

HISTORY

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

Key Messages

- It is important for answers to respond directly to the precise wording of the questions set.
- Specific contextual knowledge is important in all sections of the paper attempted.
- Answers that offer judgement and evaluation as well as the explanation of different factors are more likely to attain higher-level marks.

General Comments

There were many strong responses which used knowledge flexibly and astutely to support arguments and were able to offer genuine discussions and assessments, not merely a list of pre-learnt factors or reasons. These responses showed a strong awareness of the demands of the particular questions and responded to them clearly. Weaker responses would have benefited more from consideration of the actual question rather than adapting previous answers that candidates may have written during their studies which were similar to, but not the same as, the question set. It is very important that answers do not merely reproduce previous answers on the topic, but rather use knowledge and maintain a focus on arguments related specifically to the chosen questions. There were few significantly weak final answers, and there were indications that most candidates planned their time well in the examination. Handwriting was generally clear, but there were a small number of responses in which the script was unclear or the writing very small.

What follows are suggestions about approaching the examination which could improve candidate performance. Only questions with significant numbers of responses are included.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

There was good knowledge of the role of some specific towns such as Verulamium, and use of archaeological evidence from the period in many responses. Many answers needed more breadth to the discussion and a wider range of factors to assess. Changes in the role of towns over the course of the century were generally well analysed.

Question 3

There was general acceptance of the view that Penda's influence was largely military and reflected his aggressive character, but also some good analysis of the problems with the sources about Penda. Some answers needed to consider a wider range of explanations and to make the most of what is known about this period. Some chose to argue that the emergence of Mercia as a power and the achievements of later rulers would not have been possible without the foundations laid by Penda.

Question 4

Answers needed to be focused on the problems, and those which argued that the mission succeeded without great difficulty needed a broader perspective. The view that conversion to Rome was seen as the height of sophistication was clearly explained, but sometimes needed a stronger evidential base.

Question 6

The most successful answers began by identifying the problems Theodore faced. There was a varying amount of knowledge about exactly what Theodore achieved, though others would have benefitted from a stronger understanding of the role of Wilfred. Some answers developed a sound argument that it was the length of his tenure as archbishop that was the key to Theodore's success.

Question 7

Bede's historical work was generally mentioned, and often criticised for its Christian bias, but his other writings were less commonly discussed, and many responses would have benefitted from more detailed knowledge about Bede. Where alternative achievements were well known, there needed to be more development of their significance. There was some misconception that *Beowulf* was the product of a Northumbrian author. A variety of conclusions were reached, but responses would benefit where conclusions are reached evidentially and are not only asserted.

Question 12

Identifying the qualities which might be needed more sharply would have improved some answers. However, responses often were able to show how the challenge of the Godwins changed and developed, and how Edward's efforts were inconsistent.

Question 13

Many answers to this question would have benefitted from a wider focus, by looking at the law, social change, the church and castle buildings. Some responses were rather narrow as they only focused on military success. Some answers made very good use of references to contemporary chronicles and to the Domesday Book.

Question 14

In many responses to this question more could have been achieved by analysing what might make a well governed country at that time and analysing how well William met those demands. An over-reliance on the debate over William's personality prevented some answers from being as effective as they could have been.

Question 22

Some responses to this question referred to the debate about innovation though they would have benefitted from greater support. More specific knowledge was required than some responses offered. The issue of focus was important, as in some responses there was rather a lot of discussion about how vital reform was given Henry's inheritance and the size of his empire, but less on what he actually did.

Question 23

More effective answers dealt directly with how well governed England was without bringing in knowledge about the Crusades. Where knowledge such as this is brought into a response it is essential that such information is made relevant to the question set. This reinforces the importance of dealing with the specific question asked.

Question 27

Most responses demonstrated wide-ranging knowledge of Edward's reign. However, responses in most cases would have benefitted had they focused exclusively on England as set in the question, as many candidates brought in Edward's foreign policy with a focus on Scotland, Wales and France in a variety of different combinations. Most questions did include a paragraph at least discussing Edward's attempts to reclaim royal rights in England and there was discussion of *quo warrant* and other statutes.

Question 29

Responses to this question in many cases would have benefitted from moving the focus of the answer beyond only assessing the reasons for Edward's failure as a king and eventual deposition, by attempting a more balanced analysis of his actions and policies as king, such as considering what actions he undertook.

While most answers mentioned Bannockburn, responses would have benefited had this been made part of a wider discussion of Edward's attempts to regain the initiative both in Scotland and domestically.

Question 32

Responses to this question often demonstrated a good knowledge of Henry IV's reign and some discussion of many issues in close detail: the initial conspiracies of 1400; the Percy rebellions; Parliament and Henry's disease were all considered, as well as the rise of the faction around the young Prince. The best responses were able to focus on the challenges these presented and the extent to which Henry overcame them, though some responses became overly-descriptive.

Question 33

Most responses discussed a good range of issues for Henry's success. These were often explained with good supporting detail, though some answers were assertive. Some candidates challenged the notion of Henry's success and criticised his campaigns, which did not really focus on the question's demands. The best answers were able to provide a focus on 'best explains', and did not limit their answers to Agincourt.

Question 36

Stronger answers to this question were able to deal with a wide range of points that explained Henry VI's loss of his throne: Henry's mental incapacity and the military disasters that undermined faith in him as king were discussed by most candidates, though his political failures in failing to spread patronage beyond a small clique were dealt with more rarely. Responses that focussed on explaining various reasons as to why Henry lost his throne, or on explaining the Yorkist success in the Wars of the Roses, would have benefitted had they focussed more on the extent to which Henry could be personally held to blame for the problems that beset him.

Question 37

Strong responses to this question evaluated the extent to which Edward and Richard innovated. Some answers analysed the effectiveness of Yorkist rule from 1471-1485 generally and would have benefitted had they been more focussed on the specific demands of the question. Responses that defined what may be understood as 'innovation' in the context of late medieval government generally, such as discussion of the Chamber's use in finance and Edward's less belligerent foreign policy, performed well. The best responses managed to balance the answer with a debate on innovation, alongside the more standard discussion of Yorkist competence, in terms of maintaining grips on the provinces by the devolving of power to regional magnates and the reconstruction of a system of royal administration.

Question 38

Many responses to this question would have been improved if there had been more consideration about what would count as a successful relationship between the king and the nobility, short of the king having complete control over his major subjects. Many responses did include discussion of bonds and recognisances, the use of JPs and 'new men' in government, and retaining.

Question 40

Many responses to this question would have benefitted from discussion of the 1530s and 1540s in greater detail, as many responses focussed mostly on the successes or otherwise of Henry's foreign policy. More successful answers engaged directly with the aims and considered the term 'realistic' throughout the period. Some responses would have benefitted on expanding beyond a limited concentration on Wolsey and the earlier part of the reign.

Question 41

Most responses to this question were able to identify the King's 'personal concerns' with the issues of dynastic security: his desire for an annulment of his marriage with Katherine of Aragon and the pregnancy of Anne Boleyn in early 1533 were both identified as key points. Some answers dealt with Henry's personal concerns as the cause rather than influencing the course of the Reformation. Some were able to explore the desire for finance in issues such as the closure of the monasteries, and there was discussion of Henry's desire to increase his control over the Church as a means of consolidating his increased sense of majesty. Some responses would have benefited from more secure expression of knowledge on the religious legislation from 1535 onwards.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/12

British History Outlines c. 1399–1815

Key Messages

- It is important for answers to respond directly to the precise wording of the questions set.
- Specific contextual knowledge is important in all sections of the paper attempted.
- Answers that offer judgement and evaluation as well as the explanation of different factors are more likely to attain higher-level marks.

General Comments

There were many strong responses which used knowledge flexibly and astutely to support arguments and were able to offer genuine discussions and assessments, not merely a list of pre-learnt factors or reasons. These responses showed a strong awareness of the demands of the particular questions and responded to them clearly. Weaker responses would have benefited more from consideration of the actual question rather than adapting previous answers that candidates may have written during their studies which were similar to, but not the same as, the question set. It is very important that answers do not merely reproduce previous answers on the topic, but rather use knowledge and maintain a focus on arguments related specifically to the chosen questions. There were few significantly weak final answers, and there were indications that most candidates planned their time well in the examination. Handwriting was generally clear, but there were a small number of responses in which the script was unclear or the writing very small.

What follows are suggestions about approaching the examination which could improve candidate performance. Only questions with significant numbers of responses are included.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

Responses to this question often demonstrated a good knowledge of Henry IV's reign and some discussion of many issues in close detail: the initial conspiracies of 1400; the Percy rebellions; Parliament and Henry's disease were all considered, as well as the rise of the faction around the young Prince. The best responses were able to focus on the challenges these presented and the extent to which Henry overcame them, though some responses became overly-descriptive.

Question 2

Most responses discussed a good range of issues for Henry's success. These were often explained with good supporting detail, though some answers were assertive. Some candidates challenged the notion of Henry's success and criticised his campaigns, which did not really focus on the question's demands. The best answers were able to provide a focus on 'best explains', and did not limit their answers to Agincourt.

Question 5

Stronger answers to this question were able to deal with a wide range of points that explained Henry VI's loss of his throne: Henry's mental incapacity and the military disasters that undermined faith in him as king were discussed by most candidates, though his political failures in failing to spread patronage beyond a small clique were dealt with more rarely. Responses that focussed on explaining various reasons as to why Henry lost his throne, or on explaining the Yorkist success in the Wars of the Roses, would have benefitted had they focussed more on the extent to which Henry could be personally held to blame for the problems that beset him.

Question 6

Strong responses to this question evaluated the extent to which Edward and Richard innovated. Some answers analysed the effectiveness of Yorkist rule from 1471-1485 generally and would have benefitted had they been more focussed on the specific demands of the question. Responses that defined what may be understood as 'innovation' in the context of late medieval government generally, such as discussion of the Chamber's use in finance and Edward's less belligerent foreign policy, performed well. The best responses managed to balance the answer with a debate on innovation, alongside the more standard discussion of Yorkist competence, in terms of maintaining grips on the provinces by the devolving of power to regional magnates and the reconstruction of a system of royal administration.

Question 7

Many responses to this question would have been improved if there had been more consideration about what would count as a successful relationship between the king and the nobility, short of the king having complete control over his major subjects. Many responses did include discussion of bonds and recognisances, the use of JPs and 'new men' in government, and retaining.

Question 9

Many responses to this question would have benefitted from discussion of the 1530s and 1540s in greater detail, as many responses focussed mostly on the successes or otherwise of Henry's foreign policy. More successful answers engaged directly with the aims and considered the term 'realistic' throughout the period. Some responses would have benefitted on expanding beyond a limited concentration on Wolsey and the earlier part of the reign.

Question 10

Most responses to this question were able to identify the King's 'personal concerns' with the issues of dynastic security: his desire for an annulment of his marriage with Katherine of Aragon and the pregnancy of Anne Boleyn in early 1533 were both identified as key points. Some answers dealt with Henry's personal concerns as the cause, rather than as influencing the course, of the Reformation. Some were able to explore the desire for finance in issues such as the closure of the monasteries, and there was discussion of Henry's desire to increase his control over the Church as a means of consolidating his increased sense of majesty.

Question 11

Answers to this question showed considerable background knowledge on the wider context of the Mid-Tudor Crisis and the historiography surrounding the Dukes of Somerset and Northumberland. As a result the answers were able to provide a good view of the extent to which the crisis year of 1549 was a product of Somerset's incompetence and thus by presenting a positive view of Northumberland, the answer could suggest that Edward's reign was not quite the endless crisis implied in the question. However, while this dealt with the issue of continuous crisis, less successful needed to engage with the issue of the profundity of the crisis and focus on the problems created by a royal minority, and particularly one that had such a strong religious agenda.

Some responses confined themselves only to commenting on Somerset, but a wider focus was needed to meet the requirements of the question.

Question 12

Most responses to this question addressed foreign and religious policy, but there were some responses that also made effective comment on administrative and financial reform. Better answers gave a balanced response. There was some good appreciation of traditionalist and revisionist accounts of Mary's reign especially as regarding foreign policy, and the loss of Calais was generally put into context, with the Spanish alliance being given more credit than is often the case, and overall Mary's failures were attributed as much to factors outside her control i.e. early death, as to her own judgements.

Question 13

Some answers showed knowledge of the historiography of Elizabeth's relationship with Parliament, and there was some very detailed discussion of Neale's thesis and criticisms of this view, with many concluding that parliament was not ultimately a threat to Elizabeth as the old view of its increasing importance through Elizabeth's reign was untenable. A number of responses needed to focus directly on the wording of the question. There was a good understanding of the dynamics of parliamentary politics, with many responses detailing the close relationship of many Privy Councillors with MPs, weaker answers needed to focus on the issue of parliamentary management sustained analysis of the precise question.

Question 14

Most responses achieved a good balance between the two groups. The more sophisticated answers evaluated the nature of 'threat' and how it changed and developed, and supported this with robust material. Many responses achieved balance by exploring both Puritans and Catholics in good detail, and showing some appreciation of the different nature of threat each group posed. There was good detail on missionary priests, Catholic plots and the Spanish Armada and an attempt to assess the strengths and limitations of the seriousness of these to Elizabeth's security, though some responses needed to stress Mary, Queen of Scots' presence in England after 1568 as a catalyst for events, and the Northern Rebellion of 1569 could have been discussed in many responses. Similarly with the puritans, there was an appreciation of the different threats from conformists, Presbyterians and separatists and good discussion of the way that Elizabeth was able to deal with them. Most responses gave extensive detail but many responses would have benefitted from discussing the different natures of the threats posed by Catholics and Puritans concisely and with precision.

Question 22

Most responses described the Crown's financial distress, though the more successful answers were able to show how the relationship could be affected by other issues and indeed how these issues linked. There was considerable knowledge of the historical debate shown by some candidates who used it appropriately to support the analysis. Weaker answers needed to focus more on Parliament and go beyond a general account of the problems faced by James I, and ensure coverage of the entire time period.

Question 23

Better answer showed an understanding of what good government might be and evaluated whether this was the case for Charles I. Historical and historiographical debate was used appropriately in these responses. Weaker responses tended to outline aspects of the personal rule and explain why they were opposed. While financial issues were understood and there was some appreciation of the impact of Laud, these responses would have benefitted from considering Wentworth.

Question 24

Better responses dealt with both aspects of the debate, and the stronger responses dealt with the period in question, rather than including material too far back into the war. 'Good luck' was seen in terms of favourable circumstances and was sometimes rather broadly interpreted. Weaker answers needed to discuss the abilities Cromwell showed outside his military reputation.

Question 25

Some very persuasive answers to this question demonstrated real depth of knowledge of the policies and abilities of Charles II and avoiding writing too much about his social excesses.

Question 27

Answers were generally well-focused on intention and practice, and some subtle arguments about the limitations of the powers of the Crown were produced. These answers were very well supported and responded directly to the question.

