

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- Read questions carefully and consider their implications and demands.
- Remember to offer your own supported opinions and not rely on learnt answers.
- Make sure that your handwriting is legible.

General comments

Many responses were supported by sound factual knowledge and showed an ability to explain factors, but fewer showed developed judgements. All the questions invited higher-level thinking and assessment rather than description and explanation, however full. Candidates need to be sure to give balanced arguments, weighing the different factors rather than explaining them, and developing critical judgements. Historiography can be illuminating but candidates may reach the highest marks without historiographical references. The description of different views is not a shortcut to an informed judgement based on sustained thought about the period. Some references to historians were too broad to qualify as evidence used to help answer the question. For example, the idea that ‘the Whig school’ had distinct views about a range of mediaeval or early modern topics was often unsupported.

When responding to questions such as **Question 6** ‘St. Wilfred was more important than Theodore of Tarsus in the consolidation of Christianity in England after the Synod of Whitby.’ Was he?,’ candidates must remember to consider both of the figures in the quotation and focus on the period in the question.

The examination requires candidates to think about the issues raised in the questions, therefore it is not sufficient to reproduce learnt material. Through clearly expressed argument, candidates should offer their own opinions and judgements rather than just recount their knowledge. Candidates should also write legibly. When each word is a struggle to read, the flow of an argument is made very difficult to follow by poor handwriting.

The range of questions answered and the understanding shown were often impressive. There was much writing which showed an engagement with the past and some rigorous thinking. By stressing the need to respond to the questions, there is no suggestion that answers should be straightjacketed or be forced to take a particular line. Examiners are open to all sorts of supported arguments and judgements and, indeed, would like to encourage candidates to take risks and give their own supported views, and to demonstrate their reading and thinking about the past with vigour and enthusiasm. That is the opposite approach to reproducing a list of reasons common to all the candidates in a centre and containing common material and views.

Comments on specific questions

Questions with a very small number of responses are not included.

Question 4

There were a number of detailed responses to this question. These were mostly well informed regarding Penda’s undoubted military successes but, on occasion, lacked balance when comparing this to other facets of his rule. Clarification of what constituted ‘outstanding ability’ aided the strongest responses to the question. Some awareness of the lack of evidence for the period contributed to the overall analysis in part, though this was not frequent in the responses provided. Nuanced responses were able to differentiate

between military and political success and revealed a broader understanding of the period in which Penda's successes were put into context.

Question 7

Responses to this question were mostly of a high quality. A great many responses were able to identify successfully a range of cultural achievements relevant to the period. The strongest responses formed judgements based on the 'what best explains' aspect of the question and most usually centred judgements on the evidence of Bede. More limited responses tended to provide a chronological overview of the various policies undertaken by each ruler in the period. Assessing and analysing the achievements against one another led to higher levels of attainment in this question.

Question 8

Responses which overlooked the central importance of English divisions underperformed in this question. These tended to overly focus on Viking strengths rather than making effective comparison of these to the factor given in the question. Further awareness of the internal divisions inherent in England during the period in question would have duly strengthened responses. Those answers providing specific detail on reasons for Viking success other than technology invariably scored more strongly. Some thoughtful assessment of 'how far' was present in the stronger responses offered.

Question 9

There were a large number of responses to this question and many achieved considerable success. It was important for answers to make effective comparison of King Alfred's military prowess against his governing. To do this, some responses dealt with the concepts separately, sometimes in list fashion analysis concerning the relationship between both fighting and governing, and showed that the first was an expedient to the latter. Knowledge of the period was generally strong and most judgements were well substantiated. It was pleasing to note the range of responses offering thoughtful consideration of the factors.

Question 13

There were some strong responses to this question which argued convincingly that it was William of Normandy's ability which was the deciding factor and gave plenty of examples to prove their point. The strongest responses recognised that the question was focused on the Battle of Hastings and so gave the battle the bulk of their attention. Weaker responses were less well centred on the battle and needed to write less about William's preparations and more about his tactics and strategy. Most responses took as their alternative argument the mistakes made by King Harold and the strongest often suggested that it was William's ability to exploit these errors that was the deciding factor. Weaker responses were descriptive of the battle and needed to pick out the actions which illustrated precisely the points they were trying to make. Some of the stronger responses took the view that as the battle lasted all day, the two sides were evenly matched and that it was the death of Harold which made the crucial difference as, after that, the Anglo-Saxons gave up and fled.

Question 14

To answer this question, candidates needed to show a thorough understanding of its terms. Stronger answers explained the nature of the challenge and then analysed Henry I's response and generally showed he was successful, albeit with a degree of good fortune on his part. The crisis of 1119–1120 was well analysed by these answers. Weaker responses gave insufficient coverage to the problems Henry faced in having lands in both England and Normandy and some made no reference to the key battle at Tinchebrai. Their responses were more concerned about how Henry governed England and often needed to make this material specifically relevant by showing how he faced challenges in governing England when he was in Normandy. Some of these were about Henry's achievements more than the challenges he faced. Stronger responses were able to use the reforms of the household and the exchequer to argue that these were necessary to increase Henry's revenue and control in view of his need to finance his wars in Normandy. Weaker responses used the legal reforms to show a way Henry met the challenge, but needed to relate this to the terms of the question and to devote more time to more obviously relevant examples. The same could be said of discussions about Henry I and the Church. Some stronger answers suggested that the biggest challenge Henry faced was the succession and that it was the one where he failed most obviously, and that this failure could be seen as outdoing all his other successes.

