke were well analysed and the final disaster explained by linking a number of factors.

Question 32

Henry V proved a popular topic and the question was usually well answered. Responses focused directly on the elements of luck and ability in the outcomes of the reign. There were plenty of examples of luck and ability and some responses suggested that Henry's ability to take advantage of good fortune was what made him successful. It was also argued that he died at the right moment, before his reputation could suffer as even he would have found it hard to hold on to the French empire. The stable situation he inherited in England and the fractured royal power in France were seen as lucky circumstances while his administrative acumen, firm dealing with rebellion and his undoubted military skill demonstrated his ability. Some answers identified the murder of the Duke of Burgundy as a key moment since it brought the Burgundians to the English side.

Question 34

The answers were well focused on the factors which led to the loss of the French lands, but were not always able to reach a substantiated judgement as to which of the factors was the best explanation. They needed to weigh up the problems faced by the English against the French resurgence. Some identified the death of Bedford or the loss of the Burgundian alliance as key moments which made the loss much more likely.

Question 35

Answers needed to identify the dramatic nature of the changes in fortune of the Yorkists from victory at St Albans to the severe defeat at Wakefield and the remarkable revival in the accession of Edward IV. Without this context, responses could become an account of events with a few reasons attached. The roles of individuals such as Richard of York and Margaret of Anjou, and the Earl of Warwick, along with some minor players, were often argued to be the chief explanation for the dramatic changes of fortune.

Question 37

The answer focused well on Warwick's motives and suggested that it was influence and the role of first adviser that he sought rather than rule as such. There could have been more discussion of how far his ambitions involved being the power behind the throne and hence a kind of 'rule'.

Question 38

Some of these answers focused very well on why Richard III was not overthrown early in his reign and explained his reputation from his administration in the North and the lack of organised and supported noble opposition, along with his robust reaction to protests from Hastings and Buckingham. The reasons why he was finally defeated were less effectively analysed, but some answers argued usefully that he was very unlucky to be overthrown by an unknown invader with little backing and a tenuous claim to the throne.

Question 39

Answers were able to argue convincingly that Henry VII was very concerned with dynastic security, with reference to his foreign policy and his treatment of what might be over mighty subjects. The crisis at the end of the reign was often less carefully analysed and could be cited to show how his concerns lasted all his life. Responses needed to provide evidence for some alternative concerns and usually suggested that Henry was determined to restore financial and administrative efficiency. Some considered that these concerns could be linked as dynastic security depended on sound government. Some took the view that dynastic security was a main concern at the start and end of the reign, but less so in the middle years. The emphasis needed to be on the safety of the dynasty, and thus show how provision for the succession was a main factor in Henry's concerns.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/12

British History Outlines c. 1399–1815

Key Messages

- It is very important that answers respond very specifically to the exact wording of the question and deal fully with its demands
- A knowledge of historiography may be very useful, but indiscriminating introduction of reference to historians and their views regardless of the actual question is not helpful in offering a focused response.
- Rehearsed 'lists of factors' are unlikely to demonstrate the higher level skills of analysis and discrimination required for the top levels.

General Comments

The variety of questions tackled over the three papers is tribute to the range of interests pursued by Centres who have taken advantage of the wide variety of choice available in Cambridge Pre-U History. The Themes sections were answered only by a small number of candidates, and this report can only encourage Centres to promote these interesting and rewarding topics. The knowledge displayed, the understanding shown and the fluency of much of the writing all supported the best answers. Where there is most room for improvement is in the expression of greater supported judgement and engagement with the implications of questions which invite a personal view. Many answers offered sustained explanations but did not present arguments at the higher-level skill of assessing factors and sustaining criticism of different ways of explaining the past. This is not a call for historiographical surveys, but an encouragement for answers to address the requirements of the questions for clear personal views and judgements. 'What best explains...' is not the same as 'Give a series of possible explanations...' The provocative 'Did it?' or the more restrained 'How valid is this judgement?' questions really do mean that candidates should be confident and offer their reasoned and supported personal views. The development of those views should be a key element in the courses which lead to the examinations. Knowledge for its own sake is secondary to the use of that knowledge in discussion and argument. However, without adequate knowledge, arguments can degenerate into assertions and judgements can become facile. The best responses kept a good balance and offered mature and convincing views which explained the past in a living and meaningful way. Where model answers were reproduced and stereotyped judgements merely repeated, the opposite was true. Cambridge Pre-U questions are set to stimulate a reasoned and supported personal response.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 4

Most of the answers showed good knowledge of the events surrounding the first phase of the Wars of the Roses, and some were able to give very well focused responses on precisely why the Yorkist fortunes fluctuated, often focusing on the weak leadership of Henry VI as the crucial factor. A high proportion of answers misunderstood the demands of the question and either sought exclusively to explain why the Yorkist faction eventually won or in some cases discussed the causes of the conflict.

Question 6

Candidates answering this question often failed to grasp what its focus was and ended up writing explanations about why Warwick and Edward IV fell out, especially examining Edward's marriage with Elizabeth Woodville and the rise of the Woodville family rather than analysing Warwick's ambitions. Where there was focus, candidates were able to concentrate on the alliance with Margaret of Anjou and Henry VI as showing that he was more concerned with maintaining his centrality to events rather than a desire to rule as king.

Question 7

Many candidates found it difficult to focus on both elements of the question, with the aspect of why Richard was able to survive being focused on often at the expense of why he eventually fell in 1485. Usually there was a discussion of the opposition to the Woodvilles and the lack of Lancastrian alternatives. There was not enough detailed knowledge demonstrated about the Buckingham revolt. Very few candidates actually discussed Bosworth or the role of the Stanleys. On the other hand, the discussions about the strengths of Richard did have some range and depth.

Question 8

Most candidates failed to deal directly with the issue of *how* concerned Henry was as opposed to how Henry tried to improve the security of the dynasty or, less relevantly, why he was insecure. Only a handful of responses were able to introduce a dynamic aspect into their answer too, by discussing the increased problems after 1502, though the early part of the reign was well covered. Most answers gave a summary of Henry's policies towards the attempted usurpers, foreign policy and domestic policy where it related to his security (e.g. treaties with other European powers, relations with the nobility) but most found it difficult to make a judgement about what this said about the seriousness with which Henry took these threats.

Question 9

Candidates had a good level of knowledge of Wolsey's period of ascendancy and were able to discuss his domestic policies and foreign policy with some confidence. There was an understandable focus on the Treaty of London and the Amicable Grant/attempts at annulment on either range of the spectrum from success to failure. The main issue with many answers was that they generally focused on how un/successful Wolsey was in aspects of policy, but failed to consider closely what the role of a Chief Minister was in the early Tudor period and thus Wolsey's effectiveness. This was answered sporadically, in terms of Wolsey's ability to help England punch above its weight in foreign policy terms and the impossibility of the annulment issue, but the lack of consistent focus made it hard for some answers to offer higher level analysis.

Question 10

Candidates were able to show their awareness of the continuity/change debates that pertain to the English Reformation and discuss the extent of changes, with the main line being that the changes were not that fundamental as England gained a situation which approximated to "Catholicism without the Pope." There was some discussion of the introduction of reformed ideas, and the dissolution of the monasteries received some attention. While the overall discussion was generally of a good standard, there was not quite enough consideration of the issue of "fundamental change" and how far royal authority and the supremacy changed things. There was also generally less focus on the 1540s in answers with most candidates concentrating on the events of the 1530s, which meant their analysis lacked some perspective.

Question 12

This question was very popular in some Centres with many candidates choosing to answer it. While on the one hand there was a good knowledge of the period and the overarching historiographical debate, candidates found it difficult to select relevant focused material that would deal with the question's thrust. Therefore, there was often a large focus on the institutional integrity of Mary's Privy Council but less discussion on her religious policy, which seemed rather eccentric selection. Many candidates directed their attention on Somerset and the Rebellions of 1549 as the main focus of crisis, while contrasting this with Northumberland and Mary's reigns. The lack of focus on what was a "crisis" meant that a lot of the material did not cohere into a tightly focused analysis and some candidates ended up merely describing the problems that occurred during Edward and Mary's reigns. To some extent there appeared to be a rehearsal of previously written essays, rather than enough direct concentration on the particular question.

Question 13

Many candidates who tackled this question looked at a sensible set of policies such as religion, foreign policy and economic policy. In their introductions, however, few candidates highlighted on what could be considered Mary's major mistakes. The more sophisticated answers did this which led to more fluent analysis throughout the question. Some candidates went beyond 1563 and the remit of the question. Many candidates did conclude that economically Mary had made some sensible reforms that Elizabeth was able to build on. By contrast, in the fields of religion and foreign policy, Elizabeth had inherited some real problems and tried hard to tackle these. Not many candidates evaluated the way in which Elizabeth sought to use

propaganda to promote herself and was unwilling to tie herself into a marriage in order to avoid the perceived mistake that Mary had made in her marriage to Phillip II, with the consequence that she was criticised for allowing England to be dominated and used by a foreign power.

Question 15

This answer was quite popular and several Centres had a large proportion of answers. Most candidates were able to discuss the central issue of relations with Spain being apparently driven by religious factors, but being more related to English concerns over the neutrality of the Netherlands in a strategic sense. Even those candidates stressing the secular considerations emphasised that after 1585 religion played an increasing role. While the answers were generally well focused and written, there were several issues such as the space given by some candidates to Ireland, which is not technically foreign policy in the Elizabethan period, and that a few dealt with the period before 1568. The 1590s were relatively ignored by many candidates.

Question 21

This answer was very popular with some Centres. The range of examples was quite impressive, and covered the whole chronological period: from the tax rebellions under Henry VII to the Essex rebellion under Elizabeth. Most candidates gave reasonable attention to the Pilgrimage of Grace which, given the significance of the rebellion, was quite important. A range of issues were discussed from the size of the rebellions to their lack of purpose and geopolitical centrality. The strength of the royal government was also used in many answers. The main issue with many essays was a lack of coherence in structure and argument which often came from a lack of planning. There was not enough concentration on the “best explains” aspect of the question either. Some answers were very descriptive and told the story of many rebellions rather than focusing on thematic sweep.

Question 23

Candidates showed a good knowledge of James I's reign with most answers being centred around the King's record in foreign policy, Parliament and finance. On the whole, most answers argued that foreign policy was the most successful while his record in Parliament was more mixed and while finance received mostly negative notices. The main issue for candidates was considering what successful kingship entailed in the context of the early 17th century. A failure to plan a coherent theoretical framework from the start meant that some weaker answers were rather assertive and less convincing when it came to making an overall assessment of James' kingship as opposed to the component parts.

Question 24

This question was not attempted by many candidates. Responses provided tended to either be very good or rather weak. Weaker responses tended not to support answers with relevant examples or analysis and to focus on one side of the question or the other (usually the appeal). The more developed answers provided a good definition of what significance could be considered to be and evaluated the question in this light. Ultimately, the significance of Puritanism in this context was argued to be the way in which it became such a problematic force during the reign of Charles II.

Question 25

Many candidates who tackled this question drifted into a rather narrative based approach. There were often long lists of things that Charles did, and long lists of things that Parliament did, and little intertwined analysis of the roles of both. Although coverage of the events leading to the outbreak of the Civil War could be wide ranging in such answers, it was often lacking in really effective focus on the question. Some answers were able to show an understanding of a wide range of issues about the causes of the Civil War from Charles' mistakes to the rise of Parliament and the behaviour of parliamentary leaders after 1640. While candidates were able to focus on the actions of Charles and the extent to which his actions caused the Civil War (apart from the attempt to arrest the five MPs in 1642, which were related to Charles' ineptitude), responses were quite generalised. Often responses did not focus on the extent to which Charles was personally responsible for these actions and to what extent his actions were forced on him. The focus was often quite broad, with the “11 years of tyranny” being focused on quite extensively, when the 1640–42 period would have been more appropriate.

Question 28

This was a popular question for candidates and most answers were able to give a good account of James' policy mistakes, alienation of the Anglican elites and the consequences of the birth of his son, alongside the availability of William of Orange as a viable alternative and the efficacy of his invasion. While most candidates gave a good analytical response, only a minority were able to focus on the specific aspect of why James' reign was so short, as opposed to a more generalised explanation of why James was forced out.

Question 29

The answers to this question generally gave a balanced account of William's reign that assessed the positive and negative aspects of his reign. Much of the focus of the answers was on the foreign policy aspects of his reign, particularly the aspects related to his absences, and with his relationship with the Whigs, which meant he had a poor relationship with Parliament given the original accord that had allowed his seizure of the throne. The Act of Succession was used by several candidates to highlight the weaknesses of his rule.

Question 35

Some of the answers to this question were excellent as candidates were able to show the interaction of the main issues: Pitt's individual ability and his capacity to gain royal favour given the politically maladroit ways of Fox which created a circumstance where he was able to rise very quickly. The importance of patronage was emphasised by good candidates who were able to show that networks were crucial to success in eighteenth century politics, reflecting excellent knowledge of the period. While some answers were extremely well detailed and written, the weaker answers (while still showing some understanding) tended to lose focus discussing the later aspects of Pitt's period in power and dealing with reasons why Pitt stayed in power for so long, rather than focusing on why he rose so high in the first place.

Question 37

Candidates were able to give a good account of the reasons for Whig absence from office covering both Whig weaknesses – especially the role of Fox and the divisions amongst them – and the wider circumstances such as George III's antipathy, the remarkable abilities of Pitt and the wider context of the French Revolution. The main issue for candidates was being selective from such a wide range of possible factors and finding a persuasive overall argument.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/13

British History Outlines c. 1689–2000

Key Messages

- It is very important that answers respond very specifically to the exact wording of the question and deal fully with its demands.
- A knowledge of historiography may be very useful, but indiscriminating introduction of reference to historians and their views regardless of the actual question is not helpful in offering a focused response.
- Rehearsed 'lists of factors' are unlikely to demonstrate the higher level skills of analysis and discrimination required for the top levels.

General Comments

The variety of questions tackled over the three papers is tribute to the range of interests pursued by Centres who have taken advantage of the wide variety of choice available in Cambridge Pre-U History. The Themes sections were answered only by a small number of candidates, and this report can only encourage Centres to promote these interesting and rewarding topics. The knowledge displayed, the understanding shown and the fluency of much of the writing all supported the best answers. Where there is most room for improvement is in the expression of greater supported judgement and engagement with the implications of questions which invite a personal view. Many answers offered sustained explanations but did not present arguments at the higher-level skill of assessing factors and sustaining criticism of different ways of explaining the past. This is not a call for historiographical surveys, but an encouragement for answers to address the requirements of the questions for clear personal views and judgements. 'What best explains...' is not the same as 'Give a series of possible explanations...' The provocative 'Did it?' or the more restrained 'How valid is this judgement?' questions really do mean that candidates should be confident and offer their reasoned and supported personal views. The development of those views should be a key element in the courses which lead to the examinations. Knowledge for its own sake is secondary to the use of that knowledge in discussion and argument. However, without adequate knowledge, arguments can degenerate into assertions and judgements can become facile. The best responses kept a good balance and offered mature and convincing views which explained the past in a living and meaningful way. Where model answers were reproduced and stereotyped judgements merely repeated, the opposite was true. Cambridge Pre-U questions are set to stimulate a reasoned and supported personal response.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

Better answers offered an assessment of William as ruler, not merely successes and failures of the Settlement and some of the policies followed. There were some lengthy accounts of the Revolutionary Settlement and, generally, there was more explanation of some strong and weak points than assessment.

Question 3

Though there were some well-informed answers about Walpole's ministry as a whole, there was less specific knowledge and judgement about his foreign policy. Some candidates wrote a lot about financial policy and the need to avoid costly wars thereby unbalancing their answers.

Question 4

The concept of what a 'great wartime leader' entailed in the context of the period was not sufficiently considered in many answers and the result was an explanation of some of his policies. The stress was more of 'success' than greatness and the wartime leadership was considered in rather general terms by some.