Question 28

There was some sound focus on Marlborough and his military campaigns and qualities and better responses addressed his relative importance, considering a range of other factors. Given its importance, some responses would have benefitted from additional attention to the Battle of Blenheim.

Question 32

This question was done very well and most responses address a range of points that were relevant to the question. Candidates were able to discuss a wide range of the ministries while also evaluating alternative explanations for the instability of the 1760s, with George III being the most commonly used in constructing the counter-argument. Several candidates were able to give effective arguments that discussed the relative importance of the different factors and show how they interacted with each other.

Question 33

Though some answers explained why there was a rebellion in 1775, better responses were able to address the question more directly and considered why, despite the intensity of feeling and the incidents which showed unrest, the outbreak did not occur until 1775.

Question 35

Better answers to this question were generally well balanced and were able to discuss the positive quality of Pitt's policies as well as discussing the serial failures of Fox in the period. While many responses showed a good knowledge of the period and an understanding of the political culture, other responses needed to focus more on the issue of Pitt's 'abilities' and not only on Pitt's successes, which are not the same thing. Some weaker answers needed more detail on Fox. It is important that responses address the exact wording of the question as set.

Question 36

Many responses were able to discuss a wide range of points that explained British victory in the Napoleonic war. There was more developed knowledge and discussion of British strengths, e.g. naval strategy and British economic strength, than dealing with alliances, which while these were discussed, needed the precise detail found with the other factors. Some responses needed to ensure a focus on the precise time-frame of the question.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/13

British History Outlines c. 1689–2000

Key Messages

- It is important for answers to respond directly to the precise wording of the questions set.
- Specific contextual knowledge is important in all sections of the paper attempted.
- Answers that offer judgement and evaluation as well as the explanation of different factors are more likely to attain higher-level marks.

General Comments

There were many strong responses which used knowledge flexibly and astutely to support arguments and were able to offer genuine discussions and assessments, not merely a list of pre-learnt factors or reasons. These responses showed a strong awareness of the demands of the particular questions and responded to them clearly. Weaker responses would have benefited more from consideration of the actual question rather than adapting previous answers that candidates may have written during their studies which were similar to, but not the same as, the question set. It is very important that answers do not merely reproduce previous answers on the topic, but rather use knowledge and maintain a focus on arguments related specifically to the chosen questions. There were few significantly weak final answers, and there were indications that most candidates planned their time well in the examination. Handwriting was generally clear, but there were a small number of responses in which the script was unclear or the writing very small.

What follows are suggestions about approaching the examination which could improve candidate performance. Only questions with significant numbers of responses are included.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

Answers were generally well-focused on intention and practice, and some subtle arguments about the limitations of the powers of the Crown were produced. These answers were very well supported and responded directly to the question.

Question 2

There was some sound focus on Marlborough and his military campaigns and qualities and better responses addressed his relative importance, considering a range of other factors. Given its importance, some responses would have benefitted from additional attention to the Battle of Blenheim.

Question 6

This question was done very well and most responses address a range of points that were relevant to the question. Candidates were able to discuss a wide range of the ministries while also evaluating alternative explanations for the instability of the 1760s, with George III being the most commonly used in constructing the counter-argument. Several candidates were able to give effective arguments that discussed the relative importance of the different factors and show how they interacted with each other.

Question 7

Though some answers explained why there was a rebellion in 1775, better responses were able to address the question more directly and considered why, despite the intensity of feeling and the incidents which showed unrest, the outbreak did not occur until 1775.

Question 9

Better answers to this question were generally well balanced and were able to discuss the positive quality of Pitt's policies as well as discussing the serial failures of Fox in the period. While showed a good knowledge of the period and an understanding of the political culture, other responses needed to focus more on the issue of Pitt's 'abilities' and not only on Pitt's successes, which are not the same thing. Some weaker answers needed more detail on Fox. It is important that responses address the exact wording of the question as set.

Question 10

Many responses were able to discuss a wide range of points that explained British victory in the Napoleonic war. There was more developed knowledge and discussion of British strengths, e.g. naval strategy and British economic strength, than dealing with alliances, which while these were discussed, needed the precise detail found with the other factors. Some responses needed to ensure a focus on the precise time-frame of the question.

Question 17

Many answers discussed a range of points in answering this question, with the Peterloo Massacre and Cato House Conspiracy being the most common evidence used. It was often argued that the authorities were very successful in handling the radical threat as it was contained, and as its main cause of support was the economic crisis that occurred after the end of the Napoleonic Wars, so the upturn in economic growth in the 1820s helped undermine popular support for radical solutions. These responses would have benefitted from some balance, such as making the case that the government's responses were heavy-handed and counter-productive.

Question 18

There was some good knowledge of Castlereagh's foreign policy, and most argued that his support of emperors and kings was to secure peace, rather than to reconstruct the *ancien regime* for its own sake. The blocking of Russian initiatives was used to argue that Castlereagh had no principled support for monarchy and traditional European hierarchy. The best answers also offered some counter argument and discussion.

Question 19

This question was done well by those who attempted to respond directly to the question, and candidates showed an impressive knowledge of Peel's record in government. The best answers were able to offer a clear judgement, the most common being that Peel's achievements before 1841 were for the benefit of his party, while those after 1841 were for the benefit of his country. Some weaker responses were slightly unbalanced in their treatment of the two discrete time periods under focus, while others needed to compress their material into an effective comparative analysis.

Question 22

Most responses to this question were in agreement with the statement, with the permissive nature of Disraeli's legislation being the main focus of criticism, and the Artisan's Dwelling Act of 1875 being used as support in many answers. Responses generally viewed Disraeli's policies as being enacted in narrow self-interest. The best answers were able to give a more balanced and nuanced view, appreciating the breadth of legislation in the context of the 1870s. Some responses needed to give equal weighting to the two terms of the question.

Question 23

There were sound responses to this question which offered a balanced treatment of foreign policy under both Gladstone and Disraeli. However, some responses included material on colonial issues that were not relevant to the question and many responses needed to focus more on some important elements such as the Eastern Question and Gladstone's foreign policy.

Question 24

Many responses discussed the role of Lord Salisbury in some detail as well as the relative tumult in the Liberal Party who, deprived of leadership, unity and identity, were not much of a challenge. There was a lot of discussion of Salisbury's policies such as the cultivation of 'Villa Toryism' and his ability to use patriotism to appeal to working class votes: the phrase 'wrapped himself in the flag' appeared in many answers in this context, especially when referring to the Khaki election of 1900. The best answers were able to deal with the crucial element of 'best explains' and evaluate the relative importance of the different factors, with Lord Salisbury's ability to exploit and further Liberal divisions by recruiting the Unionists under Joseph Chamberlain being the most popular explanation.

Question 25

Responses to this question tended to focus more on why there were so many political conflicts in this period, with the introduction of radical pushing of 'collectivist' policies and the People's Budget, alongside the problem of Home Rule. While these answers showed some good detail and appreciation of the main issues of the period, many answers would have benefitted from a narrower focus and specifically examining the issue of why 'party politics' was so bitter and instead looking at the country as a whole. Many answers looked at issues such as Womens' Suffrage which while this helped create a febrile atmosphere, were not really part of the party political scene.

Question 26

Many answers looked at the Trade Union movement as the main explanation, and the Taff Vale case as a key watershed moment in explaining the rise of Labour Party due to the creation of an effective funding and administrative structure, while the Lib-Lab Pact was also used as a way of explaining the first step of Labour's electoral success. Many responses would have benefitted from including material on Labour's leadership, and Keir Hardie and Ramsay MacDonald would have provided a suitable increase in the range of discussion.

Question 33

The answers showed an appreciation of the debates over military effectiveness of British leadership with positive and negative assessments completed fairly well. The main focus was on Haig and the battles from 1916 to 1918, with a fair treatment of the mistakes British commanders made along with consideration of the wider circumstances they were operating in.

Question 34

Responses included discussion of the divisions in the Liberal Party which resulted from the war, the squeezing of the Liberal Party by the rise of Labour as a credible governing party and the mistakes and legacy of Lloyd George's coalition government. Others discussed the strengths of the Conservative Party in the 1920s under Baldwin. Some responses needed to focus on the term 'best explains' instead of giving descriptions of the reasons for Liberal decline and narrative accounts of the Liberal Party from 1918-1929. Some candidates also discussed the period before 1918 in detail but there was a need to link this effectively to events in the period developed by the question. Weaker responses needed to move the focus of their response beyond the Lloyd George coalition government.

Question 35

Most responses agreed with the statement in the question and wrote an answer that emphasised falling union membership during the period and the failure of Union leadership during the General Strike. Some candidates made the interesting point that it was by middle classes doing the manual tasks that were carried out by strikers in 1926 that empathy for the Union cause increased. Many responses would have benefitted from additional discussion of the wider ideological context or the politics of the relationship with the Labour

Party. A few of the best answers were able to discuss the subtle improvements of the Union position in the 1930s.

Question 36

Candidates were able to give a good summary of the arguments in favour of appeasement and against it: the weakness of British military; the political popularity of appeasement given the memories of the Great War and the feeling that Versailles had been too harsh. Where responses featured discussion of the 1920s, this needed to be linked explicitly to the 1930s to be relevant. There could have been more appreciation of the changing position between 1938 and 1939, and the extent to which Britain was truly prepared. Responses needed to focus on the term 'realistic'.

Question 38

Candidates who answered this question generally focused on De Gaulle's opposition as being the main reason for Britain's failure to gain admittance in the 1960s and his death in 1970 explaining their success in 1973. Several responses gave a view that Britain's economic decline explained the reluctance to grant the UK membership. These responses would have benefitted by identifying the more strategic reasons for De Gaulle's objections which was the reluctance of the UK to give up its Atlanticist tendencies and the French president's suspicion of American influence. More could have been made of Britain's post-war view (best summarised by Churchill) of enthusiasm for European unity but Britain's absence in favour of its continued imperial role, which was transformed into the Commonwealth. The best responses linked factors by explaining how the economic shifts of the 1950s and 1960s, plus the desire to escape the political costs of modernisation altered the circumstances.

Question 41

Most responses demonstrated a good knowledge of Thatcher's period in office, while other answers would have benefitted from assessing the successes and failures of Thatcher's period in office as well as assessing her strengths and weaknesses as Prime Minister.

Question 42

Many responses would have benefitted from being less partisan in their approach, and trying to give a balanced account of Blair's time in office. Some responses required more evidence in place of assertion. The main focus of many responses was on education and economic policy and insufficient focus on social legislation and public service reform.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/21

European History Outlines c. 300–c. 1516

Key Messages

- It is important for answers to respond directly to the precise wording of the questions set.
- Specific contextual knowledge is important in all sections of the paper attempted.
- Answers that offer judgement and evaluation as well as the explanation of different factors are more likely to attain higher-level marks.

General Comments

There were many strong responses which used knowledge flexibly and astutely to support arguments and were able to offer genuine discussions and assessments, not merely a list of pre-learnt factors or reasons. These responses showed a strong awareness of the demands of the particular questions and responded to them clearly. Weaker responses would have benefited more from consideration of the actual question rather than adapting previous answers that candidates may have written during their studies which were similar to, but not the same as, the question set. It is very important that answers do not merely reproduce previous answers on the topic, but rather use knowledge and maintain a focus on arguments related specifically to the chosen questions. There were few significantly weak final answers, and there were indications that most candidates planned their time well in the examination. Handwriting was generally clear, but there were a small number of responses in which the script was unclear or the writing very small.

What follows are suggestions about approaching the examination which could improve candidate performance. Only questions with significant numbers of responses are included.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 8

The answers to this question needed to focus on the exact terms of the question. The qualifying word here was *substantial* and the requirement was for a balanced discussion about the extent of cultural revival. Consideration of the changes made by Charlemagne in other aspects of his rule was not pertinent to this particular question. Knowledge of the changes seemed to be lacking in detail.

Question 11

Responses were able to analyse the extent to which the German rulers were responsible for the revival of monarchical power, most answers concentrated on the reign of Otto I. There were some, however, which included the achievements of Henry I and saw his role as one of laying the foundations of recovery. There was some good analysis of the example of Charlemagne and the influence his reputation exerted. The favourable chronicle accounts of Otto I also figured as an explanation for his reputation. The administrative system in Germany and Otto's subjugation of his enemies within and without Germany, were also cited as reasons for the revival. The ease with which Otto II succeeded his father was seen as evidence of the control Otto I had in Germany.

Question 12

Many responses featured detailed knowledge about the early Capetians, but would have benefitted from more focused analysis of the word *surprisingly*. Some answers did consider it well, arguing either that the Capetians had plenty of good fortune and some abilities but failed to make the most of their advantages and so were surprisingly weak, or that their small land-holdings and vigorous vassals meant that their weakness was no surprise at all. There was recognition that the achievements of the various monarchs varied and some were weaker than others. Some successful responses challenged the terms of the question to mount a case for saying that the early Capetians were, by contrast, relatively strong and their long reigns and assured provision of heirs assisted their survival. Some answers moved forward to the reign of Louis VI but this was outside the question.

Question 15

These answers usually considered the attempts of Leo IX to carry out reforms. Some described the abuses in the Church at the time with some vigour and were, perhaps, over-influenced by the hostile views of some contemporaries. The reform programme to end simony and clerical marriage and to establish the primacy of Rome needed to be outlined for its success to be evaluated, but long descriptions were not necessary. Some of the judgements depended too heavily on the perceived triumph of Leo at his Council at Reims. Others suggested that the introduction of the election decree in 1059 was the real stabilising factor. Some made their assessments on the basis that later reformers achieved much more, although the initiation of reform was not to be under-valued. Thus a variety of successful approaches to the question were seen.

Question 16

There were two alternative answers to this question. One suggested that Barbarossa was largely to blame for his own problems in his refusal to accept defeat in Italy and his determination to emerge victorious. The other saw the Italians as the chief reason and the unlikely alliance of the Normans and the papacy, along with the resistance from the communes of northern Italy. There was some stress on the malaria epidemic which affected Frederick's army in 1167. Some answers argued that Frederick's timely surrender in 1176 and his submission to the Pope were a solution to his problems and left the way open for his son, Henry VI to be more successful.

Question 17

There were some high quality answers to this question, displaying plenty of sound knowledge. Other responses would have benefitted from clearer focus and more substantial consideration to the factor identified in the question. Thus a discussion of the role of the Abbot Suger and his influence in French government and on Louis personally could be opened. On Louis VII, the impact of the disaster at Vitry and his crusading experiences could be considered. Most responses which did this then concluded that the advice given by Suger was not always governed by religious considerations and hence that other factors were more vital as explanations. The insistence of the monarchs on the maintenance and expansion of the royal demesne, and especially the part played by Louis VI in travelling extensively within his kingdom, illustrated one aspect of their success. There was some suggestion that Louis VII was not universally successful, notably in his dealings with Henry Plantagenet.

