

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- Demands for judgement and higher order thinking skills, rather than just explanation, must be met in order to achieve the highest bands.
- When questions ask for consideration of a stated factor, consideration of that factor must be central to the response and not disregarded or addressed only in part.
- The exact wording of the question must be considered to ensure that its demands are met and the response is focused on the terms of the question and not only on the topic in general.

General comments

Essay answers were often well structured, demonstrated the selection of a breadth and suitable depth of knowledge, and the standards of written communication were generally high. There was also a very wide range of questions over the three papers that were answered, showing that centres had taken advantage of the opportunities offered by Pre-U History to study a variety of topics. Generally, explanation was more developed in answers than the higher order thinking skills of assessment and judgement. It was common for a view to be expressed in the opening paragraph which was then not developed in the essay as a whole. This was the case in answers to questions which needed a supported view about the relative importance of different factors ('What best explains....?') or the importance or significance of a named factor. It was not unusual to see explanation of a list of factors predominate, which really gave little weight to the demand of the question for specific judgement.

Such answers had merit: they were often clear and well expressed and offered some clear and well supported explanations. However, a dimension was missing, and these responses needed engage with sustained discussion centred round the formation of the judgement in order to receive credit in the higher bands. The effort which had gone into writing explanations, often accompanied by relevant references to historians and some factual detail, was apparent, but more consideration of the relative importance of different explanations or how the concepts in questions might be addressed would have resulted in higher mark levels and shown a deeper understanding.

In some responses, the candidate's judgement, his or her considered opinion as a result of reflection on the topics studied, seemed to be stifled by a desire to offer factual information to support a series of explanations or points. These responses might have scored marks in the higher levels of the mark scheme had they demonstrated higher order thinking skills which demonstrated reflection on the topics studied. Many answers needed a more direct response to the question, as all require analysis and judgement for a full response. These elements needed to be more developed in many responses, even if this meant limiting explanations and examples, as these were sometimes unnecessarily long, and points could have been supported more succinctly. For example, in Paper 13, **Question 6** asked specifically about British 'incompetence' as being responsible for the loss of the American colonies. It did not ask whether 'Britain' was responsible but rather about 'incompetence'. It is important to note exactly what is being asked. Where judgement was offered in answer, and where there was an engagement with the concepts in the question, essays were rewarded appropriately with marks in the higher bands.

When there is a specific element in the question, the strongest responses focussed their answers on the consideration of that factor, then weight must be given to that factor and other factors must be related to it. Weaker responses to this type of questions often considered the factor in the question only in part of the response, but then wrote separately about other factors and did not clearly weigh those factors against the lead factor. An example of this type of question is **Question 10** on Paper 22, which asked whether religion was the chief cause of the instability in the period 1547–1558. This was not the same as 'Was there a mid-Tudor crisis?' or 'What best explains the instability in the mid-Tudor period?' to which a response may have

given equal weight to various factors when forming a judgement. The whole of this question is about the importance of the factor of religion, and answers that were focused on this consideration, with other factors written about in a way that weighed them against this factor, were awarded marks in higher bands.

Some questions asked about two specific elements, and the strongest responses to these questions focused their analysis on those two elements and formed a judgement about them; some weaker responses offered a view based on a third element that has not been asked about and did not consider the named elements sufficiently to answer the question. An example of a question which sometimes elicited responses of this nature was on Paper 11, **Question 13** which asked whether '*William of Normandy's victory at the battle of Hastings owed more to the deficiencies of Harold II than to his own abilities*'. The strongest responses to this question focused entirely on these two elements, whereas weaker answers wrote a general critical survey of explanations for the outcome of the battle, and sometimes formed a judgement framed in terms of a third factor, such as luck, whereas the question asked the candidate to weigh one factor/explanation against another.

Some responses considered historians' interpretations as part of their responses. In weaker responses this sometimes consisted only of naming an historian or a school of interpretation, or explaining what it was and the position taken on the issue in the question. However, there were also several examples of stronger responses which used historiographical information more effectively by critically assessing the applicability of interpretations and approaches to the issue in the question, and analysing how far those arguments could be applied to and inform the issue in the question, in order to help to form a judgement.

Overall, there was a range of responses from fragmentary description to analysis that showed a remarkable degree of intellectual maturity, and a written style which would not have been out of place in higher education. There were some responses in which obvious limitations in knowledge restricted the credit that could be given to a response because the points made in the responses were not substantiated with evidence. More frequently though, responses showed depth and breadth of knowledge about the issue, but demonstrated less developed critical skills. In other cases, the exact terms of question were not focused on, so that knowledge was not deployed appropriately or effectively.

Comments on specific questions

Where too few candidates answered a question for a report to be written, no report will appear below.

Question 4

Weaker answers to this question suffered from a dearth of material and, beyond expounding Penda's victories, had little to add. Stronger answers considered his administrative and diplomatic skills. Some argued that he was a proud and deliberate pagan and believed his success stemmed from the favour of his Gods, and so was far more than just a successful soldier. His eventual defeat was often quoted to provide an alternative argument.

Question 8

Weaker answers to this question tended to be an account of the reigns of Aethelbald and Offa, with the factors leading to their success largely implicit in the argument. Better responses identified a series of possible explanations. These often included the military power to extend their rule and the use they made of the Church. Answers then went on to argue that Offa's power was boosted by his diplomatic ties with Europe and by his reform of government. His coinage was often used as an example to illustrate how powerful he was. Most answers referred to the eponymous Dyke, but a few neglected it entirely.

Question 10

Few stronger answers to this question were seen, as most of the responses needed to have a much clearer definition of the problems that faced these rulers. General accounts of the reigns of Eadwig and Edgar were not sufficiently focused on the terms of the question.

Question 11

Some responses did not focus sufficiently on 'outcome'. They outlined the reasons for the renewed Viking incursions but did not always analyse the reasons for Viking success. Stronger answers identified some explanations, such as the raising of large sums to pay off the Scandinavian invaders, which was a powerful

incentive to the Vikings to carry on raiding. The defeat at Maldon was generally blamed on the ineffectiveness of the king. The invasions of Swein and the destruction of the Fenland abbeys and the installation of a Danish army on the Isle of Wight were all outcomes which Ethelred seemed powerless to counter. His misguided attempt to get the upper hand on St Brice's Day and his apparent subservience to Eadric Streona in his later years were other results of his incompetence.

Question 12

This was a question that expected a clear judgement about the power of the monarchy. Some stronger responses established criteria by which the strength could be measured and often pointed out that what made a monarchy strong in this period was military might. On this score they often judged Edward harshly. Some responses argued that Edward had made sure the monarchy survived by co-operating with the Godwins and that his latter years, where he ruled with Harold as *sub-regulus*, were peaceful and prosperous and so fulfilled one of the purposes of the monarchy. Some even suggested that the monarchy could not have been that weak since it was so desirable a conquest in 1066, while others maintained the opposite, that it was weak and hence fell victim to invaders. The role of religion similarly was interpreted both as a strengthening feature, since the Church was a powerful ally, or a weakening factor, since Edward devoted so much time and money to rebuilding Westminster Abbey. Weaker responses laid out the facts but did not relate them well to the question, or found it problematic to distinguish between the person of Edward and the institution of the monarchy.

Question 13

Answers showed an impressive knowledge of the battle and the events that occurred in the months preceding it. However, there was a tendency in many answers to bring in other factors rather than focus on the issue of comparison integral to the question. 'Harold's deficiencies' were interpreted by some answers to include structural weaknesses in the Anglo-Saxon military system, and the Battle of Stamford Bridge was sometimes discussed with a level of detail which led some to move away from the focus of the question into broader discussions about Hardrada's invasions. When considering the battle itself, answers included William's preparations, his gaining papal support, his actions of landing which brought Harold to battle, his use of cavalry and archers and the feigned retreat, and finally his killing of Harold, possible in a purposeful way. Many pointed out that the length of the battle showed how equally matched the opponents were and so the deciding moment came in the death of Harold, however William contrived it. There was also a strong tendency to deal with luck separate from the focus of the question, thus drifting from the actual question. Discussion that was more focused on how the battle was decided on the basis of what can be reconstructed about Harold's strategy and tactics, and how William's abilities in terms of tactical and broader strategic / logistical / diplomatic issues, would have made a difference but the best answers were able to give a direct comparison of William and Harold.

Question 14

Stronger responses to this question had a clear idea about what a well governed country looked like in this period and recognised that popular participation was not likely to be encouraged by any ruler. Hence they praised the establishment of a firm regime and William's determined dealings with his enemies. His use of the venal Ralph Flambard to raise money was also commended, as the income provided for troops and the machinery to keep order. There were perhaps more confident assertions about the development of the Exchequer under William than is directly supported by the evidence, and furthermore some answers did end up basing their discussion on material more appropriate to Henry I's reign than William's. Some weaker responses strayed away from England into Normandy and Scotland. These examples could only be made relevant insofar as they contributed to better government in England. Similarly, long accounts of William's troubles with the Church and his quarrel with Anselm needed to be directed at the issue of good government. As Anselm lacked the backing of most of the bishops who supported William and his attempts to control the English Church, some answers argued that these issues showed good, rather than poor, government. One or two answers digressed into discussions about the reliability of Eadmer as a source. Several answers also wanted to discuss good government in the context of William's military record, which led several answers to discuss William's expeditions in Wales or Scotland in such detail as to move away from the focus of the question: England's government. This was symptomatic of a deeper problem, in which several answers appeared to be answering the question of whether William was a good king rather than looking at the structures of government and how effective William and his servants were in managing them. Answers could have used the Coronation Charter of Henry I in their answers more effectively.

Question 22

Weaker answers were not sufficiently focused on the 'long' civil war and spent too much time analysing the causes of the outbreak of the conflict. Suggesting that Henry I's ineffective arrangements for the succession made the war longer was not especially convincing. Stronger responses argued that it was the inability of either Stephen or Matilda to win the war which made it so long, and illustrated their argument with precise examples, showing how both of them either failed to take decisive action or were unable to gather and keep sufficient support to do so. There was some good discussion about the role of the baronage, some answers maintaining that the nobles changed sides for their own advantage and prolonged the war because it benefited them, while others argued that the nobles were not the cause of the length of the war as disorder was not a desirable state for the propertied classes.

Question 23

There was knowledge of England during the reign of Richard the Lionheart and in particular the actions of his regents and representatives, specifically Hubert Walter and William Longchamp. Answers were able to explain the judicial and administrative reforms of the 1190s in some detail, and there was also knowledge about the financial demands of Richard's government through the funding of the third crusade, the ransom for Richard and the campaigns against Philip Augustus. Responses to this question needed to focus on the question of damage to England caused by the absences of Richard I. Weaker answers gave an account of the events of the reign and some digressed to cover the Third Crusade. Some stronger answers argued effectively that Richard made careful preparations to ensure the country did not suffer and that the government was in safe hands while he was absent. He took care to remove Longchamp quickly when the latter's misdeeds became apparent. The raising of large sums of money to finance the Crusade and to ransom the king was taken by most answers as an example of the suffering caused by Richard's absence. There was also discussion in stronger answers about the role of Prince John and how far his activities led to destabilisation and thus the government suffering. Some answers considered the impact on the Church and stronger responses tried to show how this could be linked to government.

Question 24

There were a number of weak responses to this question, which moved away from the focus on the loss of John's lands in France to other aspects of his reign, most notably his relationship with his barons. Arguing that Magna Carta led to the loss of the lands was not a convincing approach. Stronger responses looked in detail at John's personal responsibility, citing his poor decisions in his marriage and providing Philip Augustus with an excellent excuse for attacking him, along with his apparent inactivity in Normandy. They showed how he alienated many of his supporters by actions such as the murder of Arthur. They balanced this with some attempts to defend John and suggest that Mirebeau and his plan to relieve Château Gaillard showed he was not wholly incapable. The most effective answers then went on to put forward alternative explanations, especially the financial and military capabilities of Philip II and his determination to defeat John. They came to a variety of conclusions about how to balance these explanations. Some suggested that the Angevin Empire could not be sustained indefinitely in any case. Others became too involved in consideration of the debate about whether John or Philip had the greater financial resources.

Question 27

Candidates demonstrated some good knowledge of the various statutes and reforms introduced by Edward during his reign and their strengths and weaknesses. Answers could have been improved by more consistent and detailed focus on the consequences of these reforms rather than simply discussing the problems that they aimed to solve when they were introduced. There was not always enough discussion of what effective government actually meant in practice or how it can be measured.

Question 28

Weaker responses outlined some of the reforms of Edward I and then asserted that they did or did not lead to more effective government. Some of these were not always well focused on the reforms and digressed into other aspects of the reign, notably the impact of wars with France, Scotland and in Wales. There was not always much detailed knowledge of the actual terms of the Statutes or the problems they were designed to suppress. Stronger responses were able to show that Burnell and his officials were determined to improve law and order and administration and that the complaints of the nobles about incursions into their power showed that the reforms had an impact. Others argued that the reforms increased royal powers but did not necessarily lead to better government. They also suggested that the reforms to the composition of Parliament had a long-lasting effect.

Question 29

Responses needed to be focused on the deposition of Edward in 1327. Stronger answers considered the immediate reasons, stressing the alienation of Isabella, her presence in France with the heir to the throne and the support she had from Mortimer and other nobles, and then explored the longer-term factors that had led to this situation. These could include the misrule of the Despencers, Edward's personal characteristics that led to baronial opposition and his military incompetence. They suggested that the existence of a viable alternative ruler was a key factor and that led to those who had given Edward their backing previously to withdraw their support. Less effective answers discussed Edward's failings from the start of his reign, including discussions of Piers Gaveston, who was executed in 1312, well before 1327, Bannockburn and other failings early in the reign but failed to discuss explicitly how this linked to his deposition. The roles of the Lords Ordainer and Lancaster were often overemphasised.

Question 30

Responses to this question were generally effective and were divided between those who blamed Edward for his problems and those who were more understanding of the royal dilemma. The former cited his reliance on William of Wykeham, his raising of taxes to pay for the unsuccessful French Wars, the opposition from the Good Parliament and his being in thrall to Alice Perrers and her cronies. The latter stressed his ill-health which reduced his role in government and the impact of the death of Philippa, along with the decline of the Black Prince and the rise to power of John of Gaunt. They also referenced the revival in France under Charles V, which made fighting there more problematic. Some suggested that the end of a long reign is often a time of difficulty for a monarch.

Question 31

Responses to this question needed to be aware of the characteristics of a despotic government. Weaker answers outlined some of Richard II's actions and then proclaimed that these were despotic. Stronger answers considered there might be a distinction between the perception of Richard's rule by the barons and chroniclers and the actuality. They suggested that Richard was aiming at an increase in royal power, in accordance with his views of the divine right of kings, but that despotism was not his intention and that the institutions of government were sufficiently established to prevent it, as, indeed, proved to be the case. Thus it was not in his power to be a despot. Once he began to challenge the rights of the nobles to hold their property by confiscating the inheritance of Henry Bolingbroke, his downfall was assured, they argued. There was some effective discussion of the origin of Richard's views on kingship.

Question 32

Stronger responses equated survival with success in the reign of Henry IV, given the circumstances of his accession. Thus his suppression of rebellions and establishment of sound government were seen as successes. His relationship with parliament was assessed as less successful, but he was more effective in his firm support of the Church. Stronger responses pointed out that rebellions continued to the end of his reign and the fractious relationship with his heir was a problem. Henry was also in poor health in his later years, so not wholly successful. Weaker answers tended to select some events of the reign and then assert that these showed Henry was or was not successful.

Question 33

Most answers to this question were able to weigh up the weaknesses of the French under Charles VI against the strengths of the English under Henry V. They tended to conclude that the paralysing Armagnac-Burgundian rivalry made it only too easy for Henry V to succeed. They also suggested that Henry's diplomatic skills in building alliances against the French and his military ability shown at Agincourt and the siege of Rouen contributed. He was also helped by the support of his brothers. Some argued that the wet conditions at Agincourt demoralised the French soldiers. There was some discussion about the morality of Henry's slaughter of prisoners and his treatment of women and children fleeing from Rouen, but these were really peripheral issues.

Question 34

There were few strong answers to this question. Weaker responses needed to focus much more specifically on 1461. They tended to root their explanations in the events of the 1440s and the rivalry of Somerset and York, with insufficient consideration of the aftermath of the first battle of St Alban's and of Henry's incapacity. There were some stronger answers that were able to analyse the role of Margaret. Some were very hostile and blamed her entirely. Others were more sympathetic and saw her as a mother determined to protect her

son in the absence of a strong father figure. Most suggested that Henry was far more to blame for the loss of his throne in the long term, but that Margaret had her share of responsibility in her tactics at the Parliament of Devils and treatment of York. Bastard feudalism also had some supporters, but this was rarely convincingly argued.

Question 36

Better answers showed a good understanding of the first decade of Edward IV's reign and his weaknesses and vulnerabilities as a ruler during this period. There was explanation of the continued resistance from Lancastrians and the alienation of Warwick particularly through the marriage to Elizabeth Woodville. The importance of Warwick was considered throughout and there was emphasis on how fragile Edward's security was as well as discussion of the way he strengthened his control over the country thanks to his military victories and by his use of patronage. Some answers were rather one-sided in their approach, discussing Edward's activities before his accession to the throne or elements of domestic policy more applicable to his second reign.

Question 38

The focus on Henry VII's relationship with his nobles was not always maintained and the structure of the answers sometimes lacked precision. Some responses considered the rebellions of the pretenders in great detail, without connecting these to the nobility. Some stronger answers were able to use the material relevantly. They generally argued that Henry's relationship with the nobles was uneasy, given his upbringing and accession to the throne, and he never fully trusted them as his financial and other measures indicated. But most of these responses concluded that the relationship was successful as there were no major noble rebellions and Sir William Stanley's execution encouraged others to be more prudent. Some did suggest that Henry's more ferocious policies, as the succession became more precarious at the end of his reign, might have provoked an uprising had he lived longer. One or two argued that the easy way in which the nobles accepted Henry VIII showed the relationship had not suffered that much.

Question 39

Answers to this question needed to establish what good service to Henry VIII entailed. Weaker responses insisted that Wolsey was largely serving his own interests and his main aim was to become as wealthy as possible, without providing much evidence to support this view. Some suggested that Wolsey used his position in the law courts to this end, without considering that the preservation of law and order was a royal duty and thus a service to the king. Stronger responses argued that Wolsey served the king in providing funds for his foreign policy, keeping the Church subservient and promoting royal interests in Europe. His main failure was seen to be over the divorce. Some stronger answers considered that even here he served the king as best he could, but was unable to overcome the problems in his way. They made it clear that Wolsey's position depended entirely on the favour of Henry VIII and had to not serve the king. Weaker responses needed to be more aware of the restraints on Wolsey in their assessments.

Question 40

Answers to this question struggled with the concept of significance. Some weaker responses spent some time on the opposition of Elizabeth Barton, More and Fisher and then concluded it was not significant as it had so little support. Stronger responses assessed the potential significance and suggested that the vigour with which this opposition was put down indicated the government feared it would be significant. Some weaker responses made virtually no reference to the Pilgrimage of Grace or argued it lacked significance because it was restricted to northern England. Stronger responses analysed the threat it presented and the way in which a number of grievances came together. There was some less focused discussion centred on why there was not more opposition. Some of this material could have been of relevance, but it needed to be used to assess the degree of significance.

Question 41

There was often insufficient understanding of what is meant by 'instability' in the answers to this question. Weaker responses selected exemplars from the period and then asserted that these showed instability. The question was often approached by dealing with the rule of Somerset, Northumberland and Mary I in turn, where a thematic approach would have been more effective. There was some stronger discussion about the role of religion in the Western rebellion, Ket and Wyatt and how far these risings led to instability. Some answers also considered how destabilising Mary's persecutions were, with some arguing opposition was slight, while others suggested there would have been serious trouble had Mary not died when she did. Other

causes of possible instability were generally less well analysed. Most notably, weaker answers considered that the foreign policy of both the Protectors caused instability without any real evidence to back this up. Some stronger responses were able to evaluate the importance of economic factors and some argued that inflation and poverty were the most likely causes of instability. Some weaker answers took issue with the terms of the question and tried to assert that there was no instability in the period.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/12
British History Outlines c.1399–1815

Key messages

- Demands for judgement and higher order thinking skills, rather than just explanation, must be met in order to achieve the highest bands.
- When questions ask for consideration of a stated factor, consideration of that factor must be central to the response and not disregarded or addressed only in part.
- The exact wording of the question must be considered to ensure that its demands are met and the response is focused on the terms of the question and not only on the topic in general.

General comments

Essay answers were often well structured, demonstrated the selection of a breadth and suitable depth of knowledge, and the standards of written communication were generally high. There was also a very wide range of questions over the three papers that were answered, showing that centres had taken advantage of the opportunities offered by Pre-U History to study a variety of topics. Generally, explanation was more developed in answers than the higher order thinking skills of assessment and judgement. It was common for a view to be expressed in the opening paragraph which was then not developed in the essay as a whole. This was the case in answers to questions which needed a supported view about the relative importance of different factors ('What best explains....?') or the importance or significance of a named factor. It was not unusual to see explanation of a list of factors predominate, which really gave little weight to the demand of the question for specific judgement.

Such answers had merit: they were often clear and well expressed and offered some clear and well supported explanations. However, a dimension was missing, and these responses needed engage with sustained discussion centred round the formation of the judgement in order to receive credit in the higher bands. The effort which had gone into writing explanations, often accompanied by relevant references to historians and some factual detail, was apparent, but more consideration of the relative importance of different explanations or how the concepts in questions might be addressed would have resulted in higher mark levels and shown a deeper understanding.

In some responses, the candidate's judgement, his or her considered opinion as a result of reflection on the topics studied, seemed to be stifled by a desire to offer factual information to support a series of explanations or points. These responses might have scored marks in the higher levels of the mark scheme had they demonstrated higher order thinking skills which demonstrated reflection on the topics studied. Many answers needed a more direct response to the question, as all require analysis and judgement for a full response. These elements needed to be more developed in many responses, even if this meant limiting explanations and examples, as these were sometimes unnecessarily long, and points could have been supported more succinctly. For example, in Paper 13, **Question 6** asked specifically about British 'incompetence' as being responsible for the loss of the American colonies. It did not ask whether 'Britain' was responsible but rather about 'incompetence'. It is important to note exactly what is being asked. Where judgement was offered in answer, and where there was an engagement with the concepts in the question, essays were rewarded appropriately with marks in the higher bands.

When there is a specific element in the question, the strongest responses focussed their answers on the consideration of that factor, then weight must be given to that factor and other factors must be related to it. Weaker responses to this type of questions often considered the factor in the question only in part of the response, but then wrote separately about other factors and did not clearly weigh those factors against the lead factor. An example of this type of question is **Question 10** on Paper 22, which asked whether religion was the chief cause of the instability in the period 1547–1558. This was not the same as 'Was there a mid-Tudor crisis?' or 'What best explains the instability in the mid-Tudor period?' to which a response may have

given equal weight to various factors when forming a judgement. The whole of this question is about the importance of the factor of religion, and answers that were focused on this consideration, with other factors written about in a way that weighed them against this factor, were awarded marks in higher bands.

Some questions asked about two specific elements, and the strongest responses to these questions focused their analysis on those two elements and formed a judgement about them; some weaker responses offered a view based on a third element that has not been asked about and did not consider the named elements sufficiently to answer the question. An example of a question which sometimes elicited responses of this nature was on Paper 11, **Question 13** which asked whether '*William of Normandy's victory at the battle of Hastings owed more to the deficiencies of Harold II than to his own abilities*'. The strongest responses to this question focused entirely on these two elements, whereas weaker answers wrote a general critical survey of explanations for the outcome of the battle, and sometimes formed a judgement framed in terms of a third factor, such as luck, whereas the question asked the candidate to weigh one factor/explanation against another.