Question 6

There was some uncertainty about the focus of the question and less successful answers saw it more in terms of 'problems facing governments in the 1760s', rather than linking their knowledge specifically to instability. Where there was more attempt to answer the question, there were some insightful responses but, in general, answers were rather generalised and did not sufficiently relate knowledge of some of the colonial issues to instability.

Question 7

There were some strong discussions of the relative importance of the support of the King and more general factors which explain Pitt's rise to power. However, a substantial number of answers moved away from the rise to power and offered analyses of why Pitt remained in power, and rather obviously reproducing an answer to another question in some cases.

Question 10

Most of the answers seen did not have sufficient knowledge to offer convincing arguments with some omitting any reference to Nelson and Trafalgar and some being unaware of Waterloo. Military history answers generally tended to suffer from a lack of specific knowledge in the Cambridge Pre-U papers, but answers to this question were particularly generalised. There were some attempts at argument, but many lacked conviction.

Question 17

Weaker responses to this question tended to examine the foreign policy of Castlereagh, then the foreign policy of Canning and then try to evaluate the level of difference between the two at the end. Many candidates who tackled this question more successfully, broke it down into themes such as involvement in European affairs, attempts to increase commercial power and so on, and analysed the similarities and differences between the policies on a thematic basis. A good breadth of knowledge and material was often on display in these answers. Some candidates provided impressive responses where subtle differences between what often appeared very similar policies were identified and ably explained.

Question 18

This was a popular question and a broad range of answers was provided. Those responses which were less well-developed did not provide any sort of definition of what radical could be considered to be. Although some good knowledge of the terms of the Act was deployed in such responses, they did not fully focus on the terms of the question. By contrast, the more successful responses analysed the question in light of a working definition of radical. These responses often drew on differing views of historians, as well as major political actors of the time and their own view of the Act when it was passed. Candidates tackled the question by examining a number of themes, such as spreading democracy, dealing with corruption and so on and deployed an impressive level of technical detail (such as the number of rotten boroughs that were eradicated, the size the electorate was expanded to, the differing levels of representation in certain parts of the country compared to others) and so analysed effectively the question. Answers on the 1832 Reform Bill must show a sound grasp of its main provisions to be successful.

Question 19

Candidates handled this question well. Acknowledging the context of the disastrous Tory performance of 1832, they were able to discuss both the Whig weaknesses and their loss of direction and identity in the 1830s. They also considered the Tory exploitation of these issues and the reforms to the party undertaken by Robert Peel, especially the fact that the Tories had become better organised and responded better than the Whigs to the changing world of the 1832 Reform Act. Peel's decision not to form a government in the Bedchamber crisis of 1839 was also referred to by several candidates as a reason why the Tory's revived as it meant the Whigs became even less popular. The main issue amongst some answers was the failure to

address the question's emphasis on the rapidity of the Tory rise, which led to answers that analysed more generally the reasons for Tory improvements.

Question 20

Answers to this question were often not very well developed. There tended to be a lack of setting out in Introductions as to what effective leadership with regard to the Chartist Movement could be considered to be. Consequently, many answers tended to adopt a rather narrative approach, even if they displayed some good knowledge about the Chartist Movement and its activities. The more successful answers examined the question in light of what the aims of the Chartist Movement were and how ably the movement was led by the likes of O'Brien and Lovett towards fulfilling these goals. Where the argument was that leadership proved ineffective, there was often further explanation advanced which argued that the Movement probably would not have succeeded anyway, even if more effectively led, because of the societal forces (such as the Middle Class desire for order and stability) that were ranged against it. Many saw the question as demanding a comparison of leadership with other factors in explaining the failure of Chartism, emphasising the importance of reading questions carefully to see what they really require. Many answers simply did not know enough about Chartist leaders to offer effective analysis.

Question 22

Few answers merely offered a general survey of Gladstone's domestic policies and the best answers offered a clear analysis of the benefits for the different classes, some challenging the view and others agreeing with it. A persistent misunderstanding involved the ending of the purchase of commissions and the introduction of more competitive examinations in the civil service. Neither, as many answers claimed, opened the higher ranks of army and administration to the working classes in a significant way.

Question 23

There were some strong answers which offered a sustained discussion about Disraeli's role, engaged with 'transformed' well and kept a focus on the party. Weaker responses offered a somewhat indiscriminating review of domestic and foreign policy from 1874–1880 which veered into what seemed like answers to different questions. It would have been helpful to have shown some awareness of the position of the party in 1874 and to have understood how this might have changed by 1880.

Question 24

Weaker responses tended to not be able to break the question down into relevant themes or factors and often adopted a more general approach. The focus shifted in too many answers to the growth of Labour and trade unions were not at the heart of the answer. Many responses also suffered from a lack of detailed knowledge of the topic so that points were often not expanded on with precise examples and explanation. The more effective responses focused on a number of factors and evaluated the question through these with good supporting evidence and explanation. Such answers were able to draw on the specific significance of cases such as the Taff Vale and Lyons v Wilkins judgement or the growth of staple industries. The strongest responses to this question were able to link together and analyse the various factors.

Question 25

There was a wide degree of quality of responses to this question. Many were rather weak lacking in coverage of relevant events or knowledge of the period, and fell into simplistic and unsupported narrative. A good number of answers also focused on the more general causes of World War I without focusing on why Britain had become more actively involved in European affairs in the run up to the War breaking out. The stronger answers to this question were able to analyse a number of factors such as the background to the Entente with France in 1904, Britain's imperial situation from the Boer War onwards, a growing fear of Germany and a concern to preserve the Balance of Power. Such answers were supported by a good level of technical detail such as the causes and consequences of the naval race with Germany and were able to argue that there were a number of linked reasons as to why Britain emerged from a period of 'splendid isolation' to end up in an Alliance with two countries who were more often than not historic rivals.

Question 26

The best answers to this question worked around a definition of what a political crisis for Asquith's government could be considered to be and analysed the questions against this. Without this, answers tended to discuss 'problems' or 'issues' rather than crises. Such answers usually argued that while the clash

with the Lords was a big crisis, ultimately it was resolved (and in a way which left a lasting working legacy) and therefore was not the biggest one faced. Rather it was problems such as those in Ireland which were worse, especially following the election of 1910 when the Liberals were dependent on the support of Irish Nationalists for a parliamentary majority coupled with the fact that the country seemed to be sliding towards civil war. The suffragette problem was also often cited as a bigger 'crisis', since it seemed to erode the Liberal Party's authority over time. Weaker responses were often characterised by a lack of good understanding or knowledge of the clash with the Lords, with the result this side of the question was not effectively analysed. Many candidates preferred to focus on aspects of the question they knew more about and tried to gloss over the Lords issue which meant their responses were not fully focused on the question.

Question 34

The best responses to this question focused on what constituted an achievement included assessing the problems the government faced, the aims it had and how it tried to fulfil these in terms of policy and the legacy it left behind. In the light of such a definition, many candidates argued against the proposition citing evidence such as the Addison Act, Finance Act and establishment of an Irish Free State. Moreover, some candidates convincingly argued that such achievements were all the more significant given the Coalition nature of the government and the context in which it was operating at the end of World War I when much of Lloyd George's time was taken up with foreign policy matters. Weaker answers to this question tended to provide a list of things the government did but did not support this with any real effective analysis of achievement.

Question 35

Those who tackled this question attempted to provide a yardstick in the Introduction through which to measure successful. This included assessing how far Baldwin met his aims, electoral success, effectiveness with which problems were tackled and his legacy. Candidates were generally able to provide a reasonable level of knowledge to support assessment of how Baldwin fared within these areas, although economy was the one area of policy that was not especially well developed and candidates often lacked sufficient depth of detail (such as examining Tariff policy or a return to the Gold Standard) to be able to fully support their points. Few candidates also focused on his personality and the role that this played in enabling him to serve as Prime Minister for such a relatively long cumulative period of time in an era when other Prime Ministers often did not remain in office for long. Many candidates tackled well his handling of the General Strike.

Question 36

This was a popular question and one which was often handled very well when answers went beyond catalogues of 'causes'. Most candidates who attempted it were able to identify and explain a number of reasons as to why Labour was able to win the election and provide some good supporting evidence to elaborate on their points. The more sophisticated answers constructed an analysis that weaved Labour's strengths, such as adoption of the Beveridge Report and the promise of a 'new Jerusalem' (i.e. a message of optimism at the end of the War when the public seemed to be clamouring for it, given the hardships suffered and the defeat of Nazism) with Conservative weaknesses (a lacklustre campaign, not helped by the Party machinery being run down during the War, and Churchill's errors and negative message, such as comparing Labour to the Gestapo). Such answers demonstrated how Labour's strength both contributed to but also benefited from the Conservative's shortcomings, and used this to demonstrate why Labour's victory seemed to defy expectations that because Churchill had led the country to victory in the War, this would win him the election.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/21

European History Outlines c. 300–c. 1516

Key Messages

- Answers should engage with the key words of the questions and not attempt merely to offer responses which made occasional references to them.
- Comparisons with other periods are not looked for as a matter of course, and should not be introduced unless they offer real insights or help the arguments.
- Factual knowledge should be used flexibly in response to the requirements of the question and not be introduced for its own sake.

General Comments

The responses to the European questions varied quite considerably. The best answers showed a very strong knowledge base and addressed the questions very directly. There was clear understanding of concepts and showed sophistication in both style and content. On the other hand, there were responses that were significantly weaker than those seen in the other papers, with little understanding of the requirements of the question and little factual knowledge. Examiners reported that many answers did not engage with the concepts of the question. Where a key element was included in the question this was sometimes dismissed and instead the answer written on a topic that was connected but with had a different focus. The examination places a great deal of emphasis on responding to the actual questions set, but some responses included standard or generalised historical arguments or debates which did not link to the concept in question. A sound understanding of different possible interpretations is required, but explicit reference to historiography as such is not necessary for even the highest marks. Answers at the highest level should show evidence that Candidates have understood and have come to their own view, but need not have studied particular historical interpretations. Historiographical study can enrich understanding, but many responses merely quoted historian's names or referred to standard interpretations that did not often provide support for arguments. There were also a lot of comparison with other countries and other periods. Where such comparisons are historically valid they were credited but such links were deployed helpful only on rare occasions, and were sometimes strained or speculative, such as comparing Mussolini with Charles I. As will be seen from the comments below, there was little take-up of questions on Themes, despite their obvious historical interest.

There is a danger that reports focus simply on problems and omissions, but most responses were characterised by very strong writing and detailed and well-used knowledge. The points below should be seen in that wider context.

Comments on Specific Questions

Only questions which attracted a reasonable number of responses are considered.

Question 7

Answers needed to be focused on the problems which Charlemagne faced and on the diversity of his Empire. Hence a general account of how he governed was not likely to achieve high marks, unless it was directed specifically at the question. Thus, the identification of disunity as a problem and the suggestion that Charlemagne tried different methods for different groups, could lead to an analysis of his treatment of Saxons, Lombards and Avars and his failure against the Arabs, and this was a successful way of approaching the question. Descriptions of his governmental methods and his efforts at centralisation were also used to illustrate his methods, although the evaluation of the success of these was often less clearly dealt with. Answers which tried to argue that the so-called Carolingian Renaissance was another response to the disparity within the Empire, were less well focused.

Question 11

The responses were mostly well-informed about the early Capetians, but needed to relate their knowledge to the terms of the question. Some took each monarch in turn and often described the salient points of the reign before deciding that the individual was either lucky or able. Others chose a few incidents to show luck or ability across the period. Some better answers showed there was change over time in the achievements of the early Capetians and that for some their ability lay in exploiting their good fortune and favourable circumstances. Answers concluded either way with luck being more prevalent.

Question 13

Answers contained some good knowledge about the topic and put forward a range of explanations. Some supported the view that the rulers were responsible, while others favoured the view that the disunity of the Arabs was the main factor. Some argued quite convincingly that the rulers were, at times, actually barriers to the Reconquest through their rivalries and weaknesses.

Question 14

Some responses did not feel the dispute was particularly prolonged, given the length of some medieval quarrels. Others argued that Gregory was largely to blame for his combative personality and ability to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory. Some of the analysis of the nature of the dispute needed a fuller understanding of what was at issue and why it was so important to the combatants. The complex situation in Germany was also not clearly explained in some answers.

Question 16

Responses needed to focus on Frederick's activities in Italy. Although his armies came largely from Germany and events there sometimes limited his ability to be in Italy, his activities in Germany were not central to this question. Some answers argued convincingly that that Frederick's aims were impossible to achieve and the hostility of the Italian cities to his efforts to establish control of the Papacy could not be overcome with the resources which he had at his disposal. The problems with the papal mule figured rather too markedly in some responses.

Question 17

Answers needed to focus on the situation in France at the start of the reign of Louis VI compared with the end of the reign of Louis VII. Without some assessment of strength in 1108, it was difficult to estimate how much progress had been made. Some answers described the achievements of the two monarchs but without sufficient regard for the exact terms of the question. There was, however, some good, balanced analysis of the position in 1180 considering the greater internal strength in France as opposed to the extent of the threat from the Angevins. Some answers suggested that the power of the Angevins was more apparent than real and hinted at the events to come in the next reign as proving this contention.

Question 18

Philip Augustus remains a popular topic and the responses generally focused on the factor given in the question, before moving on to consider other explanations. But some needed to give the financial and military factors fuller coverage, while others were quite descriptive and needed to analyse the impact of the reforms introduced by Philip. Some saw that the improvements to his revenue linked to his ability to hire more troops. Philip's own personal qualities and his determination to oust the Angevins from their position in France were also explained and there was good discussion about how far the quarrels of the Devil's Brood were responsible for French success. Some of this could become too speculative but, generally, it was well-controlled and led to a variety of supported conclusions.

Question 19

Answers needed only to consider the achievements of Innocent in France and Germany therefore references to Italy, or even to England, were not relevant. There tended to be insufficient mastery of the details of the relationship between Innocent and the relevant rulers, hence answers were not particularly successful.

Question 28

The answers showed plenty of detailed knowledge about Louis IX, but less ability to relate it to the terms of the question. There was some sound discussion of his motives for going on Crusade with the point being made that his aims could have been somewhat mixed. His role as an arbitrator in Europe was also capable of being assessed in both religious and more secular terms. One response argued convincingly that the way Louis saw his actions may have been solely in terms of his religious outlook, while the views of others could be that religion was a convenient cloak for the ambitions of the French monarchy.

Question 29

Philip the Fair generally was praised in the responses for his adept handling of affairs in France, notably in comparison with the mayhem under his successors. The overthrow of the Templars, often described in graphic terms, was mostly seen as a useful, but not an essential, feature in his success. His dealings with the Papacy and his contribution to improvements in French administration, particularly his ability to bring in large sums of money were also considered by most responses. Assessment was needed as the focus of such analysis, rather than an account of his methods. The role of his advisers could have been more fully covered in some answers.

Question 30

These were not generally successful answers, as they were insufficiently focused on the methods employed by the Avignon Papacy to bolster their power. They tended to over-estimate the influence of the French monarchy and to argue that this was essentially weakening to the Papacy, with insufficient evidence or depth to the argument.

Question 33

These responses were well focused and well informed. There was some sensible selection of suitable evidence and few answers attempted a long narrative. Key points for Burgundian influence were identified, such as the murder of Jean sans Peur, the Treaty of Troyes and the Peace of Arras. These were sufficient to support a view that Burgundy played an extensive role, but there were also periods when its role lessened, notably in the closing years of the War.

Question 35

These answers had some difficulty in defining what was meant by a 'real recovery' and often saw the reign in terms of laying the foundation for greater progress under Louis XI. But they recognised that the situation at the end of the reign was far superior to that pertaining at its beginning. There was a tendency to describe what was achieved rather than to assess the impact of reforms. The problems Charles faced in dealing with his heir were not sufficiently considered.

Question 45

This was largely a description of the activities of various patrons, mostly the Medici and the Papacy, and the role of alternative factors was less well considered.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/22

European History Outlines c. 1378–c. 1815

Key Messages

- Answers should engage with the key words of the questions and not attempt merely to offer responses which made occasional references to them.
- Comparisons with other periods are not looked for as a matter of course, and should not be introduced unless they offer real insights or help the arguments.
- Factual knowledge should be used flexibly in response to the requirements of the question and not be introduced for its own sake.