Question 18

Philip Augustus remains a popular topic and the responses largely saw his energy, administrative and financial strength and his ruthless exploitation of the opportunities given him, notably by John, as the prime reason for the growth of French monarchical power. An alternative explanation lay in the own goals scored by his opponents. Henry II's inability to control his restless family, the foolhardiness of Richard I, and the incompetence of John meant that Philip did not meet much concerted and organised resistance. Some responses argued that the ease with which Richard regained his lands when he did return from the crusade showed that Philip would not have been as successful had the opposition been of a higher calibre. This was a question where most candidates came to a supported judgement in their conclusions.

Question 19

There was some useful discussion about exactly what Innocent III achieved, but answers would have benefited from a fuller knowledge of the dealings of Innocent with various European rulers. One response looked at Innocent in context and in relation to the later medieval developments in the power of the papacy.

Question 24

Many responses covered the roles of the crusading leaders in great depth, and the Military Orders were well understood. Other responses would have benefitted greatly from focus on the specific factor in the question.

Question 26

Answers were well focused and came to a clear judgement, usually that the Church was relatively successful on the surface in eradicating heresy, quite brutally at times, but less so in winning the hearts and minds of those who favoured unorthodox creeds. There was good discussion of the part played by the Inquisition.

Question 40

Responses to this question described the achievements of Ferdinand and Isabella but needed to be more focused on the extent of unity. Some responses built suggested that the Catholic Kings did not intend to unite Spain and hence the lack of unity was to be expected.

Question 46

Essays which were capable of discussing a range of positive factors about the Church in the fifteenth century (doctrinal flexibility, provision of social services, regional sensitivity, and political balance) were able to achieve higher marks than those which concentrated exclusively on the wording 'crusading ideal'. Answers which explored what that phrase might mean and noted the use of 'only' were generally more analytical and therefore better rewarded.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/22

European History Outlines c. 1378–c. 1815

Key Messages

- It is important for answers to respond directly to the precise wording of the questions set.
- Specific contextual knowledge is important in all sections of the paper attempted.
- Answers that offer judgement and evaluation as well as the explanation of different factors are more likely to attain higher-level marks.

General Comments

There were many strong responses which used knowledge flexibly and astutely to support arguments and were able to offer genuine discussions and assessments, not merely a list of pre-learnt factors or reasons. These responses showed a strong awareness of the demands of the particular questions and responded to them clearly. Weaker responses would have benefited more from consideration of the actual question rather than adapting previous answers that candidates may have written during their studies which were similar to, but not the same as, the question set. It is very important that answers do not merely reproduce previous answers on the topic, but rather use knowledge and maintain a focus on arguments related specifically to the chosen questions. There were few significantly weak final answers, and there were indications that most candidates planned their time well in the examination. Handwriting was generally clear, but there were a small number of responses in which the script was unclear or the writing very small.

What follows are suggestions about approaching the examination which could improve candidate performance. Only questions with significant numbers of responses are included.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 9

Responses to this question described the achievements of Ferdinand and Isabella but needed to be more focused on the extent of 'unity'. Some responses built suggested that the Catholic Kings did not intend to unite Spain and hence the lack of unity was to be expected.

Question 11

Responses to this question that explicitly addressed the wording 'profound consequences' achieved the highest marks, as doing so not only demonstrated engagement with the question, but also a depth of understanding of the early-modern Church and the significance of religion in society. These responses that did not focus specifically on the word *profound* needed a structure to enable them to go beyond a list-like response detailing the results of Luther's actions, and to take the narrative well on to 1555. Answers would have done better to concentrate on the immediate results and the situation within Germany which made Luther's ideas fall on such fertile ground, given, as some argued, the profundity of the impact was seen by 1521. Some made the point that Luther did not intend to set a Reformation in motion. The relative inaction of Pope and Emperor was well discussed.

Question 13

The best responses to this question recognised the exact terms of the question, whereas other responses described how Charles ruled Spain without addressing the qualifying word *well*. Most pointed out that Charles' initial reception in Spain was poor and led on to revolt. Some argued that this was not all his fault and was attributable simply to inexperience. A number of responses would have benefitted from more discussion of the latter part of his reign, and his absences, which some responses blamed for

misgovernment. Further discussion of the role of his appointed deputies and advisers and, of his wife, Isabella would have added beneficial detail and support to many responses. Most blamed Charles for the financial problems in Spain, but more precise and informative discussion would have benefitted many responses. Charles' eventual relative popularity was largely underestimated. The question did not say 'by' Charles I and instead used 'under', and those candidates who picked up on the use of that preposition were able to include arguments about the nobility and the Church, helping them reach a conclusion which included a better range of reasons.

Question 14

It was crucial that responses to this question addressed what may be meant by the term '*Magnificent*'. While a definition was not essential, answers needed to show that the implications of the term had been considered. Many responses argued that Suleiman owed much to the foundations laid by his predecessors, to the exploits of the Janissaries and to the weakness of his opponents. His only magnificence was perceived to be in his court and that was criticised for its extravagance. The best responses went beyond this iconoclastic style of historiography, and balanced the unpicking of his reputation where demonstrably romanticised with an explanation for the extension of the Ottoman Empire and its success as a state under Suleiman, which formed a more wholly adequate explanation. Some responses would have benefitted from additional support, for example, some referred to him as a Lawgiver, but needed much detailed illustration of his work in this role.

Question 15

There was some strong knowledge of the achievements of Ivan and some sound judgements, contrasting the situation at the end of his reign with that at the start. The difficulties of his final years were well understood.

Question 16

The best responses to this question focussed on the exact terms and made these central to the question. There were some good approaches to the question, which discussed first of all his vision, or lack of it, often using his religious policies as the mainstay of the argument. These then went on to look at his judgement, particularly in his choice of advisers and in his administrative, taxation and economic policies. This was a better way into the question than considering his policies in turn and then concluding that they did or did not show vision or judgement. Some responses would have benefitted from being better balanced in their criticism, for example, Philip II was rarely credited with either vision or good judgement, though he enjoyed a lengthy reign over a forty year period.

The question specified rule in Spain so his rule elsewhere was not relevant to the discussion.

Question 18

There was some sound knowledge about the religious orders in these answers, but the analysis of their contribution could have been better emphasised in many responses. Better responses clarified the distinction between the Counter-Reformation and the Catholic-Reformation, which was at time not always understood. The use of the plural ('religious orders') invited candidates to refer to more than the Jesuits in answering this question and those essays which included discussion of other orders did better than those which focused solely on the Jesuits. Essays which included assessment and discriminated between the Counter and Catholic Reformations achieved the higher bands. Better answers incorporated other factors which affected the various reformations and were able to connect arguments concerning the other factors to an assessment of the contributions of the order. Responses that discussed a range of factors contributing to the reformations needed to focus more on the core of the question.

Question 22

Responses that were capable of discussing a range of positive factors about the Church in the fifteenth century (for example, doctrinal flexibility, provision of social services, regional sensitivity and political balance) were able to achieve higher marks than those which concentrated exclusively on the wording 'crusading ideal'. Answers which explored what that phrase might mean and noted the use of 'only' were generally more analytical and therefore better rewarded.

Question 26

Responses to this question debated the causes of inflation and would have done better to focus on the wording 'profound consequences' for more than one European society. Responses needed to ensure that they answered the question as set, as some responses interpreted 'why?' as 'how?' or 'profound consequences' as 'effects'. Accurate reading of the questions would have enabled candidates to have focussed more on the central tenet of the question.

Question 27

Those essays which explicitly addressed the words 'truly' and 'monarchy' were able to demonstrate greater analysis than those which discussed what Richelieu did for Louis XIII. Other responses would have benefitted had they focussed on evaluation rather than description; many essays would have been better to consider a view of Richelieu's contributions after rather than during his life.

Question 29

Responses that recognised that the word 'principal' enabled evaluation of a range of causes, whilst dealing explicitly with Franco-Habsburg rivalry, were able to access the higher marks. Candidates who were able to demonstrate understanding of more than one form of rivalry were particularly able to demonstrate full comprehension of the question. Crucial to the answer was to come to a judgment, rather than indicate simply that the war was the consequence of a variety of causes.

The majority of essays described Louis' policies but would have benefitted from explaining what lay behind them. Louis' personal religiosity was often discussed but pressures on the King and in particular the way that those pressures changed during his reign were largely only considered by those candidates achieving the higher marks. This was a question about causation and asked candidates to place significance on each of the causes discussed. Top answers needed to address both those aspects.

Question 37

Responses to this question generally disagreed with the statement and argued that both the Regency and the government of Fleury, whichever they chose, had some merits. Most responses addressed domestic policies in detail but some responses would have benefitted from additional discussion of foreign policy.

Question 38

Responses had some varied analysis of the reign of Maria Theresa, but needed to be more focused on 'effective', which is not the same as successful.

Question 39

Good responses were those which noted both 'compare' and 'contrast', and the best responses considered what might be meant by 'the development of Prussia'. Responses that discussed the relative merits of each king, needed to focus on the main thrust of the question. There were some good direct comparisons, but most answers chose to consider the rulers separately and make the comparison at the end of the answer or at the end of each aspect being analysed, and may have benefitted from integrating the conclusion throughout. Most responses concluded that Frederick William I was supreme in his military contribution but was superseded by his son in most other areas of government. In such a broad question it was appropriate to use evidence from each reign selectively.

Question 41

Responses to this question would have benefitted from focussing more directly on what was wrong with the *ancien régime* initially and then could have moved on to other, possibly more successful, aspects of Louis XV's reign.

Question 42

There was some sound understanding of what it meant to be an 'Enlightened Despot' and hence answers were able to assess how far Joseph II complied. Some responses would have benefitted from a clearer structure so that the argument is clearer and the prose less descriptive.

Question 44

Most responses to this question featured strong discussion of the shortcomings of the monarchy and the influence of writers and thinkers. However many responses needed to ensure that the factor in the question was adequately considered, and most would have benefitted from consideration and definition of the term 'economic' in this context. Clarifying the terms might have aided some candidates to distinguish between immediate and long term causes, and display deeper thinking about the process of historical causation. Those responses which gained the highest marks had two attributes. First, they recognised that 'economic factors' meant more than simply 'fiscal problems' and that the question asked about the 1789 crisis, rather than the ensuing revolution. Second, they expressly dealt with placing economic factors in a hierarchy of reasons, so were able to talk about significance. Other responses would have benefitted from a broader definition of the Crown's fiscal problems.

Question 45

It was important in responses to this question to go beyond a discussion of the *Code Napoléon* and to discuss religious policies, education, his organisation of the country's government, and finances. Better answers related such discussion to the question of whether the policies might have been of benefit to France, and not merely to considerations of overall success or failure or the extent to which he was a dictator.

Question 46

Good responses appreciated that a reign of two halves could be a simplistic understanding, and that Alexander was complex, enigmatic and difficult to pigeon-hole. He was both a reactionary and a liberal at different times. Although many answers tackled the question well, some responses would have benefitted from clarity of understanding, for example, a number of responses stated that Alexander's 'unwise experiments' engendered a 'savage reaction' from the people – rather than appreciating the fact that his was the 'savage reaction'. Many answers appreciated that as much did not come to pass, they were neither experiments nor unwise. Most answers would have benefitted from discussing Alexander's growing religiosity, though the better ones covered all aspects of his domestic policy, including administrative and educational, small changes to serfdom, and the military colonies and Poland.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/23

European History Outlines c. 1715–c. 2000

Key Messages

- It is important for answers to respond directly to the precise wording of the questions set.
- Specific contextual knowledge is important in all sections of the paper attempted.
- Answers that offer judgement and evaluation as well as the explanation of different factors are more likely to attain higher-level marks.

General Comments

There were many strong responses which used knowledge flexibly and astutely to support arguments and were able to offer genuine discussions and assessments, not merely a list of pre-learnt factors or reasons. These responses showed a strong awareness of the demands of the particular questions and responded to them clearly. Weaker responses would often have benefited from more consideration of the actual question than on adapting previous answers which were similar to, but not the same as, the question set. There were a considerable number of responses to questions in the twentieth century sections of the paper in which candidates could have gained significantly higher marks by adapting their knowledge to focus on the question set, as in some cases candidates included material that was not relevant or focussed on answering the question as set. It is very important that answers do not merely reproduce previous answers on the topic, but rather use knowledge and maintain a focus on arguments related specifically to the chosen questions. There were few significantly weak final answers and there were indications that candidates planned their time well in the examination. Handwriting was generally clear, but there were a small number of response in which the script was unclear or the writing very small.

What follows are suggestions about approaching the examination which could improve candidate performance. Only questions with significant numbers of responses are included.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

Responses to this question generally disagreed with the statement and argued that both the Regency and the government of Fleury, whichever they chose, had some merits. Most responses addressed domestic policies in detail but some responses would have benefitted from additional discussion of foreign policy.

Question 2

Responses had some varied analysis of the reign of Maria Theresa, but needed to be more focused on 'effective', which is not the same as successful.

Question 3

Good responses were those which noted both 'compare' and 'contrast', and the best responses considered what might be meant by 'the development of Prussia'. Responses that discussed the relative merits of each king, needed to focus on the main thrust of the question. There were some good direct comparisons, but most answers chose to consider the rulers separately and make the comparison at the end of the answer or at the end of each aspect being analysed, and may would have benefitted from integrating the conclusion throughout. Most responses concluded that Frederick William I was supreme in his military contribution but was superseded by his son in most other areas of government. In such a broad question it was appropriate to use evidence from each reign selectively.

Question 5

Responses to this question would have benefitted from focussing more directly on what was wrong with the *ancien régime* initially and then could have moved on to other, possibly more successful, aspects of Louis XV's reign.

Question 6

There was some sound understanding of what it meant to be an 'Enlightened Despot' and hence answers were able to assess how far Joseph II complied. Some responses would have benefitted from a clearer structure so that the argument is clearer and the prose less descriptive.

Question 8

Most responses to this question featured strong discussion of the shortcomings of the monarchy and the influence of writers and thinkers. However many responses needed to ensure that the factor in the question was adequately considered, and most would have benefitted from consideration and definition of the term 'economic' in this context. Clarifying the terms might have aided some candidates to distinguish between immediate and long term causes, and display deeper thinking about the process of historical causation. Those responses which gained the highest marks had two attributes. First, they recognised that 'economic factors' meant more than simply 'fiscal problems' and that the question asked about the 1789 crisis, rather than the ensuing revolution. Second, they expressly dealt with placing economic factors in a hierarchy of reasons, so were able to talk about significance. Other responses would have benefitted from a broader definition of the Crown's fiscal problems.

Question 9

It was important in responses to this question to go beyond a discussion of the Code Napoleon and to discuss religious policies, education, his organisation of the country's government, and finances. Better answers related such discussion to the question of whether the policies might have been of benefit to France, and not merely to considerations of overall success or failure or the extent to which he was a dictator.