Question 22

Stronger responses were able to identify some shortcomings on both sides, such as Stephen's soft-heartedness and Matilda's abrasiveness and could show how these qualities made it difficult for them to gain sufficient support to be in a winning position. These responses also included a number of other factors which prolonged the war such as the lack of a decisive battle; for example, even Lincoln, who settled little in the end and the activities of barons like Geoffrey de Mandeville prolonging the war for their own interests. Others argued quite convincingly that Henry I was to blame for not settling the succession and not providing a power base for Matilda in England making it hard for her to gain an ascendancy. They also suggested that Matilda's marriage to Geoffrey of Anjou made her unacceptable to much of the baronage. Some of the weaker responses focused on the ways in which Stephen and Matilda were unable to maintain their level of support, without reflecting that, in such a scenario, the other side should then have been able to win. They needed to write less description of the impact of the war as contained in the chronicles and focus more strongly on the terms of the question.

Question 23

Stronger responses focused on achievements, such as: Henry II's restoration of order after the anarchy including the inquisition of the sheriffs, his revival of the financial apparatus and the work of Richard FitzNigel, and his defeat of the rebellion of his sons; they weighed these up against his legal reforms and came to a variety of conclusions about which were his greatest achievements. Weaker answers either focused on detailed descriptions of the legal reforms of Henry II or barely mentioned the Assizes. They needed to concentrate on analysis of Henry's achievements. Reference to his failures was not required. Some discussed how far Henry was an innovator and argued that much of his legal programme was derived from his grandfather. This would have been relevant in a question about the extent of Henry's achievement, but had less immediacy in the question set.

Question 24

Answers to this question were often weakened by only considering Richard I as a king and neglecting to analyse his role as a soldier. Stronger answers varied in their assessment of Richard as king. Some argued that his financial demands both before the Crusade and for his ransom were such that he must be a poor king. While others suggested that his recognition of the duty of a Christian monarch to go on a Crusade showed him as a good king, and that he did his best to ensure sound government in his absence and to restore it when he returned. Even stronger answers were less convincing on the issue of his ability as a soldier, but some referred to the way he reconquered his lands from the French after he came home and argued that but for his inopportune death, he could have made the Angevin empire last much longer. The way he dealt with his brother John was used by some stronger answers to illustrate his grasp of the essentials of kingship.

Question 25

There were plenty of stronger responses which argued effectively that the main explanation was that King John was untrustworthy. They could provide plenty of examples from his murder of Arthur and treatment of the de Braose family, to his summoning troops relieving them of their passage money and sending them home again. These answers also focused on 'frequently' by analysing events across the whole reign. They suggested that alternative explanations could be found in John's financial exactions and his personal involvement in government, and some referred to his designs on baronial wives and daughters. They then concluded that these issues alone would not cause such hostility as they were not unique to John, whereas his unpredictability was. There were weaker responses which made some less convincing arguments. These needed to cite evidence to show, for example, that the barons were hostile to John because he lost his French lands or that they were upset about his quarrel with the Pope, as often these arguments were little more than assertions.

Question 27

The stronger responses to this question made a direct comparison between the impact of Edward I's rule in England and in France. They assessed the outcome of the statutes passed by his parliament and his use of parliament, as well as his financial exactions and the disputes these caused, notably in 1297. Most argued that he achieved more in England, since the issue about how far Edward's homage to Philip IV empowered the French to intervene in Gascony was not fully resolved. It did, however, involve Edward in expensive and damaging warfare and his offers of terms were not always accepted, as stronger answers suggested. Some weaker responses referred to Edward's wars in Wales and Scotland but, to make this material relevant, they

needed to make clear how these impinged on Edward's government of England. The weaker responses also needed to show more detailed knowledge of events in the French wars to support their arguments.

Question 29

Stronger responses made a reasonable effort to make some mention of military failure. Some argued that Edward II's failed Scottish expedition in 1310 led straight to the setting up of the Lords Ordainer. Bannockburn was one of the worst defeats ever suffered by the English at the hands of the Scots and Edward's role was hardly glorious, but he could not make peace until he had redeemed the situation a little. The loss gave Lancaster useful ammunition against the king. Stronger responses also suggested that the Scottish capture of Berwick led to Edward's last Scottish venture in 1322 and another fiasco. This, they intimated, merely illustrated for much of the nobility Edward's unfitness to be king. Some of these responses also used the battle of Boroughbridge to show that even a victory did not help Edward as his overthrow of Lancaster led to the revival of the Despensers and their corrupt rule helped to fire up the opposition to depose Edward. Other factors were also mentioned such as the advisers like Gaveston whom Edward favoured and Edward's incapacity as a ruler. It was noted by some stronger answers that there was a crisis within four years of Edward's accession, showing that difficulties pervaded the reign. Less strong answers recounted the reasons why Edward was deposed and needed to focus on the exact terms of the question and consider the reign as a whole, rather than just look at events in 1327.

Question 31

There were plenty of strong responses to this question and answers explored a range of factors which contributed to Richard II's deposition. They were able to select a number of his own actions which led to his downfall and the best focused on his actions in the period immediately before his deposition. Some of these argued that it was Richard's revenge on Arundel, Warwick and Gloucester, his refusal to let Bolingbroke take over his inheritance from John of Gaunt and his bad decision to go to Ireland which led to his deposition, whereas others saw the root of the deposition from Richard's actions earlier in the reign. Some suggested that his actions were underpinned by his beliefs about the nature of kingship. Better responses provided some alternative explanations, such as the conservative attitude of the nobility and the impact the imposition of the Lords Appellant had on the king. The fall-out from the Merciless Parliament was cited as another cause. Weaker answers were often marked by their concentration on the earlier events in the reign and so needed to see that the focus of the question was on the latter period and adjust accordingly. Some were hazy about Richard's beliefs about the powers of a king and credited him with some unlikely ideas on how far he could override parliament.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/12
British History Outlines,
1399–1815

Key messages

- Read questions carefully and consider their implications and demands.
- Remember to offer your own supported opinions and not rely on learnt answers.
- Make sure that your handwriting is legible.