General Comments

The responses to the European questions varied quite considerably. The best answers showed a very strong knowledge base and addressed the questions very directly. There was clear understanding of concepts and showed sophistication in both style and content. On the other hand, there were responses that were significantly weaker than those seen in the other papers, with little understanding of the requirements of the question and little factual knowledge. Examiners reported that many answers did not engage with the concepts of the question. Where a key element was included in the question this was sometimes dismissed and instead the answer written on a topic that was connected but with had a different focus. The examination places a great deal of emphasis on responding to the actual questions set, but some responses included standard or generalised historical arguments or debates which did not link to the concept in question. A sound understanding of different possible interpretations is required, but explicit reference to historiography as such is not necessary for even the highest marks. Answers at the highest level should show evidence that Candidates have understood and have come to their own view, but need not have studied particular historical interpretations. Historiographical study can enrich understanding, but many responses merely quoted historian's names or referred to standard interpretations that did not often provide support for arguments. There were also a lot of comparison with other countries and other periods. Where such comparisons are historically valid they were credited but such links were deployed helpful only on rare occasions, and were sometimes strained or speculative, such as comparing Mussolini with Charles I. As will be seen from the comments below, there was little take-up of questions on Themes, despite their obvious historical interest.

There is a danger that reports focus simply on problems and omissions, but most responses were characterised by very strong writing and detailed and well-used knowledge. The points below should be seen in that wider context.

Comments on Specific Questions

Only questions which attracted a reasonable number of responses are considered.

Question 10

Better answers offered valid comparisons but some responses were uncertain about foreign policy and some neglected it, offering pre-considered lists of explanations of the policies of Ferdinand and Isabella and how far they had achieved unity, rather than addressing this particular question directly enough.

Question 11

There were some strong answers which engaged directly with the concept of 'conservative' and discussing its different aspects. Few merely offered descriptions and generally the question was addressed well, if with varying degrees of knowledge and understanding about the key aspects of Luther's theology.

Question 12

Though there was generally a focus on Charles as King of Spain, the central concept of 'well-governed' was not always considered enough, or in some cases not at all, and what followed were long accounts of the revolts early in the reign followed by some successes and failures, some of which related to the issue in the question and some did not.

Question 13

Candidates understandably maintained there was more to Suleiman than just military abilities, though this was sometimes dealt with rather superficially; moreover, many of his campaigns (e.g. against Persia) were omitted. Weak candidates saw him as totally successful, better ones balanced their accounts with failures (Vienna, Malta, etc.). This was followed by consideration of law reform and a few minor comments on administration, but nothing on the arts, or building.

Question 14

Weaker responses asserted that France was strong despite military failures, financial ruin and religious division (though some did not discuss the latter). Better candidates saw the two kings as failures on the basis of these points, but did not describe why France was nevertheless important (size, potential strength, etc.). Most agreed France was culturally strong, though few wrote much about this element.

Question 16

The best answers produced a balanced assessment of both domestic and foreign policies in the reign of Philip II, with a clear definition of what Catholics and Spanish interests might be, and an awareness that these might overlap, for example in the case of the Dutch or the later stages of Anglo–Spanish relations; some candidates produced less balanced answers, with little reference to foreign policy. There was a lack of consideration of the financial and economic effects of an ambitious and expansionist foreign policy, as well as of the cultural effects of the Counter-Reformation. More discussion of how far Philip's priorities changed over the course of his long reign, especially in response to international events was needed.

Question 17

Many answers tended to focus very narrowly on France itself and omitted the wider conflict – the role of the Dutch, the English and Spain. Some essays stopped in 1589 and omitted Henri IV altogether. Better answers were able to go beyond a rehearsed list of factors to consider the relative importance of different explanations.

Question 27

Most candidates answering this question disagreed with the premise, on the grounds that the attack on the Huguenots was, in contemporary terms, far from a mistake and in fact helped support the strengthening of the monarchy which was central to Richelieu's career. The best candidates linked this to a discussion of what constituted success and failure in 17th century French government, and backed this strongly with relevant information. Weaker candidates avoided description, but tended to focus mostly on analysing the success of the policy towards the Huguenots, neglecting the other aspects of Richelieu's policies.

Question 28

Most candidates examined the roles of Lerma and Olivares, analysing the extent of their success. Some responses did not consider the role of the monarchs, not only in appointing these and other ministers, but in deciding how much autonomy they had and intervening in decision making when they wished. Some consideration of the debate about the causes of Spain's decline, and the extent to which this can be attributed to the governments of this period, would have raised the quality of discussion.

Question 30

Attempted by very few candidates, the best of which took issue with the question, arguing that, for the treaty to be remarkable would mean that its judgments did not reflect the balance of power which was the outcome of the War. This line was very well sustained. Successful candidates challenged the question from a sound basis of knowledge and understanding. Weaker candidates offered rather indiscriminating descriptions.

Question 31

Most candidates were full of praise for the Great Elector and ran through the importance of the army (though the fact that it was a peacetime standing army was generally not mentioned). Their answers missed an appreciation of the political geography of his possessions, the acquisition of territory (Mazarin's largesse at Westphalia was not mentioned), and his longevity. Better candidates appreciated that the relative decline of Brandenburg-Prussia's neighbours helped, and also pointed out that although Brandenburg-Prussia rose, it was not really a major power and suffered from economic weakness.

Question 33

Many agreed with the statement, though absolutism itself was never really defined. Stronger candidates contrasted LXIV's control with the weakness of the monarchy during the Frondes. There was often some good material on intendants, the nobles, and Versailles, but little on the Church or religion and his degree of control over foreign policy. (Colbert and Louvois were mentioned rarely in responses.). Thoughtful analyses were clear about the limits of royal power – the size of France, the poor communications, the need to work through the existing social structure

Question 34

'Unwise experiments' were too often ignored in answers which just wrote about what Peter did; others made token references to the question ('thus we can see this was not an unwise experiment'). Very few candidates grasped the concept in the question. Others realised that Peter tried things and, if they did not work, he sometimes abandoned them, and sometimes he did not; therefore, he was experimental and could be both wise and unwise.

Question 36

Generally, answers did not show sufficient detailed knowledge of the years 1698–1701 to be able to make a judgement about responsibility for the outbreak. Both ignored the jockeying for influence in Madrid and the Spanish view that Louis XIV was the man most likely to hold the Empire together. Louis XIV was genuinely surprised by Charles II's will whereas the candidates felt he had engineered it. In fact, Louis XIV was held solely responsible for the outbreak and it is true he did make a number of blunders – but there is a bit more to it.

Question 39

Better answers highlighted Prussia's economic weaknesses and focused on the achievements of the monarchs who did much with unfavourable material (and contrasted this with Prussia's collapse against Napoleon). Many candidates simply gave a paragraph on the economy (which was painted in a positive light) and then went on to discuss what the kings did. Quite a few responses were unbalanced, praising Frederick the Great and largely ignoring his father.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/23

European History Outlines c. 1715–c.2000

Key Messages

- Answers should engage with the key words of the questions and not attempt merely to offer responses which made occasional references to them.
- Comparisons with other periods are not looked for as a matter of course, and should not be introduced unless they offer real insights or help the arguments.
- Factual knowledge should be used flexibly in response to the requirements of the question and not be introduced for its own sake.

General Comments

The responses to the European questions varied quite considerably. The best answers showed a very strong knowledge base and addressed the questions very directly. There was clear understanding of concepts and showed sophistication in both style and content. On the other hand, there were responses that were significantly weaker than those seen in the other papers, with little understanding of the requirements of the question and little factual knowledge. Examiners reported that many answers did not engage with the concepts of the question. Where a key element was included in the question this was sometimes dismissed and instead the answer written on a topic that was connected but with had a different focus. The examination places a great deal of emphasis on responding to the actual questions set, but some responses included standard or generalised historical arguments or debates which did not link to the concept in question. A sound understanding of different possible interpretations is required, but explicit reference to historiography as such is not necessary for even the highest marks. Answers at the highest level should show evidence that Candidates have understand and have come to their own view, but need not have studied particular historical interpretations. Historiographical study can enrich understanding, but many responses merely quoted historian's names or referred to standard interpretations that did not often provide support for arguments. There were also a lot of comparison with other countries and other periods. Where such comparisons are historically valid they were credited but such links were deployed helpful only on rare occasions, and were sometimes strained or speculative, such as comparing Mussolini with Charles I. As will be seen from the comments below, there was little take-up of questions on Themes, despite their obvious historical interest.

There is a danger that reports focus simply on problems and omissions, but most responses were characterised by very strong writing and detailed and well-used knowledge. The points below should be seen in that wider context.

Comments on Specific Questions

Only questions which attracted a reasonable number of responses are considered.

Question 8

Many answers suffered from the same weaknesses: no definition of either the bourgeoisie or their grievances (though this was implicit in the narrative on the structure of society), and no real detailed knowledge of how events unfolded in the summer of 1789. Many candidates just gave long term causes, such as finance and the weakness of the King and then stopped with the calling of the Estates General, and some did not distinguish between the economy and government finance.

Question 10

This attracted some very well-informed answers, many of which went beyond generalisations to consider the events preceding the Fall and balanced his personal unpopularity and the changing circumstances in which terror was no longer as necessary, since the threat from counter-revolution had receded.

Question 11

There were many prepared answers on why Napoleon fell, with descriptive paragraphs on the Russian Campaign and very little focus on the crucial years of 1813/14. The 1812 campaign was described at length without making the explanatory links with the eventual fall of Napoleon. Other factors were often considered, but suffered from similar limitations. Stronger candidates realised Napoleon still had opportunities to avoid downfall in 1813 despite defeat and formidable opposition, and considered the relative importance of his arrogance that led him to reject offers of peace.

Question 18

Many candidates relied on describing disagreements at the conference instead of evaluating the terms of the peace and their long term consequences. It was not clear from some responses what the problems might have been that were either created or solved. Often, the concept in the question was simply ignored.

Question 20

Many candidates dealt with one then the other; most knowing more about Louis XVIII than Louis Philippe. Better candidates attempted close comparison, going back and forth looking at religious policy, foreign policy, financial and economic policy and style of kingship, and engaged with the comparison of the two as kings, not merely the contexts in which they ruled.

Question 21

There were some very strong answers to this question which not only showed good knowledge of the nature of German Nationalism, but were able to assess its relative importance and to discuss how it was manipulated by Bismarck. The main problem with weaker answers to this question is that they did not really display enough, or in some cases any, detailed knowledge of German nationalism – it was either dismissed or then followed by the economy, army or Bismarck – or it was asserted to be important followed by the economy, army or Bismarck. Answers often suffered from a recitation of a list of ‘factors which led to German Unification’. Sometimes the lists dealt with aspects of Nationalism and sometimes ignored it or dismissed it.

Question 22

Many answers dismissed foreigners and offered accounts knew Mazzini, Cavour and Garibaldi. Their argument was helped by stopping in 1861 and ignoring Prussia’s crucial role in 1866 (the Piedmontese/Italians defeated again) and 1870; therefore very many left out Venetia and Rome. Moreover, they erroneously contended that Cavour manipulated Napoleon III (when it was, in fact, often the other way round) and exaggerated Mazzini’s importance. The importance of Cavour’s participation in the Crimean War was often considerably over-estimated. Better candidates saw foreign aid as crucial and could point to the failures of 1848/9 (repeated in 1866) to show that the Piedmontese/Italians were no match for the Austrians, though knowledge of the political geography of Italy was not evident. Good answers also showed balance by discussing the Italian contribution, in particular the role of Garibaldi.

Question 23

Many answers had a clear thesis that the reforms were detrimental and could show how those such as the peasantry, nobles and intelligentsia were disappointed while giving balance to show that the army reforms were a success. Some answers simply stated the reforms strengthened Tsardom but did not take a long term view ignoring, for instance: how trial by jury was discredited and was replaced by military tribunals; how emancipation opened up a power vacuum in the countryside; and, how the *zemstva* created a dangerously democratic precedent. Better answers offered a balanced analysis setting the obvious need for modernisation and the weaknesses shown by the Crimean War against some of the limitations and unintended consequences of the changes.

Question 24

Many candidates did not clearly define the key elements of German Liberalism. Liberalism was often simply equated with the National Liberal party. Very many candidates simply agreed with the question, ignoring the fact that the Liberals were the biggest party in the Reichstag in 1887. Better candidates, however, attempted a definition and offered some balanced discussion. Some candidates confused German Liberalism with modern 'liberalism' (which included a strong anti-clerical element and a hostility to state intervention).

Question 27

This produced responses of very different quality. Successful answers were well focused and included awareness of modern interpretations and focused well on 1914. Some of the best answers in Paper 23 were on this topic. However, many answers were less developed giving either stock causes that went through all the long term factors, or a narrow concentration on the Balkans without explaining how the War became Europe-wide. Many candidates stopped with the ultimatum to Serbia and did not go on to show how events unfolded after 28 July. A lack of detailed knowledge on some of the key developments of the period rendered some arguments invalid.

Question 36

There was a lot of unconvincing assertions about how Weimar was doomed from the start (though many rehearsed this theory only to dismiss it); better answers pointed out how Weimar in fact survived 1919–23 and then prospered (while pointing out the fragility of the 'golden years'); most plumped for the Wall Street Crash as the moment that Weimar was doomed, but many just stopped in 1929. Better answers dealt with the crucial period 1930–33. Even better answers pointed out that Weimar was recovering in 1932, the Nazi vote was dropping and, therefore, it was not doomed until von Papen persuaded Hindenburg to appoint Hitler. Some candidates did not show understanding of the complex events of 1932–33.

Question 38

Many answers did not display detailed knowledge of 1931–1939. Answers were better on the outcome than the outbreak of the Civil War, while weak responses simply wrote about it. Those candidates who knew something about what happened prior to the Civil War did not focus enough on the key element of responsibility and there were many lists of reasons offered which did not address the question directly enough.

Question 42

Most responses blamed Truman and weaker answers did not seem to consider the events of 1945–46. The lack of balance was a factor in making many responses limited. Many candidates ignored Yalta, Potsdam, Poland, etc. thereby producing one-sided and somewhat superficial arguments. More successful candidates relied less on historiographical description, but considered the whole period after 1945.

Question 43

Weaker answers often provided descriptions of elements of the collapse of the Soviet Union so there was a lot of irrelevance about East Germany, Poland and meetings with Reagan. Glasnost and perestroika were mentioned, but were never fully explained with examples. Candidates lacked a detailed knowledge of Gorbachev's domestic achievements between 1985–91. Few candidates were able to make sustained judgements about, say, perestroika and glasnost, with many merely asserting that he did do 'too much, too fast'.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/03

US History Outlines c. 1750–c. 2005

Key Messages

- Candidates should not rely on reproducing essays done previously on the topic in the question, but should consider the precise requirements of the question they are addressing.
- Higher level marks depend on a consideration of different possible explanations and also a distinct judgement about the issue in the question.
- To achieve more thoughtful and analytical responses, candidates need to go beyond lists of learned explanations with limited attempts to discriminate between them.

General Comments

There was continued interest in American and Asian History which offers candidates a rewarding wider perspective on the past and contains much of considerable interest. The strengths of answers were often in their factual knowledge and there were few brief or incomplete answers. The understanding of historical developments was often strong, and the writing showed an interest in and engagement with the past. Weaknesses were mostly in the application of knowledge to the question and in responding directly to its demands. In some answers, attempts were made to mould knowledge and arguments to a particular topic to which were not immediately pertinent. In some cases answers included references to the wording of previous years' questions, even if irrelevant to the particular question under consideration.

Though it may be a strategy for candidates when revising material the creation of lists of factors – causes, consequences, strengths and weaknesses of leaders, and so on – must be seen for what it is, that is a first step and a guide, not a finished product to be reproduced. Cambridge Pre-U History questions frequently ask 'What best explains' which is different from 'What explains' and requires consideration of the relative importance of factors. This ability to discriminate sets aside the pedestrian reproduction of causes or consequences, from the well-considered and thoughtful analysis that this type of question hopes to elicit. Where there is a judgement required by a quotation, or the type of question which asks 'how valid is the judgement?' or 'how far do you agree?', then a list of the strengths and weaknesses of a leader, or points for and against a proposition, is much less effective than a genuine discussion which leads to a considered and supported judgement.