Question 10

Good responses appreciated that a reign of two halves could be a simplistic understanding, and that Alexander was complex, enigmatic and difficult to pigeon-hole. He was both a reactionary and a liberal at different times. Although many answers tackled the question well, some responses would have benefitted from clarity of understanding, for example, a number of responses stated that Alexander's 'unwise experiments' engendered a 'savage reaction' from the people – rather than appreciating the fact that his was the 'savage reaction'. Many answers appreciated that as much did not come to pass, they were neither experiments nor unwise. Most answers would have benefitted from discussing Alexander's growing religiosity, though the better ones covered all aspects of his domestic policy, including administrative and educational, small changes to serfdom, and the military colonies and Poland.

Question 17

Where a response established what the issues faced by the peacemakers were, it could provide analysis of the realism of the solution. Many responses would have benefitted from defining the issues clearly before evaluating the possible solutions. Many candidates considered 'realistic' to mean 'successful' and as a result, could not provide the analysis which the question required.

Question 18

Many responses to this question argued strongly in favour of one side of the argument, but even where such a response could be fully justified, most answers would have benefitted from a more robust attempt at presenting a counter argument. There points that can be deemed beneficial with regard to the serfs, the development of the railway, and even, surprisingly, with regard to the arts and literature, and most responses would have benefitted from presenting these in greater detail. Material on Russification and foreign policy was potentially crucial, and most responses would have benefitted from inclusion of this evidence.

Question 21

Many responses demonstrated strong knowledge of the main reasons for Italian unification generally. However, the majority of responses to this question would have benefitted from closer focus on the specific wording of the question; it was important to note the date and to deal explicitly on the word 'diplomacy'. Better answers offered a clear judgement on relative importance of different factors but retained a focus on the question set.

Question 22

Many responses established what Bismarck's aims were, and used their knowledge to offer some assessment, and there was strong and detailed knowledge about foreign policy. Better responses discussed the importance of changing circumstances during the period.

Question 24

Some answers concentrated on Alexander III, but most responses would have benefitted from discussing Nicholas II. However, responses that discussed Nicholas II needed to ensure that they stayed within the 1914 end date of the question. The best responses compared the two reigns and considered what 'effective' rule might be.

Question 25

Better answers offered an analysis of the situation in 1871 as a starting point from which to judge how far the degree of unity had changed by 1914. There was a lot of understanding of the elements of disunity, but stronger answers were able to focus on continuity and change and did not only reproduce a list of 'the problems of Italy'.

Question 26

The most effective responses to this question targeted their answers to the specific wording of the question, 'irresponsible militarism'. Other responses needed to avoid giving undue prominence to limited aspects, for example by concentrating only on the Anglo-German naval race. Responses needed to focus on the exact terms of the question rather than write a generalised response debating the responsibility of Germany.

Question 34

Good responses to this question discussed what 'excessively idealistic' might mean in context, and the best were able to differentiate between 'idealistic' and 'unrealistic'. Weaker answers did not discuss a range of policies implemented in 1919. Most responses focused on the terms imposed on Germany and assumed that reparations, guilt, land loss and reducing the size of the military were 'idealistic'. Responses needed to focus on the precise question set and not only write a generalised response on the topic.

Question 36

Those answers which addressed the question of what the 'interests of Russia' might be were able to provide some evaluation and offer effective answers. Other responses needed to establish a clear framework, as a number discussed what Stalin did, and tried to compare pre-1941 domestic policies with post-1941 foreign policies. Many responses would have benefitted from greater evidence of post-1941 policies, especially domestic policies and the way in which Stalin ruled, and clearer focus on the question set, as almost all responses condemned Stalin, though that was not the focus of the question.

Question 37

The best responses to this question defined the terms of their argument. It was important to establish what 'Hitler's War' might mean, as many responses interpreted the question as being solely about why the Second World War started in 1939, but would have benefitted from discussion of 1941 and consideration about whether the nature of the war developed. It is crucial that responses engage with the wording of the question.

Question 38

Many candidates interpreted this as a question about the break-up of the Soviet Union and Gorbachev's role in that process. Most responses would have gained significantly higher marks had they answered the question as set. Responses needed to consider what 'challenge' might mean and how to measure whether a challenge might be serious. Most responses wrote in depth about Hungary and Czechoslovakia but needed to include material about post-1968 challenges.

Question 40

Many responses set out an argument blaming Stalin for the start of the Cold War and giving Reagan all the credit for ending it. These responses needed to focus on the question set, include a balanced analysis and deploy relevant knowledge of American actions.

Question 41

Most responses to this question would have benefitted from setting out what Franco's aims were and whether they changed over his time in power. Candidates needed to consider the words 'in this period', which must refer to 1945 to 2000 (as set out in the heading of **Section 8**). Some responses included discussion of Franco's aims before 1945, which was not pertinent, but would have benefitted from considering Franco's legacy, and so whether any of Franco's aims (to the extent that he had any beyond staying in power) lasted after his death.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/03

US History Outlines c.1750

Key Messages

- It is important for answers to respond directly to the precise wording of the questions set.
- Specific contextual knowledge is important in all sections of the paper attempted.
- Answers that offer judgement and evaluation as well as the explanation of different factors are more likely to attain higher-level marks.

General Comments

There were many strong responses which used knowledge flexibly and astutely to support arguments and were able to offer genuine discussions and assessments, not merely a list of pre-learnt factors or reasons. These responses showed a strong awareness of the demands of the particular questions and responded to them clearly. Weaker responses would have benefited more from consideration of the actual question rather than adapting previous answers that candidates may have written during their studies which were similar to, but not the same as, the question set. It is very important that answers do not merely reproduce previous answers on the topic, but rather use knowledge and maintain a focus on arguments related specifically to the chosen questions. There were few significantly weak final answers, and there were indications that most candidates planned their time well in the examination. Handwriting was generally clear, but there were a small number of responses in which the script was unclear or the writing very small.

What follows are suggestions about approaching the examination which could improve candidate performance. Only questions with significant numbers of responses are included.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

Responses that focused on economic and commercial were the best answers. Other responses would have benefitted had they focussed on these areas and less on the general reasons for the outbreak of the war of independence. There were answers which attempted to deal with matters of trade and economic dispute, though some responses could have benefitted from focusing more on the core element of the question, which was about the relative benefits. The best responses addressed the period before the outbreak of the Revolutionary War should not be seen entirely in terms that went beyond an examination of the 'causes of conflict'.

Question 2

A study of the American Enlightenment should involve leading figures and key ideas specific to America. Answers would have been improved by more specific unextending of the nature of the American enlightenment and engaging with its impact in the whole period covered by the question. Answers which focused on some unattributed and generalised ideas behind opposition to the British needed to focus more on the specific demands of the question. Both **Questions 1** and **2** were seen by some as being largely about the causes of the American Revolution and answers would have been improved by more direct engagement with the questions and more knowledge.

Question 3

There were some strong answers which sustained focus on the key issue in the question and were able to discuss the role of individuals and the nature of the British leadership. There were different views offered and some thoughtful and analytical responses. Weaker responses included some material on leadership and would have benefitted from an alternative structure that went beyond a list of reasons for British defeat.

Answers which produced a list which did not include British leadership were not responding to the question sufficiently and would have benefited from looking carefully at its demands.

Question 5

There were some thoughtful answers which went beyond listing explanations and engaged with their relative importance, responding directly to the wording of the question which asked 'what best explains'. This is a common Pre-U History formulation and better answers go beyond an explanation of factors to offer supported judgement on relative importance. Thus there were some insightful assessments of purely economic explanations which showed an awareness of the broader reasons for the extent.

Question 6

The best responses to this question would have resulted from a study and consideration of the nature of Jacksonian democracy. The question asked quite specifically for a consideration of the political system and many responses interpreted this narrowly in terms of the policies of Jackson.

Question 8

The best responses to this question went some way between generalised discussions of slavery and its opponents. There was some strong knowledge of individual aspects and a better knowledge of the issue of slavery in the territories, though a number of responses would have benefited from additional focus on the Republicans and Lincoln. A breakdown of the question might have led more answers to address the 'mounting sectional conflict' and consider the whole time period.

Question 9

There were some very full answers which set resources against other elements and showed a good understanding of the changing nature of the war. It was noticeable that factual support was stronger here than in the preceding questions. Some weaker responses would have benefited from a focus on the key issue in the question rather than a general explanation of a list of reasons for the outcome.

Question 10

Answers which set the terms of the discussion by outlining what the reputation was were generally more successful than answers which set down some of Lincoln's actions and policies and then commented on their success or failure. Thus the question discriminated well between those who attempted to respond directly to the key word 'reputation' and those who were more concerned to reproduce material about the presidency of Lincoln.

Question 11

Responses to this question demonstrate knowledge was sometimes shown of the expansion, but this would have been made more effective had there been more assessment of the relative importance of the key factor in the question. Answers generally would have been improved by a stronger awareness of when and where gold was important. The main factor in the question does have to be considered carefully in responses even when other factors may be stressed in a response.

Question 17

Stronger responses to this question were able to isolate Grant's role, other responses required greater knowledge to make answers effective.

Question 19

There was some very strong and detailed knowledge of US 'imperial' expansion. Stronger answers used the knowledge in relation to a consideration of what might constitute an 'empire'. Other responses focused on outlining what happened and adding some basic comment, and would have benefited from a more analytical and less narrative or descriptive approach.

Question 20

Many responses demonstrated extensive knowledge, and where knowledge was used and policy and personality distinguished there were some good responses. Other responses would have benefitted from addressing the question as set. It was clear that some answers were really answering a question 'How successful were Roosevelt's foreign and domestic policies?' and some responses would have benefitted from much greater emphasis his personality.

Question 21

Again answers which attempted to define and focus on what the interests were achieved better results than answers which started by an outline of Wilson's policies and then added some comment on their effectiveness generally.

Question 22

Better answers engaged with the degree of depression, taking into account the 'so' in the question. Most answers were able to offer some causes of the Depression. Responses that offered an explanation of the stock market crisis needed to focus more on the precise terms of the question, where it is was used as evidence, responses needed to ensure the relationship of the Wall Street Crash to the subsequent depression.

Question 24

Most responses to this question exhibited detailed knowledge, but some answers would have been more successful had they focussed lesson on how far the US was isolationist. The question was about 'attempts to maintain world peace' and better answers focus on those specific terms; weaker answers shifted the focus to isolationism and general economic and immigration policies. Selection of material was important.

Question 25

Strong answers to this question were able to discuss leadership and some answers showed an extensive knowledge of Eisenhower and other generals as well as Roosevelt.

Question 26

There were some strong and detailed responses which engaged directly with the elements in the question distinguishing ambition, party politics and principles. The selection and organisation of material was impressive and some clear judgements were offered. Some responses introduced arguments on the negatives of ambition and party politics, and some explanations not related to the question, but needed to offer more assessment of principles.

Question 27

Most responses to this question wrote about Eisenhower's qualities and personality generally or offered a series of reasons for the election. Responses would have benefitted from more sustained discussion, as some responses offered factors other than the honesty and integrity of 'Ike'.

Question 28

There was knowledge of a range of possible explanations, and some answers questioned the assumption that there was overwhelming popular opposition. Stronger responses offered a judgement, though, not about the extent – which is a different question – but what best explains the extent and weighed different factors.

Question 29

There were some thoughtful responses which balanced the Kennedy legacy, including Kennedy's domestic reforms as well as the impact of his assassination, with Johnson's own drive and profound interest in domestic change. Some responses included material on foreign policy but this was not relevant as the question explicitly asked for 'domestic successes'.

Question 30

The best responses to this question assessed the visit and put it into the context of other dealings with Communist countries, other responses would have been improved if there had been more judgement on the relative significance of the visit to China and if that key element had received fuller treatment.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/04

African and Asian History Outlines c. 1750

Key Messages

- It is important for answers to respond directly to the precise wording of the questions set
- It is important for supporting knowledge to be offered in all sections of the paper attempted
- It is important for answers to offer judgement and evaluation as well as the explanation of different factors for higher-level marks.

General Comments

The significant number of responses on this Paper demonstrate that there is a continued interest in Asian history and there was some very strong knowledge about aspects of Chinese and Japanese History. Less responses on the questions pertaining to India demonstrated strong knowledge, and there were no answers to questions on Africa and Southeast Asia. There are accessible studies available if Centres were to extend the range of topics. There were many impressive responses which used knowledge flexibly and well to support arguments and were able to offer genuine discussions and assessments, not merely a list of pre-learned factors or reasons. Good responses showed a strong awareness of the demands of the particular questions and responded to them clearly. Supporting knowledge was stronger in answers on China and Japan than answers on India. Indeed, some of the best supported essay answers in Pre-U History were on China and Japan. It should be emphasised that if India is going to be studied, then it should be given as much time and attention as Japan or China. There are many good texts available and it is a dangerous strategy for candidates to attempt questions on Indian history with inadequate knowledge. Weaker responses would often have benefited from more consideration of the actual question than on adapting previous answers which were similar to, but not the same as, the question set. It is very important that answers do not merely reproduce previous answers on the topic, but rather use knowledge and maintain a focus on arguments related specifically to the chosen questions. There were few significantly weak final answers, and there were indications that candidates planned their time in the examination well. Standards of handwriting improved, but in a small number of cases candidates affect a style which is too small for examiners to read. It is a part of preparing for an examination to ensure that answers are legible. What follows are suggestions about approaching the examination which could improve candidate performance. Only questions with significant numbers of responses are included.

Comments on Questions

Question 17

Better answers not only showed an awareness of the developments but attempted to assess their significance, usually in terms of the 1911 Revolution and the end of the dynasty. Some answers were rather reliant on considering the impact of the Boxer rebellion, but many did see that the period also saw developments and few fell back on a generalised analysis of the weakness of the regime.

Question 18

The main elements of instability were often well known, but answers could have been significantly improved had there been some attempt to assess the relative importance of the factors rather than simply outlining them in a sort of list of explanations. 'What best explains...?' is not the same as 'What explains...?' and in preparing candidates for Pre U History Centres should consider as a major element the assessment as well as the explanation of different causes.

Question 19

Where answers dealt with the period from 1937 there were some strong responses. Better answers analysed the situation before the invasion and the threats to the CCP and weighed the effects of the distraction of Jiang by the Japanese against the leadership and tactics of the Communists. Weaker responses offered various reasons for the success of Mao in 1949 with limited awareness of the period before 1945 and would have benefited from a stronger knowledge of the earlier period.

Question 20

There were a wide variety of responses. Answers started with an outline of some policies and added a brief comment on the cost obviously offered less effective analysis than those who considered the nature of the 'progress' and what 'price' meant in human terms and also in terms of overall development. The question did require some careful organisation of material and some distinction between the earlier years and later developments which better answers demonstrated.

Question 21

Though not as popular as the earlier questions on China, many answers did offer a considered and balanced judgement and there were relatively few descriptions of his policies with merely limited or generalised comments

Question 22

Answers would have been improved by more consideration of the impact of 1857 and less considerations of the causes. It is important to respond to the demands of the question rather than reproducing previous answers to a different question.