Some responses considered historians' interpretations as part of their responses. In weaker responses this sometimes consisted only of naming an historian or a school of interpretation, or explaining what it was and the position taken on the issue in the question. However, there were also several examples of stronger responses which used historiographical information more effectively by critically assessing the applicability of interpretations and approaches to the issue in the question, and analysing how far those arguments could be applied to and inform the issue in the question, in order to help to form a judgement.

Overall, there was a range of responses from fragmentary description to analysis that showed a remarkable degree of intellectual maturity, and a written style which would not have been out of place in higher education. There were some responses in which obvious limitations in knowledge restricted the credit that could be given to a response because the points made in the responses were not substantiated with evidence. More frequently though, responses showed depth and breadth of knowledge about the issue, but demonstrated less developed critical skills. In other cases, the exact terms of question were not focused on, so that knowledge was not deployed appropriately or effectively.

Comments on specific questions

Where too few candidates answered a question for a report to be written, no report will appear below.

Question 1

Stronger responses equated survival with success in the reign of Henry IV, given the circumstances of his accession. Thus his suppression of rebellions and establishment of sound government were seen as successes. His relationship with parliament was assessed as less successful, but he was more effective in his firm support of the Church. Stronger responses pointed out that rebellions continued to the end of his reign and the fractious relationship with his heir was a problem. Henry was also in poor health in his later years, so not wholly successful. Weaker answers tended to select some events of the reign and then assert that these showed Henry was or was not successful.

Question 2

Most answers to this question were able to weigh up the weaknesses of the French under Charles VI against the strengths of the English under Henry V. They tended to conclude that the paralysing Armagnac-Burgundian rivalry made it only too easy for Henry V to succeed. They also suggested that Henry's diplomatic skills in building alliances against the French and his military ability shown at Agincourt and the siege of Rouen contributed. He was also helped by the support of his brothers. Some argued that the wet conditions at Agincourt demoralised the French soldiers. There was some discussion about the morality of Henry's slaughter of prisoners and his treatment of women and children fleeing from Rouen, but these were really peripheral issues.

Question 3

There were few strong answers to this question. Weaker responses needed to focus much more specifically on 1461. They tended to root their explanations in the events of the 1440s and the rivalry of Somerset and York, with insufficient consideration of the aftermath of the first battle of St Alban's and of Henry's incapacity. There were some stronger answers that were able to analyse the role of Margaret. Some were very hostile and blamed her entirely. Others were more sympathetic and saw her as a mother determined to protect her

son in the absence of a strong father figure. Most suggested that Henry was far more to blame for the loss of his throne in the long term, but that Margaret had her share of responsibility in her tactics at the Parliament of Devils and treatment of York. Bastard feudalism also had some supporters, but this was rarely convincingly argued.

Question 7

Better answers showed a good understanding of the first decade of Edward IV's reign and his weaknesses and vulnerabilities as a ruler during this period. There was explanation of the continued resistance from Lancastrians and the alienation of Warwick particularly through the marriage to Elizabeth Woodville. The importance of Warwick was considered throughout and there was emphasis on how fragile Edward's security was as well as discussion of the way he strengthened his control over the country thanks to his military victories and by his use of patronage. Some answers were rather one-sided in their approach, discussing Edward's activities before his accession to the throne or elements of domestic policy more applicable to his second reign.

Question 7

The focus on Henry VII's relationship with his nobles was not always maintained and the structure of the answers sometimes lacked precision. Some responses considered the rebellions of the pretenders in great detail, without connecting these to the nobility. Some stronger answers were able to use the material relevantly. They generally argued that Henry's relationship with the nobles was uneasy, given his upbringing and accession to the throne, and he never fully trusted them as his financial and other measures indicated. But most of these responses concluded that the relationship was successful as there were no major noble rebellions and Sir William Stanley's execution encouraged others to be more prudent. Some did suggest that Henry's more ferocious policies, as the succession became more precarious at the end of his reign, might have provoked an uprising had he lived longer. One or two argued that the easy way in which the nobles accepted Henry VIII showed the relationship had not suffered that much.

Question 8

Answers to this question needed to establish what good service to Henry VIII entailed. Weaker responses insisted that Wolsey was largely serving his own interests and his main aim was to become as wealthy as possible, without providing much evidence to support this view. Some suggested that Wolsey used his position in the law courts to this end, without considering that the preservation of law and order was a royal duty and thus a service to the king. Stronger responses argued that Wolsey served the king in providing funds for his foreign policy, keeping the Church subservient and promoting royal interests in Europe. His main failure was seen to be over the divorce. Some stronger answers considered that even here he served the king as best he could, but was unable to overcome the problems in his way. They made it clear that Wolsey's position depended entirely on the favour of Henry VIII and had to not serve the king. Weaker responses needed to be more aware of the restraints on Wolsey in their assessments.

Question 9

Answers to this question struggled with the concept of significance. Some weaker responses spent some time on the opposition of Elizabeth Barton, More and Fisher and then concluded it was not significant as it had so little support. Stronger responses assessed the potential significance and suggested that the vigour with which this opposition was put down indicated the government feared it would be significant. Some weaker responses made virtually no reference to the Pilgrimage of Grace or argued it lacked significance because it was restricted to northern England. Stronger responses analysed the threat it presented and the way in which a number of grievances came together. There was some less focused discussion centred on why there was not more opposition. Some of this material could have been of relevance, but it needed to be used to assess the degree of significance.

Question 10

There was often insufficient understanding of what is meant by 'instability' in the answers to this question. Weaker responses selected exemplars from the period and then asserted that these showed instability. The question was often approached by dealing with the rule of Somerset, Northumberland and Mary I in turn, where a thematic approach would have been more effective. There was some stronger discussion about the role of religion in the Western rebellion, Ket and Wyatt and how far these risings led to instability. Some answers also considered how destabilising Mary's persecutions were, with some arguing opposition was slight, while others suggested there would have been serious trouble had Mary not died when she did. Other

causes of possible instability were generally less well analysed. Most notably, weaker answers considered that the foreign policy of both the Protectors caused instability without any real evidence to back this up. Some stronger responses were able to evaluate the importance of economic factors and some argued that inflation and poverty were the most likely causes of instability. Some weaker answers took issue with the terms of the question and tried to assert that there was no instability in the period.

Question 11

This question was not often answered effectively. Weaker responses tended to assert that certain events constituted a threat without explaining wherein the threat lay. This was especially the case with the Puritans, as the threat to the structure of Elizabeth's Church and to her authority was rarely fully understood. Some of these answers suggested that there were no threats as Elizabeth overcame them all. Stronger responses nearly all concluded that the threat from Catholics was greater as they aimed to kill Elizabeth and replace her, whereas Puritans only wanted to reform the Church. One or two had some nice comparisons between Catholic plotters and the writers of the Marprelate tracts. Some suggested that after 1587 there could have been a shift in that Puritans were more of a threat in that period. Weaker answers were often very sparing in their use of material to illustrate their arguments. Some had no reference to the Jesuits and referred to the Puritans in very general terms.

Question 12

There were some well informed and clearly argued responses to this question. Most of them were able to identify the problems that faced Mary in Scotland and assess her degree of success. The general verdict was that she succeeded in dealing with the religious issue when she first arrived and established relatively sound government, but failed spectacularly over the question of her marriage and that this was a key failure as it led directly to her downfall. Some of Mary's defenders suggested that no-one could have dealt successfully with the Scottish nobles, compounded by the vicious criticism of John Knox. Others were less generous and saw many of her decisions as deeply flawed.

Question 13

In general, the responses to this question struggled to combine a focus on Elizabeth's aims in different policy areas with a detailed examination of the role of her council in assisting her in achieving those aims. Some confused council with parliament. Most responses were quite vague about the composition of the council, with few mentioning specific individuals within it, and relatively few were able to identify the contributions made by the council in foreign or religious policy. There were some stronger answers that considered the role of faction and how far the ambitions of the councillors affected the advice they gave. The general conclusion was that Elizabeth was well served; better served than she deserved according to one critic, unimpressed by her indecision.

Question 14

Answers to this question very clearly needed to establish what Elizabeth's aims were and could not be effective unless they did so. They also needed to note that it ended in 1588. Stronger responses noted that her aims were not necessarily consistent, especially towards Spain, over the course of the reign. Weaker answers either failed to identify any aims, or focused on less likely scenarios, such as suggesting Elizabeth wanted to extend Protestantism throughout Europe or lived in fear of an invasion from Europe throughout the period. Some concentrated on trading relations but made no mention of the Netherlands. Stronger responses recognised that Elizabeth's aims were constricted by her financial position and were often reactions to events in Europe, so that her scope for making policy was limited. Most suggested that maintaining the independence of the Netherlands was the key issue once the rising had begun there and that this impacted on her relations with both France and Spain. Some used her diplomacy and marriage negotiations effectively in their discussion of her success. Others considered the role of her advisers in making and carrying out foreign policy and so contributing to the outcome. Some concluded that the outbreak of war with Spain showed she failed, while others suggested that deferring the war for so long was a success.

Question 22

Weaker candidates equated success with ability and just described the successes and failures of James' reign. The elements of the reign were often considered in a way that showed some knowledge and understanding, but there was a tendency to present rehearsed arguments about the degree to which problems were inherited, rather than engaging with his ability to deal with them. Discussion of his relations with Parliament was sometimes neglected in favour of lengthy accounts of foreign policy.

Question 23

Weaker answers failed to explain how tyranny would be defined or measured. Others tended to go outside the timeframe of the question, seeking to explain the causes of the Civil War. Others focused on why Charles refused to call Parliament, rather than how tyrannical he was. There was also a tendency to equate unpopularity or Parliamentary opposition with tyranny. Weaker answers discussed the overall success of policies of the 1630s, ignoring or giving only slight attention to the concept of 'tyranny'. Though religious policies were considered, the activities of Thomas Wentworth were often given little or no attention.

Question 24

Answers tended to cover Parliament's strengths, Royalist weakness and then other factors. Stronger responses did attempt to weigh the advantages of Parliament against the supposed weaknesses and poor decisions of the King. Weak ones did so in isolation, whereas stronger answers tried to weigh their relative significance to argue a case. Some answers attempted to argue that 1642 was the key error by Charles that lost the war. The use of knowledge of military events and developments during the war was often limited and the New Model Army's role was often assessed inaccurately.

Question 32

The quality of responses to this question varied in how well they engaged with 'incompetence'. Weaker responses had difficulties distinguishing British incompetence from British weaknesses, and thus offered a comparison of British weaknesses and American strengths. Moreover, whilst a number of responses addressed the role of British government in causing the revolution as a result of the Stamp Act and Coercive Acts, few considered whether these policies were the result of incompetence and even fewer were able to explain why. On the other hand, stronger responses demonstrated an impressive understanding of the key decisions taken by the British government and British military commanders such as Howe, Cornwallis and Burgoyne, and were thus able to offer a precise response to the question. Some perceptive responses saw the connection between the early British military mistakes and the entry of France into the conflict.

Question 34

Candidates showed good knowledge of the period, both in terms of Pitt's period in charge of government between 1783 and 1793 and the vicissitudes of the Whig opposition. Some answers were focused more on why Pitt was able to maintain his position as prime minister rather than focusing explicitly on the emphasis of the question on why the Whigs were kept out of power. Pitt's own strengths, the weaknesses of Foxe and the support of the King were all identified as issues relevant to the question. Some answers discussed material that fell outside of the period in the question and they would be advised to find other detail rather than attempt to justify this selection, which is hard to do convincingly.

Question 35

This question tended to be unevenly answered, with responses focused predominantly on either military strength or diplomacy. Weaker responses were imprecise in explaining how military or diplomatic actions contributed to victory, with the analysis of Britain's role in funding the various coalitions often rather underdeveloped or not considering how Wellington's Peninsular Campaign affected the broader conflict. Stronger answers tended to identify the relationship between military and diplomatic strength, particularly the role played by Britain's naval dominance in allowing her to fund the coalitions against Napoleon. The strongest answers were those which argued that the importance of diplomatic and military strength varied, both in form and over time, and demonstrated a key understanding of how British actions in either field affected Napoleon's plans, for example, by leading him to launch his invasion of Russia.

Question 36

Candidates showed good knowledge of the methods by which the Act of Union with Ireland was secured. Some differentiation between the long-term and short-term factors that led to the Union would have been a better approach to the wording of the question. Some answers could have put more adequate focus on the security aspect in terms of the potential threat of France and which provides a major explanation.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/13
British History Outlines c.1688–2000

Key messages

- Demands for judgement and higher order thinking skills, rather than just explanation, must be met in order to achieve the highest bands.
- When questions ask for consideration of a stated factor, consideration of that factor must be central to the response and not disregarded or addressed only in part.
- The exact wording of the question must be considered to ensure that its demands are met and the response is focused on the terms of the question and not only on the topic in general.

General comments

Essay answers were often well structured, demonstrated the selection of a breadth and suitable depth of knowledge, and the standards of written communication were generally high. There was also a very wide range of questions over the three papers that were answered, showing that centres had taken advantage of the opportunities offered by Pre-U History to study a variety of topics. Generally, explanation was more developed in answers than the higher order thinking skills of assessment and judgement. It was common for a view to be expressed in the opening paragraph which was then not developed in the essay as a whole. This was the case in answers to questions which needed a supported view about the relative importance of different factors ('What best explains....?') or the importance or significance of a named factor. It was not unusual to see explanation of a list of factors predominate, which really gave little weight to the demand of the question for specific judgement.

Such answers had merit: they were often clear and well expressed and offered some clear and well supported explanations. However, a dimension was missing, and these responses needed engage with sustained discussion centred round the formation of the judgement in order to receive credit in the higher bands. The effort which had gone into writing explanations, often accompanied by relevant references to historians and some factual detail, was apparent, but more consideration of the relative importance of different explanations or how the concepts in questions might be addressed would have resulted in higher mark levels and shown a deeper understanding.

In some responses, the candidate's judgement, his or her considered opinion as a result of reflection on the topics studied, seemed to be stifled by a desire to offer factual information to support a series of explanations or points. These responses might have scored marks in the higher levels of the mark scheme had they demonstrated higher order thinking skills which demonstrated reflection on the topics studied. Many answers needed a more direct response to the question, as all require analysis and judgement for a full response. These elements needed to be more developed in many responses, even if this meant limiting explanations and examples, as these were sometimes unnecessarily long, and points could have been supported more succinctly. For example, in Paper 13, **Question 6** asked specifically about British 'incompetence' as being responsible for the loss of the American colonies. It did not ask whether 'Britain' was responsible but rather about 'incompetence'. It is important to note exactly what is being asked. Where judgement was offered in answer, and where there was an engagement with the concepts in the question, essays were rewarded appropriately with marks in the higher bands.

When there is a specific element in the question, the strongest responses focussed their answers on the consideration of that factor, then weight must be given to that factor and other factors must be related to it. Weaker responses to this type of questions often considered the factor in the question only in part of the response, but then wrote separately about other factors and did not clearly weigh those factors against the lead factor. An example of this type of question is **Question 10** on Paper 22, which asked whether religion was the chief cause of the instability in the period 1547–1558. This was not the same as 'Was there a mid-Tudor crisis?' or 'What best explains the instability in the mid-Tudor period?' to which a response may have

given equal weight to various factors when forming a judgement. The whole of this question is about the importance of the factor of religion, and answers that were focused on this consideration, with other factors written about in a way that weighed them against this factor, were awarded marks in higher bands.

Some questions asked about two specific elements, and the strongest responses to these questions focused their analysis on those two elements and formed a judgement about them; some weaker responses offered a view based on a third element that has not been asked about and did not consider the named elements sufficiently to answer the question. An example of a question which sometimes elicited responses of this nature was on Paper 11, **Question 13** which asked whether '*William of Normandy's victory at the battle of Hastings owed more to the deficiencies of Harold II than to his own abilities*'. The strongest responses to this question focused entirely on these two elements, whereas weaker answers wrote a general critical survey of explanations for the outcome of the battle, and sometimes formed a judgement framed in terms of a third factor, such as luck, whereas the question asked the candidate to weigh one factor/explanation against another.

Some responses considered historians' interpretations as part of their responses. In weaker responses this sometimes consisted only of naming an historian or a school of interpretation, or explaining what it was and the position taken on the issue in the question. However, there were also several examples of stronger responses which used historiographical information more effectively by critically assessing the applicability of interpretations and approaches to the issue in the question, and analysing how far those arguments could be applied to and inform the issue in the question, in order to help to form a judgement.

Overall, there was a range of responses from fragmentary description to analysis that showed a remarkable degree of intellectual maturity, and a written style which would not have been out of place in higher education. There were some responses in which obvious limitations in knowledge restricted the credit that could be given to a response because the points made in the responses were not substantiated with evidence. More frequently though, responses showed depth and breadth of knowledge about the issue, but demonstrated less developed critical skills. In other cases, the exact terms of question were not focused on, so that knowledge was not deployed appropriately or effectively.

Comments on specific questions

Where too few candidates answered a question for a report to be written, no report will appear below.

Question 6

The quality of responses to this question varied in how well they engaged with 'incompetence'. Weaker responses had difficulties distinguishing British incompetence from British weaknesses, and thus offered a comparison of British weaknesses and American strengths. Moreover, whilst a number of responses addressed the role of British government in causing the revolution as a result of the Stamp Act and Coercive Acts, few considered whether these policies were the result of incompetence and even fewer were able to explain why. On the other hand, stronger responses demonstrated an impressive understanding of the key decisions taken by the British government and British military commanders such as Howe, Cornwallis and Burgoyne, and were thus able to offer a precise response to the question. Some perceptive responses saw the connection between the early British military mistakes and the entry of France into the conflict.

Question 8

Candidates showed good knowledge of the period, both in terms of Pitt's period in charge of government between 1783 and 1793 and the vicissitudes of the Whig opposition. Some answers were focused more on why Pitt was able to maintain his position as prime minister rather than focusing explicitly on the emphasis of the question on why the Whigs were kept out of power. Pitt's own strengths, the weaknesses of Foxe and the support of the King were all identified as issues relevant to the question. Some answers discussed material that fell outside of the period in the question and they would be advised to find other detail rather than attempt to justify this selection, which is hard to do convincingly.

Question 9

This question tended to be unevenly answered, with responses focused predominantly on either military strength or diplomacy. Weaker responses were imprecise in explaining how military or diplomatic actions contributed to victory, with the analysis of Britain's role in funding the various coalitions often rather underdeveloped or not considering how Wellington's Peninsular Campaign affected the broader conflict.

Stronger answers tended to identify the relationship between military and diplomatic strength, particularly the role played by Britain's naval dominance in allowing her to fund the coalitions against Napoleon. The strongest answers were those which argued that the importance of diplomatic and military strength varied, both in form and over time, and demonstrated a key understanding of how British actions in either field affected Napoleon's plans, for example, by leading him to launch his invasion of Russia.

Question 10

Candidates showed good knowledge of the methods by which the Act of Union with Ireland was secured. Some differentiation between the long-term and short-term factors that led to the Union would have been a better approach to the wording of the question. Some answers could have put more adequate focus on the security aspect in terms of the potential threat of France and which provides a major explanation.

Question 17

Some answers showed good knowledge of the various domestic policies of the Tory government of the 1820s under Lord Liverpool. There was extensive discussion of Robert Peel and his penal reforms, attitudes to economic policy and Catholic emancipation and electoral reform. However, answers did not clarify their working definition of 'Liberal Toryism', which led their analysis to become rather assertive. Some answers went into discussions about the nature of liberalism, which became rather digressive. There were also answers that dealt with the degree of difference between policies before and after 1822 without engaging enough with the concept in the question. The best answers managed to provide a clear analysis of the 1820s with a relative and absolute sense of the term 'liberal'.

Question 18

In general, responses would have improved with more engagement with the question of consistency. Weaker responses tended to be rather one-sided and listed Canning's various aims. They then argued that these aims were consistent or inconsistent without considering whether or not they were consistent with each other or indeed whether they were consistently pursued. Some responses also misinterpreted the question and compared Canning's foreign policy to Castlereagh's. Stronger responses, whether they argued that Canning had consistent aims or not, were distinguished by their ability to discuss competing interpretations, particularly of whether or not Canning pursued a 'liberal' foreign policy and his approach to international interventions. These responses were also the most likely to attempt to identify Canning's overall aims, particularly the importance of maintaining the balance of power and pursuing Britain's commercial interests.

Question 19

This was a popular question and produced responses of widely varying quality. The weakest responses were those that did not identify specific provisions of the Great Reform Act. Otherwise, most responses offered some analysis of the changes to the franchise, but varied in their ability to consider other consequences of the Great Reform Act. Some responses tended to argue that the Great Reform Act changed the nature of British parliamentary politics and parties, often noting the significance of Peel's Tamworth Manifesto, but were unclear in their explanations of how the Great Reform Act resulted in these changes. There was also an assumption that 1832 somehow led to a natural development of a more democratic Britain. The strongest responses were those that were sharply focused on 'significance' by assessing the extent to which the Great Reform Act changed the structure of Britain's social and political systems. Stronger answers were also characterised by great precision, clearly identifying how the Great Reform Act resulted in changes to the party system or encouraged future reform movements, often by referring to specific provisions of the Act.

Question 20

Many responses focused primarily on the weaknesses of the Conservative Party during this period, in particular the divisions after 1846 and the role of the Peelites. This material was covered in some depth, although why this kept the Conservatives out of power was often implicit rather than developed in any depth. There was relatively little discussion of the strengths of the Whigs/Liberals or of the broader national context.

Question 22

Candidates showed good knowledge of the strengths and weaknesses of Disraeli's domestic policies overall. Answers focused on the benefits to wider society of these reforms and the limitations of permissive legislation, but they were less consistent in analysing what success meant. Some looked at how these could be seen as success for Disraeli personally or for the Conservative Party, but a clearer statement of definition

in the introduction of what criteria of 'success' would be used could have been advantageous. Some answers did not consider the earlier period of the question from 1868–1874 in their focus, merely concentrating on Disraeli's domestic policies during his period of government.

Question 23

This was a very popular question with some centres and candidates had a good grasp of the organisational strengths of the Conservative Party, its ability to appeal to newly enfranchised voters and the splits and dissensions that wracked the Liberals. The strongest answers had a clear sense from the start about how far Lord Salisbury's skills at exploiting Liberal weaknesses through the attraction to the party of unionists was more important than the splits over Home Rule occurring in the first place. Answers could have been improved by explicitly focusing on the factor in the question ('Liberal weaknesses') and relatively evaluating its importance rather than just listing the various factors that explained Conservative dominance.

Question 24

Responses often discussed a range of points including the rise of Socialist ideas, the Trades Unions' problems in operating freely, such as the Taff Vale case, and the Lib-Lab pact. More could have been made of how these allowed the Labour Party to establish itself in parliament rather than just using these factors to explain the Labour Party's increase in support and rise in importance. Some answers did not really emphasise the importance of key individuals such as Keir Hardie either and some did not link Taff Vale with trade union support for Labour.

Question 26

Many answers showed knowledge of a range of factors explaining Britain's entry into the First World War. More could have been said about the stated factor in the question, which was sometimes only discussed in terms of dismissing its importance. Other answers merely presented a range of different factors as an unconnected list of reasons. There would have been a much stronger response if the ambiguities of the events under discussion were addressed with a clearer argued approach, where the importance of helping Entente partners or Britain's own self-interests were clearly identified as the main factor, and this was demonstrated through a careful comparison of its manifestation through events.

Question 33

Responses were able to discuss a range of issues that the Coalition government undertook, especially its Housing policies and its handling of foreign policy, including its handling of the Irish situation. There were a surprising number of answers that saw Ireland as part of foreign policy. Some answers included discussion of the Representation of the People Act, which preceded the coalition of 1918–22, or discussed the victory in the war, both of which lay outside the purview of the question. Some answers also lost the focus of the question by considering the Coalition's record in terms of successes and failures and did not consider the issue of 'significance' sufficiently. The treatment of foreign policy could have been more balanced in some cases, with limited assessment of its achievements and limitations. More attention could have been given to the various other policies that the Coalition government introduced, such as raising the school leaving age, demobilisation and national insurance, as the focus was rather narrow.