There were some areas of weak knowledge and it was a fact that candidates tried to answer questions about which they had insufficient knowledge to sustain or support effective arguments. More positively, some topics which in the past have suffered from weaker support, this year seemed to be better known. Some of the best answers showed a very confident use of material, fluent written style and an awareness of possible ways of looking at issues which did not depend only on recitations of references to historians. Where the best answers did make use of historiographical evidence, this evidence was evaluated critically.

Comments on Specific Questions

Comments on individual questions are offered only when there were enough answers to justify feedback.

Question 1

This produced some varied answers and many engaged with 'responsible' in a thoughtful way. The question did not necessarily demand a consideration of 'blame' and there were some subtle arguments about the British being inadvertently responsible because of developments in the colonies. Many candidates tried to balance the responsibility of British and Colonists, though weaker ones offered 'one way' answers showing why the British actions led to revolt, rather than focusing on the question. Some answers did not go much beyond the taxation issues of the 1760s, but there was a far stronger coverage of a wider period than has

sometimes been the case with answers to questions on this topic. In general, more was known about British policy than Colonial responses.

Question 2

There were many answers which offered judgements about the relative importance of different factors and, as with **Question 1**, there was stronger supporting knowledge this year than has sometimes been the case with questions on the War. Detailed knowledge of the campaigns was not offered by many candidates and there were some signs of prepared answers when similar details appeared in the work of different candidates – though sometimes remembered more or less accurately. Such answers often relied more on recounting lists than offering judgements.

Question 5

There were some very strong responses which engaged with the position of slavery in US society, but weaker answers offered very generalised comments. The question needs to be explained properly and ‘economic system’ defined. Some answers did not fully understand the implications of the question.

Question 6

There were very well-focused answers which considered the implications of the question carefully and distinguished purely economic factors with the wider context. However, some answers drifted away from the question into long accounts of the quarrels over slavery.

Question 7

There were few strong answers here and many appeared to know little about the topic apart from the war with Mexico.

Question 8

This proved problematic for some candidates who described the Compromise and then outlined the disputes over slavery rather than addressing the question as such. Many offered more on the challenges to the Compromise rather than why it lasted.

Question 9

If the US Civil war is studied, then its military history should receive due attention. Answers rarely knew why Lee has been considered such a great leader and some could not name a battle he fought. Grant’s leadership was seen only in general terms. Few considered Vicksburg and many thought he was at Gettysburg. The later stages of the War were known about only in very general terms.

Question 10

Many candidates were able to offer views about Lincoln’s contribution to victory and to compare him with Davis, but fewer were able to consider the issue of support and, importantly, the degree of support. Thus, a lot of information was shoehorned into the answer with the hope that it might explain support. On the positive side, some candidates won respect in their very strong answers showing good knowledge of the varying support and some discrimination in their explanations.

Sadly, the Themes section did not attract enough responses to make comment meaningful.

Question 20

Though many candidates restricted their answers to expansion, there was generally a focus on the distinction between economic factors and other considerations, and better answers offered a judgement. There was some strong supporting detail on some elements, for example Hawaii and Cuba.

Question 21

The question did need to be explained and some were uncertain about what was required by the use of the word ‘slogan’, and indeed ‘Square Deal’, and offered a general answer on the success of Roosevelt’s foreign and domestic policies in the hope that it would deal with issue in the question. Better responses were aware

of what was meant by 'Square Deal' and discussed whether policies actually offered the benefits suggested by the rhetoric.

Question 22

There were some effective discussions about the relative importance of short- and long-term factors and there was some impressive consideration of different views. However, many responses were thin and clearly wanted to drift to Wilson at Versailles. Oddly, a significant number of answers failed to refer to the unrestricted submarine warfare.

Question 23

Many answers offered lists of reasons for the supposed failure of Prohibition and there were lengthy accounts of the problems faced in enforcement and the gangsterism of the 1920s. Better responses linked knowledge to explaining why it did not last and went beyond a catalogue approach to offer an answer to 'what best explains...?' Some did not actually get on to the Repeal.

Question 24

Given that opposition to the New Deal is dealt with by many standard text books and is an important element, it was disappointing that so many responses were more an answer to 'how successful was the New Deal' or merely a list of supposed limitations. As opposition came from different quarters and for different reasons, the question could not be well addressed simply by pointing out some limitations and adding a comment that this explained opposition. Better answers distinguished different sorts of opposition and showed a good understanding of why the measures were controversial, but often fell short of an overall judgement.

Question 26

It would be useful if candidates drew more distinction between 'effective' and 'successful'. However, many did establish criteria by setting out aims, and the knowledge of policy was more developed than in **Question 7** about an earlier period of foreign policy. Candidates often found it difficult to assess, rather than to describe US policy at Yalta and Potsdam, but were more confident in dealing with Berlin and Korea.

Question 28

The question was not popular and answers divided into those which understood what the 'Vietnamisation' policy was and those who ignored it, or dismissed it quickly and focused on presenting a list of reasons why the US lost the Vietnam War.

Question 29

This question required an understanding and exposition of the domestic problems that faced the US on Kennedy's accession as a basis for any judgement. Where this was offered, there was some strong analysis and a variety of judgements which suggested that this topic had the 'model answer' approach as much as some in Section 1. There was some insightful writing about the limitations Kennedy faced in constitutional terms.

Question 30

Again, there were a variety of views here and some thoughtful analyses, with some arguing that real domestic and foreign policy achievements make 'failure' too harsh, even though the policies had limitations. Others took the view that Watergate overrode any achievements and that there were distinct limitations, especially in domestic policy. Knowledge was often well used and few relied simply on long accounts of Watergate.

There were few responses to either more recent history or to the themes in Section 7.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/04

African and Asian History Outlines c. 1750–c. 2000

Key Messages

- Candidates should not rely on reproducing essays done previously on the topic in the question, but should consider the precise requirements of the question they are addressing.
- Higher level marks depend on a consideration of different possible explanations and also a distinct judgement about the issue in the question.
- To achieve more thoughtful and analytical responses, candidates need to go beyond lists of learned explanations with limited attempts to discriminate between them.

General Comments

There was continued interest in American and Asian History which offers candidates a rewarding wider perspective on the past and contains much of considerable interest. The strengths of were often in their factual knowledge and there were few brief or incomplete answers. The understanding of historical developments was often strong, and the writing showed an interest in and engagement with the past. Weaknesses were mostly in the application of knowledge to the question and in responding directly to its demands. In some answers, attempts were made to mould knowledge and arguments to a particular topic to which were not immediately pertinent. In some cases answers included references to the wording of previous years' questions, even if irrelevant to the particular question under consideration.

Though it may be a strategy for candidates when revising material the creation of lists of factors – causes, consequences, strengths and weaknesses of leaders, and so on – must be seen for what it is, that is a first step and a guide, not a finished product to be reproduced. Cambridge Pre-U History questions frequently ask 'What best explains' which is different from 'What explains' and requires consideration of the relative importance of factors. This ability to discriminate sets aside the pedestrian reproduction of causes or consequences, from the well-considered and thoughtful analysis that this type of question hopes to elicit. Where there is a judgement required by a quotation, or the type of question which asks 'how valid is the judgement?' or 'how far do you agree?', then a list of the strengths and weaknesses of a leader, or points for and against a proposition, is much less effective than a genuine discussion which leads to a considered and supported judgement.

There were some areas of weak knowledge and it was a fact that candidates tried to answer questions about which they had insufficient knowledge to sustain or support effective arguments. More positively, some topics which in the past have suffered from weaker support, this year seemed to be better known. Some of the best answers showed a very confident use of material, fluent written style and an awareness of possible ways of looking at issues which did not depend only on recitations of references to historians. Where the best answers did make use of historiographical evidence, this evidence was evaluated critically.

Comments on Specific Questions

Comments on individual questions are offered only when there were enough answers to justify feedback.

For all its intrinsic interest, African History continued to attract no responses. The distinction between the US outlines, where there was a wide variety of questions tackled, and Paper 4, where the range was much more restricted, is striking

Question 17

There was some good knowledge of the period 1895–1911, but not enough answers were attempted to link it to ‘unrest’ and many candidates wanted to answer about the limitations of reforms. Thus, while many candidates referred to the Boxer Rising, few candidates attempted to explain this obvious manifestation of unrest. In terms of the question, the focus of many answers was not clear.

Question 18

Many candidates knew a great deal about the period 1911–1928, but few of their answers looked at the period in terms of ‘problems’ or tried to assess the relative seriousness of the different factors outlined. The impression given was too often a reproduction of a list of ‘consequences of the 1911 Revolution, rather than a direct engagement with the question set.

Question 20

There were some thoughtful explanations offered, but few answers seemed to demonstrate in any depth anything of significance about the military aspects. Many candidates commented on the weaknesses of the Chiang regime, but their answers tended to be quite generalised about the civil war.

Question 21

There were few answers, and mostly these ignored the focus of the question and wrote about Mao’s policies.

Question 22

There were some well-supported explanations of the changes wrought by the experience of 1857 and it was good to see this period being studied. More attempts to consider ‘how great?’ would have improved answers.

Question 23

Most answers engaged with both independence and partition and, in better responses, a distinction was made and a variety of views offered. In some responses, there was an impressive treatment of the movement for an independent Pakistan, but most tended to focus more on the nationalist unrest and the impact of war.

Question 28

By and large the distinguishing factor was the ability to focus on ‘benefit’. Where candidates were able to consider the impact of the changes made under the Meiji restoration and offer a balanced assessment, the results were impressive. Where responses were no more than a list of changes with a few comments about ‘benefit’ added, there was obviously a need to move from a recitation of learned material to a more focused response to the question set.

Question 29

Better answers distinguished ‘nationalism’ as a phenomenon and the expansionist policies of the 1929–41 period which obviously were influenced by it. Many candidates were tempted to reproduce work on expansion. However, some candidates distinguished between different factors in the rise of nationalism and offered strong analyses.

Question 37

The responses to this question often did not consider the key issue in the question and offered rehearsed lists of the reasons for European penetration, therefore lacked a sustained relevant analysis. The importance of responding to the issue in the question cannot be emphasised enough. Many candidates seemed to have to respond to this question without knowing enough to answer it, therefore, underlying the importance of revising enough topics to offer a choice, in case one of the questions involves an issue which they have not considered enough to offer a strong answer.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/51

The Norman Conquest, 1051–1087

Key Messages

- In **(a)** questions, quite specific and detailed comparisons and contrasts relevant to the question should be made in a point by point approach, not by sequential treatment of the documents.
- In **(b)** questions, there should be the deployment of contextual knowledge as this is a specific requirement of the question. This should be applied to the consideration of the documents not merely added at the end.
- In the essay answers, responses would be deepened by appropriate use of relevant documents studied.

General Comments

There were more Special Subjects taken this year and there were some strong answers that emphasised the differences and similarities in **(a)**. However, some candidates did not respond to the question but wrote a generalised comparison or contrast. Responses to the part **(a)** questions benefit from a close reading and close comparisons of the two sources.

Use of contextual knowledge as well as documentary support is stipulated for the part **(b)** questions. The best answers were well organised, such as by identifying documents which offered similar interpretations and then assessed that interpretation by use of contextual knowledge and/or by interrogation using evidence extracted from the other documents, taking into account that they should not necessarily be taken at face value, but rather critically evaluated as historical evidence. (A good example of this can be seen in Paper 53 in which the apparent fulsome willingness of the abbots to surrender their beloved religious houses to the King must be seen in the context of the likely consequences of any signs of reluctance.) The best answers took these matters into account when utilising the documentary evidence to argue for or against the hypothesis, analyse a source, or use the evidence of the source to analyse another source. There was deployment of knowledge in many responses in part **(b)**, but some answers did not go beyond a treatment of the documents and made no use of knowledge. However, successful **(b)** questions were led by a study of the documents and not approached as an essay answer in which the documents merely illustrate points which candidates wish to make about the issue in the question. Many responses would have benefitted had they used contextual knowledge to support an argument led by the documents, rather than using evidence taken from the documents to support an argument constructed largely separately to the documents. Successful responses took this approach to the interplay and balance of contextual and documentary evidence.

Many of the points made in the Outline Papers' reports apply to the essays written in the Special Subject papers, in particular that successful candidates responded to the precise demands of the question whereas this was lacking in the weak responses. However, the essays are on a carefully studied Special Subject and would be enriched by some references to key texts studied. There was some very strong understanding shown of the issues in both questions with some insightful and sustained analysis, and the points made about the individual questions must be seen in that context.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** Some responses did not focus on the specific terms of the question and compared them in general terms, rather than what the documents said about Tostig. Not all candidates recognised that Document A preceded the exile of Godwin and his family, while Document D concerned their triumph and that this fact explained the differences between them. The reference in Document A to

the fury of Godwin was not often compared with his more peaceable intentions in Document D, although his readiness to negotiate in both documents was recognised.

- (b) Most responses followed the thrust of the documents in arguing that Godwin was the more powerful. In some cases, their conclusion was based more on contextual knowledge than on a close reading of the documents. Hence, the eagerness of the royal army to fight in Document A and royal activity on board ship in Document D were often missed. Responses did not make good use of Document B as they needed to read it carefully to see that it showed the extent to which Godwin lost power and thus was the best evidence for Edward being in control. The points made in Document E about the inherent respect which the Crown attracted, even from Godwin, were also often neglected.

Question 2

Responses were well focused on the terms of the question and the factor mentioned was well analysed. There was some good use of the Bayeux Tapestry as evidence. Most concluded that William had much of the luck as well as the ability to exploit his good fortune. There was some good comparison of the relative strengths of the opposing armies.

Question 3

Some answers lacked focus on the changing levels of resistance and the reasons for resistance. Those answers which did this, generally argued that the imposition of Norman rule and the building of castles, along with the Harrying of the North convinced the English that resistance was futile. Some candidates made the point that William was less successful in preventing resistance from discontented Normans and that some English remnants joined in.

Question 4

Successful answers concentrated on the impact on government and law and discussion of the imposition of feudalism needed to be within this context, rather than the strictly military focus. Most responses considered how far William maintained the Saxon administration and the innovations which he made were accurately assessed. Domesday Book was well linked to previous enquiries, but its scope was seen as something new. The fact that it could be undertaken at all was envisaged as a tribute to the capabilities of the government machine. There was good consideration of the role of mints.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/52

Special Subject – The Crusades, 1095–1192

Key Messages

- In **(a)** questions, quite specific and detailed comparisons and contrasts relevant to the question should be made in a point by point approach, not by sequential treatment of the documents.
- In **(b)** questions, there should be the deployment of contextual knowledge as this is a specific requirement of the question. This should be applied to the consideration of the documents not merely added at the end.
- In the essay answers, responses would be deepened by appropriate use of relevant documents studied.

General Comments

There were more Special Subjects taken this year and there were some strong answers that emphasised the differences and similarities in **(a)**. However, some candidates did not respond to the question but wrote a generalised comparison or contrast. Responses to the part **(a)** questions benefit from a close reading and close comparisons of the two sources.

Use of contextual knowledge as well as documentary support is stipulated for the part **(b)** questions. The best answers were well organised, such as by identifying documents which offered similar interpretations and then assessed that interpretation by use of contextual knowledge and/or by interrogation using evidence extracted from the other documents, taking into account that they should not necessarily be taken at face value, but rather critically evaluated as historical evidence. (A good example of this can be seen in Paper 53 in which the apparent fulsome willingness of the abbots to surrender their beloved religious houses to the King must be seen in the context of the likely consequences of any signs of reluctance.) The best answers took these matters into account when utilising the documentary evidence to argue for or against the hypothesis, analyse a source, or use the evidence of the source to analyse another source. There was deployment of knowledge in many responses in part **(b)**, but some answers did not go beyond a treatment of the documents and made no use of knowledge. However, successful **(b)** questions were led by a study of the documents and not approached as an essay answer in which the documents merely illustrate points which candidates wish to make about the issue in the question. Many responses would have benefitted had they used contextual knowledge to support an argument led by the documents, rather than using evidence taken from the documents to support an argument constructed largely separately to the documents. Successful responses took this approach to the interplay and balance of contextual and documentary evidence.