Question 23

Answers would have been improved by a more even coverage of the period and by dealing with the period asked about, not, for instance, devoting valuable time to a description of the events of 1947. The work of Gandhi was, oddly, dealt with in a very limited way by some.

Question 25

Answers to this question would have benefited from more knowledge of Nehru's policies. Generally there was insufficient support for comments made and limited understanding of the ideas behind both economic development and foreign policy.

Question 28

Not a popular question, it nevertheless produced some answers which showed a perceptive understanding of the factors which lay behind nationalism and did balance the longer-term resentments of the West with an analysis of Japan's economic problems, and often linked the two. Few did not offer some judgement, though less effective responses did content themselves with a list of explanations. However, this question was generally well tackled.

Question 29

This question did elicit more attempts to weigh factors than some others with the stem 'What best explains..?', and better responses set western weaknesses against the determination and effectiveness of Japanese military action. Some did question 'success', given the failure to destroy the US carriers, but did not allow this to divert attention from the many objectives achieved.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/51

The Norman Conquest, 1051–1087

Key Messages

- In dealing with **(a)** questions, more explanation as to why the documents should disagree or agree by referring to their provenance would help responses to obtain higher marks.
- In dealing with **(b)** questions, the use of knowledge in a discriminating way to assess the documents, avoiding references to material that is not relevant to the question, would benefit responses.
- In the essay questions, the precise wording of the question should be considered.

General Comments

The overwhelming majority of responses to the Special Subject papers this session featured point-by-point comparison and contrast in answers to the **(a)** questions and many candidates were able to demonstrate skills beyond the sequential treatment of the documents. Attempts were made in most responses to use both the passages and contextual knowledge in **(b)** questions, though sometimes there was imbalance, especially if candidates regarded the **(b)** question as an essay rather than a document-based exercise. Better answers were critical of the passages and in the context of the issue of the question tested the documents as evidence. Some answers made little attempt to go beyond what the passages contained; it is important that candidates respond to the instruction 'you should refer to contextual knowledge', which is explicitly stated. Some of the essays would have been enriched by more reference to evidence and improved by a stronger focus on the actual question, but better answers often showed extensive knowledge and effective analysis. Most responses demonstrated skilful and confident handling of the documents, but centres should be aware that Special Subjects should be studied in appropriate depth; in some cases there was little difference in the support offered in the Special Subject essays to the work submitted in the Outlines Papers.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** Most of the responses saw the similarities between the documents clearly and the ravaging of the Normans was fully covered. The different versions of exactly how William dealt with the Danes were less well analysed in that William's bribery of the Danes to persuade them to leave was viewed as out of character for the Conqueror. But some answers suggested that it showed William's pragmatism and that his inherent strength meant that the Danes were unlikely to take advantage as they had done in earlier periods. The provenance was not so well utilised; answers needed to say more than that the viewpoints were English and Norman, but to use the tone and detail in the documents to assist in the analysis.
- (b)** By using the documents as a set many answers argued that C, D and E showed William using the tactics of terror, while A and B suggested he used diplomacy with Edgar and Malcolm and sound military tactics against Hereward. The 'Harrying of the North' was used as evidence to develop the argument about terror and contextual knowledge from the Domesday Survey supported this view. Most responses reached this level, but stronger ones were able to identify other factors from the documents, such as references to castles in A and D and to wise choices of castellans, luck in the death of Edwin in B and the storm at sea in E and William's ability to recruit more men from the continent in A and E. There was plenty of contextual knowledge to support these points, though some responses needed to argue more clearly which was the favoured method. Good responses suggested that terror worked, as the decline in revolts and the evidence of the documents showed and so it was the decisive factor.

Question 3

The majority of the answers reached Band 2, showing strong understanding of the terms of the question. These answers were able to identify examples showing William's leadership skills from events both before and during the battle, and then consider these against other issues, such as the errors made by Harold and the element of luck which favoured William. Different responses suggested that each of these explanations was the chief one and usually marshalled the material appropriately. There was good, well-informed discussion of the rights and wrongs of Harold's decision to march south soon after Stamford Bridge and also about how far he could rely on the loyalty of some of his fellow Anglo-Saxon leaders. The few less strong answers needed to reach a clear judgement and relied too heavily on narration of the events of the battle.

Question 4

These answers were not very effectively argued. They had some sound knowledge of the workings of the Anglo-Saxon state, but then tended to assert that William carried on using most of its institutions without further development. Some of the answers strayed away from government to discuss innovations such as church building and changes in society, while neglecting some legal issues like the forest laws. The coverage needed to be wider and more precise.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/52

Special Subject - The Crusades, 1095–1192

Key Messages

- In dealing with **(a)** questions, more explanation as to why the documents should disagree or agree by referring to their provenance would help responses to obtain higher marks.
- In dealing with **(b)** questions, the use of knowledge in a discriminating way to assess the documents, avoiding references to material that is not relevant to the question, would benefit responses.
- In the essay questions, the precise wording of the question should be considered.

General Comments

The overwhelming majority of responses to the Special Subject papers this session featured point-by-point comparison and contrast in answers to the **(a)** questions and many candidates were able to demonstrate skills beyond the sequential treatment of the documents. Attempts were made in most responses to use both the passages and contextual knowledge in **(b)** questions, though sometimes there was imbalance, especially if candidates regarded the **(b)** question as an essay rather than a document-based exercise. Better answers were critical of the passages and in the context of the issue of the question tested the documents as evidence. Some answers made little attempt to go beyond what the passages contained; it is important that candidates respond to the instruction 'you should refer to contextual knowledge', which is explicitly stated. Some of the essays would have been enriched by more reference to evidence and improved by a stronger focus on the actual question, but better answers often showed extensive knowledge and effective analysis. Most responses demonstrated skilful and confident handling of the documents, but centres should be aware that Special Subjects should be studied in appropriate depth; in some cases there was little difference in the support offered in the Special Subject essays to the work submitted in the Outlines Papers.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** The comparison was usually well made, with most responses treating the documents as a set, and few answers dealt with the documents separately. The contrast was well set in context with the different outlooks of the two writers. Some answers picked up the point that A, in trying to sound attractive to settlers, was, in fact, illustrating the problems outlined in B. The weaker responses needed to look for more points of comparison.
- (b)** Most answers used the documents well as a set and could group them effectively. They also largely came to the same conclusion, namely that the lack of settlers was less vital than the need for warriors or the growing threat from the Muslims and, indeed, Byzantium. Some answers pointed out that the Crusaders had some victories in this period or that settlers, living in harmony with their neighbours as A indicated, were not what the Crusader States needed anyway. There was not always much use of contextual knowledge, which would have strengthened the answers and some of the evaluation of D and E missed some obvious pointers.

Question 2

Answers were usually well-focused, though some responses gave long accounts of Urban's speech at Clermont. There was some strong analysis of the problems which the Papacy had faced and the need to revive its prestige and reputation, which a Crusade was ideally poised to do. Hence there was discussion in the answers of the mixed motives which could be attributed to the Pope and how far the Crusade, by giving him a central role in Europe, was for secular ends. The alternative view, citing the purely religious

enthusiasm which Urban inspired, argued that he was largely devoted to the religious ideal and a genuine longing to see Jerusalem in the hands of Christians. One response pointed out that, whatever his motives, the outcome of the Crusade did not enhance his reputation that strongly. A clear judgement was needed for higher-Band marks.

Question 3

There was good focus on the issues of poor planning and poor leadership and generally answers were able to link these problems with the failure of the Crusade. Most responses saw Louis VII as a poor planner and an even worse leader, while Conrad was viewed as little better. The best leader, if he could be described as such, was considered to be Bernard of Clairvaux. Other factors considered included the issue of how far the Crusader States were viable in the long run and the ambivalent attitude of the Emperor in Constantinople. There was some discussion about whether the Crusade, in its widest sense, could be seen as a failure, with reference to successes in the Iberian Peninsula.

Question 4

Responses to this question featured full analysis of the role of the Crusader States and detailed and balanced discussion of the leadership of Guy de Lusignan and Reynald de Chatillon. The answers then went on to assess the other factors and blamed the unsustainable nature of the Crusader States once the Muslims regrouped under Saladin. There was good differentiation in these answers between long and short term factors.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/53

The Reign of Henry VIII, 1509–1547

Key Messages

- In dealing with **(a)** questions, more explanation as to why the documents should disagree or agree by referring to their provenance would help responses to obtain higher marks.
- In dealing with **(b)** questions, the use of knowledge in a discriminating way to assess the documents, avoiding references to material that is not relevant to the question, would benefit responses.
- In the essay questions, the precise wording of the question should be considered.

General Comments

The overwhelming majority of responses to the Special Subject papers this session featured point-by-point comparison and contrast in answers to the **(a)** questions and many candidates were able to demonstrate skills beyond the sequential treatment of the documents. Attempts were made in most responses to use both the passages and contextual knowledge in **(b)** questions, though sometimes there was imbalance, especially if candidates regarded the **(b)** question as an essay rather than a document-based exercise. Better answers were critical of the passages and in the context of the issue of the question tested the documents as evidence. Some answers made little attempt to go beyond what the passages contained; it is important that candidates respond to the instruction 'you should refer to contextual knowledge', which is explicitly stated. Some of the essays would have been enriched by more reference to evidence and improved by a stronger focus on the actual question, but better answers often showed extensive knowledge and effective analysis. Most responses demonstrated skilful and confident handling of the documents, but centres should be aware that Special Subjects should be studied in appropriate depth; in some cases there was little difference in the support offered in the Special Subject essays to the work submitted in the Outlines Papers.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** This was generally well done and there were some consideration of provenance and comparison of the very different situations in 1529 and 1535. There were some speculations about the significance of B being written in Mary's reign and weaker responses would have benefited from appreciation of the different contexts. A small number of responses paraphrased the sources.
- (b)** Better answers considered the challenge in the passages and assessed the implications by using contextual knowledge. Less effective answers saw an opportunity to write an essay about the Pilgrimage of Grace which made some reference to the documents but did not analyse them evenly or thoroughly. There was some good knowledge shown and in better answers well used.

Question 2

Though there were some well-focused answers here, a significant number used the question to discuss Wolsey's reputation or his strengths and weaknesses generally, or to discuss his foreign policy with limited or strained reference to 'royal authority'. Some responses were clearly clumsily adapted responses to another question done previously. It is very important to consider the precise wording of the question and to respond directly to it.

Question 3

Responses to this question demonstrated good understanding of the relative importance of factional politics. Less effective answers tended to produce a list of reasons which included faction. A small number of responses merely described aspects of Cromwell's career.

Question 4

The best answers were those who considered what the aims might have been and dealt with the whole period. Less successful answers described aspects of the policies, mostly after 1540 and then added some comments about success or failure, these responses needed to address the idea of consistency as a central tenet of their argument.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/54

Special Subject - Reformation Europe, 1516–1559

Key Messages

- In dealing with **(a)** questions, more explanation as to why the documents should disagree or agree by referring to their provenance would help responses to obtain higher marks.
- In dealing with **(b)** questions, the use of knowledge in a discriminating way to assess the documents, avoiding references to material that is not relevant to the question, would benefit responses.
- In the essay questions, the precise wording of the question should be considered.

General Comments

The overwhelming majority of responses to the Special Subject papers this session featured point-by-point comparison and contrast in answers to the **(a)** questions and many candidates were able to demonstrate skills beyond the sequential treatment of the documents. Attempts were made in most responses to use both the passages and contextual knowledge in **(b)** questions, though sometimes there was imbalance, especially if candidates regarded the **(b)** question as an essay rather than a document-based exercise. Better answers were critical of the passages and in the context of the issue of the question tested the documents as evidence. Some answers made little attempt to go beyond what the passages contained; it is important that candidates respond to the instruction 'you should refer to contextual knowledge', which is explicitly stated. Some of the essays would have been enriched by more reference to evidence and improved by a stronger focus on the actual question, but better answers often showed extensive knowledge and effective analysis. Most responses demonstrated skilful and confident handling of the documents, but centres should be aware that Special Subjects should be studied in appropriate depth; in some cases there was little difference in the support offered in the Special Subject essays to the work submitted in the Outlines Papers.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** Answers were able to see similarities in the general concerns of both Charles V and the Pope and in the strong language used by each of them in condemning Luther and his beliefs. Indeed some responses thought they were trying to outdo one another with their vehemence. There was good comment on the provenance, especially suggesting that, although clearly one-sided, the documents represented the views of the writer accurately. Some answers did not comment on the difference arising from the papal assertion that many of Luther's followers had abjured him after the Papal Bull. Those that did pick this up were able to argue that this was wishful thinking from the Papacy.
- (b)** Many responses used the documents effectively as a set and focused well on the terms of the question, considering widely accepted carefully. While most answers grouped documents A, C and E against B and D, there was good evaluation of the contents of the documents to show this was not necessarily how they aligned. Good answers argued that A was very early and Luther did not have access to reports from all over Germany, while B was a narrow geographical view as was E. Some went on to say that three major cities were mentioned, so there clearly was some spread of Lutheranism. Strong responses then explained that the very hostile tone of C and D indicated that there was a threat which frightened the Emperor and the Pope, so these documents supported the view that there was a spread, even if not in all areas. There was good use of contextual knowledge about the spread to back up or challenge the documents. Weaker answers needed to analyse in a more developed way.

Question 2

There were some well-argued answers to this question which weighed up the inheritance of Spain and the Holy Roman Empire effectively. Many concluded that Spain may have appeared less strong, especially after the revolts of the early 1520s, and had inherent separatist problems, but was in fact stronger, as its support for Charles and financing of much of his foreign commitments demonstrate. The Empire was analysed in terms of the reforms initiated by Maximilian and it was argued that it must have been a desirable inheritance since three European rulers sought to be elected as Emperor. Most answers concluded that princely power was a serious difficulty for Charles, compounded by the spread of Lutheranism. Less strong answers needed to focus more on the early period of Charles' governance as some responses move away from the inheritance to what followed next, some even reaching his abdication. Such responses needed to keep to the terms of the question.

Question 3

Stronger answers analysed the role of the Jesuits and their impact on the Roman Catholic Church and balanced this against other factors, such as the other new orders, the reformed Papacy and the Council of Trent. By avoiding description these responses focused on what was achieved, arguing that in the terms of the sixteenth century it was the Council of Trent which drove the Counter-Reformation most strongly and to its widest effect, while in a longer time frame the Jesuits could be seen in this role. Weaker answers described the establishment of the Jesuits but needed more evaluative comment as to the extent of their contribution or assessment of their position in impelling reform forwards.

Question 4

There were an insufficient number of responses to this question for a report to be written.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/55

The Reign of Charles I, 1625–1649

Key Messages

- In dealing with **(a)** questions, more explanation as to why the documents should disagree or agree by referring to their provenance would help responses to obtain higher marks.
- In dealing with **(b)** questions, the use of knowledge in a discriminating way to assess the documents, avoiding references to material that is not relevant to the question, would benefit responses.
- In the essay questions, the precise wording of the question should be considered.