Answers discussed a range of factors related to the decline of the Liberal Party. The rise of the Labour Party taking voters from the working classes and the effectiveness of the Conservative Party under Stanley Baldwin were both contrasted with the divisions in the Liberals and the collapse of their organisation. Some answers discussed the consequences of the Coalition government and the withdrawal of Conservative support for Lloyd George, which ended up focusing more on this period than that highlighted by the question. More could have been made of the structural problems of the electoral system that disadvantaged third parties as shown by the Liberal campaign of 1929, which had dealt with many of the problems of the earlier elections. The ability to identify different problems being more imperative during the whole time period would have helped some answers reach a more satisfying relative evaluation of factors. Some answers failed to go much beyond 1922 and seemed more like a response to the impact of the First World War on the decline of the Liberals than a direct response to the question set. It is important to look at the dates in the question.

Question 35

There was some sound knowledge of elements of Britain in the 1930s, but some answers were rather vague in their discussion of actual policy. More thought about the two elements of the question would have resulted in stronger answers in some cases, as while 'unemployment' was dealt with, 'depression' was not always

specifically mentioned. There was a good assessment of differences between the south and the north, but this was not really a response to economic problems.

Question 38

Less successful responses, while identifying a number of different consequences of the Suez Crisis, struggled to explain why these resulted from the events of 1956 and did not focus enough on policy, which was the specific focus of the question. There was therefore little focus on the reasons why Britain backed down and how this impacted on policy. Likewise, while it was understood that Britain increasingly depended on the United States, there were few examples of how this changed British foreign policy during this period. There was some more developed analysis of the impact of changing attitudes to Europe and the policy it led to.

Question 39

There was often a list of well supported explanations, but less judgement. There was some good knowledge of the political events of the period and the main personalities. Rising affluence and the divisions in an exhausted Labour Party were both presented as the main reasons for the success of the Conservatives. The strongest answers were able to identify how different issues were more pertinent at different times – Conservative success in the mid-1950s was as much to do with Labour divisions, while the rising affluence of the period was an electoral boon in the late 1950s when accompanied by the tactically astute leadership of Macmillan. Some answers became rather descriptive or failed to deal with the whole period under investigation.

Question 41

Candidates showed knowledge of Margaret Thatcher's main policies but answers would have benefited from a clear definition of 'socialism'; so apart from her hostility to Keynesian economics and nationalised industries, there was often little focused analysis of the aspects of her period in office that could be characterised as 'anti-socialist'. There might have been more discussion of her personal antipathy to left-wing members of the Labour Party or her adoption of the ideas of Hayek or Friedman. More conservative critiques of socialist ideas (liberty, inefficiency, etc.) could have been present in some answers. The other factors that were discussed were the need to secure electoral advantage and her desire to break with the post-war consensus rather than just obsession with socialism as well as elements of foreign policy not directly linked to socialism.

Question 47

The few answers offered had some explanation of the development of the welfare state but some were less successful in explaining the influence of the wars, especially the First World War. This exemplifies the importance of engaging with the factor in the question and being sure that this is possible before choosing a question like this with a named factor.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9769/21 European History Outlines c.300–c.1500</p>
--

Key messages

- Demands for judgement and higher order thinking skills, rather than just explanation, must be met in order to achieve the highest bands.
- When questions ask for consideration of a stated factor, consideration of that factor must be central to the response and not disregarded or addressed only in part.
- The exact wording of the question must be considered to ensure that its demands are met and the response is focused on the terms of the question and not only on the topic in general.

General comments

Essay answers were often well structured, demonstrated the selection of a breadth and suitable depth of knowledge, and the standards of written communication were generally high. There was also a very wide range of questions over the three papers that were answered, showing that centres had taken advantage of the opportunities offered by Pre-U History to study a variety of topics. Generally, explanation was more developed in answers than the higher order thinking skills of assessment and judgement. It was common for a view to be expressed in the opening paragraph which was then not developed in the essay as a whole. This was the case in answers to questions which needed a supported view about the relative importance of different factors ('What best explains....?') or the importance or significance of a named factor. It was not unusual to see explanation of a list of factors predominate, which really gave little weight to the demand of the question for specific judgement.

Such answers had merit: they were often clear and well expressed and offered some clear and well supported explanations. However, a dimension was missing, and these responses needed engage with sustained discussion centred round the formation of the judgement in order to receive credit in the higher bands. The effort which had gone into writing explanations, often accompanied by relevant references to historians and some factual detail, was apparent, but more consideration of the relative importance of different explanations or how the concepts in questions might be addressed would have resulted in higher mark levels and shown a deeper understanding.

In some responses, the candidate's judgement, his or her considered opinion as a result of reflection on the topics studied, seemed to be stifled by a desire to offer factual information to support a series of explanations or points. These responses might have scored marks in the higher levels of the mark scheme had they demonstrated higher order thinking skills which demonstrated reflection on the topics studied. Many answers needed a more direct response to the question, as all require analysis and judgement for a full response. These elements needed to be more developed in many responses, even if this meant limiting explanations and examples, as these were sometimes unnecessarily long, and points could have been supported more succinctly. For example, in Paper 21, **Question 41** (which also appears as **Question 10** on Paper 22) asked specifically about whether only a superficial unity had been achieved in the Spanish kingdoms in 1516. It did not ask about the success of the reigns of Ferdinand and Isabella generally, and it required an analysis of the situation by 1516. It is important to note exactly what is being asked. Where judgement was offered in answer, and where there was an engagement with the concepts in the question, essays were rewarded appropriately with marks in the higher bands.

When there is a specific element in the question, the strongest responses focussed their answers on the consideration of that factor, then weight must be given to that factor and other factors must be related to it. Weaker responses to this type of questions often considered the factor in the question only in part of the response, but then wrote separately about other factors and did not clearly weigh those factors against the lead factor. An example of this type of question is **Question 10** on Paper 22, which asked whether religion was the chief cause of the instability in the period 1547–1558. This was not the same as 'Was there a mid-

Tudor crisis?’ or ‘What best explains the instability in the mid-Tudor period?’ to which a response may have given equal weight to various factors when forming a judgement. The whole of this question is about the importance of the factor of religion, and answers that were focused on this consideration, with other factors written about in a way that weighed them against this factor, were awarded marks in higher bands.

Some questions asked about two specific elements, and the strongest responses to these questions focused their analysis on those two elements and formed a judgement about them; some weaker responses offered a view based on a third element that has not been asked about and did not consider the named elements sufficiently to answer the question. An example of a question which sometimes elicited responses of this nature was on Paper 11, **Question 13** which asked whether ‘*William of Normandy’s victory at the battle of Hastings owed more to the deficiencies of Harold II than to his own abilities*’. The strongest responses to this question focused entirely on these two elements, whereas weaker answers wrote a general critical survey of explanations for the outcome of the battle, and sometimes formed a judgement framed in terms of a third factor, such as luck, whereas the question asked the candidate to weigh one factor/explanation against another.

Some responses considered historians’ interpretations as part of their responses. In weaker responses this sometimes consisted only of naming an historian or a school of interpretation, or explaining what it was and the position taken on the issue in the question. However, there were also several examples of stronger responses which used historiographical information more effectively by critically assessing the applicability of interpretations and approaches to the issue in the question, and analysing how far those arguments could be applied to and inform the issue in the question, in order to help to form a judgement.

Overall, there was a range of responses from fragmentary description to analysis that showed a remarkable degree of intellectual maturity, and a written style which would not have been out of place in higher education. There were some responses in which obvious limitations in knowledge restricted the credit that could be given to a response because the points made in the responses were not substantiated with evidence. More frequently though, responses showed depth and breadth of knowledge about the issue, but demonstrated less developed critical skills. In other cases, the exact terms of question were not focused on, so that knowledge was not deployed appropriately or effectively.

Comments on specific questions

Where too few candidates answered a question for a report to be written, no report will appear below.

Question 1

Some responses began by correctly pointing out that Diocletian’s reforms were a response to the ‘third century crisis’ but without saying what that crisis was. Most answers suggested that the emperor’s reforms were effective in his lifetime (without emphasising the longevity of his reign), but that they did not last. While this is true of the Tetrarchy (it did not solve the problem of succession), it is not true of many of his other reforms regarding the administration, taxation and defence of the frontiers. Unfortunately, the detail of his provincial changes (twelve dioceses and nearly a hundred provinces) eluded many, as did his tax changes (taxation in kind as a civilised substitute for unpopular forced requisitioning). Moreover, whether or not some of the frontier/army reorganisation should be ascribed to him when it was called into question thirty years ago is a moot point, but the candidates have obviously been taught this. Nonetheless, candidates covered most of the bases and were generally positive about his reforms; indeed, better candidates were aware that Christian commentators were concerned to play down the pagan emperor’s success and that we need to see past this.

Question 3

While most responses did not ignore economic factors, there was a distinct lack of balance as they moved on to list all the reasons for the fall of the (Western) Empire. Naturally, barbarian invasions took pride of place, but the obvious economic point about the invasions was rarely made: the depredations led to depopulation which deprived central government of tax revenue, as did the wholesale takeover of western provinces. Moreover, some would have benefitted from a firmer sense of chronology and there were references to the third century crisis or the defeat of Valens at Adrianople as causes, when in fact the focus should have been on the fifth century. Indeed, it was not until the 440s with the loss of Africa to the Vandals that the Western Empire began to run out of money and could not pay its army.

Question 6

More successful responses were able to respond in detail to the divisions between the Byzantine and Sassanid Empires and within the Christian Church. These had a wide range and often included detailed observations on the nature of Muslim military power. Relatively few focused on the unity of the Muslims behind the teachings of Islam; rather unity was analysed in political terms.

Question 7

Many responses dealt directly with Charlemagne's military prowess and his desire to build a Christian Empire. While his academic and administrative achievements were not ignored, most agreed with the question's premise. However, some took a more nuanced view that the establishment of a new Christian Empire was his chief ambition. Less successful answers offered a more general survey of the reign's features rather than considering Charlemagne's ambitions as such.

Question 13

Responses which offered a detailed assessment of Roger's military achievements were able to secure higher marks. Weaker responses tended to lack a range of knowledge which was needed to offer a balanced assessment across the reign. Better responses were able to define government broadly and included trade and economic considerations, but evidence on administration was often thin and would have benefited from including Roger's introduction of a new legal code.

Question 14

Responses which were able to define Gregory's aims at the outset were more successful. Weaker responses narrated the dispute between Gregory and Henry IV without effective focus on Gregory's aims. The broader context of Church reform and the Investiture Dispute was often not clearly defined or discussed to any real degree.

Question 17

Better responses evaluated the competing factors in the strengthening of the French monarchy and explained convincingly and in a sustained manner why one factor was more significant. Many identified Philip Augustus's 'legalism' as key, which allowed for a discussion of positive relations with the nobility, feudalism and the revival of conflict with the Angevins. Most responses to this question focused well on the strengthening of the French monarchy and were able to put forward a range of explanations. They usually concluded that the key factor was either Philip's financial security or the weakness of his opponents. Many took the evidence that he was defeated by Richard I but able to beat John as showing that his military skills were not the deciding issue. Answers also argued that he was able to get the better of Innocent III and so strengthen the monarchy's independence from the Church. The development of Paris, the emergence of the concept of 'Frenchness' and even Gothic architecture were all quoted as boosting the monarchy. Weaker responses lacked sufficient support and some needed a stronger grasp of chronology, more consideration of the King's financial and administrative strengths and detail of the rivalry with the Angevins.

Question 18

Stronger responses offered some balance and identified Innocent's aims as a way of judging success and failure, and worked through his hopes of eradicating heresy, winning back the Holy Land, reforming the Church and maintaining papal supremacy. The general view of these answers was that he was successful with the Lateran Council and establishing the Papal States and failed with the Crusades. The latter was often blamed on circumstances beyond Innocent's control. With regard to Philip II and King John, opinion was more divided, some arguing Innocent failed as both held out against him, and others that both had to give in eventually, albeit for pragmatic reasons. Weaker responses tended to focus on the Crusades and the kings and so needed a better balance. Some referred to the dispute with the Holy Roman Empire and perhaps its impact on Italian politics and the Papal States but did not go beyond this.

Question 23

Responses that were able to define influence initially and explain the different types of influence, including political, intellectual, religious and social, exerted by friars were immediately on the way to scoring better

marks. Candidates who were able to evaluate both the degree of influence and precisely identify in which areas did better. For example, stronger answers would consider whether the influence exerted by the Dominicans was greater as a result of the Inquisition or whether it was through their role in the universities.

Question 25

Weaker responses here tended to focus on a narrow range of heretical movements – most typically the Cathars. Better responses were able to draw on a wider range of groups, thus meeting the full demands of the question more effectively. Good responses often explained developments, in part, due to weak Church authority/organisation, but did not always discuss in great detail the nature of heretical ideas and why they were appealing. Better responses were also more effective at explaining the reasons for disaffection with the established Church.

Question 29

Virtually all responses to this question identified Philip's enemies successfully and so most responses were focused on Flanders, England, the Templars and the Papacy. Most considered he was successful with the Templars as they were eradicated, even if all their wealth went elsewhere, and against Boniface, whose death helped to precipitate the Avignon Papacy and so benefit France. Flanders and England were not seen as being overcome, especially at Courtrai, and the cost of campaigns was a serious problem. Weaker responses deviated from the focus, some suggesting that lack of money was an enemy, or that all the credit should go to Nogaret and Philip did little.

Question 31

Answers to this question needed a clear structure to be successful. Stronger responses argued that the states were independent at first but disruption from the plague and the marauding mercenaries led to some losing their independence. Siena was often quoted as an example. Florence, Venice and Milan were the main exemplars of independent states, with the stress on their political independence. Weaker responses were very vague, with few references to actual states, or digressed into descriptions of humanism and the work of Dante. Some tried to assess the degree of social or artistic independence, which needed to be more precisely argued. Others considered the threat to independence as their focus.

Question 35

Stronger answers maintained a tight focus on the question and demonstrated sufficient knowledge of problems within Byzantium to make a critical evaluation of the arguments in response to the question. Weaker responses listed factors leading to the fall of Constantinople, often with a lot of narrative, and did not engage with question's focus on internal problems. There were some generalised explanations of Ottoman strengths which were not sufficiently linked to the question's demands to receive significant credit. The strongest answers reflected on how Byzantine weakness interacted with other external factors.

Question 37

Most answers showed a wide-ranging factual knowledge of different aspects of Louis XI's reign, particularly with regard to relations with Burgundy (less so with England), economic policies, and his attempts to curb noble power. Very few candidates offered any reflection on the criteria by which 'success' might be measured, which limited the number of answers which got beyond the top of Band 3. Stronger answers offered some relative judgement on whether domestic and foreign policy were equally successful. Weaker answers simply listed a range of things that Louis XI did and offered an underdeveloped judgement about the extent to which these were 'successful'.

Question 38

Stronger answers to this question drew their evidence from a good range of the conflicts that made up the Italian Wars, showing strong factual knowledge. Most answers engaged well with the question's invitation to analyse whether plunder 'best explains' the wars in comparison to other factors. There was some effective analysis of both the internal situation within the Italian states and the external conditions in invading powers. Some effective responses also differentiated between the motives of France and Spain for their interventions in Italy.

Question 39

Very few answers attempted to define what papal priorities should have been, but those that did showed a sound understanding of values and expectations of the time and used this to produce a sustained critical evaluation of papal policies and actions. The strongest answers also differentiated between popes and showed good knowledge of specific popes. Most answers covered nepotism and simony, financial policies, sexual immorality, defence and expansion of the Papal States, and patronage of the arts and humanism. However, weaker answers simply listed these and asserted the extent to which they showed 'right' or 'wrong' priorities, with little sustained judgement.

Question 40

Essays showed good factual knowledge of Ivan III's reign, but most would have benefited from some analysis of how a ruler's 'principal achievement' might be defined and measured. Weaker answers offered a descriptive list of things Ivan III did, with limited relative judgement. Most answers cited Novgorod and reducing the authority of the princes; however, many answers might have given more attention to Ivan's achievements in the creation of a recognisable Russian 'state' in terms of administration and diplomacy.

Question 41

Many answers showed a good basic understanding of key areas of Ferdinand and Isabella's reign and were able to offer some assessment of how 'unified' they were: constitutional arrangements, separate political/administrative institutions, economic policies, religious unity. Gains in Grenada were frequently cited, but there was little discussion of Navarre. Only a few stronger answers reflected on the extent to which 'unity' was actually sought and desired by the monarchs or their people. Many responses would have been improved by a discussion of what happened after Isabella died (1504–1516) whereby the two separate kingdoms came to be ruled by one man. The accidental nature of the unity that came about could have reinforced earlier arguments about how unity was never achieved, as it was never the intention. Weaker answers tended towards descriptive lists of features of the reign, in which policies were described as showing superficial or real unity, but with only limited explanation of why this was the case.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/22
European History Outlines
c.1400–c.1800

Key messages

- Demands for judgement and higher order thinking skills, rather than just explanation, must be met in order to achieve the highest bands.
- When questions ask for consideration of a stated factor, consideration of that factor must be central to the response and not disregarded or addressed only in part.
- The exact wording of the question must be considered to ensure that its demands are met and the response is focused on the terms of the question and not only on the topic in general.

General comments

Essay answers were often well structured, demonstrated the selection of a breadth and suitable depth of knowledge, and the standards of written communication were generally high. There was also a very wide range of questions over the three papers that were answered, showing that centres had taken advantage of the opportunities offered by Pre-U History to study a variety of topics. Generally, explanation was more developed in answers than the higher order thinking skills of assessment and judgement. It was common for a view to be expressed in the opening paragraph which was then not developed in the essay as a whole. This was the case in answers to questions which needed a supported view about the relative importance of different factors ('What best explains...?') or the importance or significance of a named factor. It was not unusual to see explanation of a list of factors predominate, which really gave little weight to the demand of the question for specific judgement.

Such answers had merit: they were often clear and well expressed and offered some clear and well supported explanations. However, a dimension was missing, and these responses needed engage with sustained discussion centred round the formation of the judgement in order to receive credit in the higher bands. The effort which had gone into writing explanations, often accompanied by relevant references to historians and some factual detail, was apparent, but more consideration of the relative importance of different explanations or how the concepts in questions might be addressed would have resulted in higher mark levels and shown a deeper understanding.

In some responses, the candidate's judgement, his or her considered opinion as a result of reflection on the topics studied, seemed to be stifled by a desire to offer factual information to support a series of explanations or points. These responses might have scored marks in the higher levels of the mark scheme had they demonstrated higher order thinking skills which demonstrated reflection on the topics studied. Many answers needed a more direct response to the question, as all require analysis and judgement for a full response. These elements needed to be more developed in many responses, even if this meant limiting explanations and examples, as these were sometimes unnecessarily long, and points could have been supported more succinctly. For example, in Paper 21, **Question 41** (which also appears as **Question 10** on Paper 22) asked specifically about whether only a superficial unity had been achieved in the Spanish kingdoms in 1516. It did not ask about the success of the reigns of Ferdinand and Isabella generally, and it required an analysis of the situation by 1516. It is important to note exactly what is being asked. Where judgement was offered in answer, and where there was an engagement with the concepts in the question, essays were rewarded appropriately with marks in the higher bands.

When there is a specific element in the question, the strongest responses focussed their answers on the consideration of that factor, then weight must be given to that factor and other factors must be related to it. Weaker responses to this type of questions often considered the factor in the question only in part of the response, but then wrote separately about other factors and did not clearly weigh those factors against the

lead factor. An example of this type of question is **Question 10** on Paper 22, which asked whether religion was the chief cause of the instability in the period 1547–1558. This was not the same as ‘Was there a mid-Tudor crisis?’ or ‘What best explains the instability in the mid-Tudor period?’ to which a response may have given equal weight to various factors when forming a judgement. The whole of this question is about the importance of the factor of religion, and answers that were focused on this consideration, with other factors written about in a way that weighed them against this factor, were awarded marks in higher bands.

Some questions asked about two specific elements, and the strongest responses to these questions focused their analysis on those two elements and formed a judgement about them; some weaker responses offered a view based on a third element that has not been asked about and did not consider the named elements sufficiently to answer the question. An example of a question which sometimes elicited responses of this nature was on Paper 11, **Question 13** which asked whether ‘*William of Normandy’s victory at the battle of Hastings owed more to the deficiencies of Harold II than to his own abilities*’. The strongest responses to this question focused entirely on these two elements, whereas weaker answers wrote a general critical survey of explanations for the outcome of the battle, and sometimes formed a judgement framed in terms of a third factor, such as luck, whereas the question asked the candidate to weigh one factor/explanation against another.

Some responses considered historians’ interpretations as part of their responses. In weaker responses this sometimes consisted only of naming an historian or a school of interpretation, or explaining what it was and the position taken on the issue in the question. However, there were also several examples of stronger responses which used historiographical information more effectively by critically assessing the applicability of interpretations and approaches to the issue in the question, and analysing how far those arguments could be applied to and inform the issue in the question, in order to help to form a judgement.

Overall, there was a range of responses from fragmentary description to analysis that showed a remarkable degree of intellectual maturity, and a written style which would not have been out of place in higher education. There were some responses in which obvious limitations in knowledge restricted the credit that could be given to a response because the points made in the responses were not substantiated with evidence. More frequently though, responses showed depth and breadth of knowledge about the issue, but demonstrated less developed critical skills. In other cases, the exact terms of question were not focused on, so that knowledge was not deployed appropriately or effectively.

Comments on specific questions

Where too few candidates answered a question for a report to be written, no report will appear below.

Question 4

Stronger answers maintained a tight focus on the question and demonstrated sufficient knowledge of problems within Byzantium to make a critical evaluation of the arguments in response to the question. Weaker responses listed factors leading to the fall of Constantinople, often with a lot of narrative, and did not engage with question’s focus on internal problems. There were some generalised explanations of Ottoman strengths which were not sufficiently linked to the question’s demands to receive significant credit. The strongest answers reflected on how Byzantine weakness interacted with other external factors.

Question 6

Most answers showed a wide-ranging factual knowledge of different aspects of Louis XI’s reign, particularly with regard to relations with Burgundy (less so with England), economic policies, and his attempts to curb noble power. Very few candidates offered any reflection on the criteria by which ‘success’ might be measured, which limited the number of answers which got beyond the top of Band 3. Stronger answers offered some relative judgement on whether domestic and foreign policy were equally successful. Weaker answers simply listed a range of things that Louis XI did and offered an underdeveloped judgement about the extent to which these were ‘successful’.

Question 7

Stronger answers to this question drew their evidence from a good range of the conflicts that made up the Italian Wars, showing strong factual knowledge. Most answers engaged well with the question’s invitation to analyse whether plunder ‘best explains’ the wars in comparison to other factors. There was some effective analysis of both the internal situation within the Italian states and the external conditions in invading powers.

Some effective responses also differentiated between the motives of France and Spain for their interventions in Italy.

Question 8

Very few answers attempted to define what papal priorities should have been, but those that did showed a sound understanding of values and expectations of the time and used this to produce a sustained critical evaluation of papal policies and actions. The strongest answers also differentiated between popes and showed good knowledge of specific popes. Most answers covered nepotism and simony, financial policies, sexual immorality, defence and expansion of the Papal States, and patronage of the arts and humanism. However, weaker answers simply listed these and asserted the extent to which they showed 'right' or 'wrong' priorities, with little sustained judgement.

Question 9

Essays showed good factual knowledge of Ivan III's reign, but most would have benefited from some analysis of how a ruler's 'principal achievement' might be defined and measured. Weaker answers offered a descriptive list of things Ivan III did, with limited relative judgement. Most answers cited Novgorod and reducing the authority of the princes; however, many answers might have given more attention to Ivan's achievements in the creation of a recognisable Russian 'state' in terms of administration and diplomacy.