Many of the points made in the Outline Papers' reports apply to the essays written in the Special Subject papers, in particular that successful candidates responded to the precise demands of the question whereas this was lacking in the weak responses. However, the essays are on a carefully studied Special Subject and would be enriched by some references to key texts studied. There was some very strong understanding shown of the issues in both questions with some insightful and sustained analysis, and the points made about the individual questions must be seen in that context.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** Most responses concentrated on the reasons for the fall of Nicaea, but some compared the documents in general terms. Most recognised that the role of siege engines and the despair of the Turks when their reinforcements failed, appeared in both documents, while the main difference came from the attitudes to the Emperor Alexius. This was clearly explained by the authorship of the documents. This was largely a well-answered question.

- (b) Some answers were well informed about the reasons for Crusader victories and wanted to use their knowledge as a base for an answer and so bent the documents to their purpose. A better approach is to use the documents in detail together with contextual knowledge to support or challenge what they say. Hence better answers identified examples of military skill in the vigorous attack in Document A, the archers' skill in Document B, and the way troops were drawn up in Document C. Document B was used to suggest the Franks were less skilled than the Emperor and his troops. An alternative explanation given was usually that the Franks possessed religious zeal, demonstrated in Documents A, C and D, and examples like the discovery of the Holy Lance were brought into play. In addition, the failure of the Muslims to send help to Nicaea and the unpreparedness of Kerbogha evident in Document C were used to show their weaknesses. Some answers affirmed that the Muslims were disunited but the documents did not really make this clear.

Question 2

Successful answers were focused on the enthusiastic nature of the response, rather than on the general reasons why Crusaders embarked on their long journey. Good answers included comments on some of the specifics of Urban's speech and of his campaign before Clermont to show why his appeal was so well received. Considerations like the issuing of an indulgence, the vivid description of the horrors being perpetrated on the Christian pilgrims to the East and the prospect of wealth were discussed. Descriptions of the Crusade were not rewarded.

Question 3

Successful responses included a robust section on the role of the Military Orders. Some candidates offered sufficient responses by arguing their role was slight, given the dates of their foundation, and then proceeded to discuss other reasons for the survival of the Crusader States. Other candidates gave acceptable responses by arguing that the other factors were more vital, but the factor given in the question was not to be dismissed too lightly.

Question 4

This was a well-answered question with responses engaging well with the terms of the question and arguing that the loss of Barbarossa's prestige and diplomatic skills mattered more than the military impact, while the result of Philip's premature departure was to unsettle Richard I once rumours reached him about machinations back home. Some responses suggested Philip's return home was advantageous as it ended disputes among the leadership and he left many of his troops behind to continue to fight. Some saw the loss of Barbarossa and Philip as leading to failure, but others argued Richard could be successful on his own. There was also good discussion about how far the Crusade was a failure.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/53

The Reign of Henry VIII, 1509–1547

Key Messages

- In **(a)** questions, quite specific and detailed comparisons and contrasts relevant to the question should be made in a point by point approach, not by sequential treatment of the documents.
- In **(b)** questions, there should be the deployment of contextual knowledge as this is a specific requirement of the question. This should be applied to the consideration of the documents not merely added at the end.
- In the essay answers, responses would be deepened by appropriate use of relevant documents studied.

General Comments

There were more Special Subjects taken this year and there were some strong answers that emphasised the differences and similarities in **(a)**. However, some candidates did not respond to the question but wrote a generalised comparison or contrast. Responses to the part **(a)** questions benefit from a close reading and close comparisons of the two sources.

Use of contextual knowledge as well as documentary support is stipulated for the part **(b)** questions. The best answers were well organised, such as by identifying documents which offered similar interpretations and then assessed that interpretation by use of contextual knowledge and/or by interrogation using evidence extracted from the other documents, taking into account that they should not necessarily be taken at face value, but rather critically evaluated as historical evidence. (A good example of this can be seen in Paper 53 in which the apparent fulsome willingness of the abbots to surrender their beloved religious houses to the King must be seen in the context of the likely consequences of any signs of reluctance.) The best answers took these matters into account when utilising the documentary evidence to argue for or against the hypothesis, analyse a source, or use the evidence of the source to analyse another source. There was deployment of knowledge in many responses in part **(b)**, but some answers did not go beyond a treatment of the documents and made no use of knowledge. However, successful **(b)** questions were led by a study of the documents and not approached as an essay answer in which the documents merely illustrate points which candidates wish to make about the issue in the question. Many responses would have benefitted had they used contextual knowledge to support an argument led by the documents, rather than using evidence taken from the documents to support an argument constructed largely separately to the documents. Successful responses took this approach to the interplay and balance of contextual and documentary evidence.

Many of the points made in the Outline Papers' reports apply to the essays written in the Special Subject papers, in particular that successful candidates responded to the precise demands of the question whereas this was lacking in the weak responses. However, the essays are on a carefully studied Special Subject and would be enriched by some references to key texts studied. There was some very strong understanding shown of the issues in both questions with some insightful and sustained analysis, and the points made about the individual questions must be seen in that context.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** This question was generally well tackled and candidates' answers made some close references to the texts to show both similarities and differences. An encouraging number of answers offered some explanation for this by reference to context. A few candidates considered the sentiments at face value, but some noticed the presence of some heavyweight pressure in Document A.

- (b) This question was generally more successfully answered when candidates attempted to group and cross-refer as much as possible. Contextual knowledge could be used indiscriminately. Often it was not shaped to advance evaluation, though in many instances it was. Knowledge ‘tacked on’ to reinforce a point might have helped evaluation, but sometimes candidates wanted to add in large swathes of supporting knowledge, which then upset the balance of their answer. The very best candidates used their supporting knowledge to test ambiguities in the sources, and to flesh out nuances. There was some doubt about whether Document C was evidence for purely religious motivation and Document E was rather neglected by some, and some were unsure how to handle the fact that Document C was ‘not used’ (the draft statute), and only a few linked it to Document D. Generally speaking, candidates spotted that the surrenders (Documents A and B) were done under varying degrees of duress. Some excellent candidates could explain the reasons why Document A had to be done in the presence of a great lord, and Document B did not, by referring to the Pilgrimage of Grace, and the change of political situation by 1538. Few candidates adapted the material on bishoprics (Document C), the new financial gains (Document D), and new patronage (Document D) to relate it to increased political power of Crown. Generally, though there were some well-focused and perceptive responses.

Question 2

The better answers looked closely at the last year or so of Wolsey’s career and linked the ‘praemunire’ charge and King’s impatience of divorce to longer term strengths and weaknesses of Wolsey as a statesman. Very good answers included explanations of how circumstances were beyond his control, and assessed whether this was really a ‘limitation’. Discussion of the context of foreign policy 1528–29, Campeggio’s mission, the failure of Blackfriars and the machinations of the ‘Boleyn faction’ were key areas of knowledge for the most tightly focused responses. The best candidates were able to argue that as the King’s Minister, Wolsey was always vulnerable, no matter whether it is believed he was ‘alter rex’.

Less good responses discussed the essay in terms of Wolsey’s weaknesses, without explicit linkage to his fall. Quite a lot of Band 4 responses were surveys of Wolsey’s failings, or assessments of his political achievements, with only a cursory mention to the circumstances of his fall.

Question 3

This essay was the least well done on this paper. Candidates found it hard to compare the two, other than sequentially. Candidates had little to say about social change, such as poor laws, or the impact of dissolution of monasteries. Political change was not always evaluated, but described. Coverage of Cranmer’s career was notably weaker than that of Cromwell’s. The best responses were able to formulate an answer around the longevity of change, notably in the role of statute in forming the Church of England, or Cromwell’s purported ‘revolution in government’. Many of the responses resorted to ‘relevant narrative’.

Question 4

This was generally done well. Strong candidates looked at broad themes such as political obedience, the absence of fundamental religious change, repression and Cromwell’s Injunctions and preaching. Weaker candidates spent too long on actual opposition (Nun of Kent, More and Fisher) without linking this to the question, but most answers offered some relevant explanation. A number of responses asserted that anticlericalism was strong and that this was a powerful reason, but stronger candidates tested whether indeed anticlericalism is a credible reason for lack of opposition. The best answers, therefore, attempted to show which of the factors best explained the lack of opposition.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/54

Special Subject – Reformation of Europe, 1516–1559

Key Messages

- In **(a)** questions, quite specific and detailed comparisons and contrasts relevant to the question should be made in a point by point approach, not by sequential treatment of the documents.
- In **(b)** questions, there should be the deployment of contextual knowledge as this is a specific requirement of the question. This should be applied to the consideration of the documents not merely added at the end.
- In the essay answers, responses would be deepened by appropriate use of relevant documents studied.

General Comments

There were more Special Subjects taken this year and there were some strong answers that emphasised the differences and similarities in **(a)**. However, some candidates did not respond to the question but wrote a generalised comparison or contrast. Responses to the part **(a)** questions benefit from a close reading and close comparisons of the two sources.

Use of contextual knowledge as well as documentary support is stipulated for the part **(b)** questions. The best answers were well organised, such as by identifying documents which offered similar interpretations and then assessed that interpretation by use of contextual knowledge and/or by interrogation using evidence extracted from the other documents, taking into account that they should not necessarily be taken at face value, but rather critically evaluated as historical evidence. (A good example of this can be seen in Paper 53 in which the apparent fulsome willingness of the abbots to surrender their beloved religious houses to the King must be seen in the context of the likely consequences of any signs of reluctance.) The best answers took these matters into account when utilising the documentary evidence to argue for or against the hypothesis, analyse a source, or use the evidence of the source to analyse another source. There was deployment of knowledge in many responses in part **(b)**, but some answers did not go beyond a treatment of the documents and made no use of knowledge. However, successful **(b)** questions were led by a study of the documents and not approached as an essay answer in which the documents merely illustrate points which candidates wish to make about the issue in the question. Many responses would have benefitted had they used contextual knowledge to support an argument led by the documents, rather than using evidence taken from the documents to support an argument constructed largely separately to the documents. Successful responses took this approach to the interplay and balance of contextual and documentary evidence.

Many of the points made in the Outline Papers' reports apply to the essays written in the Special Subject papers, in particular that successful candidates responded to the precise demands of the question whereas this was lacking in the weak responses. However, the essays are on a carefully studied Special Subject and would be enriched by some references to key texts studied. There was some very strong understanding shown of the issues in both questions with some insightful and sustained analysis, and the points made about the individual questions must be seen in that context.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** Answers were not well focused on the terms of the question. The plight of the peasants was often neglected and the similarities between the documents, which both blame those in authority, bishops in Document A and princes in Document B, for the problems the peasants faced, were rarely pointed out. Both also suggested that the peasants felt they had no choice but to rebel.

There was some better explanation of the attitudes expressed in the documents using the dates of their publication.

- (b) Responses tended not to distinguish between religious and economic factors, although both were present in the documents and, in reality, there were strong links between them. However, using most of the documents, candidates performed well in considering the misinterpretation by the peasants of the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. Some candidates went on to argue that Luther saw it as a religious duty for the Prince to rule well and so a failure to do so could be ranked as a religious factor. Candidates generally did not identify that economic factors (references to cheating and robbing and the selfish levying of taxes and other burdens) appeared in most of the documents. Conclusions could be drawn either way from the documents, but some responses relied more heavily on contextual knowledge to make a judgement, which was not what the question required.

Question 2

Answers needed to focus on Charles V's aims as Holy Roman Emperor, so extensive coverage of his aims as King of Spain was not necessary. Most answers used his efforts to have his brother recognised as King of the Romans to illustrate his dynastic aims, while the threats from the Princes, the Lutherans and the Turks showed how hard he fought to preserve his Empire. Although the Netherlands were relevant to the answer, some responses spent too long considering problems faced there, an area where, arguably, his rule faced fewer challenges.

Question 3

These answers did not grapple successfully with the terms of the question, writing general accounts of the Catholic Reformation rather than identifying the problems faced by the Papacy.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/55

The Reign of Charles I, 1625–1649

Key Messages

- In **(a)** questions, quite specific and detailed comparisons and contrasts relevant to the question should be made in a point by point approach, not by sequential treatment of the documents.
- In **(b)** questions, there should be the deployment of contextual knowledge as this is a specific requirement of the question. This should be applied to the consideration of the documents not merely added at the end.
- In the essay answers, responses would be deepened by appropriate use of relevant documents studied.

General Comments

There were more Special Subjects taken this year and there were some strong answers that emphasised the differences and similarities in **(a)**. However, some candidates did not respond to the question but wrote a generalised comparison or contrast. Responses to the part **(a)** questions benefit from a close reading and close comparisons of the two sources.

Use of contextual knowledge as well as documentary support is stipulated for the part **(b)** questions. The best answers were well organised, such as by identifying documents which offered similar interpretations and then assessed that interpretation by use of contextual knowledge and/or by interrogation using evidence extracted from the other documents, taking into account that they should not necessarily be taken at face value, but rather critically evaluated as historical evidence. (A good example of this can be seen in Paper 53 in which the apparent fulsome willingness of the abbots to surrender their beloved religious houses to the King must be seen in the context of the likely consequences of any signs of reluctance.) The best answers took these matters into account when utilising the documentary evidence to argue for or against the hypothesis, analyse a source, or use the evidence of the source to analyse another source. There was deployment of knowledge in many responses in part **(b)**, but some answers did not go beyond a treatment of the documents and made no use of knowledge. However, successful **(b)** questions were led by a study of the documents and not approached as an essay answer in which the documents merely illustrate points which candidates wish to make about the issue in the question. Many responses would have benefitted had they used contextual knowledge to support an argument led by the documents, rather than using evidence taken from the documents to support an argument constructed largely separately to the documents. Successful responses took this approach to the interplay and balance of contextual and documentary evidence.

Many of the points made in the Outline Papers' reports apply to the essays written in the Special Subject papers, in particular that successful candidates responded to the precise demands of the question whereas this was lacking in the weak responses. However, the essays are on a carefully studied Special Subject and would be enriched by some references to key texts studied. There was some very strong understanding shown of the issues in both questions with some insightful and sustained analysis, and the points made about the individual questions must be seen in that context.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** The vast majority identified the key differences between the sources. A subtle similarity (that the King is supposed to be the defender of 'liberties') was detected by a lot of candidates, although less good answers only concentrated on differences. Good discussions were extended as to whether Charles I's view of kingship could be seen as an actual statement of his true feelings on the matter, or whether he was pitching for martyrdom. A common pitfall was to compare the

sources as records of Charles' kingship rather than, the nominated issue, which was 'view of the role of king'. Some candidates included a paragraph at the end on provenance, where the evaluation was not carefully linked to the precise demands of the question. Stronger answers integrated the provenance throughout the answer.

- (b) Well directed answers focused clearly on Cromwell's role (as based on Sources B and C), and evaluated the provenance of each source carefully in showing how convincing the view was. The more successful answers grouped the sources into themes, rather than dealing with each source in succession (for example, by dividing their paragraphs into Cromwell, Charles and Parliament). Those that used and digested all the documents and related them to the precise demands of the question were rewarded, as long as this was supported by a range and depth of contextual knowledge. On occasions, candidates used evidence or own knowledge, or both, an approach which would be better suited to a normal essay. Some answers contained lengthy sections that made no references to sources. The quality of evaluation varied hugely, with good understanding of the more obvious sources (Documents A and D), and less effective interpretations of Document C (which indicated Cromwell's hesitation). Answers which focused on the provenance at the very end, and did not integrate it with the content were less effective.

There was some excellent evaluation though the discussion of Document C as evidence was variable, in particular whether Burnet would want to paint Cromwell in a bad light. The ambiguity of the source ('Cromwell was in a quandary') also caused indecision. Candidates were often adept at using the provenance of the other sources (the Parliamentarian colonel's wife, the High Court of Justice) to serve their argument. Document D was generally not used well, possibly because of the absence of Cromwell in the source. Of course, this is a point that can be used to make a judgment on his responsibility. The best answers used contextual knowledge to assess how far Cromwell was able to influence the High Court of Justice, and Parliament itself.