General comments

Many responses were supported by sound factual knowledge and showed an ability to explain factors, but fewer showed developed judgements. All the questions invited higher-level thinking and assessment rather than description and explanation, however full. Candidates need to be sure to give balanced arguments, weighing the different factors rather than explaining them, and developing critical judgements. Historiography can be illuminating but candidates may reach the highest marks without historiographical references. The description of different views is not a shortcut to an informed judgement based on sustained thought about the period. Some references to historians were too broad to qualify as evidence used to help answer the question. For example, the idea that ‘the Whig school’ had distinct views about a range of mediaeval or early modern topics was often unsupported.

When responding to questions such as **Question 14** “‘Though she resented Parliament, Elizabeth I managed it successfully.’ Discuss, with reference to the period 1565–1603,” candidates must remember to consider both the individual in the quotation and focus on the period in the question.

The examination requires candidates to think about the issues raised in the questions therefore it is not sufficient to reproduce learnt material. Through clearly expressed argument, candidates should offer their own opinions and judgements rather than just recount their knowledge. Candidates should also write legibly. When each word is a struggle to read, the flow of an argument is made very difficult to follow by poor handwriting.

The range of questions answered and the understanding shown were often impressive. There was much writing which showed an engagement with the past and some rigorous thinking. By stressing the need to respond to the questions, there is no suggestion that answers should be straightjacketed or be forced to take a particular line. Examiners are open to all sorts of supported arguments and judgements and, indeed, would like to encourage candidates to take risks and give their own supported views, and to demonstrate their reading and thinking about the past with vigour and enthusiasm. That is the opposite approach to reproducing a list of reasons common to all the candidates in a centre and containing common material and views.

Comments on specific questions

Questions with a very small number of responses are not included.

Question 6

This question was answered by a significant number of candidates, responses fell into two camps. The first were generic Henry VII essays which tended to focus on the issue of the security of the regime and were often narrative with occasional comments about tyranny. These questions tended to evaluate everything including attempting to show why Henry was not a tyrant in his foreign policy. The second style focused on the issue of tyranny with a particular focus on his relationship with the nobility, his style of governance and

rebellion. The very best answers in this category demonstrated change over time with clear contextual support.

Question 7

Stronger responses often showed a clear awareness of Henry VIII's foreign policy aims, and based their judgement on the extent to which he achieved these accordingly. Many answers concluded, convincingly, that Henry was unable to achieve his aims in these years due to a range of problems on the Continent. The material offered was often wide-ranging and well-handled although discussion of Wolsey's actions was often limited. More limited responses strayed from foreign policy and provided some measure of irrelevant material concerning domestic developments or foreign policy after 1529.

Question 8

There was a small group who answered this question on the dissolution of the monasteries. For the most part, their responses were unbalanced focusing only on the impact the dissolution had on Henry VIII's finances. Candidates could have referred to the artistic, cultural, architectural, educational or charitable losses caused by the dissolutions. Some responses acknowledged that the dissolutions might have had an impact on the inmates of the monasteries.

Question 9

Some responses tended to deal with Somerset then Northumberland; others compared them thematically. Both approaches worked well so long as there was a strong sense of analysis. The very best answers linked factors and were able to show that Northumberland inherited problems that Somerset was unable to solve; these better answers also understood the contextual socio-economic issues that had an impact on the relative success of governance in this period. Stronger responses were often characterised by equal treatment of Somerset and Northumberland and gave a clear sense of what effective governance meant in mid-Tudor England. Some responses outlined the general historiography of the period, though often without explicitly linking this to the demands of the question and the judgement provided.

Question 10

The most successful answers were able to judge thematically Mary I's abilities as monarch in a range of relevant areas. There was some analytical use of the historiography here to re-assess the Marian historical reputation in light of the judgements provided. Most responses offered sufficiently broad coverage of a key range of issues with foreign policy often being used to temper the positive assessment provided in other areas (for example, economic or religious policy). Many responses thoughtfully concluded that Mary lacked time to implement her policies successfully. There was some balanced evaluation of religious and foreign policy. The area of governance, Council or Parliament was less well tackled.

Question 11

More limited analyses did not consider the growth and development aspect of the question though relevant factors were identified: there was some effective treatment of Parliament and grass roots support to reach a judgement concerning the rise of Puritanism. Further focus on what best explains and effective comparison of factors would have enabled responses to achieve higher levels of overall attainment. In some cases, there was an over-focus on the terms of the Elizabethan settlement, rather than Puritanism itself. Some responses concluded that the growth and development of Puritanism was the result of the decline of Catholicism and the threat posed by the seminary priests, so the bulk of the essay was an exploration of the Catholics.

Question 12

This year saw a large number of responses to this question. Answers were generally well informed about the period of Mary Stuart's rule in Scotland. More successful responses were able to reach judgements through comparing Mary's culpability alongside broader factors such as the nature of rule and nobility in sixteenth century Scotland. Some responses tended to focus too heavily on Mary's reforms. Answers needed to avoid a chronological account of Mary's downfall and flight to England. There were a number of thoughtful arguments concerning external factors mitigating Mary's ability to rule effectively.