Question 10

Many answers showed a good basic understanding of key areas of Ferdinand and Isabella's reign and were able to offer some assessment of how 'unified' they were: constitutional arrangements, separate political/administrative institutions, economic policies, religious unity. Gains in Grenada were frequently cited, but there was little discussion of Navarre. Only a few stronger answers reflected on the extent to which 'unity' was actually sought and desired by the monarchs or their people. Many responses would have been improved by a discussion of what happened after Isabella died (1504–1516) whereby the two separate kingdoms came to be ruled by one man. The accidental nature of the unity that came about could have reinforced earlier arguments about how unity was never achieved, as it was never the intention. Weaker answers tended towards descriptive lists of features of the reign, in which policies were described as showing superficial or real unity, but with only limited explanation of why this was the case.

Question 11

Better responses here began by discussing in some meaningful way the nature of 'abuses' in the Roman Catholic Church and the extent to which Luther addressed these in his actions and writings in the timeframe. Those which were then able to go beyond this and analyse, in particular, the way Luther's theology was evolving into something more than this scored more highly. Weaker responses lost focus on the question and fell back on general explanations for the rise of Lutheranism or narratives of developments after 1517. Some answers would have benefited from greater consideration and understanding of Luther's theology.

Question 12

Most answers attempted some relative judgement of William of Orange's role in the Dutch revolt, as required by the question, with a greater or lesser degree of support. Weaker answers disposed of William's role in a rather cursory manner (asserting that it was not very important, but with limited supporting evidence or explanation) before going into much greater detail on the role of the Duke of Alba and religious factors. By contrast, there was stronger analysis from answers that maintained a focus on the question and offered a sustained relative assessment of the role of William of Orange in relation to these other factors.

Question 13

Most responses to this question covered a good range of topics, including taxation and economic policy, government (including the role of foreign office holders), religious uniformity, and the need to supply troops and cash for 'imperial' affairs. The revolt of the Comuneros was frequently cited, but many answers seemed unsure how to assess its significance. Very few answers suggested any criteria by which the effectiveness of the reign might be measured, with most essays simply listing different things Charles I did and commenting on whether these were 'effective' or 'ineffective'. Some weaker answers ignored the question's clear focus on Charles's Spanish kingdoms and pursued tangents on his policies elsewhere, notably in the New World.

Question 16

Many answers did not show a strong grasp of the meaning of the word 'prudent.' Some effective consideration of this word at the outset offered a much better prospect of a strong score. Unfortunately, weaker candidates drifted off the 'domestic' term of the question and included sometimes long but irrelevant passages about Philip's other territories. Philip's approach to religious orthodoxy was most frequently cited as evidence, generally for the contention, and weaker responses often lacked range much beyond this. There were some strong responses which ranged convincingly across key elements such as religious policy, finance, the economy and political control.

Question 17

Better responses were able to provide convincing evidence regarding relations between 'over-mighty' subjects; weaker responses were not able to make specific references to key noble families like those of Guise and Montmorency. Equally, candidates who were able to deal with both the 'outbreak' and the 'continuation' parts of the question scored more highly; the former element was more apparent in weaker responses. Answers which could offer evidence across the chronological range also scored more highly; weaker responses tended to draw examples mainly or exclusively from the outbreak of the conflict.

Question 18

Most responses would have benefited from more factual support and though some mention of Jesuit missionary work around the globe and their role in education in Europe was made, the knowledge base was too restricted for answers to be effective. The distinction between Catholic and Counter-Reformation was understood but mostly not really illustrated. Consideration of the last session of the Council of Trent and the Jesuits' role as confessors to the Holy Roman Emperors would have been helpful.

Question 19

Stronger responses tended to have a better balance and to sustain a focus on 'the recovery of France'. Weaker responses focused either on Sully with little discussion of the role of Henri IV, or offered a general survey of the reign with limited coverage of the work of Sully. Better answers considered in some detail Sully's role but also provided a convincing analysis of Henri IV. Sully was sometimes seen too narrowly, limiting his importance to financial matters; better responses were able to consider Sully's contribution to the economy and government in wider terms.

Question 42

Though there was often sound knowledge of elements of the reign, not enough answers defined and engaged with the concept of 'fundamental problems', and essays were led more by a review of changes than by how well they addressed the key problems facing Russia. When the problems were firmly the basis of the essay there was some successful and well balanced judgement, but answers that simply ran through reforms with somewhat limited comment on their general success were not really answering the question. Sections on foreign policy were particularly prone to 'stand-alone' without being linked to any problems, fundamental or otherwise.

Question 43

This produced a range of opinions but better answers established some criteria for success and offered a clear comparison. When responses were led by this need for a sustained argument about the relative achievement in different aspects, results were often impressive. Where they were led by description of

different policies accompanied by comments on success and failure and a somewhat inconclusive final paragraph, the results were less successful, even though the essays were often well informed.

Question 44

The responses to this question varied quite significantly. Better essays responded directly to the requirement to decide 'what best explains' the Terror, offering a list of well supported explanations with at least some level of relative judgement. There was some effective discussion about the relative importance of war and counter-revolution and political factions and ideology. Most answers referred to factors including the threat of war and invasion, fear of internal enemies, and radical influence. Most cited the September Massacres, although the level of detail was variable and weaker answers did not explain why this was significant. Better answers explored the ideology behind Robespierre's actions rather than simply describing what he did. Some responses were uncertain about the meaning of the term 'terror' and there were some which simply wrote about the causes of the fall of the Constitutional monarchy or about the outbreak of the Revolution in 1789.

Question 45

Most answers were aware of the issues about how far Napoleon destroyed or continued the work of the Revolution, but some did not respond very directly to the wording of the question. There was some strong and well balanced analysis which recognised that Napoleon did maintain some elements of the Revolution but saw that some claims that he made were somewhat specious given the authoritarian nature of the regime. Many, too, did consider all three elements, though 'liberty' was sometimes rather unconvincingly stretched to include domestic peace at the expense of any real political freedom, and fraternity was less well covered. The weaker responses fell back on simply describing some changes and commenting on their success. It would be worthwhile for candidates studying this topic to be sure what the Civil Code actually was and to understand more accurately what was agreed in the Concordat.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/23
European History Outlines
c.1700–c.2000

Key messages

- Demands for judgement and higher order thinking skills, rather than just explanation, must be met in order to achieve the highest bands.
- When questions ask for consideration of a stated factor, consideration of that factor must be central to the response and not disregarded or addressed only in part.
- The exact wording of the question must be considered to ensure that its demands are met and the response is focused on the terms of the question and not only on the topic in general.

General comments

Essay answers were often well structured, demonstrated the selection of a breadth and suitable depth of knowledge, and the standards of written communication were generally high. There was also a very wide range of questions over the three papers that were answered, showing that centres had taken advantage of the opportunities offered by Pre-U History to study a variety of topics. Generally, explanation was more developed in answers than the higher order thinking skills of assessment and judgement. It was common for a view to be expressed in the opening paragraph which was then not developed in the essay as a whole. This was the case in answers to questions which needed a supported view about the relative importance of different factors ('What best explains...?') or the importance or significance of a named factor. It was not unusual to see explanation of a list of factors predominate, which really gave little weight to the demand of the question for specific judgement.

Such answers had merit: they were often clear and well expressed and offered some clear and well supported explanations. However, a dimension was missing, and these responses needed engage with sustained discussion centred round the formation of the judgement in order to receive credit in the higher bands. The effort which had gone into writing explanations, often accompanied by relevant references to historians and some factual detail, was apparent, but more consideration of the relative importance of different explanations or how the concepts in questions might be addressed would have resulted in higher mark levels and shown a deeper understanding.

In some responses, the candidate's judgement, his or her considered opinion as a result of reflection on the topics studied, seemed to be stifled by a desire to offer factual information to support a series of explanations or points. These responses might have scored marks in the higher levels of the mark scheme had they demonstrated higher order thinking skills which demonstrated reflection on the topics studied. Many answers needed a more direct response to the question, as all require analysis and judgement for a full response. These elements needed to be more developed in many responses, even if this meant limiting explanations and examples, as these were sometimes unnecessarily long, and points could have been supported more succinctly. For example, in Paper 21, **Question 41** (which also appears as **Question 10** on Paper 22) asked specifically about whether only a superficial unity had been achieved in the Spanish kingdoms in 1516. It did not ask about the success of the reigns of Ferdinand and Isabella generally, and it required an analysis of the situation by 1516. It is important to note exactly what is being asked. Where judgement was offered in answer, and where there was an engagement with the concepts in the question, essays were rewarded appropriately with marks in the higher bands.

When there is a specific element in the question, the strongest responses focussed their answers on the consideration of that factor, then weight must be given to that factor and other factors must be related to it. Weaker responses to this type of questions often considered the factor in the question only in part of the response, but then wrote separately about other factors and did not clearly weigh those factors against the lead factor. An example of this type of question is **Question 10** on Paper 22, which asked whether religion

was the chief cause of the instability in the period 1547–1558. This was not the same as ‘Was there a mid-Tudor crisis?’ or ‘What best explains the instability in the mid-Tudor period?’ to which a response may have given equal weight to various factors when forming a judgement. The whole of this question is about the importance of the factor of religion, and answers that were focused on this consideration, with other factors written about in a way that weighed them against this factor, were awarded marks in higher bands.

Some questions asked about two specific elements, and the strongest responses to these questions focused their analysis on those two elements and formed a judgement about them; some weaker responses offered a view based on a third element that has not been asked about and did not consider the named elements sufficiently to answer the question. An example of a question which sometimes elicited responses of this nature was on Paper 11, **Question 13** which asked whether ‘*William of Normandy’s victory at the battle of Hastings owed more to the deficiencies of Harold II than to his own abilities*’. The strongest responses to this question focused entirely on these two elements, whereas weaker answers wrote a general critical survey of explanations for the outcome of the battle, and sometimes formed a judgement framed in terms of a third factor, such as luck, whereas the question asked the candidate to weigh one factor/explanation against another.

Some responses considered historians’ interpretations as part of their responses. In weaker responses this sometimes consisted only of naming an historian or a school of interpretation, or explaining what it was and the position taken on the issue in the question. However, there were also several examples of stronger responses which used historiographical information more effectively by critically assessing the applicability of interpretations and approaches to the issue in the question, and analysing how far those arguments could be applied to and inform the issue in the question, in order to help to form a judgement.

Overall, there was a range of responses from fragmentary description to analysis that showed a remarkable degree of intellectual maturity, and a written style which would not have been out of place in higher education. There were some responses in which obvious limitations in knowledge restricted the credit that could be given to a response because the points made in the responses were not substantiated with evidence. More frequently though, responses showed depth and breadth of knowledge about the issue, but demonstrated less developed critical skills. In other cases, the exact terms of question were not focused on, so that knowledge was not deployed appropriately or effectively.

Comments on specific questions

Where too few candidates answered a question for a report to be written, no report will appear below.

Question 6

Though there was often sound knowledge of elements of the reign, not enough answers defined and engaged with the concept of ‘fundamental problems’, and essays were led more by a review of changes than by how well they addressed the key problems facing Russia. When the problems were firmly the basis of the essay there was some successful and well balanced judgement, but answers that simply ran through reforms with somewhat limited comment on their general success were not really answering the question. Sections on foreign policy were particularly prone to ‘stand-alone’ without being linked to any problems, fundamental or otherwise.

Question 7

This produced a range of opinions but better answers established some criteria for success and offered a clear comparison. When responses were led by this need for a sustained argument about the relative achievement in different aspects, results were often impressive. Where they were led by description of different policies accompanied by comments on success and failure and a somewhat inconclusive final paragraph, the results were less successful, even though the essays were often well informed.

Question 8

The responses to this question varied quite significantly. Better essays responded directly to the requirement to decide ‘what best explains’ the Terror, offering a list of well supported explanations with at least some level of relative judgement. There was some effective discussion about the relative importance of war and counter-revolution and political factions and ideology. Most answers referred to factors including the threat of war and invasion, fear of internal enemies, and radical influence. Most cited the September Massacres, although the level of detail was variable and weaker answers did not explain why this was significant. Better

answers explored the ideology behind Robespierre's actions rather than simply describing what he did. Some responses were uncertain about the meaning of the term 'terror' and there were some which simply wrote about the causes of the fall of the Constitutional monarchy or about the outbreak of the Revolution in 1789.

Question 9

Most answers were aware of the issues about how far Napoleon destroyed or continued the work of the Revolution, but some did not respond very directly to the wording of the question. There was some strong and well balanced analysis which recognised that Napoleon did maintain some elements of the Revolution but saw that some claims that he made were somewhat specious given the authoritarian nature of the regime. Many, too, did consider all three elements, though 'liberty' was sometimes rather unconvincingly stretched to include domestic peace at the expense of any real political freedom, and fraternity was less well covered. The weaker responses fell back on simply describing some changes and commenting on their success. It would be worthwhile for candidates studying this topic to be sure what the Civil Code actually was and to understand more accurately what was agreed in the Concordat.

Question 17

Most answers used the structure offered by the question to offer a balanced assessment of points of agreement and disagreement between the Great Powers at the Congress of Vienna. Weaker answers drifted into description, simply listing points without showing sufficiently detailed knowledge to support and explain their arguments fully. There was good understanding of the shared desire to prevent Napoleon's return and of mixed responses to the Tsar's Holy Alliance plans. Fewer answers included disputes over Poland and Saxony, which could have provided material for further discussion of areas of disagreement. Generally, stronger knowledge of the actual issues discussed would have been beneficial.

Question 18

Responses to this question generally showed knowledge of Nicholas I's reign, but in weaker essays this tended towards narrative (usually comprising a list of things that Nicholas did) rather than contributing to an argument about whether the reign was stronger in 1855 than in 1825. More successful essays engaged closely with the terms of the question and attempted a sustained comparison of the state of the Tsarist regime at the start and end of Nicholas I's reign. The very strongest answers reflected on how the strength of a regime might be measured. Most answers featured some discussion of government bureaucracy, censorship and repression. However, there was surprisingly little detailed analysis of the Crimean War. There was also little discussion of the lack of revolution in 1848.

Question 19

This question attracted a number of weaker responses, many of which took the question's instruction to 'Assess the achievements of Louis Philippe' as an invitation simply to list various things that he did during his reign (most commonly with a focus on economic and industrial growth and education reforms), with only limited attempts at critical evaluation. There were better responses which considered both foreign and domestic policy in more depth, but in general there might have been more focus on 'achievements' rather than just aspects of the reign or the personality of the ruler.

Question 20

This question attracted some strong responses that made a nuanced and balanced argument for the interaction of Bismarck's own diplomatic skills and leadership with circumstances beyond his control. Weaker answers simply offered a list of factors leading to German unification (primarily Austrian decline and Prussian economic growth, although some answers also discussed the role of German nationalism), with only limited critical evaluation. Most essays did attempt some kind of relative judgement, but in weaker arguments this was asserted rather than supported by evidence and explanation, making the judgements appear rather arbitrary. Weaker answers also lost focus on the question, attempting to assess the relative importance of factors discussed, but not in relation to Bismarck as the question demanded. It would have benefited many candidates to have made the links between the wars and unification more explicit. The significance of the actions which he took in leading to unification could have been better explained in many cases.

Question 21

This question attracted a significant proportion of weaker answers, as few essays demonstrated sufficient knowledge of the Piedmontese monarchy to offer any relative evaluation of its role in Italian unification. Weaker answers made only a token nod to the question's focus on the monarchy (or, in a few cases, tried to sidestep it altogether), asserting its lack of importance before launching into a generic list of other factors which contributed to unification, for example, Cavour, Garibaldi, Mazzini, help from foreign powers. Some answers attempted to compensate for a lack of knowledge of the monarchy by conflating it with Cavour. Other responses offered some explanation of the role of the monarchy but focussed on only one king. Only the strongest answers evaluated the contributions of both Charles Albert and Victor Emmanuel II in equal detail.

Question 22

While most responses made some attempt to evaluate the success of Alexander II's reforms, only the stronger answers attempted to define some criteria for measuring 'success'. The strongest answers also attempted to define 'modernisation' and explain why it was needed. Less successful responses engaged much less directly with the key idea in the question and simply listed various reforms enacted by Alexander II, with a heavy focus on the emancipation of the serfs, and asserted that they were 'successful' or 'unsuccessful' with little explanation as to why or how they might have modernised Russia. Better answers attempted some critical assessment of the 'success' of these measures, noting the limits and downsides to various policies.

Question 23

While some responses pursued a view that economic developments were far more of an achievement than the social and political developments, the question's requirement to 'Assess the domestic achievements of Wilhelmine Germany' produced a number of answers that struggled to find an analytical peg on which to hang their factual knowledge. Many essays demonstrated good knowledge of the period, but were essentially a list of things that happened in Wilhelmine Germany with little in the way of critical evaluation. Most answers focused heavily on economic developments and related military expansion. There was also frequent mention of the parliamentary system and the role of the SPD, although most essays struggled to explain the significance of this within the framework offered by the question. Very few answers made any reference to cultural and scientific achievements in the period.

Question 24

Stronger answers to this question were characterised by a sustained comparison of the two tsars, making relative judgements about how well they served Russian interests throughout the essay (or, at least, in the conclusion). Weaker answers simply listed various different things the two men did with some comments on how successful these were but with little or no comparative judgement. Even in stronger answers, many would have benefited from defining the 'interests of Russia' more clearly from the outset to support a more analytical approach to the question.

Question 26

The strongest answers maintained a focus on the question throughout, showing adequate knowledge of the role of Austria-Hungary and making well explained relative judgements about its role compared to (and in interaction with) other factors leading to the outbreak of war. However, a significant proportion of answers largely ignored the question and produced a generic list of 'factors leading to the First World War' (or, in slightly better essays, an all-purpose response to 'What was the most important factor in the outbreak of WWI?') with limited focus on the question other than including Austria-Hungary in the list. Most answers placed a heavy emphasis on the role of Germany, but only stronger answers consciously assessed this in relation to and alongside Austria-Hungary. There was a wide variety of opinions about the extent to which the Serbian government was involved in the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand, all of which were confidently asserted as fact.

Question 33

The demands of the question were not always fully understood and some responses failed to explain why the campaigns and grand plans of 1914 resulted not in the swift victory of their authors' imagination but in bitter stalemate. Some offered a general explanation of the nature of the stalemate and some neglected to mention the Schlieffen Plan at all. There were some effective analyses which explained why hopes were not fulfilled but in general more consideration of the relative importance of different reasons would have been helpful.

Question 34

The best answers to this question showed a detailed knowledge of the terms of the treaty, the aims of the participants in the Paris Peace Conference and its aftermath, and they used this detail in an assessment of the extent to which the punishment of Germany can be justified. Weaker answers tended to rehearse the terms of the treaty, and combined this with unsupported statements as to its fairness. Oddly, the territorial changes which had so much emotional significance were sometimes neglected, as was the disparity between the Fourteen Points and the final treaty.

Question 35

Most answers demonstrated a sound basic knowledge of events leading to the downfall of the Provisional Government, but many weaker answers drifted into narrative in place of analysis when it came to describing events such as the Kornilov affair. Most essays were structured as a list of factors leading to the downfall of the government, including unpopular continuation of the war, lack of reforms, and failure to prevent the rise of the Bolsheviks. In most cases, answers included an attempt to make a relative judgement about the role of the Provisional Government (the focus of the question), but in weaker answers this judgement was somewhat arbitrary and required fuller explanation and justification to be convincing.

Question 36

Though a familiar topic, this was not generally well done. Some answers tended to go back to 1919 and write at length about the weaknesses of Weimar. Many rejected the premise of the question and went into great detail about Hitler's speaking ability, Goebbels' propaganda and party organisation – ignoring the fact that the Nazis only had 2.5 per cent of the vote in 1928. Of course, the Wall Street Crash was not ignored, but there were assertions that 'it did not provide a satisfactory explanation' which were not supported. Answers also gave limited consideration to the events which led Hitler to office, and the intrigues of Von Papen and Schleicher received limited accurate attention. The years 1933–34 were not always analysed and many answers failed to explain Hitler's consolidation of power. These developments obviously involved a move away from economic factors into the realm of political machination.

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- Demands for judgement and higher order thinking skills, rather than just explanation, must be met in order to achieve the highest bands.
- When questions ask for consideration of a stated factor, consideration of that factor must be central to the response and not disregarded or addressed only in part.
- The exact wording of the question must be considered to ensure that its demands are met and the response is focused on the terms of the question and not only on the topic in general.

General comments

United States history continues to be popular and there were many well-informed answers tackling the major political issues and social and economic topics.

Essay answers were often well structured, demonstrated the selection of a breadth and suitable depth of knowledge, and the standards of written communication were generally high. There was also a very wide range of questions over the three papers that were answered, showing that centres had taken advantage of the opportunities offered by Pre-U History to study a variety of topics. Generally, explanation was more developed in answers than the higher order thinking skills of assessment and judgement. It was common for a view to be expressed in the opening paragraph which was then not developed in the essay as a whole. This was the case in answers to questions which needed a supported view about the relative importance of different factors ('What best explains...?') or the importance or significance of a named factor. It was not unusual to see explanation of a list of factors predominate, which really gave little weight to the demand of the question for specific judgement.

The higher levels of the mark scheme involve higher order thinking skills which demonstrate reflection on the topics studied and a very direct response to questions which all require analysis and judgement; for example, **Question 2** asked what best explains why the colonies declared independence, not what factors explain the quarrels between the colonists and Britain. The strongest answers responded to exactly what is being asked. Where judgement was offered and where there was an engagement with the concepts in the question.

In some responses, the candidate's judgement, his or her considered opinion as a result of reflection on the topics studied, seemed to be stifled by a desire to offer factual information to support a series of explanations or points. These responses might have scored marks in the higher levels of the mark scheme had they demonstrated higher order thinking skills which demonstrated reflection on the topics studied. Many answers needed a more direct response to the question, as all require analysis and judgement for a full response. These elements needed to be more developed in many responses, even if this meant limiting explanations and examples, as these were sometimes unnecessarily long, and points could have been supported more succinctly. An example of this is Question 11 which asked whether rapid population growth was the main reason for Western expansion. This was not the same as asking for a list of reasons for Western expansion and needed consideration of the key element in the question and comparison with other factors. It is important to note exactly what is being asked. Where judgement was offered in answer, and where there was an engagement with the concepts in the question, essays were rewarded appropriately with marks in the higher bands.

When there is a specific element in the question, the strongest responses focussed their answers on the consideration of that factor, then weight must be given to that factor and other factors must be related to it. Weaker responses to this type of questions often considered the factor in the question only in part of the response, but then wrote separately about other factors and did not clearly weigh those factors against the lead factor. Some questions asked about two specific elements, and the strongest responses to these

questions focused their analysis on those two elements and formed a judgement about them; some weaker responses offered a view based on a third element that has not been asked about and did not consider the named elements sufficiently to answer the question. An example of a question which sometimes elicited responses of this nature was **Question 25** which asked about whether the navy made the greatest contribution of the three arms of the US military was not the same as asking for an assessment of the role of the US to the allies' victory, so comparisons with, say, the role of the USSR, or the role of the US economy, were not required. The strongest responses to this question focused entirely on these two elements, whereas weaker answers wrote a general critical survey of explanations for the outcome of the battle, and sometimes formed a judgement framed in terms of a third factor, such as luck, whereas the question asked the candidate to weigh one factor/explanation against another.

Some responses considered historians' interpretations as part of their responses. In weaker responses this sometimes consisted only of naming an historian or a school of interpretation, or explaining what it was and the position taken on the issue in the question. However, there were also several examples of stronger responses which used historiographical information more effectively by critically assessing the applicability of interpretations and approaches to the issue in the question, and analysing how far those arguments could be applied to and inform the issue in the question, in order to help to form a judgement.

Overall, there was a range of responses from fragmentary description to analysis that showed a remarkable degree of intellectual maturity, and a written style which would not have been out of place in higher education. There were some responses in which obvious limitations in knowledge restricted the credit that could be given to a response because the points made in the responses were not substantiated with evidence. More frequently though, responses showed depth and breadth of knowledge about the issue, but demonstrated less developed critical skills. In other cases, the exact terms of question were not focused on, so that knowledge was not deployed appropriately or effectively.