General Comments

The overwhelming majority of responses to the Special Subject papers this session featured point-by-point comparison and contrast in answers to the **(a)** questions and many candidates were able to demonstrate skills beyond the sequential treatment of the documents. Attempts were made in most responses to use both the passages and contextual knowledge in **(b)** questions, though sometimes there was imbalance, especially if candidates regarded the **(b)** question as an essay rather than a document-based exercise. Better answers were critical of the passages and in the context of the issue of the question tested the documents as evidence. Some answers made little attempt to go beyond what the passages contained; it is important that candidates respond to the instruction 'you should refer to contextual knowledge', which is explicitly stated. Some of the essays would have been enriched by more reference to evidence and improved by a stronger focus on the actual question, but better answers often showed extensive knowledge and effective analysis. Most responses demonstrated skilful and confident handling of the documents, but centres should be aware that Special Subjects should be studied in appropriate depth; in some cases there was little difference in the support offered in the Special Subject essays to the work submitted in the Outlines Papers.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** Most responses identified the emphasis in document E that they feared Laud was bringing in superstition and the Roman Church and that this he directly denied in C. Stronger answers noted that the accusation that he had persecuted and punished opponents was borne out by C since his speech was made at once such instance of punishment. Consideration of provenance was usually good as the responses developed the theme that the documents came from sources very hostile to each other. There was some suggestion that the Articles of Impeachment would have wanted to find every possible accusation and so might have an element of exaggeration, while Laud, in 1637, spoke forthrightly. Good answers needed to make most of these points.
- (b)** The documents were well used by the answers to this question. Some responses felt Laud was unjustly criticised, while others sided with the Puritans. As long as the argument was supported from the documents and contextual knowledge, either view could reach high Bands. There was good grouping of the documents with A and C being set up against B, D and E. The first view was developed by suggesting that A showed how little reverence there was and so Laud's reforms were needed, while C showed Laud defending his position and denying innovation. The other documents were then discussed, but dismissed as making their case too rancorously. These answers used evidence to show that Laud had no intention of turning to the Church of Rome. The other view argued that there was innovation, that Laud was provocative, that bishops, such as Juxon were too powerful and that the tone of the Puritan documents reflected their deep fear for the future of the church. Better responses used all the documents fully, while weaker answers needed to identify more of the points in B especially.

Question 2

Some answers were well focused and recognised that religious issues were the main factor in creating a royalist party from those who disliked the abolition of bishops and also felt royal power had been emasculated beyond a reasonable measure. These responses were able to name individuals and explain their motivation clearly. Less strong answers spent too long in assessing the reasons for Charles' unpopularity in 1640, showing some failure to perceive where the thrust of the question lay. Some of these were also rather descriptive of the reforms passed in 1640-1.

Question 3

There were mostly good answers to this question with some showing detailed knowledge of Leveller aims and methods. Virtually all addressed the issue in the question and some agreed it was the main factor and included arguments that both the elite and the workers were excluded, for different reasons, and also showed that women resented being marginalised by the Levellers. Others suggested that the programme was too radical, the leadership eccentric and the movement had no coherence. The death of Rainborough was another factor stressed by some. The better responses covered a good range of factors, while the weaker needed to move on from the factor in the question to get a balanced consideration and so reach a clear conclusion.

Question 4

Answers had some good analysis of the role of Charles I and generally argued that he was to blame. His belief in Divine Right was seen as driving his duplicity and refusal to compromise. There was less strength in the argument that there were other factors, particularly the divisions between the army and Parliament and the Presbyterian/Independent divide. The responses need to be more assured and focussed in discussing these aspects as some moved on to events in 1648 and even to the execution of Charles in 1649.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/56

The French Revolution, 1774–1794

Key Messages

- In dealing with **(a)** questions, more explanation as to why the documents should disagree or agree by referring to their provenance would help responses to obtain higher marks.
- In dealing with **(b)** questions, the use of knowledge in a discriminating way to assess the documents, avoiding references to material that is not relevant to the question, would benefit responses.
- In the essay questions, the precise wording of the question should be considered.

General Comments

The overwhelming majority of responses to the Special Subject papers this session featured point-by-point comparison and contrast in answers to the **(a)** questions and many candidates were able to demonstrate skills beyond the sequential treatment of the documents. Attempts were made in most responses to use both the passages and contextual knowledge in **(b)** questions, though sometimes there was imbalance, especially if candidates regarded the **(b)** question as an essay rather than a document-based exercise. Better answers were critical of the passages and in the context of the issue of the question tested the documents as evidence. Some answers made little attempt to go beyond what the passages contained; it is important that candidates respond to the instruction 'you should refer to contextual knowledge', which is explicitly stated. Some of the essays would have been enriched by more reference to evidence and improved by a stronger focus on the actual question, but better answers often showed extensive knowledge and effective analysis. Most responses demonstrated skilful and confident handling of the documents, but centres should be aware that Special Subjects should be studied in appropriate depth; in some cases there was little difference in the support offered in the Special Subject essays to the work submitted in the Outlines Papers.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** There were a wide range of responses to this question. More successful answers identified the similarities and differences between the two documents point by point. In order to access the higher marks answers had to address both similarities and differences, though not necessarily in equal measure. An in-depth understanding of the documents was required. Weaker responses demonstrated a more superficial understanding of the documents. For example, at first glance it does appear as though the King is in no danger at all in Document E. However, a closer reading reveals signs that, despite the apparent joy of the crowd, there are signs of trouble brewing below the surface. Stronger responses focused purely on the documents and their provenance. There is no need to bring in passages of own knowledge: answers that demonstrated a good understanding of the documents contained an implicit understanding of the context. Weaker responses approached the documents in a sequential manner, and would have benefitted had critical evaluation (where deployed) was integrated thorough, rather than being appended to the answer. It is necessary to include critical evaluation to access the very highest marks, but this critical evaluation has to be sensitive and cannot be simply stock evaluation. For example, responses that cited that Source C was unreliable because the writer was there at the time (or vice versa) did not demonstrate a good understanding of the provenance and how that might impact upon the author's view.
- (b)** Many responses to this question focused on whether the King was indecisive, rather than analysing whether this indecision was crucial in the crumbling of royal authority. Many answers also read as essays with the documents brought in to back up points. Instead, answers needed to focus

strongly on the documents, with own knowledge being brought in to extend and develop the overall argument. Most candidates were able to identify passages that demonstrated the King's indecision. However, there was comparatively little discussion of the actual events of May and July, and few answers managed to demonstrate how the King's indecision did or did not lead to a loss of his authority.

Stronger answers were structured thematically. It is important that enough time is given to the topic of 'indecision'. There were several examples of answers that addressed this only in a short paragraph, before going on to discuss other factors. The best answers weighed up the King's indecision against other factors such as the role of the crowd and evaluated their relative importance. A sense of discussion and engagement with the question are required for the highest marks.

The best responses dealt with all the documents, though not necessarily to an equal degree. Weaker responses mentioned one or two of the documents only briefly, or not at all. The strongest responses dealt effectively with provenance. As in the case of **Question 1a**, responses must move beyond assertions such as saying a source is reliable because it is primary or secondary. An understanding of the author's possible motives and the time at which they are writing is vital. The very strongest answers managed to integrate a sense of critical evaluation into the answer as it developed, rather than adding it in a paragraph at the end.

It is vital that the responses focus directly on the question and what it is asking, rather than simply comparing the documents over different factors and themes.

Question 2

There were a wide variety of responses to this question. Most responses tackled the issue of the King and his use of the veto, along with the distrust that was caused by the Flight to Varennes. Many responses would have benefitted from the overall framework that would have resulted from a discussion of the actual end of the Constitution in August 1792. The strongest answers demonstrated an understanding of both the terms of the Constitution itself and the reasons for its short life. Most answers wrote about one or two other factors in comparison to the King. Growing radicalism and the war were often discussed. The strongest answers evaluated the relative importance of these factors and analysed whether or not these meant that the Constitution was bound to fail. Most responses made reference to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, but only a few discussed the actual terms of the Constitution itself. Analysis of the issue of active and passive citizens would have been a beneficial additional to many responses.

Most responses demonstrated a good understanding of the key factors in this period, but the strongest were able to set these in a tightly structured answer that directly answered the question of whether or not the Constitution could have survived. Many answers simply presented a 'list' of factors set out over three main paragraphs, before coming to a short conclusion. This approach, however detailed, normally prevented a responses being awarded higher than Band 3.

Question 4

This was a popular question and there were many respectable answers. Most answers discussed Robespierre's actions, particularly those on the eve of the coup of Thermidor and the Cult of the Supreme Being. The loss of support of the Sans-Culottes, disillusionment with the Terror and rivalry between the Committee of Public Safety and the Committee of General Security were also frequently discussed. Many answers demonstrated a good understanding of the narrative of the period. The best answers approached the question in an evaluative and analytical way. Many answers were a 'list' of factors with little linkage or discussion between them. The best answers set out an argument that was then developed and discussed through the analysis of three or four factors in Robespierre's downfall.

Some answers would have benefitted if the detail included had been restricted only that which was pertinent to the question asked. Discussions of the execution of Louis and of the Constitution of 1791 were not directly relevant to the question and so detracted from the overall argument. Whilst many answers demonstrated a good overall understanding of the period only a few responses contained detail of the Laws of Frimaire or Prairial.

The best answers were clear in their analysis and argument. These answers were marked by a sense of discussion and engagement with the question.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/57

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

Key Messages

- In dealing with **(a)** questions, more explanation as to why the documents should disagree or agree by referring to their provenance would help responses to obtain higher marks.
- In dealing with **(b)** questions, the use of knowledge in a discriminating way to assess the documents, avoiding references to material that is not relevant to the question, would benefit responses.
- In the essay questions, the precise wording of the question should be considered.

General Comments

The overwhelming majority of responses to the Special Subject papers this session featured point-by-point comparison and contrast in answers to the **(a)** questions and many candidates were able to demonstrate skills beyond the sequential treatment of the documents. Attempts were made in most responses to use both the passages and contextual knowledge in **(b)** questions, though sometimes there was imbalance, especially if candidates regarded the **(b)** question as an essay rather than a document-based exercise. Better answers were critical of the passages and in the context of the issue of the question tested the documents as evidence. Some answers made little attempt to go beyond what the passages contained; it is important that candidates respond to the instruction 'you should refer to contextual knowledge', which is explicitly stated. Some of the essays would have been enriched by more reference to evidence and improved by a stronger focus on the actual question, but better answers often showed extensive knowledge and effective analysis. Most responses demonstrated skilful and confident handling of the documents, but centres should be aware that Special Subjects should be studied in appropriate depth; in some cases there was little difference in the support offered in the Special Subject essays to the work submitted in the Outlines Papers.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** The most effective responses to this question understood that a thematic approach to the content and provenance of Documents B and D would be the most rewarding. Both sources saw a threat to the Union and both saw the question of slavery as fundamental to the Union's future. It is important that such similarities (and differences) are exemplified by close reference to the text and the better responses did this well. A clear understanding of the dating was essential, as Document B was from a time when compromise seemed possible, whereas Document D was from a point when such hopes were fast receding. This, and the origins of the two documents, was used to explain the differences in tone and language. The very best answers interwove comparisons of provenance with those of content but responses that separated the two components were able to score well as long as the comparative points were precise and well exemplified.
- (b)** The best responses to this question made use of all five documents and did so in a fairly even manner, giving due weight to the points each made in regard to the issue. While no specific judgement was expected, it was necessary that a final view was expressed, not on the issue of whether 'grievances between North and South were too deep-seated', but on whether the evidence supported this assertion or not. Grouping of the sources into those that support this assertion and those that suggested that relations broke down for other, possibly more short-term, reasons was not essential but the better answers approached the question in this way and so focused the arguments more tightly. There was also an understanding that some documents (e.g. Document B) might be used to support more than one view and that relevant own knowledge about events of

the later 1850s and the start of the 1860s was essential to evaluate both the content of the documents and the validity of the assertion in the question.

Question 2

There were an insufficient number of responses to this question for a report to be written.

Question 3

There were an insufficient number of responses to this question for a report to be written.

Question 4

Better responses to this question clearly demonstrated understanding that, while there were a range of factors to consider, the Dred Scott case was central to the answer and needed to be a major focus both of the main body of the answer and of the conclusion. The significance of the case in terms of the North's fears of a 'Slave Power' conspiracy and the expansion of slavery 'into all the territories of the United States'; its different effects on the Democrat and Republican parties; and its impact on the vexed question of Kansas-Nebraska were all fruitful areas for consideration. A careful analysis of these areas characterised the better responses and thus contextualised the Dred Scott judgement. However, it was well understood by the writers of the stronger responses that it was necessary to consider the relative importance of judgement against other factors to determine whether it was this case that triggered conflict or whether it 'merely' added to the growing sectional tensions. The best responses therefore also considered a range of alternative influences which included the hardening of attitudes over time (and especially 1857-61), the effect of the John Brown raid, the belated Crittenden attempt at compromise, the election of President Lincoln amongst others. The best conclusions attempted to evaluate the significance of the Dred Scott case against these other considerations and judged accordingly.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/58

Gladstone and Disraeli, 1867-1886

Key Messages

- In dealing with **(a)** questions, more explanation as to why the documents should disagree or agree by referring to their provenance would help responses to obtain higher marks.
- In dealing with **(b)** questions, the use of knowledge in a discriminating way to assess the documents, avoiding references to material that is not relevant to the question, would benefit responses.
- In the essay questions, the precise wording of the question should be considered.

General Comments

The overwhelming majority of responses to the Special Subject papers this session featured point-by-point comparison and contrast in answers to the **(a)** questions and many candidates were able to demonstrate skills beyond the sequential treatment of the documents. Attempts were made in most responses to use both the passages and contextual knowledge in **(b)** questions, though sometimes there was imbalance, especially if candidates regarded the **(b)** question as an essay rather than a document-based exercise. Better answers were critical of the passages and in the context of the issue of the question tested the documents as evidence. Some answers made little attempt to go beyond what the passages contained; it is important that candidates respond to the instruction 'you should refer to contextual knowledge', which is explicitly stated. Some of the essays would have been enriched by more reference to evidence and improved by a stronger focus on the actual question, but better answers often showed extensive knowledge and effective analysis. Most responses demonstrated skilful and confident handling of the documents, but centres should be aware that Special Subjects should be studied in appropriate depth; in some cases there was little difference in the support offered in the Special Subject essays to the work submitted in the Outlines Papers.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** The main similarity between the two documents is that they both agree that the Education Bill was a positive measure and both greet it with some enthusiasm, Document C more so than B. Key differences relate to the role of the School Boards in terms of religion and attendance, with Document B also commenting on the failure to abolish all school fees. Better responses identified these key points and used carefully selected quotations from each document to exemplify the individual document's point of view. This was better done if the points were taken one by one rather than document by document – the former approach allowed for a tighter focus on the issues. The best responses used their own knowledge to comment on the two speakers, the significance of Dixon's membership of the National Education League (Document B) or the different strands of liberalism the two men represented. This was better way of critically evaluating the sources than providing a wide-ranging description of how the Liberal Party had developed from a disparate collection of political groupings.
- (b)** Better responses showed that the candidates had recognised that the focus of this question had to be on the five documents and how far they supported (or otherwise) the assertion in the question. These responses avoided the temptation to write an essay about Gladstone's policies with passing references to the documents – **Questions 2, 3 and 4** are the places for such essays. The importance of own knowledge was shown only inasmuch as it developed points in the documents or provided a means of evaluating the reliability of those documents. The best responses both grouped the documents so as to focus the answer on the twin issues of 'progressive' and 'united'. Those responses also understood that certain documents (i.e. B and C) suggested both

progression and disunity and that Document D, although the words of Gladstone himself, did not reflect a party that was really united. Documents A and E represented the two extremes as far as the question was concerned (both united and progressive in A, neither in E) and better responses evaluated them according both to provenance and to their content.