Question 2

Candidates had difficulty in assessing the impact of war on society. Weaker candidates tended to focus on political change, or fiscal exactions, without developing ideas about how that impacted on society. Only a handful of candidates developed themes on class conflict, mortality, physical destruction, trade disruptions. Centres possibly had not approached this topic from this angle in their teaching. A common weakness of responses to this essay was to deal with impacts individually rather than to develop an overall argument as to whether the war was destructive, disruptive, or largely insignificant in people's lives. Very few candidates were able to point out regional variations, though one or two were able to assess how the war experiences of different sections of society were variable.

Question 3

Answers to this question generally needed to engage with the real essence of the Army Revolt, what caused it, and the friction with the Presbyterians in Parliament (e.g. Holles). The stronger answers linked pay to wider tensions (e.g. over being sent to Ireland) and a small number of answers mentioned the mutiny at Burford, but some answers ignored or gave cursory mention to pay and then dwelt upon other possible reasons for the Army Revolt, notably the impact of the Levellers. The better responses demonstrated how discontent about pay translated into a revolt because of religious, political and social developments.

Question 4

A common problem was for candidates to describe in detail the unpopularity of Arminianism without showing the connection towards the rise of sects. One answer focused exclusively on the Personal Rule and did not incorporate any material from after 1640. Another popular contextual cause was the breakdown of the political and social order, though this was done less effectively. Some answers also did not focus sufficiently on the question's emphasis on proliferation.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/56

Special Subject – The French Revolution, 1774–1794

Key Messages

- In **(a)** questions, quite specific and detailed comparisons and contrasts relevant to the question should be made in a point by point approach, not by sequential treatment of the documents.
- In **(b)** questions, there should be the deployment of contextual knowledge as this is a specific requirement of the question. This should be applied to the consideration of the documents not merely added at the end.
- In the essay answers, responses would be deepened by appropriate use of relevant documents studied.

General Comments

There were more Special Subjects taken this year and there were some strong answers that emphasised the differences and similarities in **(a)**. However, some candidates did not respond to the question but wrote a generalised comparison or contrast. Responses to the part **(a)** questions benefit from a close reading and close comparisons of the two sources.

Use of contextual knowledge as well as documentary support is stipulated for the part **(b)** questions. The best answers were well organised, such as by identifying documents which offered similar interpretations and then assessed that interpretation by use of contextual knowledge and/or by interrogation using evidence extracted from the other documents, taking into account that they should not necessarily be taken at face value, but rather critically evaluated as historical evidence. (A good example of this can be seen in Paper 53 in which the apparent fulsome willingness of the abbots to surrender their beloved religious houses to the King must be seen in the context of the likely consequences of any signs of reluctance.) The best answers took these matters into account when utilising the documentary evidence to argue for or against the hypothesis, analyse a source, or use the evidence of the source to analyse another source. There was deployment of knowledge in many responses in part **(b)**, but some answers did not go beyond a treatment of the documents and made no use of knowledge. However, successful **(b)** questions were led by a study of the documents and not approached as an essay answer in which the documents merely illustrate points which candidates wish to make about the issue in the question. Many responses would have benefitted had they used contextual knowledge to support an argument led by the documents, rather than using evidence taken from the documents to support an argument constructed largely separately to the documents. Successful responses took this approach to the interplay and balance of contextual and documentary evidence.

Many of the points made in the Outline Papers' reports apply to the essays written in the Special Subject papers, in particular that successful candidates responded to the precise demands of the question whereas this was lacking in the weak responses. However, the essays are on a carefully studied Special Subject and would be enriched by some references to key texts studied. There was some very strong understanding shown of the issues in both questions with some insightful and sustained analysis, and the points made about the individual questions must be seen in that context.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** The best answers here not only outlined the similarities and differences in emphasis between Danton and Robespierre, but also tried to explain why with reference to contextual knowledge about the political impact of the Committee of Public Safety. Weaker answers were generalised or implicit and failed to be precise about what was different, and included some paraphrasing.

- (b) The better answers here not only engaged closely with what ‘best interests’ might mean, but made particular use of Documents C and D, including contextual knowledge of the relationship between Robespierre and Saint-Just. Attention was also paid to tone, particularly Robespierre’s in Document B, while Document A was used to frame a counter-argument. Knowledge was also applied, but, specifically, in order to challenge the idea that the Terror was in the ‘best interests’ of the French people. Weaker answers were more implicit here, or referential, using Document E quite uncritically to suggest Robespierre was ruling in the ‘best interests’ of France, and describing the content of documents, or offering tangentially relevant information about the Cult of the Supreme Being, rather than engaging with the themes of the documents in their proper context. Many of the weaker answers finished with an asserted conclusion that was irrelevant to any evidence.

Question 2

Many answers appeared ‘pre-prepared’, in that they included cursory mention of the Assembly of Notables, though without discussion or reference to its significance. Instead, candidates moved on quickly to discussing the Estates-General, implying a seamless journey towards Revolution. They gave some indiscriminating lists of ‘causes of the Revolution’. Others were very descriptive about the events of 1787–89, relaying the policies of Calonne, Brienne and Necker without really addressing the question. Few candidates offered any kind of supported judgement that actually related to the key issue and some confused the Assembly of Notables with the Estates General.

Question 3

Candidates answered this question better than the previous question, in that they knew and understood the important developments under the Estates-General, with frequent mention of the Tennis Court Oath and the subsequent August decrees, citing the emergence of the Third Estate as the National Assembly as the most important instance of problems being made worse. Louis XVI’s actions and the proceedings of the Estates-General were mostly analysed separately, whereas it would have been better to consider them together. However, candidates’ discussions tended to focus on other factors, notably long-term financial problems of the Crown and social resentments. Weaker candidates failed to focus enough on the key issue of the Estates-General.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/57

Special Subject – The Origins and Causes
of the American Civil War, c. 1820–1861

Key Messages

- In **(a)** questions, quite specific and detailed comparisons and contrasts relevant to the question should be made in a point by point approach, not by sequential treatment of the documents.
- In **(b)** questions, there should be the deployment of contextual knowledge as this is a specific requirement of the question. This should be applied to the consideration of the documents not merely added at the end.
- In the essay answers, responses would be deepened by appropriate use of relevant documents studied.

General Comments

There were more Special Subjects taken this year and there were some strong answers that emphasised the differences and similarities in **(a)**. However, some candidates did not respond to the question but wrote a generalised comparison or contrast. Responses to the part **(a)** questions benefit from a close reading and close comparisons of the two sources.

Use of contextual knowledge as well as documentary support is stipulated for the part **(b)** questions. The best answers were well organised, such as by identifying documents which offered similar interpretations and then assessed that interpretation by use of contextual knowledge and/or by interrogation using evidence extracted from the other documents, taking into account that they should not necessarily be taken at face value, but rather critically evaluated as historical evidence. (A good example of this can be seen in Paper 53 in which the apparent fulsome willingness of the abbots to surrender their beloved religious houses to the King must be seen in the context of the likely consequences of any signs of reluctance.) The best answers took these matters into account when utilising the documentary evidence to argue for or against the hypothesis, analyse a source, or use the evidence of the source to analyse another source. There was deployment of knowledge in many responses in part **(b)**, but some answers did not go beyond a treatment of the documents and made no use of knowledge. However, successful **(b)** questions were led by a study of the documents and not approached as an essay answer in which the documents merely illustrate points which candidates wish to make about the issue in the question. Many responses would have benefitted had they used contextual knowledge to support an argument led by the documents, rather than using evidence taken from the documents to support an argument constructed largely separately to the documents. Successful responses took this approach to the interplay and balance of contextual and documentary evidence.

Many of the points made in the Outline Papers' reports apply to the essays written in the Special Subject papers, in particular that successful candidates responded to the precise demands of the question whereas this was lacking in the weak responses. However, the essays are on a carefully studied Special Subject and would be enriched by some references to key texts studied. There was some very strong understanding shown of the issues in both questions with some insightful and sustained analysis, and the points made about the individual questions must be seen in that context.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** Answers in top band showed sharp awareness of similarities and differences, by critically evaluating documents as well as the provenance. Some candidates managed to deal with the implications of the differing provenance and the impact it might have on the contents of the document, and how this related to the question. At the bottom end, weaker candidates provided a

list of quotations that identified similarities and differences without properly digesting or critically evaluating them. Some candidates compared and contrasted the documents in general terms, without explicitly linking their answer to the wording of the question.

Brief introductions were not successful since only the most obvious similarities and differences identified, but not explained. Many answers included a paragraph at the end on provenance, but the evaluation was not carefully linked to the precise demands of the question. Stronger answers integrated the provenance throughout the answer.

Candidates lost marks by treating the documents separately rather than cross-referencing throughout. On the other hand, those candidates who cross-referenced either in single sentences or in successive sentences were in a much stronger position to evaluate the documents in a critical fashion. Candidates who neglected either similarities or differences were generally in the bottom band (the similarities were less obvious than the stark differences).

- (b) The strongest answers clearly demonstrated an understanding of the documents and were able to relate the contents and provenance to the demands of the question. Such candidates treated the documents as a set and were able to make a critical and accurate judgement as to how convincing each document was for the view that the debate on slavery was primarily an economic one. Well directed answers focused clearly on the various documents that dealt with economic factors, and evaluated the provenance of each document carefully in showing how convincing the view was.

The more successful answers grouped the documents into themes, rather than dealing with each in succession; for example, by dividing their paragraphs into economic and social factors. Those that used and digested all the documents and related them to the precise demands of the question were rewarded, as long as this was supported by a range and depth of contextual knowledge. On occasions, this came across as an evidence and own knowledge approach which would have been better suited to an Outlines essay. There were some answers containing lengthy sections that made no references to the documents. Some candidates misunderstood, and therefore misinterpreted, how convincing the documents were in the presentation of the view. Many candidates failed to provide a sufficient depth of contextual knowledge. Weaker answers provided a list, albeit of relevant quotations, but undigested and not critically evaluated. There were also some unsophisticated evaluations of the provenance, with simple assertions that led candidates to dismiss the documents as being biased or unreliable sources.

The quality of evaluation varied hugely, with good understanding of the more obvious documents (**Documents A and C**), and less effective interpretations of Document B (Barton's lecture to the Academy of Sciences). A number of candidates failed to identify economic factors in the documents which contained them. Introductions were used successfully, as long as the question was answered directly and the documents treated as a set. As in question (a), those candidates who focused on the provenance at the very end, and did not integrate it with the content, lost marks.

Question 4

Most candidates were well prepared for this question, and it was generally answered well, with a good range of evidence and some engagement with different possible arguments and views. The weaker answers were more descriptive and lacked sustained analysis and wide-ranging material. Some answers were more successful in their consideration of the long-term causes than the crucial decisions taken in 1860–61.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/58

Gladstone and Disraeli, 1867–1886

Key Messages

- In **(a)** questions, quite specific and detailed comparisons and contrasts relevant to the question should be made in a point by point approach, not by sequential treatment of the documents.
- In **(b)** questions, there should be the deployment of contextual knowledge as this is a specific requirement of the question. This should be applied to the consideration of the documents not merely added at the end.
- In the essay answers, responses would be deepened by appropriate use of relevant documents studied.

General Comments

There were more Special Subjects taken this year and there were some strong answers that emphasised the differences and similarities in **(a)**. However, some candidates did not respond to the question but wrote a generalised comparison or contrast. Responses to the part **(a)** questions benefit from a close reading and close comparisons of the two sources.

Use of contextual knowledge as well as documentary support is stipulated for the part **(b)** questions. The best answers were well organised, such as by identifying documents which offered similar interpretations and then assessed that interpretation by use of contextual knowledge and/or by interrogation using evidence extracted from the other documents, taking into account that they should not necessarily be taken at face value, but rather critically evaluated as historical evidence. (A good example of this can be seen in Paper 53 in which the apparent fulsome willingness of the abbots to surrender their beloved religious houses to the King must be seen in the context of the likely consequences of any signs of reluctance.) The best answers took these matters into account when utilising the documentary evidence to argue for or against the hypothesis, analyse a source, or use the evidence of the source to analyse another source. There was deployment of knowledge in many responses in part **(b)**, but some answers did not go beyond a treatment of the documents and made no use of knowledge. However, successful **(b)** questions were led by a study of the documents and not approached as an essay answer in which the documents merely illustrate points which candidates wish to make about the issue in the question. Many responses would have benefitted had they used contextual knowledge to support an argument led by the documents, rather than using evidence taken from the documents to support an argument constructed largely separately to the documents. Successful responses took this approach to the interplay and balance of contextual and documentary evidence.

Many of the points made in the Outline Papers' reports apply to the essays written in the Special Subject papers, in particular that successful candidates responded to the precise demands of the question whereas this was lacking in the weak responses. However, the essays are on a carefully studied Special Subject and would be enriched by some references to key texts studied. There was some very strong understanding shown of the issues in both questions with some insightful and sustained analysis, and the points made about the individual questions must be seen in that context.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** Most candidates understood the main difference between the two documents was that the writer of Document A saw a need for reform of the licensing laws for moral and socially beneficial reasons, while the publicans described in Document B were against such reform. The publicans only saw a need for reform in respect of the economic competition they were experiencing from the grocers. Both documents argue from a moral point of view with Document B claiming a potential reduction

of 'the liberty and comforts of the people', but the underlying reasons for the 'moral' arguments were fundamentally different. Both documents agree that the proposed law changes should equally affect grocers selling alcohol, but, again, the rationale for such changes were different, one being to address a social need, the other what was seen as an economic unfairness.

The best responses focused not only on the ways the documents were similar or different but also on why they differed, and went a little beyond the obvious by noting that Document A was from a pro-Liberal paper and Document B was the report of a publicans' meeting. They kept a tight focus on the key issue of the question, that of 'need' and how far the new laws were necessary. They also understood that Document B was not, in itself, for or against the new legislation (it differed from Document A by being a report of a meeting while Document A represented an opinion piece, giving the paper's point of view). Some responses provided a wider context in terms of the general thrust of Liberal reforms in the 1868–1874 Ministry or with regard to Gladstone's 'moral' approach to political life.

- (b) Better responses looked to group the documents in such a way as to support at least two arguments. Many candidates found this a little difficult because of the pro-Liberal nature of four of the documents and the fact that two came from 1872. However, many candidates faced this challenge squarely by pointing out that two unpopular policies were covered (Licensing Act and the proposal to repeal income tax) and that these were representative of other unpopular policies not included in the documents. Some of the best responses picked up on the reference in Document C to the Liberals 'plundering and blundering' and used this as way to introduce the other unpopular acts. Most did not see the set as supporting the view that the unpopular policies were the cause of the Liberal loss, because of the lack of detail about domestic policy and the Liberal-orientated nature of the sources, even if they made a very good case for the domestic policies being central to the Liberal defeat.

There were strong comments on the strength of Conservative organisation, often linking to Gladstone's comments in Document E, with stronger responses suggesting that Gladstone would identify the lack of organisation at local level as a factor (it deflected criticism from the policies he had pushed through). Document E was, in fact, the one that was evaluated best. Other documents received rather formulaic evaluation along the lines that, because of their origins, they would adopt a particular standpoint.

Relatively few responses discussed the point made in Document D that the domestic policies were 'necessary' as opposed to 'popular' even though that allowed cross-reference to Document C where the verb 'plundered' was used in respect of the publicans or to Document A with its rationale for the Licensing Act. Weaker responses tended to see this as an essay on why the Liberals lost in 1874 and thus used the documents more for illustration or reference rather than the drivers of the response.

Question 2

The responses to this question did not focus on the key issues of Church and Monarchy to any great degree. There were some attempts to look at the development of Disraeli's political ideas in a much broader context, but there was a sense of wrestling a pre-prepared essay on 'Tory democracy' to fit this question. The focus had to be firmly on the two elements in the question and to dismiss either, or to give each, a very cursory overview was to miss the essence of the response. It was not necessary to determine that one or other was more important – and indeed a very good case can be made for equal value – but the main thrust of the answer had to concern these two themes.