Question 13

Responses to this question were able to thematically identify relevant factors to assess the effectiveness of Elizabeth I up to 1563. A clear pitfall to avoid was a narrative overview of the period with too much focus on either religious or foreign policy. There was relatively little coverage of Parliamentary relations, the socio-economic context or the gender issue; these might have broadened the discussion. Stronger responses were able to assess the overall effectiveness of Elizabeth in the period given through close analysis of what the problems were from the opening section provided.

Question 14

Responses to this question needed to maintain careful focus on the statement provided. Many answers were able to evaluate the success Elizabeth I had in managing Parliament and contextual support was strong. Better answers were able to comment on the issues thematically. A few highly analytical answers evaluated both the successful management and the extent to which Elizabeth resented it. Most answers were able to indicate uses of both coercion and cooperation by Elizabeth to manage Parliament. More limited responses relied on generalised historiography which was sometimes not linked to the focus of the question and, therefore, offered little to the overall analysis. They also had uneven coverage of the reign.

Question 15

This question invited responses to be very clear about why war broke out in 1585. The most successful answers evaluated both the immediate causes of the war and also why the war was not joined earlier. In general, contextual support was strong and precise. The best answers additionally demonstrated that they understood the wider geopolitical perspectives of the policy and mapped the changing circumstances for both Elizabeth I and Philip II up to 1585, and reached a thoughtful assessment of the question accordingly. More limited responses offered a list of causes for war between England and Spain more generally without explicit focus on the key developments of the 1580's. More wide-ranging discussion of events in the Spanish Netherlands would have strengthened some responses, rather than concentrating on the longer-term religious rivalries which was a more limited area in terms of question focus.

Question 22

A number of highly detailed responses were offered to this question. There was a strong understanding of the key events during James I's period of rule though these needed explicitly linking to the question statement. The statement invited some relevant historiographical debate though an over-focus on this limited the impact of some judgements. Relevant themes were often successfully identified and explored with particular success, for example, economic and religious policies. Stronger responses differentiated between the issue of James' laziness and his effectiveness in key areas of rule to produce reasoned conclusions and arguments.

Question 23

The pitfall to avoid in this question was to narrate the events of the Personal Rule rather than offering close analysis of events in 1640. The factors identified needed to be explicitly linked to the calling of Parliament twice in 1640. There was good coverage in a number of responses on Scottish affairs and religious reform. Stronger answers tended to make substantive conclusions through effectively linking the factors which resulted in the tumultuous events of 1640. More limited answers moved their focus away from 1640 to more general treatment regarding Charles I's strained relationship with Parliament.

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- Read questions carefully and consider their implications and demands.
- Remember to offer your own supported opinions and not rely on learnt answers.
- Make sure that your handwriting is legible.

General comments

Many responses were supported by sound factual knowledge and showed an ability to explain factors, but fewer showed developed judgements. All the questions invited higher-level thinking and assessment rather than description and explanation, however full. Candidates need to be sure to give balanced arguments, weighing the different factors rather than explaining them, and developing critical judgements. Historiography can be illuminating but candidates may reach the highest marks without historiographical references. The description of different views is not a shortcut to an informed judgement based on sustained thought about the period. Some references to historians were too broad to qualify as evidence used to help answer the question. For example, the idea that there was a 'Marxist interpretation' about a range of mediaeval or early modern topics was often unsupported or not made relevant to the question or answer.

When responding to questions such as **Question 41** 'Why did Margaret Thatcher face substantial opposition to her leadership from within her own party in the years 1975–1990?', candidates must remember to consider both of the figures in the quotation and focus on the period in the question.

The examination requires candidates to think about the issues raised in the questions therefore it is not sufficient to reproduce learnt material. Through clearly expressed argument, candidates should offer their own opinions and judgements rather than just recount their knowledge. Candidates should also write legibly. When each word is a struggle to read, the flow of an argument is made very difficult to follow by poor handwriting.

The range of questions answered and the understanding shown were often impressive. There was much writing which showed an engagement with the past and some rigorous thinking. By stressing the need to respond to the questions, there is no suggestion that answers should be straightjacketed or be forced to take a particular line. Examiners are open to all sorts of supported arguments and judgements and, indeed, would like to encourage candidates to take risks and give their own supported views, and to demonstrate their reading and thinking about the past with vigour and enthusiasm. That is the opposite approach to reproducing a list of reasons common to all the candidates in a centre and containing common material and views.

Comments on specific questions

Questions with a very small number of responses are not included.

Question 6

More successful answers evaluated the issues that John Wilkes was able to exploit both as an agitator and a political journalist, including the unpopularity of Bute and the reasons why. They considered the growing realisation of the concept of political rights, the concept of citizenship and the short lived nature of governments of the day. Good answers also highlighted how Wilkes was able to use his talents and techniques effectively. However, many responses to this question tended to be rather descriptive. Weaker

responses dealt with general problems of the 1760s without much reference to Wilkes. Some answers provided a narrative of what Wilkes did during his lifetime rather than focusing specifically on why this led him to political prominence.

Question 7

Stronger answers recognised that there were a number of interrelated factors at work in explaining North's dominance. These included: the maturing role of King George III (and how his approach to kingship changed over the course of his reign) and his role in helping North remain in power; the abilities of North himself; and, the lack of a unified parliamentary opposition. Less effective answers tended to treat factors in isolation and did not evaluate how they interrelated. Stronger answers were also able to recognise that stability was not all encompassing and that Britain's fortunes in the American War of Independence became a destabilising influence.