Question 2

The critical issue with this question was 'What **best** explains?' There were a range of factors that could be considered (e.g. Liberal support because of their recent, slightly less radical, bill; the skilful leadership of Derby and Disraeli and their willingness to take risks by accepting amendments; popular pressure and many others). The best responses evaluated which of these factors was the most significant, with the fact that the House of Commons comprised a majority of members who, for different reasons, supported reform generally adjudged to be the 'best explanation' for the bill's passage.

Question 3

The best responses focused on the domestic legislation (largely of the first two years) of Disraeli's administration and evaluated most in terms of their effectiveness in either relating to Disraeli's own political philosophy or to the degree to which they met their objectives. Most responses recognised that domestic legislation was not Disraeli's major forte (there were many references to him sleeping in Cabinet when social reforms were discussed). However better answers showed an awareness that the work of his subordinates had a basis in his beliefs and that he had therefore a (perhaps indirect) input into that legislation. A focus on the detail of some key pieces of legislation, apart from the Intoxicating Liquors Act (e.g. Employers and Workmen Act, Artisan's Dwellings Act, Merchant Shipping Act) provided the vehicle to evaluate the relative success of social legislation, rather than merely listing the reforms the Conservatives undertook or asserting the acts were limited/ineffective.

Question 4

Better responses understood that the phrasing of the question required an evaluative conclusion that placed Gladstone's electoral reforms in the broader context of, for example, his Irish policy, Imperial success or other domestic reforms such as the Corrupt and Illegal Practices Act of 1883. There was a need, understood by most, to explain what the Third Reform Act and its associated Redistribution Act accomplished, and several responses analysed them both in terms of their success in extending the franchise and equalising the constituencies, but also of their impact on actual voting - the benefits that accrued to the Conservative party were explored quite carefully. Better responses also provided some detail on each of the alternative achievements that were selected and avoided writing what could have become list-like prose detailing what the ministry achieved. Better conclusions evaluated the relative merits of the policies debated and reached a conclusion as to which was 'the most significant'.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/06
Personal Investigation

Key Messages

- **Candidates should submit the consultancy sheet and should not pursue titles and titles against the advice of the consultants without thinking very carefully**
- **Candidates must observe the word limit**
- **Candidates should plan carefully to ensure arguments are logically developed**

General Comments

There was wide variation in the titles chosen, and some less common topics including several local studies, such as in-depth studies of a town, using largely contemporary sources. Such studies can be rewarding where arguments and evidence are critically considered. There were a number of cases in which Personal Investigations were undertaken on almost identical topics by several candidates, the content of which were very similar. It should be stressed that independent study is at the heart of this unit. In some instances it was clear that when candidates wrote about a topic which really enthused them the Investigation was in many cases better than in cases where candidates did not seem to be very engaged with the topic. If candidates or centres are unsure about the guidance permitted, which is set out in the syllabus, they can consult Cambridge, though it is crucial that Outline Proposal Forms are submitted, as it is through this mechanism that consultants are able to advise on suggested topics.

In some cases, Investigations were written on very ambitious topics in which the required reading and research at times appeared to present a great challenge. Although in some instances ambitious topics may be appropriate, in other cases, Investigations may have benefited had a more straightforward topic been selected but more complete research conducted and a more coherent response written. Similarly there were some Investigations with esoteric titles. Where suitably researched and written, such topics could attain high marks, but in other cases Investigations may have attained higher mark where topics were selected that are easier to resource. There must be the opportunity to deploy historical knowledge and understanding whatever the topic, and not merely outline ideas, however intrinsically interesting.

A range of topics areas were frequently chosen, including studies of individuals, such as Napoleon and Lincoln, and topics routed in the American Civil War, Cold War, the Crusades, the Witch Craze and the Hundred Years' War, amongst others. Whatever the topic selected, better answers offered strong analysis with consideration of different arguments, explanations and evidence, and offered well-supported judgements.

Though difficult to generalise, often the less successful answers were those where one explanation was put forward by candidates but in which they also needed to provide fuller explanation of other factors. Though Investigations that made a judgement and presented a clear argument often scored high marks, some Investigations, after explaining the contribution of their chosen factor, needed to assess other factors in more detail so as to provide a sense of relative evaluation and give strength and credibility to the case they built. Investigations with titles that encompassed a clear debate, or where there was good primary evidence available, often led to a better outcome.

Although the choice of title had some influence on the outcome, it was the quality of the argument that was decisive. Candidates needed to undertake some careful planning to ensure their argument was logically developed and the paragraphs were inter-connected. The best responses came to a clear final judgement with convincing support. Conclusions which summarised foregoing arguments were often sound, but the best conclusions aimed for a synthesis and something emerging from this to suggest new ways of looking at the problem. In general, Investigations presented convincing understanding and explanation of the context and perspectives of the period they were engaged with; though in some cases they would have benefitted from presenting material more concisely, and avoiding excessive description.

Many candidates clearly referred to a wide range of primary and secondary sources and used these to exemplify their argument, though most would have benefitted from a more critical reading of source material and the integration of this criticism into the case they were arguing. This was particularly the case with sourced or derived from websites, where candidates must ensure that they apply skills of critical reading in the same way as all other sources. Referencing in footnotes normally followed procedure, though candidates should ensure they cite from the correct material, as in some instances it was clear that candidates mistakenly attributed evidence to a book in which it did not feature, suggesting that they may not have read the book. In some cases Investigations would have benefitted had quotations been briefer.

A significant number of Investigations would have gained higher marks had they not exceeded 4000 words. Examiners do stop reading where investigations significantly and clearly exceed this amount. In some cases, this meant that the conclusions went unread, and candidates almost certainly did less well than other might have been the case. Conventional standards of academic writing are expected, and where responses continue discussion and debate within footnotes that is more properly a part of the main body of text, rather than using these for their conventionally-intended purpose, those elements will be included in the word count. Very few were significantly below the word limit. In most cases in which the word limit was widely exceeded, responses would have been able to present the same arguments as or more effectively had descriptive or narrative sections, or quotations, been reduced in length.

Many of the Investigations presented work of a high standard, which demonstrated real intellectual curiosity and a mastery of ideas and detail which had been derived from wide reading and well-developed understanding. Many Investigations' application and scholarship attracted marks at the higher end of the mark range.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/71

Special subject - Russia in revolution, 1905-1924

Key Messages

- In dealing with **(a)** questions, more explanation as to why the documents should disagree or agree by referring to their provenance would help responses to obtain higher marks.
- In dealing with **(b)** questions, the use of knowledge in a discriminating way to assess the documents, avoiding references to material that is not relevant to the question, would benefit responses.
- In the essay questions, the precise wording of the question should be considered.

General Comments

The overwhelming majority of responses to the Special Subject papers this session featured point-by-point comparison and contrast in answers to the **(a)** questions and many candidates were able to demonstrate skills beyond the sequential treatment of the documents. Attempts were made in most responses to use both the passages and contextual knowledge in **(b)** questions, though sometimes there was imbalance, especially if candidates regarded the **(b)** question as an essay rather than a document-based exercise. Better answers were critical of the passages and in the context of the issue of the question tested the documents as evidence. Some answers made little attempt to go beyond what the passages contained; it is important that candidates respond to the instruction 'you should refer to contextual knowledge', which is explicitly stated. Some of the essays would have been enriched by more reference to evidence and improved by a stronger focus on the actual question, but better answers often showed extensive knowledge and effective analysis. Most responses demonstrated skilful and confident handling of the documents, but centres should be aware that Special Subjects should be studied in appropriate depth; in some cases there was little difference in the support offered in the Special Subject essays to the work submitted in the Outlines Papers.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** Most responses clearly grasped the key difference between the two documents – the phase that the revolution had reached in Russia. Many of these responses were also able to explain the difference from the perspective of two Bolsheviks, one of whom was recently returned to Russia, the other having been present throughout the recent events. Better answers showed an appreciation that there were differing stances on the war as well. In document A, this is made explicit by Lenin's reference to 'revolutionary defencism' and his comment that it was 'a predatory imperialist war'. The support from the war in Document B was more subtle: 'The policy of Pravda on the war was made public and approved by the Bolshevik delegates at the Congress', but contextual knowledge could supply the confirmation of Bolshevik support for the war effort at that time. Similarities were more difficult to identify, but the better answers pointed to the agreement of the need for revolutionary change, and to the fact that Kamenev's response implied that both parties shared a desire to move forward in a democratic fashion and to the fact that Lenin's demands were not challenged. The best responses evaluated the two documents by reference to the historical context rather than by *ad hominem* evaluation of the authors themselves.
- (b)** The best responses to this question recognised that there were two elements to the discussion about Lenin – his effectiveness as a leader and the degree to which he was a visionary. The most effective answers addressed both of these elements through a combination of document analysis and the focused deployment of own knowledge. The documents clearly argued that Lenin was both of these things but also that he was possibly neither. As the two most supportive documents (A, the April Theses and C, his widow's biography of Lenin) were clearly subjective, it was

important to evaluate these by reference to contextual knowledge. For example, better responses were able to assess the April Theses against their knowledge of Marxist ideology to show how the appeals to the peasants as well as the urban proletariat were both important but also visionary in the sense of recognising the realities of the structure of Russian society. The counter argument was most closely argued by D (a Social Revolutionary) and E (a modern historian). Better responses went beyond the obvious critical evaluation of D to argue that Lenin's escape to Finland actually allowed him to continue the struggle while many of his fellow leaders were in prison and that Sukhanov's was flawed not just by his obvious hostility to Lenin. Similarly, the better discussions of Richard Pipes' comments went beyond referring to him as a 'revisionist' who is 'known to be a critic of Lenin' to discuss how far his analysis of Trotsky's role was accurate in both short and long terms. Judgements were as often against the assertion in the question as they were for it, but critically the best judgements were focused on the documents as analysed in the light of own knowledge.

Question 2

The better responses understood the need to evaluate a range of possible factors that explained the failure of the 1905 Revolution rather than just providing a list of those factors. It was also understood that the disunity of the opposition, because it was cited in the question, had to be at the centre of the response, whether it was deemed to be the main cause of failure or not. Some analysis of the nature of that disunity was also seen to be central to the response – merely asserting disunity without, for example, considering the differing aspirations of peasantry, the liberal middle classes, urban revolutionaries or the armed forces (e.g. the Potemkin sailors), was clearly not going to be enough. Set against this analysis of disunity, such considerations as the changing circumstances brought about by the end of the Russo-Japanese war, the concessions the Tsar made and the reassertion of Tsarist authority were then considered and their relative significance assessed.

Question 3

There were many factors that could be discussed in response to this question about the role of the First World War in the fall of Tsarism and there was always a risk that a response would become a mere series of paragraphs each describing one of the long or short term factors. The best responses avoided this danger by recognising that the question required a consideration as to whether the war was the 'sole' reason for the Tsar's overthrow and if not (as virtually all responses concluded) how important was the war as opposed to other considerations. The most common view was that the war exacerbated a poor situation in Russia, and that the events of the period 1905 onwards had made the Tsar's position very tenuous and it only required war to topple him. However, other responses indicated that the situation was difficult but not irredeemable. The very best answers showed that the war was initially popular in Russia and drew Tsar and people closer together. There were also comments that even in 1917 there were many who wished to continue to fight for 'Mother Russia', all the hardships of the previous years notwithstanding. This suggested that had there not been a legacy of distrust of the Tsar and the system there might have been some hope of continuing the monarchy. Better responses included an analysis of the long term problems of Russia, with evidence from candidates' own knowledge to evaluate the relative importance of the different factors (the Tsar's own weaknesses, the economic and political backwardness of the country, disillusionment with the few constitutional concessions the Tsar had made, for example). The best conclusions clearly showed the writer's view as to how significant different factors were, but this view had been made clear throughout the body of the answer.

Question 4

Better responses identified a range of factors that could explain Bolshevik success in the Russian Civil War and then evaluated the role of Trotsky against these factors. Such responses appreciated that it was not enough to assert that, for example, Trotsky created the Red Army or that he was strategically and tactically competent. It was also necessary to exemplify these assertions with evidence, preferably in some detail. Having established Trotsky's role, better responses applied a similar analytical approach to the weakness of the opposition (political divisions, lack of common motivation other than defeating the Bolsheviks, and other examples), the geographical advantages enjoyed by the Bolsheviks, the roles of Lenin, war communism, perhaps the Chaka. The conclusions had to focus on Trotsky, even if the judgement was to be that his significance was less than that of the White's disunity or the effective leadership of Lenin.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/72

Special subject - Winston Churchill, 1914–1946

Key Messages

- In dealing with **(a)** questions, more explanation as to why the documents should disagree or agree by referring to their provenance would help responses to obtain higher marks.
- In dealing with **(b)** questions, the use of knowledge in a discriminating way to assess the documents, avoiding references to material that is not relevant to the question, would benefit responses.
- In the essay questions, the precise wording of the question should be considered.

General Comments

The overwhelming majority of responses to the Special Subject papers this session featured point-by-point comparison and contrast in answers to the **(a)** questions and many candidates were able to demonstrate skills beyond the sequential treatment of the documents. Attempts were made in most responses to use both the passages and contextual knowledge in **(b)** questions, though sometimes there was imbalance, especially if candidates regarded the **(b)** question as an essay rather than a document-based exercise. Better answers were critical of the passages and in the context of the issue of the question tested the documents as evidence. Some answers made little attempt to go beyond what the passages contained; it is important that candidates respond to the instruction 'you should refer to contextual knowledge', which is explicitly stated. Some of the essays would have been enriched by more reference to evidence and improved by a stronger focus on the actual question, but better answers often showed extensive knowledge and effective analysis. Most responses demonstrated skilful and confident handling of the documents, but centres should be aware that Special Subjects should be studied in appropriate depth; in some cases there was little difference in the support offered in the Special Subject essays to the work submitted in the Outlines Papers.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** Many answers identified the similarities and differences and there were some effective analyses of the texts. There were some perceptive comments about the different contexts and the different relationship with Churchill that Brooke had, struggling with the day to day complexities of command, and Attlee looking back on his dealings with the Prime Minister.
- (b)** Better responses dealt firmly with the content of the passages and did not launch into a general essay on Churchill's wartime qualities. There were some very effective answers which used the five extracts and put them into context, showing a balance between Churchill's heroic qualities and his less attractive and helpful leadership style.