Question 3

The best responses to this question avoided a chronological approach and considered the different factors that prevented the different ministries (though primarily Gladstone's) from 'solving' the Irish Question. These included: attitudes in Parliament and reluctance shown by both Houses (and especially the Lords) to go much beyond land reform; the consistent opposition in Parliament to any suggestion of Home Rule; the sometimes contradictory nature of British policy, veering from conciliation to coercion and back again; and, the developing attitudes and actions of the Irish nationalist leadership, particularly when the Liberals came to depend on their support to maintain their Commons' majority. At the very highest level, responses ascribed some sense of the relative importance of these factors, showing that such importance might change over time.

However, most responses adopted a more chronological approach, showing how the question changed, generally with the British government failing to address the current problems and using approaches more appropriate to an earlier phase of the debate. These responses were effective as long as they did not merely become a narrative of what happened with some indication perhaps of why one policy or another failed. Mere narratives did not fare well.

Question 4

There was some good factual knowledge offered, but some answers were unsure of the difference between foreign and colonial policy and, generally, objectives were not sufficiently considered, so the answers became quite general comparisons, often neglecting the important topic of the Near East.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/06
Personal Investigation

Choice of Titles

From most centres, there was a range of Personal Investigations. There was a wide variation in the titles chosen and some less common topics included several on Eastern European history in a variety of eras, local archaeological evidence and Ancient Greek history. Generally topics were mainstream and some clearly related to the periods being studied for the Outlines Papers. There has been a marked decline in the number of Investigations focusing on Nazi history and the Vietnam War; whereas there has been an increase in medieval and nineteenth-century topics.

Amongst the more standard topics, many candidates were able to achieve high marks, especially where there was a clear sense of investigation. The history of great or infamous individuals was again very popular. Individuals chosen for study included Richard III, Franco, Mussolini, Eleanor of Aquitaine, Margaret of Anjou, Henry VI, George Washington, Benjamin Disraeli, William Pitt, William Rufus and Robert Peel. Though care needs to be taken with the concept of how far a particular individual deserves their historical reputation.

It is clear that stronger Investigations benefited from the preparation and completion of a thorough and carefully constructed question and proposal. Candidates and supervisors may wish to pay close attention to the feedback given by the senior examiners/consultants about the proposals, whether this relates to the modification of a question or the recommendation of additional or different literature. Candidates who disregarded this advice sometimes produced less effective essays for the following reasons: Investigations were written using questions which did not lend itself well to the presentation of a coherent, analytical essay; Investigations were written with long timeframes, which meant that the essay was far too broad in its scope thereby preventing sufficient detail and analytical rigour.

The formula 'best explained' or taking a named factor and asking 'How far...?' remain sound approaches to formulating a question.

Quality of Argument

There were some examples of strong argument, often helped by the choice of question. The strongest answers presented a clear, independent and rigorous argument, which integrated a range and depth of material, as well as making critical judgement of the sources. At the highest level, the answers reflected a real sense of investigation, in which the candidate's knowledge and depth of reading were such that they were in a position to impose their own stamp on the material.

There was variety in the amount and degree of critical use of sources in the answers. This, again, depended to a degree on the type of question. Some Anglo-Saxon and medieval sources were more readily analysed in this way, possibly because the material available was more limited. Most of the critical use of sources was a genuine attempt to evaluate their reliability and usefulness and there was little reference to the background or achievements of historians as an evaluative tool. There was good use of cross reference in some work using both contextual knowledge and other views to assess the validity of what was being argued. Through effective use of footnoting, effective answers demonstrated how they have used their diverse sources. Some candidates clearly allowed a single source or a very small number of sources to dominate their footnotes and their essay. The finest essays were those that thoroughly digested the literature and imposed their own stamp on the material and the argument. A number of candidates alluded to historiographical debates that were not necessarily directly relevant to the precise demands of the question, but not necessarily include any effective or relevant source evaluation. There was, it seems, rather a lot of copying and pasting from different books, without fully digesting the significance of these statements for the precise demands of the question. In some cases long quotes from sources were included without much comment, simply as a way to illustrate the argument or to describe events. This is best avoided. The use of sources must be fully integrated and they should be evaluated.

There was some straight narrative and some passages of writing did not move beyond description. It can be difficult to assess key events without giving some account of what happened, but careful planning and an analytical approach can avoid the necessity to write lengthy descriptive passages.

General Points

Introductions and conclusions were variable in effectiveness and sometimes just restatements of established arguments. Scene-setting introductions were seldom well rewarded. Far more successful were those which set the issue in context and outlined the argument to be advanced. Conclusions worked best when a powerful answer to the question posed was exposed.

Some Investigations were simply overwhelmed by the volume of material, resulting in an overly descriptive piece of writing. The stronger Investigations were those with paragraphs that presented a more thematic approach. A number of essays divided paragraphs into events or periods, which encouraged narration instead of evaluation. The best essays presented a well-directed introduction that summarised the principal arguments, rather than presenting a single (in some cases several) descriptive, scene-setting paragraph(s). Many essays indicated that candidates did not edit their work carefully and this was reflected in the following ways: typographical errors and poor grammatical constructions; repetition; description and/or a measure of irrelevance; lack of structural rigour (in the overall structure and order of paragraphs, and the internal paragraph structure).

A limited bibliography made it very difficult for candidates to do the subject justice. Some bibliographies were very basic, made up largely of general text books and some GCSE books. Non-British topics seemed more prone to this problem. Some were meticulously recorded while others followed their own individual pattern.

The proposal forms were not always attached to the work submitted and more seriously, the word limit of 4000 words was exceeded in far too many Investigations. The examiners do stop reading at this point, so that in some cases the conclusion goes unread which can have a real impact on the overall outcome. Some candidates seek to include extra material in the footnotes, but this is also not considered by the examiners who are making judgements on the effective selection and deployment of material.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/71

Special Subject – Russia in Revolution, 1905–1924

Key Messages

- In **(a)** questions, quite specific and detailed comparisons and contrasts relevant to the question should be made in a point by point approach, not by sequential treatment of the documents.
- In **(b)** questions, there should be the deployment of contextual knowledge as this is a specific requirement of the question. This should be applied to the consideration of the documents not merely added at the end.
- In the essay answers, responses would be deepened by appropriate use of relevant documents studied.

General Comments

There were more Special Subjects taken this year and there were some strong answers that emphasised the differences and similarities in **(a)**. However, some candidates did not respond to the question but wrote a generalised comparison or contrast. Responses to the part **(a)** questions benefit from a close reading and close comparisons of the two sources.

Use of contextual knowledge as well as documentary support is stipulated for the part **(b)** questions. The best answers were well organised, such as by identifying documents which offered similar interpretations and then assessed that interpretation by use of contextual knowledge and/or by interrogation using evidence extracted from the other documents, taking into account that they should not necessarily be taken at face value, but rather critically evaluated as historical evidence. (A good example of this can be seen in Paper 53 in which the apparent fulsome willingness of the abbots to surrender their beloved religious houses to the King must be seen in the context of the likely consequences of any signs of reluctance.) The best answers took these matters into account when utilising the documentary evidence to argue for or against the hypothesis, analyse a source, or use the evidence of the source to analyse another source. There was deployment of knowledge in many responses in part **(b)**, but some answers did not go beyond a treatment of the documents and made no use of knowledge. However, successful **(b)** questions were led by a study of the documents and not approached as an essay answer in which the documents merely illustrate points which candidates wish to make about the issue in the question. Many responses would have benefitted had they used contextual knowledge to support an argument led by the documents, rather than using evidence taken from the documents to support an argument constructed largely separately to the documents. Successful responses took this approach to the interplay and balance of contextual and documentary evidence.

Many of the points made in the Outline Papers' reports apply to the essays written in the Special Subject papers, in particular that successful candidates responded to the precise demands of the question whereas this was lacking in the weak responses. However, the essays are on a carefully studied Special Subject and would be enriched by some references to key texts studied. There was some very strong understanding shown of the issues in both questions with some insightful and sustained analysis, and the points made about the individual questions must be seen in that context.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** Answers in top bands showed sharp awareness of similarities and differences, by critically evaluating the documents as well as the provenance. Not enough candidates considered the implications of the differing provenance of each document (although both Bolshevik, the nature and purpose of the documents were different) and the impact it might have on the contents of the documents, and how this related to the documents' viewpoint of the relations between the Party

and the people. The same can be said of the different dates of each documents, and their obvious implications.

Not all candidates read, or at least, read carefully and made use of the captions above the documents (for example, the significance of 'the label reads Counter-Revolution' and this could be cross-referenced with Document A).

Weaker answers provided a list of quotations that identified similarities and differences without properly digesting or critically evaluating them. Some made incorrect inferences, such as implying that Document A's allusion to 'Trotsky's organising genius' was corroborated by the Seni poster. Some candidates compared and contrasted the documents in general terms, without explicitly linking to the wording of the question (essentially not focusing on the documents' views on Trotsky. Stronger answers integrated comparison of the provenance throughout the answer.

- (b) The strongest candidates clearly understood the documents properly and were able to relate the contents and provenance to the demands of the question. Such candidates treated the documents as a set and were able to make a critical and accurate judgement as to how convincing each document was for the view that the strength of Red leadership was the decisive element in their victory in the Civil War. Well directed answers focused clearly on Red leadership, and distinguished it from Red Terror, while weaker ones analysed the Reds in general. The more successful answers grouped the documents into themes, rather than dealing with each one in succession (for example, by dividing their paragraphs into Red leadership and White weaknesses). Those candidates that used and digested all the documents and related them to the precise demands of the question were rewarded, as long as their answers were supported by a range and depth of contextual knowledge. On occasions, this came across as an evidence and own knowledge approach which would be better suited to a normal essay. Candidates must realise the distinction between evidence used in a normal essay and contextual knowledge deployed in this source-driven essay.

Some answers contained lengthy sections that made no references to the documents. Some candidates simply misunderstood and, therefore, misinterpreted how convincing the documents were in the presentation of the view. Most surprising was the regularity with which candidates failed to provide a sufficient depth of contextual knowledge. Weaker answers provided a list, albeit relevant quotations, that remained undigested and not critically evaluated. There was also some rather unsophisticated evaluation of the provenance, with rather simple assertions that led candidates to dismiss the documents as being biased or unreliable. The quality of evaluation varied hugely, with good understanding of the value of Wrangel as a source (a White General dwelling on White weaknesses in a private letter to Denikin), though ignoring the fact that Morgan Philips Price was a socialist.

Question 2

Many answers failed to do justice to the importance of Lenin's ideology. Some answers focused almost exclusively on the year 1917, and failed to incorporate any significant material from the years 1903–1916. Though Lenin's ideology is a complex topic, it is an important one and should not be neglected. However, for some candidates, this question was not a wise choice.

Question 3

Better answers engaged with the concept of 'popular revolution' and there were some attempts to challenge the view held by many and to suggest that February was a lot less popular than is thought and October rather more popular. The justifications were not always convincing or well-explained, but showed some thought about the issue. Weaker answers were poorly structured and ended up being far more descriptive as candidates struggled to tailor what they knew to the precise demands of the question. Some essays also lacked balance, devoting more attention to either the February or October revolutions to the neglect of the other.

Question 4

This led to some very well-focused explanations and stronger candidates grasped what was required by 'social changes'. Some candidates struggled to distinguish between the questions 'What were the social changes...' and 'How substantial were the social changes...' The result was, for example, a considerable degree of description about War Communism and the New Economic Policy. Some candidates interpreted the range of social change in quite a narrow way; for, example some wrote exclusively on women and

religion, but ignored distribution of wealth and class structure. Some candidates found it hard to unpick the differences between political change and social change. Many candidates were unable to evaluate social changes in any depth and there was some tendency to drift into general accounts of Lenin's rule. However, there was some good knowledge and discussion.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/72

Special Subject – Winston Churchill, 1914–1946

Key Messages

- In **(a)** questions, quite specific and detailed comparisons and contrasts relevant to the question should be made in a point by point approach, not by sequential treatment of the documents.
- In **(b)** questions, there should be the deployment of contextual knowledge as this is a specific requirement of the question. This should be applied to the consideration of the documents not merely added at the end.
- In the essay answers, responses would be deepened by appropriate use of relevant documents studied.

General Comments

There were more Special Subjects taken this year and there were some strong answers that emphasised the differences and similarities in **(a)**. However, some candidates did not respond to the question but wrote a generalised comparison or contrast. Responses to the part **(a)** questions benefit from a close reading and close comparisons of the two sources.

Use of contextual knowledge as well as documentary support is stipulated for the part **(b)** questions. The best answers were well organised, such as by identifying documents which offered similar interpretations and then assessed that interpretation by use of contextual knowledge and/or by interrogation using evidence extracted from the other documents, taking into account that they should not necessarily be taken at face value, but rather critically evaluated as historical evidence. (A good example of this can be seen in Paper 53 in which the apparent fulsome willingness of the abbots to surrender their beloved religious houses to the King must be seen in the context of the likely consequences of any signs of reluctance.) The best answers took these matters into account when utilising the documentary evidence to argue for or against the hypothesis, analyse a source, or use the evidence of the source to analyse another source. There was deployment of knowledge in many responses in part **(b)**, but some answers did not go beyond a treatment of the documents and made no use of knowledge. However, successful **(b)** questions were led by a study of the documents and not approached as an essay answer in which the documents merely illustrate points which candidates wish to make about the issue in the question. Many responses would have benefitted had they used contextual knowledge to support an argument led by the documents, rather than using evidence taken from the documents to support an argument constructed largely separately to the documents. Successful responses took this approach to the interplay and balance of contextual and documentary evidence.

Many of the points made in the Outline Papers' reports apply to the essays written in the Special Subject papers, in particular that successful candidates responded to the precise demands of the question whereas this was lacking in the weak responses. However, the essays are on a carefully studied Special Subject and would be enriched by some references to key texts studied. There was some very strong understanding shown of the issues in both questions with some insightful and sustained analysis, and the points made about the individual questions must be seen in that context.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** The best answers were able to show similarity and difference and explain similarity and difference. There was less **explanation** of similarity and difference by considering the different nature and origins, and particularly the different dates of the evidence.

- (b) There was a tendency for candidates to concentrate on the proposed Grand Alliance to the exclusion of other factors. Stronger answers used the documents in detail, though Document B was not as closely analysed as it deserved, given the range of material it contained. There was some effective use of contextual knowledge, mainly in questioning the realism of Churchill's position. It might have been helpful if more answers had considered Churchill's point in Document A about the Czech forces and Wise's assumption about Czech strength in Document B. However, there were some thoughtful answers and, generally, the question was well understood.

Question 2

This was overwhelmingly popular and many responses were able to discuss successes and failures and support answers by knowledge. It was good to see some use of source material. There was some awareness of the historiography of the period and of modern accounts which challenge some of the assumptions made about economic policy.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/73

Special Subject – Germany, 1919–1945

Key Messages

- In **(a)** questions quite specific and detailed comparisons and contrasts relevant to the question should be made in a point by point approach not by sequential treatment of the documents.
- In **(b)** questions there should be the deployment of contextual knowledge as this is a specific requirement of the question. This should be applied to the consideration of the documents not merely added at the end.
- In the essay answers, responses would be deepened by appropriate use of relevant documents studied.

General Comments

There were more Special Subjects taken this year and there were some strong answers that emphasised the differences and similarities in **(a)**. However, some candidates did not respond to the question but wrote a generalised comparison or contrast. Responses to the part **(a)** questions benefit from a close reading and close comparisons of the two sources.