Question 8

Better responses focused on how the French Revolution tangibly impacted on Britain, what the response of the government was and how this helped to strengthen Pitt's hand. Candidates successfully evaluated the way in which Fox's stance caused division in the opposition which ultimately led to splits in the opposition and the Portland coalition. This helped galvanise the view of those opposed to the Revolution, such as Burke, and the growth in literature was pro-government and more popular than pro-Revolution literature. The French declaration of war also fed into Pitt's strengthening hand by allowing him to focus on the maintenance of domestic law and order and defence of the realm. The strongest answers were able to provide specific supporting evidence to demonstrate how Pitt's parliamentary hand was strengthened, while more moderate answers provided a general overview and tended to treat consequences of the Revolution in isolation rather than analysing their relative importance. Some responses focused strongly on Pitt's consolidation of power, but coverage of other factors was sometimes rather thin. Further analysis of the emergence of radicalism and political legacies for the Whigs would have successfully broadened the discussion.

Question 9

The strongest answers to this question clearly articulated and analysed the role that sea power played in defeating Napoleon, both in its own right and by helping the land military campaign, as well as impacting on the economic situation and, as such, the political side of Napoleon's defeat. Many candidates argued naval power was crucial since it allowed Britain to defeat any prospect of a French invasion of the mainland and kept vital trading routes open. This also allowed for naval power to be used by Britain diplomatically to secure continental agreements. Naval power was also important in supporting the Peninsular War which some argued played an important, but not necessarily crucial part in Napoleon's defeat. Were it not for naval power this operation could not have been effected. Some candidates also evaluated other factors such as Napoleon's defeat in Russia but tied it to the overall question. Less strong answers to this question tended to assess factors in isolation rather than analysing them in relation to others, making the overall assessment of relative importance less effective.

Question 17

Most responses were strongly focused on the key issue of 'threat' in the period in this question. A number of relevant factors were successfully identified and stronger answers provided thorough coverage of the 'how serious' aspect. Most judgements tended to regard the response of the state as a crucial mitigating factor in limiting the overall threat posed by popular unrest. Effective linking of the groups to state action was a successful method of approaching this question. Some responses concentrated too much on popular unrest and group activity which led to some lack of focus in relation to the 'how serious' aspect of the question.

Question 18

Strong answers to this question provided a clear definition of 'benefits', including factors such as territorial gains, diplomatic advantages and whether strategic priorities were realised. The resulting Congress system was then evaluated in the light of whether or not these benefits were realised and whether or not overall the Congress system was beneficial to Britain. More moderate to weaker answers tended to describe the Congress System and did not fully engage with the concept of benefit which was often implicit rather than explicit.

Question 19

Close and consistent focus on the statement provided was the key to success in this question. Successful answers provided explanation and analysis of both aspects of the statement provided. Well-argued approaches often took care to investigate the aims of Grey's reforms and link these to an overall judgement regarding the intentions of the Reform Act. Those that focused on motivation analysed both the proposition in the question as well as other factors such as fear of political unrest, altruistic motives, etc.; they also discussed which was the strongest in relation to the others. Some answers focused almost exclusively on the impact of the 1832 Reform Act and sought to address the question by evaluating what it did; they tended to have implicit focus on the question. Some answers of this nature focused very little on the actual nature of the question (motivation) and resembled answers which were answering the question 'Assess the impact of the 1832 Reform Act'.

Question 20

A large number of candidates who answered this question provided an evaluation of how successful Sir Robert Peel was as Prime Minister and then evaluated his successes and failures. Such answers scored poorly as they did not effectively focus on the precise terms of the question. Successes and failures could be included as part of the question so long as they were presented as a strength or a weakness. Stronger answers evaluated Peel's strengths (for example, his economic policy and governing in the national interest) and focused on his weaknesses (such as his inability to be an effective party manager). Some candidates took the line that his decision to govern in the national interest, which was argued to be a strength, inevitably meant he would be a weak party leader given the nature of the Conservative Party at the time and contentious issues such as the Corn Laws.

Question 21

The strongest answers to this question focused on how British policy could be considered an 'over-reaction' in relation to the events of the time. British policy was assessed in this light and set against Russian policy to assess effectively whether or not what the British did could be considered an over-reaction. Russian policy was analysed in order to assess whether or not it could be considered overly assertive and aggressive and as such justify the British response, or whether British policy was predicated on exaggerations and miscalculation. More moderate answers tended to be more descriptive and highlight what British policy was with undeveloped analysis of whether or not there was over-reaction.

Question 22

Successful responses to this question tended to provide thorough coverage of both 'national interest' and 'party advantage' arguments to reach a supported judgement. Disraeli's motivation for the wide range of legislation was key here and several responses dealt successfully with this. Strong responses explored the links between national interest and party advantage. A list of evidence approach was to be avoided here in order to ensure appropriate focus on the two key concepts given in the question. Weaker answers tended to equate any limitation, or perceived limitation of the reforms as indicative of Disraeli being more concerned with party advantage but without much explanation.

Question 23

A successful approach to responding to this question was to identify clearly the aims of Gladstone's foreign policy in order to give an adequate assessment of its success over two administrations. Many responses dealt with the question chronologically then reached an overall argument regarding Gladstone's success. However, a thematic approach structured around Gladstone's aims was the hallmark of more nuanced responses. The range of material was sometimes thin and lacked coverage of issues relating to the USA, Sudan, Germany and Egypt. Material on Ireland was not relevant.