Comments on specific questions

Where too few candidates answered a question for a report to be written, no report will appear below.

Question 2

Many of the answers to this question were focused on the long-term causes and insufficiently on 1776. The distinction between protest and armed clashes between colonists and British forces, and the decision to declare independence, was frequently not appreciated. Some weaker answers barely mentioned the signing of the Declaration of Independence, being more intent on the Stamp Act and its consequences, and the ending of *salutary neglect*. Some of these answers needed to concentrate less on arguing about the rights and wrongs of British taxation of the colonies. Some answers made vague arguments about the role played by differing ideologies, without much explanation as to what these might be. Stronger answers argued that taxation was not the prime issue, but that fear of British tyranny was the spur, while others suggested that it was a radical elite which drove the movement for independence urged on by the publication of *Common Sense*. Some answers argued that the Declaration of Independence reflected the views of a minority who were able to take control of a revolutionary movement and made some comparisons with other revolutions.

Question 3

Most answers were focused on the issue in the question, although not all addressed the whole period. The establishment of the relative importance of different factors should have been given more attention, though knowledge of the issues was often strong. Stronger answers considered the role of personal differences, especially the incompatibility of Hamilton and Jefferson, and some suggested that these were the chief explanation, citing the death of Hamilton in a duel. Other answers identified economic policies as the major difference between the parties as a key factor, but some pointed out that these were not always diverse and the parties came together on some issues. Foreign policy, especially regarding the Revolutionary Wars, was often taken to be the major cause of the rivalry. Weaker answers tended to concentrate on the personal rivalries with illustrations to show the bitterness in politics in this period, but not giving sufficient discussion to other explanations.

Question 5

These answers nearly all made the argument that slavery was vitally important to the South. Stronger answers offered more assessment and went beyond a list of reasons for the importance of slavery, generally explaining that slavery was dying out at the start of the period, especially as the slave trade was abolished,

but that it was rejuvenated by the invention of the cotton gin. Hence, the economic role of slavery was seen as paramount, with evidence from the growth in the number of slaves and the vital contribution made to the economy by the cotton trade. Stronger answers went on to argue that slavery was important to most Southerners, not just slave-owners; they considered its political importance and contribution to the dominance of the South in Congress, and the way the whole Southern social system was bound up with slavery hence became seen as essential to maintaining a stratified class system. Some of these arguments needed more contextual support. Some answers concluded that the importance of slavery to the South could be gauged from the fact that eventually the South was ready to fight a Civil War to defend it.

Question 6

Stronger answers noted the importance of 'increasingly successful' within the question rather than assessing the success of attempted restrictions more generally. Effective answers to this question could argue either way, but some of the stronger responses took the view that, while slavery was able to expand in the early part of the period, opposition then built up; they cited Garrison and *the Liberator*, abolitionists like John Brown and the way the North took up the cause of restricting slavery. The counterview that the Compromises of 1820 and 1850 were undermined in the 1850s was also discussed. Some answers argued that abolition was never more than a minority view, even in the North, although the movement made a good deal of noise, which meant efforts to restrict slavery were not very successful. Some answers would have benefited from a greater distinction between 'restrict' and abolish. Weaker answers focused on the broad implications of the Compromises of 1820 and 1850 and offered a limited range of evidence beyond this. Some answers spent much time explaining the causes of failure or success of abolitionism at the expense of a more focused assessment of impact.

Question 7

There was some good contextual knowledge about Andrew Jackson and most answers made effective use of what they knew to address the question directly. They focused on Jackson's role in making politics more accessible and in extending the power of the president. Often his impact was measured by the way his reforms affected later presidents. Some answers argued that his was not the greatest impact as some reforms preceded his presidency, while others measured impact by analysing positive and negative effects. Some weaker answers digressed into a separate discussion about how far he could be seen as a democratic politician; others moved away from US politics and government into accounts of his policies towards Native Americans and the unfortunate results these had.

Question 8

This was a question where the focus needed to be firmly on the period defined in the question. Weaker answers were general accounts of the causes of the Civil War, often going back to the Missouri Compromise. A few answers made no reference to the period 1859 to 1861 and some made no reference to secession or Fort Sumter, generally arguing that slavery was the root cause of the war. Stronger answers engaged directly with the concept of 'responsible' rather than outlining the events and causes of the war and looked at the key moments in the period in this light. Some answers argued that the South was to blame, both for secession and for firing on Fort Sumter. Others argued equally keenly that the North had exasperated the South with abolitionism, John Brown, the election of Lincoln, the sending of supplies to Fort Sumter and such a threat to slavery that the South had no option but to go to war. The question of states' rights was rarely well discussed. There were some answers which suggested both sides had drifted into war and focused on the points at which it could have been avoided with greater readiness to compromise.

Question 9

The concept of the question was a discussion of outcomes and this was not always grasped. There were few strong answers to this question. Weaker answers deviated into accounts of why the North won the Civil War or accounts of Reconstruction. The significance of the preservation of the Union could have been much more considered, although some answers did point out it had not been threatened since. Alternative outcomes were mostly discussed in terms of the abolition of slavery and the impact this had on US society.

Question 10

Answers to this question had varying evaluations of the role of Lincoln. A few answers took the view that his influence was minimal, with the real work being done by the generals, supported by a strong northern economy. There was some suggestion that he became too powerful as a result of the war and took too long to win it, notably not sacking McClellan soon enough. Most answers saw him as an effective leader, citing his

appointment of Sherman and Grant, his diplomatic skills in negotiating with Britain, his control of the cabinet and his boosting of morale at Gettysburg. Weaker answers digressed into discussing why the North won the war. There were answers offered to rather different questions involving a comparison between Davis and Lincoln and the relative importance of Lincoln's leadership to the outcome of the war compared to other factors: this emphasises the importance of answering the specific question asked.

Question 11

Answers to this question usually covered several factors, but a minority of answers attempted to discuss whether the factor in the question was or was not the main reason. Population growth was generally mentioned, but often in insufficient detail. Better answers recognised that the rapidly growing cities and unpleasant living conditions were a 'push' factor in westward expansion, arguing that even the perils of the journey and the hardships of life in the West, did not deter those living such unhappy lives. Other inducements included the availability of land, encouragement by the government and belief in 'manifest destiny'. There was also mention of facilitating factors like railroads and the telephone. What many answers lacked was any kind of reference to actual Western migrations. The Gold Rush and the Mormons were sometimes referenced, but most answers dealt in generalities.

Question 12

These answers were often based on too little detailed knowledge of the impact of immigration on the USA and of racial tension, which in some cases was barely mentioned. Weaker answers needed to identify exactly who formed the immigrants of the period and some examples of reactions to their presence. Some of these answers moved into discussion of racial tensions with African Americans, rather than with immigrants. Some better answers were able to show that there were other effects and mentioned the readiness of immigrants to work in low-paid and unpleasant jobs, leading to the stimulation of the economy and an increase in exports. Government reaction and measures to limit immigration were also discussed with some concrete examples being quoted.

Question 13

There were few effective answers to this question. Most answers did not have any knowledge about the tariffs of the period and some showed little appreciation of the role of tariffs in international trade. Most of these answers dismissed tariffs as unimportant and concentrated on other explanations including cheaper transport, a growing labour force, developments in banking and finance, an abundance of natural resources and the impact of technological advances. Such answers tended to become lists of factors with little differentiation between them, or a conclusion suggesting they all worked together to bring about industrial growth.

Question 17

This question led to some well-argued answers which demonstrated strong contextual knowledge. Most of these answers argued that white supremacy was much reduced in the period immediately after the Civil War, but that it became much stronger as the political role of the Democrats revived. There was good analysis of the issues surrounding land given to freed slaves and sharecropping, the lack of enforcement of Acts giving former slave voting and other rights, and the KKK. On the other side of the argument, the right to vote was seen as a threat to white supremacy, along with the development of education and a strong Church life for former slaves, which would be pivotal in the eventual emergence of a civil rights movement. Conclusions varied from the pessimistic to the more optimistic. Weaker answers gave a general explanation of the successes and failures of Reconstruction with variable levels of supporting detail. Overall, this was a question where personal engagement and reflection were often clearly revealed in the answers.

Question 18

Answers to this question often contained little reference to any labour disputes; they blamed the employers for enforcing poor working conditions and refusing to negotiate or to recognise trade unions, while using the military to break up strikes. Workers were blamed for violence when on strike and for unions being too exclusive. Stronger answers did have examples, mostly from railroad strikes. Some answers went on to examine the role of the government in causing unrest, whereas the question focused on two possible explanations.

Question 19

The Populist Movement attracted several answers that showed a sound understanding and good supporting knowledge. Most answers could establish the ways in which the movement was popular, instancing the level of support it attracted and the elements of its programme which were taken up by other parties. They could also show it became less popular as economic improvements meant much of its original purpose was now redundant. These answers addressed the question directly and reached a logical conclusion, mostly that it was an impressive third-party movement while it lasted but had too narrow a support base to have long-term popularity. Some weaker responses equated success with popularity.

Question 21

Stronger answers showed plenty of knowledge about the Roosevelt presidency. Less developed answers tended to list the achievements without being able to assess their degree of success; they asserted that the achievements were or were not successful and needed to explain how success could be judged. Stronger answers considered success in terms of the aims of the president and suggested that policies, such as trust-busting and intervention to settle the anthracite coal strike were successful in terms of preserving capitalism by encouraging a more responsible ethos. Others argued that policies which had long-term implications, such as ending food adulteration, preserving forests and setting up National Parks were more successful because of their greater impact. Policies aimed at improving conditions for workers were seen as having limited success as child labour continued, while policies towards civil rights were evaluated as successful initiatives but also being quite narrow in scope.

Question 22

Answers to this question mostly focused on the peace negotiations after the First World War; some held Wilson responsible for the failure of the League of Nations and for the outbreak of the Second World War as he was unable to bring about a fairer peace settlement. More nuanced analyses suggested that Wilson was hamstrung by attitudes in the USA and that the League was not a total disaster, even if the USA did not join. Weaker answers described the terms of the Peace Treaties and were sometimes doubtful about which policies fell within the period of the question. Stronger answers included an assessment of the role of the USA in the war, mostly arguing that the contribution had been vital to the allied victory, but the cost in casualties made the participation of the USA subject to criticism at home and led to the support for isolationism in the 1920s.

Question 23

Answers to this question were rarely convincing. Some better answers argued that the USA was well placed to prosper after the First World War, especially when compared with its economic rivals, while the politicians of the period introduced measures and deregulation to encourage growth. The role of the assembly line was more carefully assessed in these answers which mostly recognised that factors influenced each other, so it was not always easy to decide which were causes and which were effects. Many weaker answers simply gave an account of the manifestations of the boom, with reference to flappers, radios and vacuum cleaners, along with an account of the stars of the incipient film industry. Henry Ford was fully covered.

Question 23

There were some very strong answers to this question which argued convincingly that the New Deal helped to increase the number of people who were working through a variety of initiatives and to improve conditions through the National Recovery Administration (NRA). They went on to cite the Wagner Act and attempts to help farmers. These answers were able to weigh up the benefits and generally concluded that working people did well from an unprecedented social and economic programme, and that the recognition of Trade Unions was a big advance. They pointed out that not all workers gained and that unions were often challenged by big business, and that working women and African Americans did not always have the same advantages as industrial workers. Weaker answers described the measures of the New Deal and did not always confine themselves to those which were concerned with working people.

Question 25

Stronger answers offered a considered assessment and many concluded that air power was crucial as neither the navy nor the army could have achieved victory on their own. The dropping of the atomic bomb was seen as the key to ending the war completely. The contribution of the navy to the Pacific War was clearly analysed along with their D-Day participation. Some answers concluded that the armed forces were a co-ordinated body and their roles were complementary. Some answers to this question needed more contextual detail about the Second World War and some needed a stronger grasp of the geography of the war. Weaker answers tended to dismiss the role of the navy, or to consider other reasons why the Axis powers were defeated, apart from the part played by US forces. References to the Russian war effort were made, but these were not the focus of the question.

Question 26

Most answers identified the foreign policy problems facing Truman, apart from Korea; these included Potsdam, post-war Europe and the rise of Communism and Berlin. There was some good weighing of the extent of the challenges. Some answers argued that Korea was the greatest as it was the only actual war and proved hard to win. Other answers suggested that the Communist threat was the greatest challenge as Truman was not wholly successful in meeting it. Berlin was usually seen as a lesser challenge, because, although it had the potential to be a severe challenge, it was met with relative ease. Some weaker answers explained the challenge from the Korean War and then asserted it was the greatest challenge but mentioned no other challenges.

Question 27

Stronger answers to this question were able to assess a range of factors including entrenched fear of communism, external contextual factors, the role of Truman, and, inevitably, McCarthy. Stronger answers argued that Truman was instrumental in building up the fear of communism in order to get Congress to accept the Marshall Plan, or that external events, like the rise of Mao and the Russian nuclear deterrent, made it seem as if the USA was losing the Cold War and so built fear of communism to a crescendo. They often dismissed McCarthy as a symptom rather than a cause, noting that his excesses began well after 1945. Weaker answers blamed the fear on nativism but needed to be more precise about the impact of beliefs that 'the other' was a threat to the American Way of Life in the period given. Some of the examples used were well before 1945.

Question 28

Answers which were able to identify Eisenhower's objectives were generally successful. Many offered well-constructed arguments, beginning each paragraph with an objective and then assessing his achievements. Increased prosperity, the so-called Middle Way economics, balancing the budget and cutting defence expenditure, and containment, were frequently taken as aims. In the economic sphere, Eisenhower was usually judged a success, although it was argued that prosperity was not equally shared out in the USA and problems began to arise by the end of the presidency. The Highways Act was often cited. Some answers were critical of his limited advances in the field of civil rights, while others argued that his objective was to proceed gradually, and that was what he did. There was more division among answers about his success over containment, some suggesting he had ended the Korean War and kept Formosa free, while others felt his lack of rapprochement with the USSR and failure to support the Hungarian revolution showed a lack of success.

Question 31

Some answers to this question needed to have some understanding of what political will involves in order to be successful. Weaker answers maintained it played a minimal role and moved rapidly on to military factors, the strengths of the opposition, winning hearts and minds, the role of the media, and the resistance to the war in the USA. Other answers were able to suggest that political factors led to the defeat and argued that LBJ failed to prosecute the war with much vigour because he was more committed to the Great Society. Some answers demonstrated that the support of Diem, despite misgivings, and reluctance to escalate the war because of the cost and fear of repercussions at home did play a part in the defeat; they took the view that there was never enough political will in the USA to utilise their vastly superior resources to break the resistance in Vietnam.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/04
African and Asian History Outlines
c.1750–c.2000

Key messages

- Demands for judgement and higher order thinking skills, rather than just explanation, must be met in order to achieve the highest bands.
- When questions ask for consideration of a stated factor, consideration of that factor must be central to the response and not disregarded or addressed only in part.
- The exact wording of the question must be considered to ensure that its demands are met and the response is focused on the terms of the question and not only on the topic in general.

General comments

The answers were mainly restricted to sections 4 and 5 of the syllabus. Essay answers were often well structured, demonstrated the selection of a breadth and suitable depth of knowledge, and the standards of written communication were generally high. There was also a very wide range of questions over the three papers that were answered, showing that centres had taken advantage of the opportunities offered by Pre-U History to study a variety of topics. Generally, explanation was more developed in answers than the higher order thinking skills of assessment and judgement. It was common for a view to be expressed in the opening paragraph which was then not developed in the essay as a whole. This was the case in answers to questions which needed a supported view about the relative importance of different factors ('What best explains....?') or the importance or significance of a named factor. It was not unusual to see explanation of a list of factors predominate, which really gave little weight to the demand of the question for specific judgement.

Such answers had merit: they were often clear and well expressed and offered some clear and well supported explanations. However, a dimension was missing, and these responses needed engage with sustained discussion centred round the formation of the judgement in order to receive credit in the higher bands. The effort which had gone into writing explanations, often accompanied by relevant references to historians and some factual detail, was apparent, but more consideration of the relative importance of different explanations or how the concepts in questions might be addressed would have resulted in higher mark levels and shown a deeper understanding.

When there is a specific element in the question, the strongest responses focussed their answers on the consideration of that factor, then weight must be given to that factor and other factors must be related to it. Weaker responses to this type of questions often considered the factor in the question only in part of the response, but then wrote separately about other factors and did not clearly weigh those factors against the lead factor. An example of this is **Question 18** on the relative importance of the New Life movement. The essay should explain why it could be thought the factor was decisive or important and then weigh other factors in relation to the perspective established. The debate should be centred on the factor, and the essay should not become a list of reasons or consequences which includes the factor. Answers should not dismiss the factor in a few lines and then write about other factors or ignore the main factor completely. When answers did sustain a focus on the actual question, strong analysis emerged and was rewarded.

Some responses considered historians' interpretations as part of their responses. In weaker responses this sometimes consisted only of naming an historian or a school of interpretation, or explaining what it was and the position taken on the issue in the question. However, there were also several examples of stronger responses which used historiographical information more effectively by critically assessing the applicability of interpretations and approaches to the issue in the question, and analysing how far those arguments could be applied to and inform the issue in the question, in order to help to form a judgement.

There were many examples of fluent and perceptive historical writing, some of which showed depth and maturity, and strong engagement with the issues and personalities studied. There were many answers which

showed a grasp of detail which went beyond the usual textbooks, indicating further reading and thinking about some complex topics.

Overall, there was a range of responses from fragmentary description to analysis that showed a remarkable degree of intellectual maturity, and a written style which would not have been out of place in higher education. There were some responses in which obvious limitations in knowledge restricted the credit that could be given to a response because the points made in the responses were not substantiated with evidence. More frequently though, responses showed depth and breadth of knowledge about the issue, but demonstrated less developed critical skills. In other cases, the exact terms of question were not focused on, so that knowledge was not deployed appropriately or effectively.

Comments on specific questions

Where too few candidates answered a question for a report to be written, no report will appear below.

Question 17

There were explanations which balanced the long-term factors of resentment of foreign intervention and weak government and more short-term causes. Better answers offered some judgement, but the predominant element was explanation. There was some tendency to pass lightly over the nature of the rebellion itself, so that essays tended to be more an analysis of the weakness and problems of China by the later nineteenth century.

Question 18

Though there were some very effective answers which compared the New Life movement with other aspects of Nationalist rule, particularly economic development and the overcoming of the disunity caused by the warlords, there were responses in which the key element in the question was neglected or not fully understood. Some answers read more like a critique of Chiang Kai Shek generally.

Question 19

Though there is a well-established debate about the relative importance of the political appeal of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) as opposed to the effective tactics employed in the renewed Civil War which culminated in Mao's victory in 1949, this was not always the basis of answers which seemed intent on listing the reasons for the Communist triumph, often at considerable length and without enough specific reference to the two named elements. The concept of 'victory' was often neglected, and there was not much specific analysis of military factors apart from generalisations about superior morale and guerrilla tactics.

Question 20

The concept of 'transformed' was effectively considered by stronger answers and the nature and degree of change was assessed. There was some tendency for answers to outline a variety of changes and offer underdeveloped comments on whether they amounted to a transformation. Knowledge was often strong and explanations of changes - economic, social and political - were sound, but the heart of the question was often neglected.

Question 21

Some answers tackled the issue of whether the situation by 1975 meant that Mao's successors had little choice but to reform. Many answers did not start with this concept but from the changes themselves and explained that economic reform was a greater priority than political change, which was more limited. There was sound knowledge of the changes themselves and the issue of change and continuity was considered. The central idea of whether changes were made necessary by the legacy of Mao remained rather neglected.

Question 22

There was some impressive knowledge of aspects of the Raj. Better answers set elements of exploitation – using the resources of India for the benefit of Britain – against policies which developed the sub-continent for the benefits of the inhabitants, often at a cost to the mother country. However, for some, the concept of 'exploitation' was not central to the answer. Less successful essays became a general survey of the

measures taken to benefit India and measures taken to repress discontent without showing an awareness of exploitation.

Question 23

Better answers tackled 'achievements' as opposed to simply actions and developments. Some answers struck a balance between the promotion of self-government, effective campaigns and the more limited achievements, in effecting national unity during the period of Congress Rule following the Government of India Act, and surveyed the whole period showing the evolution of the party. Less successful answers dealt with a narrower period and saw the question as an invitation to write predominantly about Gandhi.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/52
The Crusades, 1095–1192

Key messages

- In **Section A**, some responses **Question (a)** could have been stronger if they had focused on a detailed comparison and contrast of the two documents in relation specifically to the issue in the question. In some responses candidates wrote about other points of comparison and contrast unrelated to the specific issue in the question.
- In **Section A**, some responses to **Question (b)** answered the question as if it were an essay, without basing their response on the evidence available in the documents. By contrast, some other candidates wrote about the evidence available in the sources generally and not in relation to the specific issue in the question. The main task is the analysis and evaluation of the five passages insofar as they have a bearing on the specific issues in the question; some answers would have benefited if they focused more clearly on this central requirement.
- In answers to the **Section B** essay questions, many responses would have benefited had they reached a firmer judgement in the relation to the questions.

General comments

The most effective answers to **Question 1**, both to part **(a)** and part **(b)** were focused on the analysis and assessment of the documents. Different approaches were taken, but the most effective answers all linked knowledge very specifically to the documents and offered supported judgements about their value as evidence. The strongest answers included an interpretation of evidence, that is, it was related to the issue in the question. In these answers, the sources were evaluated by reference to their provenance, and contextual knowledge was used to establish a judgement about a specific topic. Less effective answers did not explain carefully enough how the sources related to the issue in the question. The requirement in part **(a)** is to identify and explain differences and similarities between two documents as evidence about a specific issue, not simply to compare and contrast two documents, but some weaker answers were written as if this were so. Similarly, in part **(b)**, the strongest answers explained how the documents offer evidence for or against a specific view. The question is not phrased to elicit an essay which uses the documents or parts of them to support different views: however, some weaker answers were written as if it had been.

The strongest answers made use of all of the documents, as stipulated in the question, and analysed and used the evidence which they offered about the issue in the question in a way that was explained clearly. These stronger answers used the message delivered by the whole of the documents, not only part of them, and wrote explanations that went beyond brief paraphrases or statements. The strongest answers used this as the basis for a judgement about the document as evidence, through evaluation of the documents based on their provenance and other characteristics, and also reference to relevant contextual knowledge. The strongest answers made full use of information given in the documents by evaluating the documents to ascertain the full extent and usefulness of the evidence in relation to the issues in the question, such as by showing, for example, that the authorship of a document might mean that its weight as evidence about the issue is especially important because the author was in a particular position of know about or influence events. The most effective responses used contextual knowledge of the period in this way. Answers which applied only generic evaluative techniques, such as stating that the author might have been unreliable because of his or her status (but without explaining with reference to the document, contextual knowledge and issue in the question why this may be so and why this may have a bearing on the issue in the question) attracted much less credit than evaluation which was specific, contextualised and appropriately supported with reference specifically to evidence from the document. The question asks specifically for the use of contextual knowledge: the strongest responses applied knowledge to the documents in order to assess them as evidence, rather than only adding factual material to their response more to assess the issue directly.

There were some very strong analyses of the documents, in which candidates selected some apt and often detailed knowledge to support critical judgements. However, there were some areas in which many responses could have been stronger. Many responses to part (a) would have scored higher marks had they included both similarities and differences identified in the content of documents, as well as in their provenance. Some responses to part (a) questions were written largely about the provenance of the documents without first having identified points of comparison and contrast between them. It is important for candidates to consider the documents as a whole in answering part (b) rather than mining the texts for decontextualised corroboration to support various points they wish to make about the issue: this sometimes led to responses in which the overall message of the documents, or their weight as evidence about the issue, was missed or mischaracterised. Some candidates adopted a thematic approach and sometimes employed this very successfully. In other cases, however, candidates taking this approach did not consistently evaluate the documents. This was because evidence from a document was used in various paragraphs and in some cases the document and the evidence it provided was evaluated in one part of the response, but not in others. In some weaker responses, evaluation was often entirely lacking and answers ignored the nature, authorship, purpose and reliability of the evidence. These responses adopted a more essay-like approach which used the documents only to supply points of factual support, and were not effective in meeting the demands of the assessment criteria. There were a substantial number of answers which offered minimal or, in some cases, no contextual knowledge in support of judgements about the documents, despite the indication in the question that this is a requirement. For some answers, a much tighter focus on the issue would have helped, as responses often included unnecessarily lengthy narration of events, or material that was pertinent to the topic but was of tangential relevance to the particular issue, and did not help to answer the question.