Use of contextual knowledge as well as documentary support is stipulated for the part **(b)** questions. The best answers were well organised, such as by identifying documents which offered similar interpretations and then assessed that interpretation by use of contextual knowledge and/or by interrogation using evidence extracted from the other documents, taking into account that they should not necessarily be taken at face value, but rather critically evaluated as historical evidence. (A good example of this can be seen in Paper 53 in which the apparent fulsome willingness of the abbots to surrender their beloved religious houses to the King must be seen in the context of the likely consequences of any signs of reluctance.) The best answers took these matters into account when utilising the documentary evidence to argue for or against the hypothesis, analyse a source, or use the evidence of the source to analyse another source. There was deployment of knowledge in many responses in part **(b)**, but some answers did not go beyond a treatment of the documents and made no use of knowledge. However, successful **(b)** questions were led by a study of the documents and not approached as an essay answer in which the documents merely illustrate points which candidates wish to make about the issue in the question. Many responses would have benefitted had they used contextual knowledge to support an argument led by the documents, rather than using evidence taken from the documents to support an argument constructed largely separately to the documents. Successful responses took this approach to the interplay and balance of contextual and documentary evidence.

Many of the points made in the Outline Papers' reports apply to the essays written in the Special Subject papers, in particular that successful candidates responded to the precise demands of the question whereas this was lacking in the weak responses. However, the essays are on a carefully studied Special Subject and would be enriched by some references to key texts studied. There was some very strong understanding shown of the issues in both questions with some insightful and sustained analysis, and the points made about the individual questions must be seen in that context.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** The better answers offered a thorough analysis of both similarities and differences, of which there were several, while also picking up the change over time that was implied in Document C by the preparedness to allow women to 'learn to use pistols' and, in the case of Bormann, even have them on the front-line. Average and good answers also discussed the potential significance of the date of Document C as a much-later interview. Weaker answers described the role of women in Nazi

Germany with little reference to the documents, and trotted out 'Kinder Kirche Kuche' without engaging with the issues raised. Few candidates said that the position of the author of Document C itself was evidence for the place of (some) women in Nazi Germany.

- (b) Here, many candidates did not adequately understand what to 'gain' might mean. There was some discussion and awareness of women's relative liberation under Weimar, but often use of the documents was generalised. Some candidates misunderstood Hitler's remarks in Document B, failing to see that 'It has often been said...' meant that what followed was a view with which he was not ostensibly agreeing. Better answers made good use of Document D, showing as it did a woman who appeared contented with her fairly restricted position under the Nazis, though this needed to be related more closely to the question of 'gain' and also interrogated further, given the date of the document as a much later recollection. There was also scope to use more knowledge to unpack the negative view given in Document E. Generally, candidates appeared to lack detailed or specific knowledge about the role of women or any well-known individual examples.

Question 2

Few candidates tackled this question, but it was generally poorly done. Some candidates misunderstood the chronology entirely and talked of the party's strength between 1929 and 1933, or indeed after. There was some discussion of *Mein Kampf* and narration of developments, but little in the way of hard evidence of the party's fortunes (e.g. election statistics) which was disappointing.

Question 3

Most candidates answered this question; there seemed a high level of preparation for a question of some kind on foreign policy, as the historiography described in some introductions, of 'intentionalist' versus 'structuralist' seemed well-rehearsed. However, this was not often used to contextualise or ground an answer, but rather as quite formulaic background. Several answers failed to mention the invasion of Poland in 1939 as an instance of a 'gamble'. There seemed to be misunderstanding of what a 'gamble' was, with 'opportunism' being used as a synonym. The treatment of the Sudetenland crisis was particularly weak in this regard. There was some better knowledge of the remilitarisation of the Rhineland, notably Hitler's instruction to his occupying force to retreat if resisted, but, again, this was not adequately contextualised diplomatically to make the case for its being a 'gamble' by many candidates. Most answers featured a counter-argument to suggest a planned foreign policy, but it tended to be a quite formulaic discussion of *Mein Kampf* and the Hossbach memorandum, and not demonstrate 'coherence' or seek to do so. Some answers appeared to be prepared answers to a similar, but different, question.

Question 4

A few candidates tackled this but there was a weak engagement with the actual question set. Weaker candidates discussed lack of 'opposition' in general terms, with reference to fear of the 'Terror-State' and the apparatus of oppression, without focusing on racial policy and why there may have been little opposition to it. Stronger candidates referred to popular anti-Semitism and the impact of propaganda, but still often failed to discuss what the potential sources of opposition might have been.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/74

Special Subject – China under Mao Zedong, 1949–1976

Key Messages

- In **(a)** questions, quite specific and detailed comparisons and contrasts relevant to the question should be made in a point by point approach, not by sequential treatment of the documents.
- In **(b)** questions, there should be the deployment of contextual knowledge as this is a specific requirement of the question. This should be applied to the consideration of the documents not merely added at the end.
- In the essay answers, responses would be deepened by appropriate use of relevant documents studied.

General Comments

There were more Special Subjects taken this year and there were some strong answers that emphasised the differences and similarities in **(a)**. However, some candidates did not respond to the question but wrote a generalised comparison or contrast. Responses to the part **(a)** questions benefit from a close reading and close comparisons of the two sources.

Use of contextual knowledge as well as documentary support is stipulated for the part **(b)** questions. The best answers were well organised, such as by identifying documents which offered similar interpretations and then assessed that interpretation by use of contextual knowledge and/or by interrogation using evidence extracted from the other documents, taking into account that they should not necessarily be taken at face value, but rather critically evaluated as historical evidence. (A good example of this can be seen in Paper 53 in which the apparent fulsome willingness of the abbots to surrender their beloved religious houses to the King must be seen in the context of the likely consequences of any signs of reluctance.) The best answers took these matters into account when utilising the documentary evidence to argue for or against the hypothesis, analyse a source, or use the evidence of the source to analyse another source. There was deployment of knowledge in many responses in part **(b)**, but some answers did not go beyond a treatment of the documents and made no use of knowledge. However, successful **(b)** questions were led by a study of the documents and not approached as an essay answer in which the documents merely illustrate points which candidates wish to make about the issue in the question. Many responses would have benefitted had they used contextual knowledge to support an argument led by the documents, rather than using evidence taken from the documents to support an argument constructed largely separately to the documents. Successful responses took this approach to the interplay and balance of contextual and documentary evidence.

Many of the points made in the Outline Papers' reports apply to the essays written in the Special Subject papers, in particular that successful candidates responded to the precise demands of the question whereas this was lacking in the weak responses. However, the essays are on a carefully studied Special Subject and would be enriched by some references to key texts studied. There was some very strong understanding shown of the issues in both questions with some insightful and sustained analysis, and the points made about the individual questions must be seen in that context.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** Answers in the top band showed sharp awareness of similarities and differences, by critically evaluating documents as well as the provenance. A few candidates considered the implications of the different authors (a newspaper editor and college professor) and the impact it might have on the contents of the documents, and how this related to the documents' view of the relations between the Party and the people. Most candidates were able to point out the more critical tone of

Document C and that the newspaper was, perhaps unsurprisingly, more restrained. Within the bottom band, weaker candidates provided a list of quotations that identified similarities and differences without properly digesting or critically evaluating them. Some candidates compared and contrasted the documents in general terms, without explicitly linking them to the wording of the question. Writing a brief introduction to this answer was insufficient, since only the most obvious similarities and differences could be identified (and not explained). Many candidates included a paragraph at the end on provenance, but the evaluation was not carefully linked to the precise demands of the question. Stronger answers integrated the provenance throughout the answer. Candidates also lost marks by treating the sources separately and not cross-referencing throughout. Those who cross-referenced either in single sentences, or in successive sentences, were in a much stronger position to evaluate the sources in a critical fashion.

- (b) The strongest candidates clearly understood the documents properly and were able to relate the contents and provenance to the demands of the question. Such candidates treated the documents as a set and were able to make a critical and accurate judgement as to how convincing each document was for the view that the objective of the Hundred Flowers campaign was to improve the lives of the people of China. The more successful answers grouped the documents into themes, rather than dealing with each in succession. Those that used and digested all the documents and related them to the precise demands of the question were rewarded, as long as this was supported by a range and depth of contextual knowledge. Some candidates misunderstood and, therefore, misinterpreted, how convincing the documents were in the presentation of the viewpoint. Many candidates failed to provide a sufficient depth of contextual knowledge. Weaker answers provided a list of quotations, albeit relevant, but that remained undigested and not critically evaluated. There was also some unsophisticated evaluation of the provenance, with simple assertions that led candidates to dismiss documents as being biased or unreliable sources.

Question 2

Candidates generally struggled to present a rigorous structure and were unable to provide detailed analysis, especially on the relative coherence of Maoism as a political philosophy. In most answers, there was an insufficient focus on ideology and ideas rather the answers tended to focus on policies.

Question 3

Candidates managed to identify some of the principal social changes, though many answers lacked sufficient range and detailed evaluation. In particular, there was not sustained analysis on how much social change was evident in the period 1949–1956. Some answers also lacked a chronological range, while others set the scene by incorporating pre-1949 material. Those answers that were focused on China's foreign policy tended to be overly descriptive and lacked direct relevance, especially narratives on the Korean War. Some responses addressed the question 'What were the social changes in China...?' rather than the question set. The more successful answers included identification of clear themes and analysis of how much social change took place for each factor.

Question 4

Candidates rarely sustained focus in explaining the beginning and end of the Cultural Revolution and some lacked full consideration of either the beginning or the end. Some candidates initially pointed out that there were too many parallels to separate the two themes, then described the key characteristics of the Cultural Revolution rather than answering the set question. Other candidates offered imbalanced answers focusing almost exclusively on the beginning or the end. There was some engagement with the historiography, but, on occasions, the candidate then drifted from the wording of the question.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/75

Special Subject – The Civil Rights
Movement in the USA, 1954–1980

Key Messages

- In **(a)** questions, quite specific and detailed comparisons and contrasts relevant to the question should be made in a point by point approach, not by sequential treatment of the documents.
- In **(b)** questions, there should be the deployment of contextual knowledge as this is a specific requirement of the question. This should be applied to the consideration of the documents not merely added at the end.
- In the essay answers, responses would be deepened by appropriate use of relevant documents studied.

General Comments

There were more Special Subjects taken this year and there were some strong answers that emphasised the differences and similarities in **(a)**. However, some candidates did not respond to the question but wrote a generalised comparison or contrast. Responses to the part **(a)** questions benefit from a close reading and close comparisons of the two sources.

Use of contextual knowledge as well as documentary support is stipulated for the part **(b)** questions. The best answers were well organised, such as by identifying documents which offered similar interpretations and then assessed that interpretation by use of contextual knowledge and/or by interrogation using evidence extracted from the other documents, taking into account that they should not necessarily be taken at face value, but rather critically evaluated as historical evidence. (A good example of this can be seen in Paper 53 in which the apparent fulsome willingness of the abbots to surrender their beloved religious houses to the King must be seen in the context of the likely consequences of any signs of reluctance.) The best answers took these matters into account when utilising the documentary evidence to argue for or against the hypothesis, analyse a source, or use the evidence of the source to analyse another source. There was deployment of knowledge in many responses in part **(b)**, but some answers did not go beyond a treatment of the documents and made no use of knowledge. However, successful **(b)** questions were led by a study of the documents and not approached as an essay answer in which the documents merely illustrate points which candidates wish to make about the issue in the question. Many responses would have benefitted had they used contextual knowledge to support an argument led by the documents, rather than using evidence taken from the documents to support an argument constructed largely separately to the documents. Successful responses took this approach to the interplay and balance of contextual and documentary evidence.

Many of the points made in the Outline Papers' reports apply to the essays written in the Special Subject papers, in particular that successful candidates responded to the precise demands of the question whereas this was lacking in the weak responses. However, the essays are on a carefully studied Special Subject and would be enriched by some references to key texts studied. There was some very strong understanding shown of the issues in both questions with some insightful and sustained analysis, and the points made about the individual questions must be seen in that context.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** The majority of candidates understood the main thrust of the two documents in that Kennedy's approach (Document C) was essentially a "top-down" legislative approach to secure equality before the law for all citizens whilst Young in Document C was advocating an approach more focused on improving the economic lot of the black community so that they could enjoy those civil rights. Many

candidates also noted the similarity between the two documents in terms of the potential for violence if nothing was done – ‘their only remedy is in the street’ (Document B) and ‘Violence could erupt at any moment unless realistic action is taken’ (Document C).

Better responses provided some context for the two documents, with references to either the March on Washington or the Birmingham campaign giving support to the potential for trouble if nothing was done. Some candidates were able to use Brown versus the Board of Education with reference to Kennedy’s comment about ‘resolving lawsuits designed to implement the Supreme Court decision nine years ago’. There was, however, some confusion over Young’s call for a ‘domestic Marshall Plan’. Young was not expressing a view that black citizens should help themselves. His point was that the Marshall Plan would create a situation in which the black communities would be enabled to help themselves.

- (b) The best responses to this question understood that the documents had to be the centre of the answer and had to drive the different arguments. Thus, they tended to group the documents so as to support or challenge the statement. Some also drew a clear distinction between legislative leadership and socio-economic leadership. Candidates who started their responses in this fashion tended to maintain a clearer structure to their answer and so produced more effective arguments. Better responses also provided relevant examples of contextual knowledge to support or challenge the documents (e.g. Eisenhower’s actions at Little Rock, Kennedy’s support for Coretta Scott King, the work of Earl Warren, etc.). The best responses also used their own knowledge to evaluate the documents.

Less good responses were often characterised by a lack of specific grouping but an approach that grouped implicitly by handling the documents, not in alphabetical order but by whether the main thrust was for or against the question’s interpretation. These responses had some analysis but also some description of content, and had rather fewer examples of contextual knowledge though this was not always particularly specific.

The least effective responses tended to review each document in order, frequently paraphrasing the content and lacking contextual knowledge. Alternatively, there were examples of responses that were not document driven. In these cases the documents were either referenced or used to greater or lesser extent to illustrate a ‘standard’ essay. Responses to this question must be firmly grounded in the documents.

Question 2

The best responses to this question began by outlining the different factors to be considered. They normally had an initial focus on the key issue (“mass participation”) before reviewing other factors. Most significantly, the responses assigned some level of relative importance to each factor. Contextual knowledge was used to illustrate these factors rather than being used merely to tell the story of mass participation or the work of Martin Luther King. The final judgement was more than just a summary of what had gone before in that it provided a judgement on the relative importance of mass participation as against any other factors, and so placed the key issue in a wider context.

Less strong responses identified different factors and exemplified these with contextual knowledge. However, there was little sense that any one factor was more important than another and the conclusion tended to underline this by being an overview of the different factors without any sense of relative significance or importance. The weakest approach was to describe a range of events (perhaps chronologically), but without relating these to the key issue or other factors. The focus tended to be wholly on events which were linked implicitly to the key issue, but not made directly relevant to it.

Many responses cited white racist resistance as an important, sometimes the most important, factor in strengthening the Civil Rights Movement. Whilst there is no doubt that such violent resistance as seen at Little Rock and in the Birmingham campaign helped harden many views and drove Presidents to act, it was essentially reactive and not a deliberate driving force behind the Civil Rights Movement. Where candidates made that difference fairly explicit, credit was given to the argument.

Question 3

Better responses were characterised by an analytical answer that used contextual knowledge to support the different arguments. They remained focused on the key issue (the role of the Southern Christian Leadership Council), but also gave due consideration to other civil rights groups, such as The NAACP, CORE and the

Black Panthers. Contextual knowledge supported arguments by showing what different groups achieved and the impact each had on the movement for civil rights. Such knowledge was not just provided, but was deployed to illustrate specific points. Judgements assigned relative significance to the different groups and evaluated the SCLC in its wider context, rather than just indicating that it was of great importance.

Question 4

Better responses were clear from the start what was meant by “discrimination” even if it was not explicitly defined. This was important as a failure to be clear-headed about what was understood by the term meant that responses were less focussed and it was less easy to identify other factors that provided opposition to the civil rights movement. The lack of voting rights and inequality of treatment before the law were two possible areas for further analysis. Better responses also used contextual knowledge to support the different arguments, for example to show how discrimination was gradually undermined by legal judgements or how a movement like the Ku Klux Klan operated both in terms of violence but also in supporting the “ethos” of discrimination that existed in the USA. Judgements did not merely review the different arguments but assigned relative significance to each and provided some conclusion directly linked to the idea of “main form of opposition”.