Question 24

There were a large number of responses to this question. Many candidates focused their answers, reasonably so, around the important leadership provided by Salisbury. However, highly successful answers broadened the range of factors to include some sharp analysis of Liberal decline, issues relating to the Empire and party organisation. Highly scoring responses established links between these factors and determined the overall reason for Conservative dominance, rather than treat them as separate phenomena. Explanations, at times, could have been more closely linked to the notion of Conservative dominance to avoid listing factors or description.

Question 26

The key issue was that of 'responsibility' and more successful responses sought to engage fully with this concept throughout their argument. Some responses to this question were limited through a lack of engagement with the provocative statement provided. These answers tended to provide a general overview regarding the causes of the First World War, rather than assessing the culpability of Britain set against other factors. Further awareness of early twentieth century diplomacy and events in Morocco and the Balkans might have helped responses broaden their range of material offered. Weaker answers did not focus on Britain but gave an account of the causes of the First World War, and some offered no material on 1914.

Question 31

Responses to this question needed to take considerable care with the wording of the statement provided. Effective coverage was required regarding both help and hindrance with analysis of the relationship between each side of the debate. The question was concerned with greater levels of political influence rather than the franchise in 1918, and successful answers kept this at the centre of their argument throughout. Some answers lacked focus and tended to provide a narration of Suffragette activity. Use of a broader range of material regarding female suffrage would have benefited answers which focused exclusively on the activities of the WSPU.

Question 33

Throughout the strongest responses to this question, candidates attempted to deal with the 'what best explains' aspect of the question. For the most part, responses included a relevant range of material though some tended to lapse into narration when discussing Lloyd George's policy and leadership style. Greater focus on the attitude and actions of the Conservatives would have enabled some candidates to respond to the question in a more nuanced manner. Strong responses explored links between factors to reach a supported judgement regarding what best explained the downfall in 1922. Weaker responses were more focused on the general strengths and weaknesses of Lloyd George, or even giving an account of post-War problems, than the actual question.

Question 34

The wording of this question challenged candidates to deal with both setbacks and progress across the period. Less successful responses tended to focus too much on one aspect of the varying fortunes for the Labour Party. Stronger responses attempted to compare the setbacks and progress, and identify wider explanations to support how these might be best explained. Candidates might have given more consideration of domestic anti-socialism in 1924 and the impact of the General Strike in 1926. 'Best explains' required responses to reach supported judgements regarding the fortunes, not just identify the positive and negatives for the Party across the period.

Question 36

There were few responses to this question. However, it is important that questions are read very carefully as some candidates wrote about the wrong world war.

Question 37

Responses to this question were mostly well focused on the key issue of the 1945 Labour landslide. Relevant factors were well identified and explained ranging from: Labour's campaign, issues surrounding the welfare state; Conservative (and Churchill's) errors; and, the impact of the Second World War. More focused answers attempted to compare and link factors to strengthen an overall argument regarding the causes behind the decisive victory. A list of factors approach often revealed satisfactory knowledge, but did not often lend itself well to more thoughtful or analytical judgement.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/21
European History Outlines,
c. 300–c. 1500

Key messages

- Read questions carefully and consider their implications and demands.
- Remember to offer your own supported opinions and not rely on learnt answers.
- Make sure that your handwriting is legible.

General comments

Many responses were supported by sound factual knowledge and showed an ability to explain factors, but fewer showed developed judgements. All the questions invited higher-level thinking and assessment rather than description and explanation, however full. Candidates need to be sure to give balanced arguments, weighing the different factors rather than explaining them, and developing critical judgements. Historiography can help to further an answer where the references made are relevant to the question and argument and the evidence is used critically, but candidates can reach the highest marks without historiographical references. The description of different views is not a shortcut to an informed judgement based on sustained thought about the period. Some references to historians were too broad to qualify as evidence used to help answer the question. For example, the idea that ‘the Marxist school’ had distinct views about a range of topics was often unsupported.

When responding to questions such as **Question 14** on ‘How successful was Basil II as ruler of the Byzantine Empire?’, candidates should recognise that the question is focused on Basil and their responses should consider his actions as ruler. A paragraph on Basil generally before a ‘list of factors’ is presented without further reference to Basil would not be a successful response.

The examination requires candidates to think about the issues raised in the questions therefore it is not sufficient to reproduce learnt material. Through clearly expressed argument, candidates should offer their own opinions and judgements rather than just recount their knowledge. Candidates should also write legibly. When each word is a struggle to read, the flow of an argument is made very difficult to follow by poor handwriting.

The range of questions answered and the understanding shown were often impressive. There was much writing which showed an engagement with the past and some rigorous thinking. By stressing the need to respond to the questions, there is no suggestion that answers should be straightjacketed or be forced to take a particular line. Examiners are open to all sorts of supported arguments and judgements and, indeed, would like to encourage candidates to take risks and give their own supported views, and to demonstrate their reading and thinking about the past with vigour and enthusiasm. That is the opposite approach to reproducing a list of reasons common to all the candidates in a centre and containing common material and views.

Comments on specific questions

Questions with a very small number of responses are not included.

Question 6

Most candidates gave strong responses to this question. They were able to explain the weaknesses of the Byzantine and Sassanid empires and how the Muslims could exploit the situation. They could then set this explanation against the leadership of the caliphs and their military strengths, along with their religious zeal.