The most effective responses to essay questions used detailed knowledge of the period but, in general, essay responses could have been improved by the use of more specific factual support. Many responses to essay questions could also have been strengthened if they had made a judgement more clearly about the issue in the question. Some responses consisted of a series of explanations which were often well supported, but did not clearly analyse their relative importance and say which explanation was preferred and why, and thus did not actually answer the question. However, a strength of Section B was that responses to essay questions were often full and did not suggest that they were being rushed because of too much time being spent on parts (a) and (b).

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Stronger answers focused entirely on the situation in France arguing that both documents showed instances of civil war and infighting, and general misfortune and decay. They then went on to suggest that Document B was more detailed in its account of the situation in France referring to famine and sickness and to conditions being so difficult that families were ready to uproot themselves. They also pointed out that only Document B mentioned the visions and portents seen in France. Less strong answers did not keep to the point and some went on to compare the documents for other purposes, such as for what they showed about reasons for joining the Crusade. Explanations for the differences between the documents tended to focus on the fact that Document A was an account of Urban's speech and so was likely to emphasise the benefits Crusaders would enjoy and thus stress the horrors they were leaving behind, while the author of Document B, as a monk, was likely to focus on superstition. Some answers suggested that as Ekkehard was German he might have been relying on hearsay for his information. Other answers, less convincingly in this context, argued that Fulcher was trying to attract settlers to the Holy Land and that Ekkehard was unreliable as he was not on the Crusade. Such comments needed to be made relevant to the content of these documents. Some weaker answers deviated into discussion about the reliability of different accounts of Urban's speech at Clermont.
- (b) Stronger answers selected material effectively to show that religious motives predominated and argued that most of the documents showed mixed motives. Distinguishing between religious and secular motivation was a problem in some answers and better ones made this a point of discussion. Stronger answers maintained that the prospect of the remission of sins was very tempting in this period and pleasing God by fighting the infidel, or the Jews in some cases, was an attractive idea. Crusaders were seen as being encouraged by visions. The devotion of pilgrims like Peter the Hermit was often cited. Less religious motives included escaping from civil war, famine and sickness, the hope of gain, taking all the possessions of the Jews, and the miseries of peasant

life. In evaluating the provenance of the documents, stronger answers noted that the three monkish authors largely backed up one another, while Anna Comnena, not well known for favouring the Franks, was likely to be reliable in her relatively generous assessment of Peter. Less strong answers suggested that all the monks were self-interested and promoting their own agenda, and they included information about the place of Steven Runciman in the historiography of the Crusades. There was some useful contextual knowledge about the religious beliefs of the period and the spread of disease and famine in France. Weaker answers cited very little evidence.

Question 2

Stronger answers put forward a variety of possible explanations and then came to a supported judgement about which was the best. The factors they identified included the setting up of a feudal structure in some Crusader States, defensive measures such as the building of castles, the role of the military orders, the disunity of the Muslims and the relative tolerance towards the people already living in the States. Many argued that, once the Muslims were more united, the Crusader States found it harder to resist and this showed that disunity was the best explanation, while others saw the leadership of the rulers of the States as crucial. Some pointed out that overcoming some of the crises that faced the States was a good explanation for their survival and suggested that their position was always quite precarious. Weaker answers described some of the features of the States, or they wrote in entirely general terms with minimal reference to any actual Crusader States or to the events of the period.

Question 3

Stronger answers identified the failings of both Conrad III and Louis VII, and many felt that the Pope and Bernard of Clairvaux were not immune from blame. Bad decisions and military incompetence were instanced in the German advance into Asia Minor, as well as the disaster in the Cadmus mountains, the failure to take Edessa, or even approach the principality, and the total catastrophe at Damascus. Most of these answers agreed with the statement in the question. They added that the emperor, Raymond of Antioch and the ambivalence of many of the settlers, also contributed. Weaker answers tended to be narrative or to provide few explanations beyond the one identified in the question.

Question 4

Answers generally needed to focus more on aspects of personal conflict. Some better answers saw Richard's capture of Acre, which Saladin had tried hard to hold on to, as a personal conflict and backed this up with references to the slaughter of prisoners, the Battle of Arsuf and the March on Jerusalem. They also argued that the two leaders never met, but that negotiations over access to Jerusalem were amicable and that they each admired the fighting qualities of the other, so the Crusade was not a personal conflict. Some answers suggested that neither Christians nor Muslims would have viewed the Crusade in this way. Less strong answers dismissed any element of personal conflict and considered whether the Crusade was a success or the roles of Richard and Saladin.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/53
The Reign of Henry VIII, 1509–1547

Key messages

- In **Section A**, some responses **Question (a)** could have been stronger if they had focused on a detailed comparison and contrast of the two documents in relation specifically to the issue in the question. In some responses candidates wrote about other points of comparison and contrast unrelated to the specific issue in the question.
- In **Section A**, some responses to **Question (b)** answered the question as if it were an essay, without basing their response on the evidence available in the documents. By contrast, some other candidates wrote about the evidence available in the sources generally and not in relation to the specific issue in the question. The main task is the analysis and evaluation of the five passages insofar as they have a bearing on the specific issues in the question; some answers would have benefited if they focused more clearly on this central requirement.
- In answers to the **Section B** essay questions, many responses would have benefited had they reached a firmer judgement in the relation to the questions.

General comments

The most effective answers to **Question 1**, both to part **(a)** and part **(b)** were focused on the analysis and assessment of the documents. Different approaches were taken, but the most effective answers all linked knowledge very specifically to the documents and offered supported judgements about their value as evidence. The strongest answers included an interpretation of evidence, that is, it was related to the issue in the question. In these answers, the sources were evaluated by reference to their provenance, and contextual knowledge was used to establish a judgement about a specific topic. Less effective answers did not explain carefully enough how the sources related to the issue in the question. The requirement in part **(a)** is to identify and explain differences and similarities between two documents as evidence about a specific issue, not simply to compare and contrast two documents, but some weaker answers were written as if this were so. Similarly, in part **(b)**, the strongest answers explained how the documents offer evidence for or against a specific view. The question is not phrased to elicit an essay which uses the documents or parts of them to support different views: however, some weaker answers were written as if it had been.

The strongest answers made use of all of the documents, as stipulated in the question, and analysed and used the evidence which they offered about the issue in the question in a way that was explained clearly. These stronger answers used the message delivered by the whole of the documents, not only part of them, and wrote explanations that went beyond brief paraphrases or statements. The strongest answers used this as the basis for a judgement about the document as evidence, through evaluation of the documents based on their provenance and other characteristics, and also reference to relevant contextual knowledge. The strongest answers made full use of information given in the documents by evaluating the documents to ascertain the full extent and usefulness of the evidence in relation to the issues in the question, such as by showing, for example, that the authorship of a document might mean that its weight as evidence about the issue is especially important because the author was in a particular position of know about or influence events. The most effective responses used contextual knowledge of the period in this way. Answers which applied only generic evaluative techniques, such as stating that the author might have been unreliable because of his or her status (but without explaining with reference to the document, contextual knowledge and issue in the question why this may be so and why this may have a bearing on the issue in the question) attracted much less credit than evaluation which was specific, contextualised and appropriately supported with reference specifically to evidence from the document. The question asks specifically for the use of contextual knowledge: the strongest responses applied knowledge to the documents in order to assess them as evidence, rather than only adding factual material to their response more to assess the issue directly.

There were some very strong analyses of the documents, in which candidates selected some apt and often detailed knowledge to support critical judgements. However, there were some areas in which many responses could have been stronger. Many responses to part (a) would have scored higher marks had they included both similarities and differences identified in the content of documents, as well as in their provenance. Some responses to part (a) questions were written largely about the provenance of the documents without first having identified points of comparison and contrast between them. It is important for candidates to consider the documents as a whole in answering part (b) rather than mining the texts for decontextualised corroboration to support various points they wish to make about the issue: this sometimes led to responses in which the overall message of the documents, or their weight as evidence about the issue, was missed or mischaracterised. Some candidates adopted a thematic approach and sometimes employed this very successfully. In other cases, however, candidates taking this approach did not consistently evaluate the documents. This was because evidence from a document was used in various paragraphs and in some cases the document and the evidence it provided was evaluated in one part of the response, but not in others. In some weaker responses, evaluation was often entirely lacking and answers ignored the nature, authorship, purpose and reliability of the evidence. These responses adopted a more essay-like approach which used the documents only to supply points of factual support, and were not effective in meeting the demands of the assessment criteria. There were a substantial number of answers which offered minimal or, in some cases, no contextual knowledge in support of judgements about the documents, despite the indication in the question that this is a requirement. For some answers, a much tighter focus on the issue would have helped, as responses often included unnecessarily lengthy narration of events, or material that was pertinent to the topic but was of tangential relevance to the particular issue, and did not help to answer the question.

The most effective responses to essay questions used detailed knowledge of the period but, in general, essay responses could have been improved by the use of more specific factual support. Many responses to essay questions could also have been strengthened if they had made a judgement more clearly about the issue in the question. Some responses consisted of a series of explanations which were often well supported, but did not clearly analyse their relative importance and say which explanation was preferred and why, and thus did not actually answer the question. However, a strength of Section B was that responses to essay questions were often full and did not suggest that they were being rushed because of too much time being spent on parts (a) and (b).

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Stronger answers selected relevant evidence from the two documents to show that they agreed that Henry's reforms were godly and, similarly, that Document C refuted claims that the reforms were radical, while Document B showed that they were middle of the road measures. Stronger answers went on to argue that the reforms had been taken over and taken to extreme lengths by Cromwell. They identified differences in that Henry VIII was directly credited with the reforms in Document B, but not in Document C. The explanations about the differences were largely based on the authorship, with Document B as an official communication bound to show Henry in a good light and Document C as a report to Norfolk, an enemy of Cromwell, more likely to emphasise Cromwell's malign influence on the reforms. Weaker answers often made a general comparison, not focused on the reforms. Some more careful reading was needed: some answers did not grasp that Document C was denying that the accusations levelled against England were true.
- (b) Stronger answers either looked at each document in turn for religious or secular concerns, or they focused on religious or secular issues drawing evidence from each document in turn. They referenced the religious conservatism of the Pilgrims, the Privy Council and Pace. In contrast, they also pointed out that Cromwell was accused of undermining the laws, refusing to acknowledge that he was wrong, and being a traitor and bad servant of the King. Some argued that the real reasons for his fall were contained in Documents D and E, being Henry's resentment over the Cleves marriage and the factional rivalry at court, with religion being a cloak for these less laudable motives. Weaker answers did not use the documents fully but gave accounts of the fall of Cromwell, with much extraneous detail, especially on the role of faction. Evaluation of the documents was usually sound, although Document E was widely accepted as obviously reliable, without full consideration of its content.

Question 2

There were several attempts (largely successful) of integrating various primary documents (including correspondence from Anne Boleyn and Hall's Chronicle). This was impressive, but primary sources should not overly dominate the essay to the detriment of either analytical rigour or providing a sufficient range and depth of contextual material. The strongest answers presented a sustained focus on Henry's failure to secure the divorce, but a large number of answers focused more on Henry's motives. There was a tendency to describe the debates represented by the books of Leviticus and Deuteronomy. Those answers which focused on the opposition to the divorce frequently alluded to Fisher's key role.

Question 3

Most answers to this question were coherently and sensibly structured. Answers generally tended to deal with each theme in turn. The internal structure of the various paragraphs was well directed: for the secular section, there was a focus on royal authority (political power), socio-economic factors and the impact on the gentry. As regards religion, there was an awareness of change over time, with consideration of shorter-term factors, then longer-term ones (for example, ten articles compared with the six articles that followed). There was also careful and subtle analysis of the state of religious change post-1536, with an overall understanding that the dissolution of the monasteries obviously did not lead to a fully-fledged Lutheran Reformation. Some highlighted the importance of severing ties with continental Catholicism.

Question 4

Stronger answers focused on some examples of opposition and explained why they lacked effectiveness. There was some good analysis of the significance of Elizabeth Barton, More and Fisher, showing their potential to be a threat and the actions Henry and Cromwell took to avoid this, along with the lack of widespread support. There was some good discussion about how these factors related to each other, and repression and propaganda were generally seen as the main explanations. Weaker responses outlined a range of explanations without linking them to examples of opposition; some of these went into political theories of the time, without reflecting how far these ideas would have circulated in Henry's England. The Pilgrimage of Grace was not mentioned in some answers, while others argued usefully that it was ineffective as it was so far away and, eventually, easily put down. Some weaker answers digressed into how far it was a threat.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/55
The Reign of Charles I, 1625–1649

Key messages

- In **Section A**, some responses **Question (a)** could have been stronger if they had focused on a detailed comparison and contrast of the two documents in relation specifically to the issue in the question. In some responses candidates wrote about other points of comparison and contrast unrelated to the specific issue in the question.
- In **Section A**, some responses to **Question (b)** answered the question as if it were an essay, without basing their response on the evidence available in the documents. By contrast, some other candidates wrote about the evidence available in the sources generally and not in relation to the specific issue in the question. The main task is the analysis and evaluation of the five passages insofar as they have a bearing on the specific issues in the question; some answers would have benefited if they focused more clearly on this central requirement.
- In answers to the **Section B** essay questions, many responses would have benefited had they reached a firmer judgement in the relation to the questions.

General comments

The most effective answers to **Question 1**, both to part **(a)** and part **(b)** were focused on the analysis and assessment of the documents. Different approaches were taken, but the most effective answers all linked knowledge very specifically to the documents and offered supported judgements about their value as evidence. The strongest answers included an interpretation of evidence, that is, it was related to the issue in the question. In these answers, the sources were evaluated by reference to their provenance, and contextual knowledge was used to establish a judgement about a specific topic. Less effective answers did not explain carefully enough how the sources related to the issue in the question. The requirement in part **(a)** is to identify and explain differences and similarities between two documents as evidence about a specific issue, not simply to compare and contrast two documents, but some weaker answers were written as if this were so. Similarly, in part **(b)**, the strongest answers explained how the documents offer evidence for or against a specific view. The question is not phrased to elicit an essay which uses the documents or parts of them to support different views: however, some weaker answers were written as if it had been.

The strongest answers made use of all of the documents, as stipulated in the question, and analysed and used the evidence which they offered about the issue in the question in a way that was explained clearly. These stronger answers used the message delivered by the whole of the documents, not only part of them, and wrote explanations that went beyond brief paraphrases or statements. The strongest answers used this as the basis for a judgement about the document as evidence, through evaluation of the documents based on their provenance and other characteristics, and also reference to relevant contextual knowledge. The strongest answers made full use of information given in the documents by evaluating the documents to ascertain the full extent and usefulness of the evidence in relation to the issues in the question, such as by showing, for example, that the authorship of a document might mean that its weight as evidence about the issue is especially important because the author was in a particular position of know about or influence events. The most effective responses used contextual knowledge of the period in this way. Answers which applied only generic evaluative techniques, such as stating that the author might have been unreliable because of his or her status (but without explaining with reference to the document, contextual knowledge and issue in the question why this may be so and why this may have a bearing on the issue in the question) attracted much less credit than evaluation which was specific, contextualised and appropriately supported with reference specifically to evidence from the document. The question asks specifically for the use of contextual knowledge: the strongest responses applied knowledge to the documents in order to assess them as evidence, rather than only adding factual material to their response more to assess the issue directly.

There were some very strong analyses of the documents, in which candidates selected some apt and often detailed knowledge to support critical judgements. However, there were some areas in which many responses could have been stronger. Many responses to part (a) would have scored higher marks had they included both similarities and differences identified in the content of documents, as well as in their provenance. Some responses to part (a) questions were written largely about the provenance of the documents without first having identified points of comparison and contrast between them. It is important for candidates to consider the documents as a whole in answering part (b) rather than mining the texts for decontextualised corroboration to support various points they wish to make about the issue: this sometimes led to responses in which the overall message of the documents, or their weight as evidence about the issue, was missed or mischaracterised. Some candidates adopted a thematic approach and sometimes employed this very successfully. In other cases, however, candidates taking this approach did not consistently evaluate the documents. This was because evidence from a document was used in various paragraphs and in some cases the document and the evidence it provided was evaluated in one part of the response, but not in others. In some weaker responses, evaluation was often entirely lacking and answers ignored the nature, authorship, purpose and reliability of the evidence. These responses adopted a more essay-like approach which used the documents only to supply points of factual support, and were not effective in meeting the demands of the assessment criteria. There were a substantial number of answers which offered minimal or, in some cases, no contextual knowledge in support of judgements about the documents, despite the indication in the question that this is a requirement. For some answers, a much tighter focus on the issue would have helped, as responses often included unnecessarily lengthy narration of events, or material that was pertinent to the topic but was of tangential relevance to the particular issue, and did not help to answer the question.

The most effective responses to essay questions used detailed knowledge of the period but, in general, essay responses could have been improved by the use of more specific factual support. Many responses to essay questions could also have been strengthened if they had made a judgement more clearly about the issue in the question. Some responses consisted of a series of explanations which were often well supported, but did not clearly analyse their relative importance and say which explanation was preferred and why, and thus did not actually answer the question. However, a strength of Section B was that responses to essay questions were often full and did not suggest that they were being rushed because of too much time being spent on parts (a) and (b).

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Most answers offered an effective comparison. They recognised that both documents saw the role of the monarch as being to govern by law with Parliament and that Charles I had promised to do so. Both documents were for holding the King to account, but in a different way. While Cromwell was having nothing more to do with him, the Commonwealth men had more radical ideas about the future. Some stronger answers referred to the social contract being outlined in Document B and suggested that this interpretation could have arisen from Ludlow's mature reflections as much as from the events of 1648. Explanations about the documents did not always recognise that although Document A was by a royalist author, it was accurately representing Cromwell's views. Some answers tried to make a distinction between the person and the institution of monarchy, but this did not throw much light on the comparison of the documents.
- (b) There were some strong answers to this question which began with Document C and its clear assertion that God was calling for the King to be punished. They went on to link this with Document B which argued that the Bible asserted that the monarchy was undesirable and Document D where the judges were influenced by their duty to God. These answers then contrasted the religious motive with Cromwell's belief that the King was deceptive and out for another war, backed up by Documents B, D and E. Even Document C mentioned the blood he had shed. Thus, these answers often concluded that it was Charles' methods of government which led to opposition. There was some good discussion of the provenance of the documents, especially Documents D and E. Less strong answers did not argue coherently, moving from one motive to another without developing any kind of argument and contextual knowledge was often either sparse, or too detailed, with long accounts of the trial of Charles I being included.

Question 2

The stronger answers were effective at sustaining comparative analysis throughout the essay. In several weaker answers, comparative analysis was restricted to the conclusion. There was generally good attention to detail, with valid forays into the early 1640s. While Wentworth's work in Ireland was sometimes well covered, his contributions in England were not particularly well addressed. Weaker answers tended to outline his policies without explaining their significance. Similarly, Laud's pro-Arminian stance was addressed, but his anti-Calvinism was neglected. There were instances where the argument focused on the reasons for opposition to Laud and Wentworth but remained implicit. Some answers sought to integrate Charles I as an additional factor, but that was too peripheral to this question. There were some nuanced answers that focused on different types of opposition (localised impact, passive nature of resistance, etc.).

Question 3

The answers to this question focused on the roles of the three protagonists of the period: the King, the army and Parliament. Stronger answers explained how each of these groups was pursuing its own agenda and hence agreement was difficult. Most answers held the King as largely responsible, with a number considering that the army was equally intransigent. Others argued that withholding back pay from the army was an incendiary policy on the part of Parliament. Some high-quality discussion emerged in many of these answers. Less strong answers had a different focus, for example, considering the various proposals put forward in some detail; they needed to be more firmly based on why the various programmes put forward were unacceptable to some. Others became enmeshed in the complex events of the period and so could not get to grips with the question.

Question 4

Some effective answers took a more thematic approach, outlining the religious, legal and economic context in which the different radical groups emerged. In some cases, the contextualisation was left imprecise without the identification and explanation of the particular radical groups. Some answers struggled with how to deal with the chronology, and this led to a greater degree of description and narration. Less developed answers did not consider sufficiently the circumstances that fostered radicalism and offered limited knowledge of radical groups. The Levellers were rarely mentioned with the focus often on the social impact of the Civil War.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/56
The French Revolution, 1774–1794

Key messages

- In **Section A**, some responses **Question (a)** could have been stronger if they had focused on a detailed comparison and contrast of the two documents in relation specifically to the issue in the question. In some responses candidates wrote about other points of comparison and contrast unrelated to the specific issue in the question.
- In **Section A**, some responses to **Question (b)** answered the question as if it were an essay, without basing their response on the evidence available in the documents. By contrast, some other candidates wrote about the evidence available in the sources generally and not in relation to the specific issue in the question. The main task is the analysis and evaluation of the five passages insofar as they have a bearing on the specific issues in the question; some answers would have benefited if they focused more clearly on this central requirement.
- In answers to the **Section B** essay questions, many responses would have benefited had they reached a firmer judgement in the relation to the questions.

General comments

The most effective answers to **Question 1**, both to part **(a)** and part **(b)** were focused on the analysis and assessment of the documents. Different approaches were taken, but the most effective answers all linked knowledge very specifically to the documents and offered supported judgements about their value as evidence. The strongest answers included an interpretation of evidence, that is, it was related to the issue in the question. In these answers, the sources were evaluated by reference to their provenance, and contextual knowledge was used to establish a judgement about a specific topic. Less effective answers did not explain carefully enough how the sources related to the issue in the question. The requirement in part **(a)** is to identify and explain differences and similarities between two documents as evidence about a specific issue, not simply to compare and contrast two documents, but some weaker answers were written as if this were so. Similarly, in part **(b)**, the strongest answers explained how the documents offer evidence for or against a specific view. The question is not phrased to elicit an essay which uses the documents or parts of them to support different views: however, some weaker answers were written as if it had been.

The strongest answers made use of all of the documents, as stipulated in the question, and analysed and used the evidence which they offered about the issue in the question in a way that was explained clearly. These stronger answers used the message delivered by the whole of the documents, not only part of them, and wrote explanations that went beyond brief paraphrases or statements. The strongest answers used this as the basis for a judgement about the document as evidence, through evaluation of the documents based on their provenance and other characteristics, and also reference to relevant contextual knowledge. The strongest answers made full use of information given in the documents by evaluating the documents to ascertain the full extent and usefulness of the evidence in relation to the issues in the question, such as by showing, for example, that the authorship of a document might mean that its weight as evidence about the issue is especially important because the author was in a particular position of know about or influence events. The most effective responses used contextual knowledge of the period in this way. Answers which applied only generic evaluative techniques, such as stating that the author might have been unreliable because of his or her status (but without explaining with reference to the document, contextual knowledge and issue in the question why this may be so and why this may have a bearing on the issue in the question) attracted much less credit than evaluation which was specific, contextualised and appropriately supported with reference specifically to evidence from the document. The question asks specifically for the use of contextual knowledge: the strongest responses applied knowledge to the documents in order to assess them as evidence, rather than only adding factual material to their response more to assess the issue directly.