Question 2

There was some sound analysis of key decisions like Gallipoli and some showed an impressive knowledge of Churchill's work during the course of the war. Other responses would have benefitted from focusing more on analysis, rather than description.

Question 3

Some had some impressive knowledge of this issue and there were some sophisticated critiques of Churchill's attitudes and assumptions. Other responses needed to retain focus on rearmament throughout, and limit discussion of other topics.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/73

Special Subject - Germany 1919-1945

Key Messages

- In dealing with **(a)** questions, more explanation as to why the documents should disagree or agree by referring to their provenance would help responses to obtain higher marks.
- In dealing with **(b)** questions, the use of knowledge in a discriminating way to assess the documents, avoiding references to material that is not relevant to the question, would benefit responses.
- In the essay questions, the precise wording of the question should be considered.

General Comments

The overwhelming majority of responses to the Special Subject papers this session featured point-by-point comparison and contrast in answers to the **(a)** questions and many candidates were able to demonstrate skills beyond the sequential treatment of the documents. Attempts were made in most responses to use both the passages and contextual knowledge in **(b)** questions, though sometimes there was imbalance, especially if candidates regarded the **(b)** question as an essay rather than a document-based exercise. Better answers were critical of the passages and in the context of the issue of the question tested the documents as evidence. Some answers made little attempt to go beyond what the passages contained; it is important that candidates respond to the instruction 'you should refer to contextual knowledge', which is explicitly stated. Some of the essays would have been enriched by more reference to evidence and improved by a stronger focus on the actual question, but better answers often showed extensive knowledge and effective analysis. Most responses demonstrated skilful and confident handling of the documents, but centres should be aware that Special Subjects should be studied in appropriate depth; in some cases there was little difference in the support offered in the Special Subject essays to the work submitted in the Outlines Papers.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** There were more differences between the documents than similarities but better responses identified that both documents commented that the Führer did not dictate to the civil service but that he was crucial, one way or another, to the decision-making process. The key difference was between Document A where Willikens clearly relished 'working towards the Führer' and Document C where Dormmüller saw mainly disadvantages created by people having direct access to Hitler and by-passing more traditional methods of decision-making. Better responses explained these differences by reference to the dates of the two documents, using contextual knowledge to show how administrative overlap and therefore confusion had developed. Such responses recognised that the answer to this question had to be document-driven and avoided using it as a vehicle for discussing in depth the changes or entering the debate as to whether such developments made Hitler a 'weak dictator' or not.
- (b)** The question of the effectiveness of Hitler's dictatorship is one that has attracted much historiographical attention, with 'structuralist' and 'intentionalist' views espoused by a wide range of historians. The better responses to this question recognised that, the historiography notwithstanding, the documents had to be central to any answer and not merely used as reference points to illustrate one theory or another. They understood that to start from the historiographical perspective was to be distracted from the essence of the question as set. The question asked 'how convincing is the evidence?' and therefore the answer had to reflect that question, both in the body of the text and in the conclusion/judgement that weighed the evidence provided. The strongest responses used contextual knowledge to evaluate the points made in the documents, not the other

way around. For example, Dorpmüller in Source C complained about the confusion of over-lapping responsibilities. Examples of this might have been the confusion between the Todt organisation and the transport ministry, or between the DAF and the Four-Year Plan. In this way own knowledge was used to support a view in a document and so lead to a conclusion about the whole question of effectiveness. In this case, the evidence might suggest ineffectiveness but the very best responses were able to show that the Nazi state could be very effective, albeit in some cases in unpleasant areas (rearmament, the development of the concentration and extermination camps, the control of the population).

Question 2

Better responses showed an awareness that this was not a question requiring a detailed account of the events leading the emergence of the Nazi party as an effective political group but an analysis of the factors that facilitated this emergence. Such responses identified the key areas of development (e.g. Hitler's own abilities and ambitions leading to a 'leader-based party', the policy of legality, the development of the party structure, the use of propaganda to tailor the appropriate message to the different interest groups). They then backed this up by reference to the different groups and types of support that the party acquired over the period up to 1929, along with the politico-economic context of the time. Above all, the best responses then evaluated the factors as to which 'best' explained the successful growth of the NSDAP to reach an argued conclusion (which was often the role and impact of Hitler himself).

Question 3

Many responses appreciated that the main thrust of this question was to assess the relative significance of repression, as against other factors, in limiting opposition to the Nazi regime. This certainly required an overview of various 'positive' factors (the legal manner in which the Nazis took power, Hitler's own personal popularity, the propaganda extolling the 'Hitler Myth', the successes in economic and foreign policy and, indeed, the success of the early war years), as well as 'negative' ones such as the disunity of opposition groups, the ambivalence of the Churches and the fact that the only body after 1934 capable of challenging Hitler, the army, was hamstrung by its oath of loyalty. Better responses realised that it was impossible to cover all of this without the answer becoming a descriptive list of factors, endeavoured to isolate the key reasons (perhaps by reference in an introductory paragraph), and evaluate these against repression. The best judgements focused clearly on the writer's selection of the key factor and explained why it (and that was usually either repression or the popularity of Hitler and/or Nazi policies) was most significant. A few very well-argued responses noted that opposition grew as the war began to go badly, but that even then support existed because many people still saw the regime as the best hope against communism and the Red Army.

Question 4

The strongest responses to this question appreciated that the crux of the debate was whether the anti-Semitism of the period 1933-39 created a context whereby the Holocaust could have happened even without the advent and circumstances of a major war. Thus the measures of the 1930s were central to these responses. Contextual knowledge was then used to evaluate how far these conditioned Germans to accept the increasingly violent treatment of the Jewish population and how far it was in fact the expansion into Poland and the USSR (with the dramatic increase in the number of Jews under Nazi control) that created the Holocaust. Discussion of the structuralist/intentionalist debate was relevant, but the better responses built the historiographical elements into their answer rather than making them the focus, which was not appropriate to the question as set. Better answers were clear on the different views but used specific examples from their own knowledge to evaluate these. For example, some responses cited examples of Germans who were not won over by the 1930s legislation and propaganda to argue for the greater importance of the war while others argued that the anti-Semitic legislation isolated ordinary Germans psychologically from the Jews and therefore facilitated the Holocaust.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/74

Special Subject - China under Mao Zedong,

1949–1976

Key Messages

- In dealing with **(a)** questions, more explanation as to why the documents should disagree or agree by referring to their provenance would help responses to obtain higher marks.
- In dealing with **(b)** questions, the use of knowledge in a discriminating way to assess the documents, avoiding references to material that is not relevant to the question, would benefit responses.
- In the essay questions, the precise wording of the question should be considered.

General Comments

The overwhelming majority of responses to the Special Subject papers this session featured point-by-point comparison and contrast in answers to the **(a)** questions and many candidates were able to demonstrate skills beyond the sequential treatment of the documents. Attempts were made in most responses to use both the passages and contextual knowledge in **(b)** questions, though sometimes there was imbalance, especially if candidates regarded the **(b)** question as an essay rather than a document-based exercise. Better answers were critical of the passages and in the context of the issue of the question tested the documents as evidence. Some answers made little attempt to go beyond what the passages contained; it is important that candidates respond to the instruction 'you should refer to contextual knowledge', which is explicitly stated. Some of the essays would have been enriched by more reference to evidence and improved by a stronger focus on the actual question, but better answers often showed extensive knowledge and effective analysis. Most responses demonstrated skilful and confident handling of the documents, but centres should be aware that Special Subjects should be studied in appropriate depth; in some cases there was little difference in the support offered in the Special Subject essays to the work submitted in the Outlines Papers.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** The comparison and contrasts were well written in most responses, though some would have benefitted from noting that the nationalist troops in A did not suffer from the demoralisation and lack of spirit shown in D but were let down by poor leadership, so sometimes like was not being compared with like by answers that attempted to show that surrenders and desertions were common elements. Some offered rather speculative comments on A assuming that because the author was American he would want to take a certain position and not making enough of the firsthand account of D being somewhat different. However, there were some effective explanations of the evidence.
- (b)** Not all answers focused on 'policies' and some wrote about general strengths and weaknesses illustrating their answers from the documents. Better answers sustained a better focus on the terms of the question and made effective use of all the documents, showing some impressive knowledge of the context of the struggle. Even when a document is somewhat full, it is important, as in the case of E to look carefully at all its content.

Question 2

There was much sound knowledge of terror and most answers offered other possible factors based more on popular and effective policies which responded to the desire for change. Better answers offered a view of relative importance.

Question 3

This was best done when candidates understood Marxist ideology. Weaker answers saw the ideology in general terms of 'equality' or helping the poor but would have benefitted from more theoretical understanding. Some answers showed strong knowledge of the policies but responded by assessing only general success or effectiveness. The ideology of Mao and the CCP is of vital importance, and Centres are advised that candidates should study this aspect carefully.

Question 4

This was often done well with a sustained comparison and a judgement. Weaker answers tended to offer rather unbalanced analyses, often offering more knowledge and comment on the relations with the USSR than with the USA which was sometimes restricted to Nixon's visit. Some answers offered sound overall knowledge of relations but needed to focus more on the term 'managed' i.e. the actual foreign policies pursued China rather than the general situations.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/75

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

Key Messages

- In dealing with **(a)** questions, more explanation as to why the documents should disagree or agree by referring to their provenance would help responses to obtain higher marks.
- In dealing with **(b)** questions, the use of knowledge in a discriminating way to assess the documents, avoiding references to material that is not relevant to the question, would benefit responses.
- In the essay questions, the precise wording of the question should be considered.

General Comments

The overwhelming majority of responses to the Special Subject papers this session featured point-by-point comparison and contrast in answers to the **(a)** questions and many candidates were able to demonstrate skills beyond the sequential treatment of the documents. Attempts were made in most responses to use both the passages and contextual knowledge in **(b)** questions, though sometimes there was imbalance, especially if candidates regarded the **(b)** question as an essay rather than a document-based exercise. Better answers were critical of the passages and in the context of the issue of the question tested the documents as evidence. Some answers made little attempt to go beyond what the passages contained; it is important that candidates respond to the instruction 'you should refer to contextual knowledge', which is explicitly stated. Some of the essays would have been enriched by more reference to evidence and improved by a stronger focus on the actual question, but better answers often showed extensive knowledge and effective analysis. Most responses demonstrated skilful and confident handling of the documents, but centres should be aware that Special Subjects should be studied in appropriate depth; in some cases there was little difference in the support offered in the Special Subject essays to the work submitted in the Outlines Papers.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a)** Strong responses to this question took the different themes within the two documents and compared or contrasted 'like with like'. Clear similarities included the impact of leading figures in the civil rights movement (Abernathy, Seay and King in Document B, Moses, Bevel and Foreman in Document D); the security of acting with others; courage to challenge authority and the non-violence of the groups – all of these were common themes. This was a much more effective approach than treating each document separately and relying on comparative comments in the handling of the second document, or even leaving the comparisons implicit. The major differences revolved around motivation, and it was here that stronger responses used the different backgrounds of the two authors most effectively. For the author of Document B there was an element of adventure as well as an academic exercise (he was a candidate studying sociology). For the author of Document B it was much more personal – she experienced first-hand and regularly the inequalities of the situation and while they were both prepared to suffer for their beliefs, for her it was a matter of life or death; for him there was the risk of arrest. Better responses deployed some contextual knowledge to evaluate the two documents rather than just deploying it in a, sometimes discrete, paragraph.
- (b)** The better responses not only focused on the key issues by grouping documents according to the views they represented but also understood that the question was asking for a judgement about 'how convincing' each argument was – and for that, own knowledge was needed to substantiate the opinions in the passages. The best responses showed an awareness that some of the

documents (e.g. Documents B and C) could be used equally effectively to support or challenge the assertion. Answers were most effective when there was a clear judgement at the end which focused on both the key issue and the documents that best supported/challenged the assertion.

Question 2

The better responses understood that this was not a question about the events of the 1960s in terms of civil rights but how (or if) the underlying principles (the 'ideology') changed. Landmark pieces of legislation, events and the roles of key individuals were only significant in as much as they illustrated the ideological developments. Central to these responses were themes such as the centrality of educational reform and voting rights; the movement's non-violent basis and the change to more violent protest brought about by Malcolm X and the Black Panthers; the move by Dr King away from a political focus towards more social and economic equality and opposition to the Vietnam War. The best responses understood that in many ways there had not been change as such – voting rights and educational reform were among the earliest (pre-1960s) principles of the movement; the separatist views of the Nation of Islam had been there from its inception and there had always been a tension between proponents of non-violent and violent forms of protest – and therefore had paid some attention to the 1950s as precursors of the 1960s developments.

Question 3

The debate for this question was the relative significance of Martin Luther King in securing civil rights 1963-68. Better responses recognised this and generally provided a range of alternative factors (e.g. pressure groups, the Supreme Court, the work of the Kennedys and Lyndon Johnson, even white brutality as personified by 'Bull' Connor) in the introduction. This had the effect of focusing the debate and generally avoiding too much description of events or the achievements of any one individual or group. The question being formulated around King, better responses initially discussed his achievements (usually playing them down to a greater or lesser degree), and then considered alternatives. The best conclusions used the foregoing debate to produce a weighted conclusion – there had to be a sense of 'relativity' in order to address the question of 'How important?' King's contribution actually was.

Question 4

There were two approaches to this question and both were shown to be effective ways of responding. What the better responses had in common was the capacity to place the impact of the Supreme Court's decisions into context and then to evaluate how significant these decisions were in context. The first approach was to focus almost entirely on the Supreme Court and evaluate the success or otherwise of its decisions from *Brown v. Board of Education* onwards. An analytic approach considered how effective the judgements were, both *de jure* and (importantly for the evaluation of significance), *de facto*. There were many cases to choose from but, for example, the fact that *Brown v. Board of Education* required *Brown II*, that or the fact that the *Bakke* case (1978) was a retreat on affirmative action provided scope for discussion. The alternative approach was to consider the role of Supreme Court judgements against 'other factors' such as the role of pressure groups, presidents or key individuals. The two approaches could, and did, overlap. For example, it is arguable that the case of the Little Rock Nine owed as much to NAACP pressure and Eisenhower's intervention, as it did to the Supreme Court's ruling. The best responses deployed enough contextual knowledge to make an effective case (without swamping the answer with details) and provided a judgement that clearly evaluated the Supreme Court's significance, either in its own terms, or against the significance of other factors.