Some argued powerfully that it was the unity of Islam contrasted with the disunity on the opposition side that made the crucial difference. The few weaker responses lacked balance and needed to weigh up the factors in a more developed way.

Question 7

Stronger responses had sound knowledge about Charles Martel and were able to use it effectively. They looked beyond his military achievements and had some criteria for judging 'substantial'. Often this involved a consideration of his legacy and the need for Pepin and Carloman to reconquer much of his territory after rebellions at his death, which was then set against Pepin being able to become the king of the Franks, which would have been impossible without the foundations laid by Charles Martel. Other discussion in stronger responses hinged on the importance of the victory at Poitiers and how far this really stopped the advance of Islam. Some responses considered Charles' military innovations and his use of heavy cavalry as a noteworthy achievement. Weaker responses were more descriptive of what he did and then concluded his actions were or were not significant. These responses needed to be more focused on the extent of their significance.

Question 8

The answers to this question were variable in quality. Stronger answers were able to assess the reasons for cultural developments effectively, often concluding that the impetus came from Charlemagne and arguing that without the pressure from the emperor there would have been little advancement. They pointed out that Charlemagne himself recruited scholars and respected learning for its own sake. They often quoted the *admonitio generalis* to back up their arguments. Other, less convincing, answers needed a tighter definition of cultural achievements as they tried to extend cultural to include governmental and became too entwined in discussion of the *missi* and other administrative changes. There were also some weaker answers which needed to focus on the debate in the question, rather than diverting to the debate about whether there was a cultural renaissance under Charlemagne. Some of the best answers included material about the building of the palace at Aachen and linked this to discussion of Charlemagne's own view of his role as emperor.

Question 9

Answers to this question were not often very strong as they were inclined to narrative accounts, which were quite generalised. They also needed a better range of examples to support their arguments. Some stronger answers argued that trade was one factor but that the possibilities for destruction, sometimes invited by those already in residence and the attractiveness of a venue, also applied. Ease of access might depend on trading patterns but the easily navigable rivers of northern Europe were a big draw for the Vikings in some answers. Weaker answers also tended to become wrapped up in arguments about whether the Vikings were keener on raiding than trading, which was not the focus of this question, but rather why they settled where they did.

Question 12

The stronger answers to this question had a clear definition in the background if not explicitly stated, of what 'favourable circumstances' involved. They usually included: the succession in the male line being maintained; the failure of their enemies to combine against them; and, their small land holdings, though small, being concentrated in the middle of France. Some suggested that the support of the Church was a favourable circumstance, while others put this forward as an alternative factor. Either approach could be used as long as it was well linked to the terms of the question. The stronger answers took the abilities of the kings themselves as another explanation. Weaker answers needed a more consistent focus on the terms of the question as they tended to outline the reasons for the survival of the Capetian kings but did not categorise them sufficiently, and made reference to favourable circumstances only in their concluding paragraphs.

Question 13

Stronger responses began with giving some kind of definition explaining what the Investiture Contest was about. They outlined the situation in the Empire and Italy but kept their full focus on the challenges Pope Gregory VII posed to Henry IV. Some responses also made it clear just when they thought the Contest began and so focused on that. Less effective responses were not well focused on the issues at the heart of the Contest. Some of these responses needed to move beyond papal targeting of simony and clerical marriage to the crucial matter of lay investiture. There were examples of weaker responses where the whole emphasis was on the long-term causes and, in extreme cases, there was very little mention of Gregory at all.

In these responses an understanding of the impact of the challenge by the papacy to the authority of lay rulers was not always effectively demonstrated. Stronger responses put the quarrels before the papacy of Gregory into context and generally argued that it was the advent of a determined and obstinate pope, which was the catalyst for the real outbreak of the Contest. Such responses suggested that excommunicating the Emperor was a very bad move on the part of Gregory as it was bound to provoke a strong reaction.

Question 15

The responses to this question were mostly not very strong. There was some evidence that the term 'against all the odds' was not fully appreciated and so weaker responses concentrated on discussing the opposition which the Crusaders overcame, or simply considered why it succeeded in capturing Jerusalem, and disregarded the term completely. Stronger responses analysed the factors making the success unlikely, such as: the lukewarm support from Alexios; the divisions among the leaders; the difficult terrain and fighting conditions; and, problems with the supply chain. Very strong responses then took each factor and showed how the Crusaders overcame it and then went on to argue that the religious drive of the Crusaders allowed them to surmount attacks against them and finally capture Jerusalem. The strong responses showed ability to adapt knowledge to the demands of the specific question.

Question 16

Nearly all answers saw that it was necessary to define what it was that Frederick Barbarossa was trying to do in order to make a judgement about his degree of success. This uniformity of approach did not continue. Stronger answers kept the aims they had defined in view all the time and were able to show that Frederick's early successes were compounded by his treatment of Milan and hence his overall success was not that great. Less strong answers needed to avoid the narrative of his campaigns and concentrate on analysing his success or failure. Some stronger answers pointed out that Frederick was going to find it hard to overcome the rooted opposition to imperial power in Italy and so long-lasting success was almost impossible. However, they gave Frederick plenty of credit for continuing to try to conquer Italy and thus control the papacy, suggesting that had he been successful.