There were some very strong analyses of the documents, in which candidates selected some apt and often detailed knowledge to support critical judgements. However, there were some areas in which many responses could have been stronger. Many responses to part (a) would have scored higher marks had they included both similarities and differences identified in the content of documents, as well as in their provenance. Some responses to part (a) questions were written largely about the provenance of the documents without first having identified points of comparison and contrast between them. It is important for candidates to consider the documents as a whole in answering part (b) rather than mining the texts for decontextualised corroboration to support various points they wish to make about the issue: this sometimes led to responses in which the overall message of the documents, or their weight as evidence about the issue, was missed or mischaracterised. Some candidates adopted a thematic approach and sometimes employed this very successfully. In other cases, however, candidates taking this approach did not consistently evaluate the documents. This was because evidence from a document was used in various paragraphs and in some cases the document and the evidence it provided was evaluated in one part of the response, but not in others. In some weaker responses, evaluation was often entirely lacking and answers ignored the nature, authorship, purpose and reliability of the evidence. These responses adopted a more essay-like approach which used the documents only to supply points of factual support, and were not effective in meeting the demands of the assessment criteria. There were a substantial number of answers which offered minimal or, in some cases, no contextual knowledge in support of judgements about the documents, despite the indication in the question that this is a requirement. For some answers, a much tighter focus on the issue would have helped, as responses often included unnecessarily lengthy narration of events, or material that was pertinent to the topic but was of tangential relevance to the particular issue, and did not help to answer the question.

The most effective responses to essay questions used detailed knowledge of the period but, in general, essay responses could have been improved by the use of more specific factual support. Many responses to essay questions could also have been strengthened if they had made a judgement more clearly about the issue in the question. Some responses consisted of a series of explanations which were often well supported, but did not clearly analyse their relative importance and say which explanation was preferred and why, and thus did not actually answer the question. However, a strength of Section B was that responses to essay questions were often full and did not suggest that they were being rushed because of too much time being spent on parts (a) and (b).

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Stronger answers paid attention to detail and offered a close analysis of the content. There were some effective comparisons and contrasts, but some obvious points were not picked up, for example, about Robespierre's doubts in Document D, which do not appear in Document C, though the two are more in agreement about Danton. The reference to the few fanatics in Document D who wanted to establish liberty by bloodshed reveals a more determined attitude by some than the writer of Document C admits. Similarities were done better with consideration of the motives of the writers and the fact that they were writing after the revolution so may be to some degree exculpatory in tone.
- (b) The debate about the Terror being driven either by ideology or a desire for security against internal and external enemies is well established. Some answers offered perceptive comments on the origin of the sources and there was some applied knowledge of threats referred to in the documents. Other answers took on the form of an essay answer referenced with extracts from the sources which did not lead easily to sustained evaluation or use of knowledge to assess evidence. The rich content of Document E was sometimes not given appropriate attention and opportunities to apply knowledge here were not always sufficiently taken. The documents were generally well linked to the question and understood.

Question 2

Most answers were focused on the key issue, though some talked generally about the nobility and the social structure of *ancien régime* France without discussing the Assembly of Notables or the so-called 'noble revolt', at sufficient length. Better answers appreciated this point within the wider context and presented alternative explanations with some sense of argument and discussion, particularly if they could link the defence of noble privilege with the role of the monarchy.

Question 3

There were some uncertainties about the reforms and some answers veered away from the changes to a consideration of the role of the monarch and the problems of constitutional monarchy, in general. There were some sound assessments of the impact of the social, constitutional and administrative changes with a balance between achievements and a failure to engage with some fundamental problems.

Question 4

There were some good discussions of the crowd with reference to socio-economic grievances and wider social structure, as well as alternative influences on political developments such as political clubs and the role of the Assembly/Convention. Few answers had enough sense of linkage and interaction between these and they tended to see the crowd in isolation without linking to political figures who sought to make use of them.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/57
Napoleon and Europe, 1798–1815

Key messages

- In **Section A**, some responses **Question (a)** could have been stronger if they had focused on a detailed comparison and contrast of the two documents in relation specifically to the issue in the question. In some responses candidates wrote about other points of comparison and contrast unrelated to the specific issue in the question.
- In **Section A**, some responses to **Question (b)** answered the question as if it were an essay, without basing their response on the evidence available in the documents. By contrast, some other candidates wrote about the evidence available in the sources generally and not in relation to the specific issue in the question. The main task is the analysis and evaluation of the five passages insofar as they have a bearing on the specific issues in the question; some answers would have benefited if they focused more clearly on this central requirement.
- In answers to the **Section B** essay questions, many responses would have benefited had they reached a firmer judgement in the relation to the questions.

General comments

The most effective answers to **Question 1**, both to part **(a)** and part **(b)** were focused on the analysis and assessment of the documents. Different approaches were taken, but the most effective answers all linked knowledge very specifically to the documents and offered supported judgements about their value as evidence. The strongest answers included an interpretation of evidence, that is, it was related to the issue in the question. In these answers, the sources were evaluated by reference to their provenance, and contextual knowledge was used to establish a judgement about a specific topic. Less effective answers did not explain carefully enough how the sources related to the issue in the question. The requirement in part **(a)** is to identify and explain differences and similarities between two documents as evidence about a specific issue, not simply to compare and contrast two documents, but some weaker answers were written as if this were so. Similarly, in part **(b)**, the strongest answers explained how the documents offer evidence for or against a specific view. The question is not phrased to elicit an essay which uses the documents or parts of them to support different views: however, some weaker answers were written as if it had been.

The strongest answers made use of all of the documents, as stipulated in the question, and analysed and used the evidence which they offered about the issue in the question in a way that was explained clearly. These stronger answers used the message delivered by the whole of the documents, not only part of them, and wrote explanations that went beyond brief paraphrases or statements. The strongest answers used this as the basis for a judgement about the document as evidence, through evaluation of the documents based on their provenance and other characteristics, and also reference to relevant contextual knowledge. The strongest answers made full use of information given in the documents by evaluating the documents to ascertain the full extent and usefulness of the evidence in relation to the issues in the question, such as by showing, for example, that the authorship of a document might mean that its weight as evidence about the issue is especially important because the author was in a particular position of know about or influence events. The most effective responses used contextual knowledge of the period in this way. Answers which applied only generic evaluative techniques, such as stating that the author might have been unreliable because of his or her status (but without explaining with reference to the document, contextual knowledge and issue in the question why this may be so and why this may have a bearing on the issue in the question) attracted much less credit than evaluation which was specific, contextualised and appropriately supported with reference specifically to evidence from the document. The question asks specifically for the use of contextual knowledge: the strongest responses applied knowledge to the documents in order to assess them as evidence, rather than only adding factual material to their response more to assess the issue directly.

There were some very strong analyses of the documents, in which candidates selected some apt and often detailed knowledge to support critical judgements. However, there were some areas in which many responses could have been stronger. Many responses to part (a) would have scored higher marks had they included both similarities and differences identified in the content of documents, as well as in their provenance. Some responses to part (a) questions were written largely about the provenance of the documents without first having identified points of comparison and contrast between them. It is important for candidates to consider the documents as a whole in answering part (b) rather than mining the texts for decontextualised corroboration to support various points they wish to make about the issue: this sometimes led to responses in which the overall message of the documents, or their weight as evidence about the issue, was missed or mischaracterised. Some candidates adopted a thematic approach and sometimes employed this very successfully. In other cases, however, candidates taking this approach did not consistently evaluate the documents. This was because evidence from a document was used in various paragraphs and in some cases the document and the evidence it provided was evaluated in one part of the response, but not in others. In some weaker responses, evaluation was often entirely lacking and answers ignored the nature, authorship, purpose and reliability of the evidence. These responses adopted a more essay-like approach which used the documents only to supply points of factual support, and were not effective in meeting the demands of the assessment criteria. There were a substantial number of answers which offered minimal or, in some cases, no contextual knowledge in support of judgements about the documents, despite the indication in the question that this is a requirement. For some answers, a much tighter focus on the issue would have helped, as responses often included unnecessarily lengthy narration of events, or material that was pertinent to the topic but was of tangential relevance to the particular issue, and did not help to answer the question.

The most effective responses to essay questions used detailed knowledge of the period but, in general, essay responses could have been improved by the use of more specific factual support. Many responses to essay questions could also have been strengthened if they had made a judgement more clearly about the issue in the question. Some responses consisted of a series of explanations which were often well supported, but did not clearly analyse their relative importance and say which explanation was preferred and why, and thus did not actually answer the question. However, a strength of Section B was that responses to essay questions were often full and did not suggest that they were being rushed because of too much time being spent on parts (a) and (b).

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) There were some insightful observations about the provenance, particularly the different nature of the two documents and how Napoleon used these different mediums to his own advantage. Stronger answers were aware of the date (August 1798) of the Battle of the Nile and how this might lead to a different interpretation of both documents, but particularly Document B. A few, less effective, answers devoted a whole paragraph to a single document, making comparative analysis difficult. In some answers, quotations from the two documents were matched but without proper explanation. In other answers, the provenance of Document A led to an exploration of the different ways in which Napoleon sought to portray his own image and this was explored at the expense of rigorous cross-referencing. The comparative analysis in some answers focused on Napoleon's identification with the French, rather than analysing his views about conquest.
- (b) It was clear that many candidates had good contextual understanding of the different documents with various references to the Vendemiaire uprising, the Battles of Arcole and the Nile, as well as the Treaty of Campo Formio (with their different implications). In some answers, this knowledge was misdirected and veered away from the documents (with too much detail on the military campaigns). There was some excellent cross-referencing, such as contrasting the brutality of Document C with the civilising mission of Documents A and B (contrasting Napoleon's intentions with his deeds). It was difficult to reward any post-1799 material given the nature of the question. Not all candidates spotted that the author of Document D (Desgenettes) was mentioned by the historian in Document E; the fact that Strathern describes him as 'no friend of Napoleon' was fully exploited by those candidates who did identify it.

Question 2

This was a popular question that was generally well structured. Stronger answers set up a debate between factors beyond Napoleon's control and factors within his control. Some answers were structured by campaigns though this lent itself towards description, while others subdivided the campaigns into more specific analytical themes. The stronger answers supplied concrete and precise evidence from specific battles to illustrate their arguments (e.g. Alexander I and Francis II ignoring Kutuzov's advice at Austerlitz). Although most answers tended not to look beyond 1809, there were some effective insights into Napoleon's later successes (e.g. Battle of Dresden). Stronger answers made some insightful interim judgements, dwelling on the strengths of Kutuzov and Archduke Charles, as well as Napoleon's weaknesses (poor improvisation and miscalculations).

Question 3

There were too few answers to this question for a report to be written.

Question 4

This question was less popular than **Question 2**. Answers tried to contextualise the nature and extent of Napoleon's European possessions (with a particular focus on the control of the satellite states and the influence of the Continental System). There was a focus on taxation and conscription, as well as the treatment of allies, especially the stirring of national resentment (notably in Spain and Germany). Stronger answers were aware of the shifting nature of the relationship between Napoleon and foreign powers.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/58
Russia in Revolution, 1905–1924

Key messages

- In **Section A**, some responses **Question (a)** could have been stronger if they had focused on a detailed comparison and contrast of the two documents in relation specifically to the issue in the question. In some responses candidates wrote about other points of comparison and contrast unrelated to the specific issue in the question.
- In **Section A**, some responses to **Question (b)** answered the question as if it were an essay, without basing their response on the evidence available in the documents. By contrast, some other candidates wrote about the evidence available in the sources generally and not in relation to the specific issue in the question. The main task is the analysis and evaluation of the five passages insofar as they have a bearing on the specific issues in the question; some answers would have benefited if they focused more clearly on this central requirement.
- In answers to the **Section B** essay questions, many responses would have benefited had they reached a firmer judgement in the relation to the questions.

General comments

The most effective answers to **Question 1**, both to part **(a)** and part **(b)** were focused on the analysis and assessment of the documents. Different approaches were taken, but the most effective answers all linked knowledge very specifically to the documents and offered supported judgements about their value as evidence. The strongest answers included an interpretation of evidence, that is, it was related to the issue in the question. In these answers, the sources were evaluated by reference to their provenance, and contextual knowledge was used to establish a judgement about a specific topic. Less effective answers did not explain carefully enough how the sources related to the issue in the question. The requirement in part **(a)** is to identify and explain differences and similarities between two documents as evidence about a specific issue, not simply to compare and contrast two documents, but some weaker answers were written as if this were so. Similarly, in part **(b)**, the strongest answers explained how the documents offer evidence for or against a specific view. The question is not phrased to elicit an essay which uses the documents or parts of them to support different views: however, some weaker answers were written as if it had been.

The strongest answers made use of all of the documents, as stipulated in the question, and analysed and used the evidence which they offered about the issue in the question in a way that was explained clearly. These stronger answers used the message delivered by the whole of the documents, not only part of them, and wrote explanations that went beyond brief paraphrases or statements. The strongest answers used this as the basis for a judgement about the document as evidence, through evaluation of the documents based on their provenance and other characteristics, and also reference to relevant contextual knowledge. The strongest answers made full use of information given in the documents by evaluating the documents to ascertain the full extent and usefulness of the evidence in relation to the issues in the question, such as by showing, for example, that the authorship of a document might mean that its weight as evidence about the issue is especially important because the author was in a particular position of know about or influence events. The most effective responses used contextual knowledge of the period in this way. Answers which applied only generic evaluative techniques, such as stating that the author might have been unreliable because of his or her status (but without explaining with reference to the document, contextual knowledge and issue in the question why this may be so and why this may have a bearing on the issue in the question) attracted much less credit than evaluation which was specific, contextualised and appropriately supported with reference specifically to evidence from the document. The question asks specifically for the use of contextual knowledge: the strongest responses applied knowledge to the documents in order to assess them as evidence, rather than only adding factual material to their response more to assess the issue directly.

There were some very strong analyses of the documents, in which candidates selected some apt and often detailed knowledge to support critical judgements. However, there were some areas in which many responses could have been stronger. Many responses to part (a) would have scored higher marks had they included both similarities and differences identified in the content of documents, as well as in their provenance. Some responses to part (a) questions were written largely about the provenance of the documents without first having identified points of comparison and contrast between them. It is important for candidates to consider the documents as a whole in answering part (b) rather than mining the texts for decontextualised corroboration to support various points they wish to make about the issue: this sometimes led to responses in which the overall message of the documents, or their weight as evidence about the issue, was missed or mischaracterised. Some candidates adopted a thematic approach and sometimes employed this very successfully. In other cases, however, candidates taking this approach did not consistently evaluate the documents. This was because evidence from a document was used in various paragraphs and in some cases the document and the evidence it provided was evaluated in one part of the response, but not in others. In some weaker responses, evaluation was often entirely lacking and answers ignored the nature, authorship, purpose and reliability of the evidence. These responses adopted a more essay-like approach which used the documents only to supply points of factual support, and were not effective in meeting the demands of the assessment criteria. There were a substantial number of answers which offered minimal or, in some cases, no contextual knowledge in support of judgements about the documents, despite the indication in the question that this is a requirement. For some answers, a much tighter focus on the issue would have helped, as responses often included unnecessarily lengthy narration of events, or material that was pertinent to the topic but was of tangential relevance to the particular issue, and did not help to answer the question.

The most effective responses to essay questions used detailed knowledge of the period but, in general, essay responses could have been improved by the use of more specific factual support. Many responses to essay questions could also have been strengthened if they had made a judgement more clearly about the issue in the question. Some responses consisted of a series of explanations which were often well supported, but did not clearly analyse their relative importance and say which explanation was preferred and why, and thus did not actually answer the question. However, a strength of Section B was that responses to essay questions were often full and did not suggest that they were being rushed because of too much time being spent on parts (a) and (b).

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Most answers perceived the similarities regarding control and suppression of dissent, but fewer saw the differences in the nature and extent of censorship with Document B referring to a temporary suppression of the press and of 'certain papers'. There was some consideration of the difference in the origin of the source with the American visitor writing to give her impressions while Lenin was issuing orders to preserve the revolution. There tended to more comparison of the nature of the sources than the actual content.
- (b) There was some effective interpretation of the documents, though not many drew a distinction between violence and repression. Most answers saw the repressive nature of Document A and noted that Document B was evidence for less repression, with some questioning the typicality of this given the developments of the repressive apparatus of the Bolshevik state. There was some effective evaluation of this evidence, questioning how far its observations were typical. There was some tendency to describe Document C and link it to the question implicitly rather than directly. There was plenty of scope for material to be taken from Document D and it was generally used relevantly, though not all its content was sufficiently analysed by some. Many answers saw that the origin and purpose of Document E affected its reliability, and some produced supporting evidence to justify its representation of repression. Fewer answers took into account that the more positive policies followed towards the peasantry were ignored by White propaganda.

Question 2

Some answers gave substantial explanations of both the divisions and limitations of the opposition and the effectiveness of concessions at a crucial time (amended when the Tsar was under less pressure), though there was little assessment of factors. Fewer answers took the opportunity for judgement on 'what best

explains'. Some weaker answers picked up on 'the 1905 Revolution' and offered long explanations of its origins and course.

Question 3

There were too few answers to this question for a report to be written.

Question 4

There were many answers which offered explanations of the fall of the Tsar in terms of the long-term weaknesses of the monarchy, often going back to the mid-nineteenth century, the events of 1905 and Bloody Sunday, and the events of the First World War, especially the Tsar going to the Front and the influence of the Tsarina and Rasputin. The impact of the war was often treated generally. Many answers gave limited attention to the February Revolution itself and the way that the regime collapsed. When the analysis was related to this, and when the war was weighed against other factors, results were impressive. When there was no reference to the February Revolution (or, in some cases, confusion of the events of February with those of October and an assessment of Lenin's supposed role in the fall of the Tsar) then analysis became less effective and more descriptive. A question about the February Revolution should be addressed by reference to the nature and events of that revolution. Many answers would, too, have benefited from greater knowledge of the actual failures of the First World War.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/59
Germany 1919–1945

Key messages

- In **Section A**, some responses **Question (a)** could have been stronger if they had focused on a detailed comparison and contrast of the two documents in relation specifically to the issue in the question. In some responses candidates wrote about other points of comparison and contrast unrelated to the specific issue in the question.
- In **Section A**, some responses to **Question (b)** answered the question as if it were an essay, without basing their response on the evidence available in the documents. By contrast, some other candidates wrote about the evidence available in the sources generally and not in relation to the specific issue in the question. The main task is the analysis and evaluation of the five passages insofar as they have a bearing on the specific issues in the question; some answers would have benefited if they focused more clearly on this central requirement.
- In answers to the **Section B** essay questions, many responses would have benefited had they reached a firmer judgement in the relation to the questions.

General comments

The most effective answers to **Question 1**, both to part **(a)** and part **(b)** were focused on the analysis and assessment of the documents. Different approaches were taken, but the most effective answers all linked knowledge very specifically to the documents and offered supported judgements about their value as evidence. The strongest answers included an interpretation of evidence, that is, it was related to the issue in the question. In these answers, the sources were evaluated by reference to their provenance, and contextual knowledge was used to establish a judgement about a specific topic. Less effective answers did not explain carefully enough how the sources related to the issue in the question. The requirement in part **(a)** is to identify and explain differences and similarities between two documents as evidence about a specific issue, not simply to compare and contrast two documents, but some weaker answers were written as if this were so. Similarly, in part **(b)**, the strongest answers explained how the documents offer evidence for or against a specific view. The question is not phrased to elicit an essay which uses the documents or parts of them to support different views: however, some weaker answers were written as if it had been.

The strongest answers made use of all of the documents, as stipulated in the question, and analysed and used the evidence which they offered about the issue in the question in a way that was explained clearly. These stronger answers used the message delivered by the whole of the documents, not only part of them, and wrote explanations that went beyond brief paraphrases or statements. The strongest answers used this as the basis for a judgement about the document as evidence, through evaluation of the documents based on their provenance and other characteristics, and also reference to relevant contextual knowledge. The strongest answers made full use of information given in the documents by evaluating the documents to ascertain the full extent and usefulness of the evidence in relation to the issues in the question, such as by showing, for example, that the authorship of a document might mean that its weight as evidence about the issue is especially important because the author was in a particular position of know about or influence events. The most effective responses used contextual knowledge of the period in this way. Answers which applied only generic evaluative techniques, such as stating that the author might have been unreliable because of his or her status (but without explaining with reference to the document, contextual knowledge and issue in the question why this may be so and why this may have a bearing on the issue in the question) attracted much less credit than evaluation which was specific, contextualised and appropriately supported with reference specifically to evidence from the document. The question asks specifically for the use of

contextual knowledge: the strongest responses applied knowledge to the documents in order to assess them as evidence, rather than only adding factual material to their response more to assess the issue directly.

There were some very strong analyses of the documents, in which candidates selected some apt and often detailed knowledge to support critical judgements. However, there were some areas in which many responses could have been stronger. Many responses to part (a) would have scored higher marks had they included both similarities and differences identified in the content of documents, as well as in their provenance. Some responses to part (a) questions were written largely about the provenance of the documents without first having identified points of comparison and contrast between them. It is important for candidates to consider the documents as a whole in answering part (b) rather than mining the texts for decontextualised corroboration to support various points they wish to make about the issue: this sometimes led to responses in which the overall message of the documents, or their weight as evidence about the issue, was missed or mischaracterised. Some candidates adopted a thematic approach and sometimes employed this very successfully. In other cases, however, candidates taking this approach did not consistently evaluate the documents. This was because evidence from a document was used in various paragraphs and in some cases the document and the evidence it provided was evaluated in one part of the response, but not in others. In some weaker responses, evaluation was often entirely lacking and answers ignored the nature, authorship, purpose and reliability of the evidence. These responses adopted a more essay-like approach which used the documents only to supply points of factual support, and were not effective in meeting the demands of the assessment criteria. There were a substantial number of answers which offered minimal or, in some cases, no contextual knowledge in support of judgements about the documents, despite the indication in the question that this is a requirement. For some answers, a much tighter focus on the issue would have helped, as responses often included unnecessarily lengthy narration of events, or material that was pertinent to the topic but was of tangential relevance to the particular issue, and did not help to answer the question.

The most effective responses to essay questions used detailed knowledge of the period but, in general, essay responses could have been improved by the use of more specific factual support. Many responses to essay questions could also have been strengthened if they had made a judgement more clearly about the issue in the question. Some responses consisted of a series of explanations which were often well supported, but did not clearly analyse their relative importance and say which explanation was preferred and why, and thus did not actually answer the question. However, a strength of Section B was that responses to essay questions were often full and did not suggest that they were being rushed because of too much time being spent on parts (a) and (b).

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Many answers saw the similarities in the two documents about why there was opposition and the concerns about the nature of the regime. There were some effective contrasts between the religious fervour of von Tresckow and the motives of the students. Some answers moved too far from the actual texts to discuss the bomb plot itself but there was some effective use of the provenance and context: one full of hope for some effective action and one on the verge of suicide. Most answers offered some comparison, though there were some sequential descriptions.
- (b) The topic of whether the power of the regime or the consent of the German people is much discussed, and some answers were more of an essay about the consent versus consensus debate illustrated from the documents, rather than a sustained analysis and evaluation of the actual evidence. Document A was generally well understood and the pressures of the regime that it shows were well explained. Some answers missed the point that Fraulein Hildebrandt was genuinely convinced that Hitler had saved Germany from Bolshevism and disapproved of the joke made, indicating that even mild resistance might be frowned on as irrelevant. Most answers focused on the repression that Dr Weckener's joke revealed as integral to the regime. Document C demonstrates how difficult resistance was and referred to the context of the suppression of the students. Fewer answers picked up on the fact that the plotter in Document D saw himself as likely to be abused and was justifying this resistance. Both these sources would have benefited from more consideration of the wartime context. Document D could be evidence for the acceptance of the regime by citizens willing to inform on any dissenters, something revealed by recent research which has challenged the model of the all-powerful and ubiquitous Gestapo. Some answers saw this willingness as evidence of the power of the state and its propaganda and moral pressure, and they made quite a convincing case. There was some effective contextual knowledge used but

some answers tended to bolt on a mini essay about the issue which was not well related to the actual texts.

Question 2

There were some strong analyses of the relative importance of the shift to legality brought about by the failure of the Putsch, which maintained the support of the middle classes and prevented Hitler being crushed by the army. There was comparison with other political factors, especially the intrigues of the elites and the political weaknesses of the Weimar governments that relied on Article 48. Some answers did not take sufficient note of the word 'political' and after a rather cursory treatment of 1923 outlined various reasons for the rise of Hitler including economic depression. Most notable among neglected elements was the political intrigue that saved Hitler after the setback of the elections of November 1932 and the growing divides within the movement.

Question 3

There were too few answers to this question for a report to be written.

Question 4

There were some discussions of the relative importance of the cumulative radicalism of measures taken by 1938 and the effects of the war, but many responses were over descriptive and focused more on explaining events before 1939. The impact of the war was less effectively considered despite references to structuralist and intentionalist historical views. The basis of the historiography was not always sufficiently well explained or understood, and the impact of the changing fortunes of Germany on the war on the tempo and intensity of the 'war against the Jews' was not always considered.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/06
Personal Investigation

General comments

The strongest essays had a careful, scholarly approach to evidence, and arguments were well developed and sophisticated in such a way as to suggest careful selection and presentation of evidence garnered from a wide and relevant reading. Reasoning, evaluation, analysis and debate, were clearly demonstrated throughout the response. There was a wide array of topics chosen, both in terms of chronology, geography and theme. While most investigations focused on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, there were also many investigations written on topics from a range of other timescales. Most essays concentrated on Europe or America, but there were also studies focussing on China, India and several on African topics. Most candidates used the feedback from the Outline Proposal Form (OPF) to help form their arguments. But there were some candidates who focused on the question they had originally proposed, rather than the modified title both suggested by the consultant and adopted by the candidate. Most essays kept to the strict word limit. Essays will not be marked beyond the word limit so if it is exceeded may result in conclusions not being marked.

Investigations based on individuals continue to be very popular, with much enthusiasm for the 'great man' debate. The proposal forms sometimes show a mismatch between the question and the approach taken. 'What best explains' questions must assess factors and not simply offer a series of explanations. If an explanation is set up and the question asks how far it can explain a particular event or development, then the investigation needs to focus on that explanation, and other explanations have to relate to it. Questions that were too broad did not usually result in sharply focused analysis or sufficient depth of detail and explanation.

Introductions which defined the scope of the answer to the question, and clearly outlined the elements to be examined, were the most successful. The more effective essays generally responded to their question directly and concisely in their introduction. The best introductions tended to be confined to a single paragraph, in which there was a sustained focus on what the argument would be and, though mention of which sources would be used might be integrated, it was laying the foundations for the judgement that would be sought that predominated in the introductions of the most successful essays. In other cases, there was a tendency to offer either a scene-setting and descriptive paragraph and/or a historiographical review, without showing how this would be relevant to what the essay set out to demonstrate in relation to the question. In some cases, there were three or more introductory paragraphs, often including descriptive historiographical surveys that were generalised surveys of the literature on the topic but were not related to the question. Stronger essays often included one or two short clear, well focused paragraph(s) that outlined the central arguments and direction that the essay would take.

The best investigations were highly analytical and argumentative in approach with a real sense that the issues and problems had been investigated. These essays were well organised with a clear structure and a coherent line of argument that was referred to throughout and with clear interim judgements. Analytical depth was achieved more easily in essays using shorter paragraphs than those using large paragraphs listing different historical interpretations. The strongest essays focused clearly on the question set; some weaker essays veered very significantly from the issue that they set out in the title and this led to reduced credit. Stronger essays limited the amount of background and contextual material they incorporated to that which was necessary to answer the question. Weaker essays often included a lot of material from before the timeframe indicated in the question and which did not contribute to answering it. The stronger essays provided a clear sense of direction, with each paragraph advancing the argument and sustaining it throughout the essay. Comparative approaches used to evaluate arguments often produced strongly analytical responses and was most effective when showing distinctive features and significance. Questions with very clearly defined date ranges were often answered well when that range was adhered to; they were often clear and concise. The strongest essays supported and challenged key arguments; weaker essays built strong arguments but did not offer evaluation of them. The type of analysis that is generally evident in a conclusion in most responses was, in stronger essays, presented and maintained throughout the essay. The

more effective essays provided wide-ranging evidence to support an argument that had already been clearly established. There was a tendency for some essays to lose the thread of the argument, owing to the volume of material, leading to causal narrative though sometimes just simple description.

Focus on the precise terms of the question is important; for example, in a number of essays on the topic of how far the superiority of northern military leadership was responsible for their success in the American Civil War, there was focus on northern strengths but there was not comparative analysis (dealing precisely with the notion of 'superiority'). Many essays strayed off their question by focusing on motives and intentions. A common focus for questions was on the role, success or effectiveness of individuals, but where the concept of greatness is introduced, some essays become an examination of an individual's successes and failures. Stronger essays evaluated whether those successes or failures were the responsibility of that individual or not. Stronger responses were some nuanced and evaluated arguments, for example, sophisticated considerations of threats to particular regimes and individuals were features of stronger essays, especially when distinctions were drawn between perceived and real threats.

The volume and quality of sources and their use and interpretation varied immensely. Generic evaluations of historians should be avoided (e.g. he/she is reliable because they are an authority because they specialise in the subject, have written numerous books and have been appointed a professor in a reputable university). Some established historiographical debates are either ill-suited or not easily adjusted to the phraseology of particular questions (e.g., the continuity or discontinuity of English Catholicism in relation to the threat that Catholicism posed to Elizabeth I's regime). Many essays used 'Historian Kershaw', for example, to attempt to evaluate interpretations critically, adding very little, and should be avoided. Similarly, many essays used an 'acclaimed historian' for many of their selections, not specifying whom they are acclaimed by. Attempts to categorise historical approaches, for example 'revisionist historians', added little critical depth except where it was shown how such an identification had a bearing on the evidence and argument made in relation to the question. More effective analysis of historians' views was often where individual interpretations were examined, rather than attempting to construct an historiographic dichotomy that posited two contrasting interpretations against one another. Where done, this latter approach often did not further the argument. Few, if any, historiographical debates fall entirely into distinct categories and so this type of analysis often served to blunt rather than to add nuance to candidates' answers.

The strongest essays imposed their own stamp on the material, carefully integrating sources and evidence throughout. In other cases, paragraphs read as if the succession of sentences had been cut and pasted from different sources. In the case of lengthier quotations, sources were more likely to be used illustratively. A wider selection of sources was more convincing, for example, using almost exclusively election polls in explaining a general election victory is not entirely persuasive.

Although the integration of primary and secondary sources is important, in some cases, the sustained and frequent focus on provenance appeared to hinder the exploration of a greater range and depth of material. Some essays utilised a document-driven structure, such as separate paragraphs about de Stael and Montesquieu on essays on the French Revolution. Although this could be effective, in some essays the thread of argument was lost as standalone paragraphs about the evaluation of sources were written without any linkage to the question. Some weaker essays were too dependent on a textual analysis of a narrow range of sources, such that in some cases this became the focus of the essay rather than the question to which the essay was intended to answer. For example, some essays on the reasons for the failure of the 1848 revolutions were more about Engels and/or Tocqueville and their interpretations than they were about the events. Similarly, on the abolition of slavery, there were some essays that were overly dependent on literary sources, therefore not sufficiently grounded in historical material and so did not address their titles, which were about slavery and not the history of its representation in literature. Stronger essays often made use of these sources, but its use was framed in the context of its value as historical evidence to help answer the question.

Although this is not an essential element of the investigation, there were some effective comparisons made. For example, in essays on War Communism and its relative contribution to the Red victory in Russian Civil War, there was a developed comparison with DORA in Britain which contributed in an historical manner to the response. Several essays on topics in the Tudor period made links between Elizabeth's decision not to marry, Henry VIII's marriages and Mary Tudor's Spanish match in ways that were historically valid and further the response. This was also true of investigations on fascism movements in countries other than Germany, where developed comparisons with the Nazis; and essays about Colonial topics such as the British responses towards Indian nationalism in the inter-war period and French Indo-China, where comparisons between the metropolises treatments of events in different colonies were made.

The strongest responses often included bibliographies characterised by specificity and correspondence with the material referenced in the text. Weaker bibliographies sometimes reflected essays that were based on a very narrow range of sources, so that the essay summarised the view of a particular author, or included a large range of volumes that were not apparently referenced, either implicitly or by citation, in the text. Some essays were based extensively on material found in freely-accessible sites on the internet. These often did not have the required breadth and depth of research, and in some cases material published on the internet by unverified or partisan groups was utilised without this evidence being cross-referenced to check its validity. The use of textbooks and works written to provide basic explanations for sixth-form students is understandable, but whole essays based on this type of evidence does not allow full exploration of the topic. In some essays, there was an overreliance on GCSE and basic A Level textbooks and book reviews. The strongest essays should be based on a range of sources, but on sources whose evaluation furthered the argument were used.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/71
Special Subject – China under
Mao Zedong, 1949–1976

Key messages

- In **Section A**, some responses **Question (a)** could have been stronger if they had focused on a detailed comparison and contrast of the two documents in relation specifically to the issue in the question. In some responses candidates wrote about other points of comparison and contrast unrelated to the specific issue in the question.
- In **Section A**, some responses to **Question (b)** answered the question as if it were an essay, without basing their response on the evidence available in the documents. By contrast, some other candidates wrote about the evidence available in the sources generally and not in relation to the specific issue in the question. The main task is the analysis and evaluation of the five passages insofar as they have a bearing on the specific issues in the question; some answers would have benefited if they focused more clearly on this central requirement.
- In answers to the **Section B** essay questions, many responses would have benefited had they reached a firmer judgement in the relation to the questions.

General comments

The most effective answers to **Question 1**, both to part **(a)** and part **(b)** were focused on the analysis and assessment of the documents. Different approaches were taken, but the most effective answers all linked knowledge very specifically to the documents and offered supported judgements about their value as evidence. The strongest answers included an interpretation of evidence, that is, it was related to the issue in the question. In these answers, the sources were evaluated by reference to their provenance, and contextual knowledge was used to establish a judgement about a specific topic. Less effective answers did not explain carefully enough how the sources related to the issue in the question. The requirement in part **(a)** is to identify and explain differences and similarities between two documents as evidence about a specific issue, not simply to compare and contrast two documents, but some weaker answers were written as if this were so. Similarly, in part **(b)**, the strongest answers explained how the documents offer evidence for or against a specific view. The question is not phrased to elicit an essay which uses the documents or parts of them to support different views: however, some weaker answers were written as if it had been.

The strongest answers made use of all of the documents, as stipulated in the question, and analysed and used the evidence which they offered about the issue in the question in a way that was explained clearly. These stronger answers used the message delivered by the whole of the documents, not only part of them, and wrote explanations that went beyond brief paraphrases or statements. The strongest answers used this as the basis for a judgement about the document as evidence, through evaluation of the documents based on their provenance and other characteristics, and also reference to relevant contextual knowledge. The strongest answers made full use of information given in the documents by evaluating the documents to ascertain the full extent and usefulness of the evidence in relation to the issues in the question, such as by showing, for example, that the authorship of a document might mean that its weight as evidence about the issue is especially important because the author was in a particular position of know about or influence events. The most effective responses used contextual knowledge of the period in this way. Answers which applied only generic evaluative techniques, such as stating that the author might have been unreliable because of his or her status (but without explaining with reference to the document, contextual knowledge and issue in the question why this may be so and why this may have a bearing on the issue in the question) attracted much less credit than evaluation which was specific, contextualised and appropriately supported with reference specifically to evidence from the document. The question asks specifically for the use of

contextual knowledge: the strongest responses applied knowledge to the documents in order to assess them as evidence, rather than only adding factual material to their response more to assess the issue directly.

There were some very strong analyses of the documents, in which candidates selected some apt and often detailed knowledge to support critical judgements. However, there were some areas in which many responses could have been stronger. Many responses to part (a) would have scored higher marks had they included both similarities and differences identified in the content of documents, as well as in their provenance. Some responses to part (a) questions were written largely about the provenance of the documents without first having identified points of comparison and contrast between them. It is important for candidates to consider the documents as a whole in answering part (b) rather than mining the texts for decontextualised corroboration to support various points they wish to make about the issue: this sometimes led to responses in which the overall message of the documents, or their weight as evidence about the issue, was missed or mischaracterised. Some candidates adopted a thematic approach and sometimes employed this very successfully. In other cases, however, candidates taking this approach did not consistently evaluate the documents. This was because evidence from a document was used in various paragraphs and in some cases the document and the evidence it provided was evaluated in one part of the response, but not in others. In some weaker responses, evaluation was often entirely lacking and answers ignored the nature, authorship, purpose and reliability of the evidence. These responses adopted a more essay-like approach which used the documents only to supply points of factual support, and were not effective in meeting the demands of the assessment criteria. There were a substantial number of answers which offered minimal or, in some cases, no contextual knowledge in support of judgements about the documents, despite the indication in the question that this is a requirement. For some answers, a much tighter focus on the issue would have helped, as responses often included unnecessarily lengthy narration of events, or material that was pertinent to the topic but was of tangential relevance to the particular issue, and did not help to answer the question.

The most effective responses to essay questions used detailed knowledge of the period but, in general, essay responses could have been improved by the use of more specific factual support. Many responses to essay questions could also have been strengthened if they had made a judgement more clearly about the issue in the question. Some responses consisted of a series of explanations which were often well supported, but did not clearly analyse their relative importance and say which explanation was preferred and why, and thus did not actually answer the question. However, a strength of Section B was that responses to essay questions were often full and did not suggest that they were being rushed because of too much time being spent on parts (a) and (b).

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) The most successful answers did justice to the provenance. There were some insightful perspectives on the authors, dwelling on the implications of the differing dates of publication (with Document A emerging from the aftermath of the Antis campaigns, contrasted by Document D dating back to the earliest stages of Mao's regime). There was also some excellent evaluation of Father Suigo, particularly the implications of a priest writing about the Communists. Several answers did not focus on the fact that both authors were Western and what could be inferred from that. In some cases, there was too much context provided at the expense of comparative analysis. There were some effective references to the language, especially the alarmed tone of Document A. The differences tended to be analysed effectively. Some answers neglected to mention the exploitation of the youth to carry out policies as a key similarity.
- (b) There was some very effective use of contextual knowledge, particularly in emphasising the various methods by which the Communist Party sought to win the hearts and minds of the people: emphasising mass rallies (most notably watching Mao announce the creation of the People's Republic of China (PRC)); support for guerrilla warfare (and the dependence on volunteers); and the increase in membership of the People's Liberation Army (PLA), as well as highlighting the extent of Guomindang (GMD) desertions. Some answers suggested that Document E was less likely to be convincing given that it was produced at the time of the terror campaigns. There was also some insightful analysis of the provenance of various documents. A significant number of answers alluded to the value of Mao's speech, acknowledging that the propaganda that it represented was precisely what provided the impetus and the driving force behind winning the hearts and minds of the people. In some answers, this was compared with the apparently sympathetic Western writer in Document D, indicating that the praise of a Western writer for a

Communist education project was arguably of greater value than a piece of Communist propaganda. Other answers questioned the value of Father Suigo's document, raising the issue of typicality (Suigo references only a particular village). Answers also highlighted the value of an American (Document C) focusing on the demoralisation of the nationalists, given that he would be likely to be sympathetic to their cause. Some candidates misinterpreted the question and focused on the reasons for winning the war, rather than securing power, and this led to a rather different interpretation of the documents.

Question 2

The stronger answers were very effective at addressing the chronological and thematic range represented by the question. Those answers that addressed both agriculture and industry, and provided a sufficient balance of each theme throughout, scored better marks. In terms of chronological range, some answers set Communist party successes in the context of the agricultural and industrial capacity that they inherited. There was a suggestion that the Communist Party production figures flattered the regime, owing to the dire consequences of the Civil War and the preceding War. Some answers provided penetrating insights of the different changes of the time period, as well as qualifying and evaluating the various successes alongside the limitations.

Question 4

Answers to this question were, generally, coherently and effectively structured. Answers took a thematic approach, focusing on ideological factors, the Sino-Soviet split, China's relative isolation and the development of nuclear weapons. There was often a very clear contextual understanding of the changing patterns of relations between China and the USA. The stronger answers showed strong insight on the relative importance of the different factors, making a clear and sustained judgement throughout.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/72

The Civil Rights Movement in the USA,
1954–1980

Key messages

- In **Section A**, some responses **Question (a)** could have been stronger if they had focused on a detailed comparison and contrast of the two documents in relation specifically to the issue in the question. In some responses candidates wrote about other points of comparison and contrast unrelated to the specific issue in the question.
- In **Section A**, some responses to **Question (b)** answered the question as if it were an essay, without basing their response on the evidence available in the documents. By contrast, some other candidates wrote about the evidence available in the sources generally and not in relation to the specific issue in the question. The main task is the analysis and evaluation of the five passages insofar as they have a bearing on the specific issues in the question; some answers would have benefited if they focused more clearly on this central requirement.
- In answers to the **Section B** essay questions, many responses would have benefited had they reached a firmer judgement in the relation to the questions.

General comments

The most effective answers to **Question 1**, both to part **(a)** and part **(b)** were focused on the analysis and assessment of the documents. Different approaches were taken, but the most effective answers all linked knowledge very specifically to the documents and offered supported judgements about their value as evidence. The strongest answers included an interpretation of evidence, that is, it was related to the issue in the question. In these answers, the sources were evaluated by reference to their provenance, and contextual knowledge was used to establish a judgement about a specific topic. Less effective answers did not explain carefully enough how the sources related to the issue in the question. The requirement in part **(a)** is to identify and explain differences and similarities between two documents as evidence about a specific issue, not simply to compare and contrast two documents, but some weaker answers were written as if this were so. Similarly, in part **(b)**, the strongest answers explained how the documents offer evidence for or against a specific view. The question is not phrased to elicit an essay which uses the documents or parts of them to support different views: however, some weaker answers were written as if it had been.

The strongest answers made use of all of the documents, as stipulated in the question, and analysed and used the evidence which they offered about the issue in the question in a way that was explained clearly. These stronger answers used the message delivered by the whole of the documents, not only part of them, and wrote explanations that went beyond brief paraphrases or statements. The strongest answers used this as the basis for a judgement about the document as evidence, through evaluation of the documents based on their provenance and other characteristics, and also reference to relevant contextual knowledge. The strongest answers made full use of information given in the documents by evaluating the documents to ascertain the full extent and usefulness of the evidence in relation to the issues in the question, such as by showing, for example, that the authorship of a document might mean that its weight as evidence about the issue is especially important because the author was in a particular position of know about or influence events. The most effective responses used contextual knowledge of the period in this way. Answers which applied only generic evaluative techniques, such as stating that the author might have been unreliable because of his or her status (but without explaining with reference to the document, contextual knowledge and issue in the question why this may be so and why this may have a bearing on the issue in the question) attracted much less credit than evaluation which was specific, contextualised and appropriately supported with reference specifically to evidence from the document. The question asks specifically for the use of

contextual knowledge: the strongest responses applied knowledge to the documents in order to assess them as evidence, rather than only adding factual material to their response more to assess the issue directly.

There were some very strong analyses of the documents, in which candidates selected some apt and often detailed knowledge to support critical judgements. However, there were some areas in which many responses could have been stronger. Many responses to part (a) would have scored higher marks had they included both similarities and differences identified in the content of documents, as well as in their provenance. Some responses to part (a) questions were written largely about the provenance of the documents without first having identified points of comparison and contrast between them. It is important for candidates to consider the documents as a whole in answering part (b) rather than mining the texts for decontextualised corroboration to support various points they wish to make about the issue: this sometimes led to responses in which the overall message of the documents, or their weight as evidence about the issue, was missed or mischaracterised. Some candidates adopted a thematic approach and sometimes employed this very successfully. In other cases, however, candidates taking this approach did not consistently evaluate the documents. This was because evidence from a document was used in various paragraphs and in some cases the document and the evidence it provided was evaluated in one part of the response, but not in others. In some weaker responses, evaluation was often entirely lacking and answers ignored the nature, authorship, purpose and reliability of the evidence. These responses adopted a more essay-like approach which used the documents only to supply points of factual support, and were not effective in meeting the demands of the assessment criteria. There were a substantial number of answers which offered minimal or, in some cases, no contextual knowledge in support of judgements about the documents, despite the indication in the question that this is a requirement. For some answers, a much tighter focus on the issue would have helped, as responses often included unnecessarily lengthy narration of events, or material that was pertinent to the topic but was of tangential relevance to the particular issue, and did not help to answer the question.

The most effective responses to essay questions used detailed knowledge of the period but, in general, essay responses could have been improved by the use of more specific factual support. Many responses to essay questions could also have been strengthened if they had made a judgement more clearly about the issue in the question. Some responses consisted of a series of explanations which were often well supported, but did not clearly analyse their relative importance and say which explanation was preferred and why, and thus did not actually answer the question. However, a strength of Section B was that responses to essay questions were often full and did not suggest that they were being rushed because of too much time being spent on parts (a) and (b).

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Some answers did not maintain their focus on the actual question of the methods of the authorities. Several answers mentioned similarities such as the biased legal system was lenient towards crimes committed against African Americans, or the fact that authorities were willing to shoot activists dead. Many answers also mentioned major differences in methods such as using informants or encouraging the Aryan Brotherhood, as well as using Whites against African Americans or fostering gang warfare between them. Several answers then paraphrased the sources or only used direct quotes from one source, which limited their answers.

When discussing provenance, stronger answers recognised the potential bias from a radical, communist crusader and activist in Document B, whereas Document D, an official US Senate Committee investigating government operations, had access to widespread testimonies and was surprisingly critical of government agencies.

- (b) Better answers clearly discussed the named factor of violence first before going on to identify other forms of White resistance, such as segregation in education (Document C), housing (Document E) and the American political system (Document A). They used specific contextual knowledge such as Civil Rights legislation, famous cases such as Brown versus the Board of Education, the Kerner Report, the Watts riots, or Freedom Rides, to illustrate the different methods. The relative importance of all these factors was critically evaluated throughout the answer before a substantiated judgement was reached. Weaker answers did not include specific contextual knowledge to support their argument and some did not address the actual question of different forms of White resistance.

Question 2

Stronger answers included various historical interpretations and evaluated the relative importance of factors throughout. Some answers were one-sided and only discussed media without identifying other reasons why Direct Action was successful. Weaker answers gave examples of when media was used but did not specify the key impacts, such as pressurising politicians to intervene or legislate, increasing membership, or exposing the brutal intolerance of opponents to the Civil Rights Movement. Better answers presented a counterview about the negative impacts of media coverage and identified other key reasons why Direct Action was successful, such as organisation and effective leadership and the persistence of protestors.

Question 3

The key aspects of this answer involved setting out both the achievements and limitations of King. Better answers identified the main 'achievements' of King such as his skills as an orator, his use of the media to promote his cause, the positive relationship he forged with the Kennedys and, above all, his effective policy of nonviolence. A balanced argument was then presented by discussing his 'limitations', such as his alienating of presidential support by criticising the Vietnam War, and the white middle class with his campaigns for social equality. Better answers went on to discuss geographical variations and recognised that King's influence was predominantly in the South and that he was less successful in northern cities such as Chicago. They also understood that he was peripheral to some of the landmark campaigns such as the Freedom Rides and lunchtime sit-ins. Weaker answers offered either a biographical narrative, or lacked a clear essay structure, or gave a one-sided answer. Specific examples of contextual knowledge and a variety of historical interpretations could have been used more widely to enable critical evaluation of both perspectives of achievements and limitations, before culminating in a substantiated judgement about King.

Question 4

Better answers clearly identified the success of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) in appealing to the youth and Whites, promoting non-violence and influencing the Democratic Convention. A balanced view was then presented by discussing the counterargument that other pressure groups such as The Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) and Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) were more effective, or, that after Carmichael became chairman, the growing involvement in radical movements and the backing of the Black Panthers reduced the SNCC support. Weaker answers did not address the question about the SNCC and instead wrote about other pressure groups such as the SCLC. Rather than discussing the effectiveness of pressure groups, weaker responses tended to lapse into narrative.