Question 17

There were some very well argued and illustrated answers to this question where the weaknesses of King John were laid bare and compared with the positive attributes of the French monarchy under Philip Augustus. The final judgement varied, with some arguing that Philip's financial resources together with his determination and strong government meant he was bound to win. These answers also often argued that the Angevin Empire contained the seeds of its own destruction. The other view was that King John threw away all the advantages he had through some disastrously bad decisions and once lost, he had no hope of regaining his patrimony. However, there were a few weaker answers which needed to focus less on the reigns of Henry II and Richard I, where Philip enjoyed less success, and so were less able to make the most of the material. Sometimes these weaker answers lacked coverage of the reign of King John and some ended in 1204.

Question 18

Stronger responses to this question immediately identified examples of rulers on whom Innocent III sought to impose his will and the issues over which he expected their obedience. It was not expected that King John would be included, but responses which discussed his disobedience of Innocent were in no way penalised. The strongest responses recognised that Innocent had limited weapons with which to defeat disobedient rulers once excommunication had failed. They also suggested that there was a cumulative effect. Once there was one disobedient ruler then others might follow. Stronger responses discussed the ideological nature of the conflict and argued that rulers were bound to resist a pope who claimed to have powers superior to theirs. Disobedience, they argued, was the best way for them to challenge his pretensions. Weaker responses concentrated on a single ruler; usually the French monarch, and some of these considered that Philip was obedient to the papal wishes, despite the King's refusal to take his wife back until faced with an Interdict or to crusade against the Cathars. These responses were not very confident in dealing with Innocent's, admittedly complex, manoeuvrings over the Empire, when they included it as an example.

Question 20

Stronger responses recognised that it was not possible to generalise across the period and so identified periods of stability and periods when the Crusader States were in turmoil. These responses argued that much depended on the condition of the opposition. Given the small number of Crusaders who settled in the

Cambridge Pre-U
9769 History June 2017
Principal Examiner Report for Teachers

States, they suggested that, when the Muslims were divided and weak, the States were stable but once strong leaders like Nur-ad-Din or Saladin emerged and united the Muslims, then the States were at risk. These responses also discussed the problems over the succession in some of the States and the rivalries among the rulers as contributors to instability. Stronger responses often discussed well the role of the military orders as a stabilising factor. Weaker responses needed to have a clearer focus on the terms of the question, as some looked only at why the States were unstable and so needed to make an assessment about the degree of instability. The length of the period to be covered made problems for the weaker responses which began with a narrative.

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- Read questions carefully and consider their implications and demands.
- Remember to offer your own supported opinions and not rely on learnt answers.
- Make sure that your handwriting is legible.

General comments

Many responses were supported by sound factual knowledge and showed an ability to explain factors, but fewer showed developed judgements. All the questions invited higher-level thinking and assessment rather than description and explanation, however full. Candidates need to be sure to give balanced arguments, weighing the different factors rather than explaining them, and developing critical judgements. Historiography can help to further an answer where the references made are relevant to the question and argument and the evidence is used critically, but candidates can reach the highest marks without historiographical references. The description of different views is not a shortcut to an informed judgement based on sustained thought about the period. Some references to historians were too broad to qualify as evidence used to help answer the question. For example, the idea that ‘the Marxist school’ had distinct views about a range of topics was often unsupported.

When responding to questions such as **Question 11** ‘What best explains why Luther’s protest in 1517 developed into the German Reformation?’, candidates should recognise that the question is focused on the contribution of an individual, and their responses should consider how Luther’s and his actions developed into the German Reformation. A paragraph on Luther generally before a ‘list of factors’ is presented without further reference to Luther or his actions would not be a successful response.

The examination requires candidates to think about the issues raised in the questions therefore it is not sufficient to reproduce learnt material. Through clearly expressed argument, candidates should offer their own opinions and judgements rather than just recount their knowledge. Candidates should also write legibly. When each word is a struggle to read, the flow of an argument is made very difficult to follow by poor handwriting.

The range of questions answered and the understanding shown were often impressive. There was much writing which showed an engagement with the past and some rigorous thinking. By stressing the need to respond to the questions, there is no suggestion that answers should be straightjacketed or be forced to take a particular line. Examiners are open to all sorts of supported arguments and judgements and, indeed, would like to encourage candidates to take risks and give their own supported views, and to demonstrate their reading and thinking about the past with vigour and enthusiasm. That is the opposite approach to reproducing a list of reasons common to all the candidates in a centre and containing common material and views.

Comments on specific questions

Questions with a very small number of responses are not included.

Question 2

Better answers were able to place the achievements of Venice in their broader context and compare them to those of other city states. Thematic approaches were rare but achieved this most fully, while some definition

of success (perhaps in the introduction) helped to qualify achievements and avoid a descriptive list of things that happened in the cities.

Question 3

Better answers examined the symbolism of the fall of the Roman Empire to the burgeoning Ottoman Empire and weighed these against the practical benefits of its conquest. Greater consideration of the decline of Constantinople in the years preceding its fall would have lent weight to arguments that it was only an event of symbolic importance.

Question 6

Better answers considered the idea that the early Italian Wars were 'more than a power struggle between France and Spain' and weighed this against other issues such as internecine Italian struggles. The role of the Pope and/or the Empire were largely overlooked and answers would have benefited from exploration of these factors.

Question 7

More successful answers assessed the degree to which the Papacy involved itself in 'worldly considerations' and focused on the 'dominated' and 'purely' aspects of the question. Comments on the wider perception of the Papacy in Europe and continuing fervent religiosity lent themselves to more nuanced answers. Less developed answers confused the Papacy with the state of the Church in general. The focus tended to be on the excesses of the popes with little consideration given to their wider roles and such answers lacked balance.

Question 8

The responses tended to agree with the question and describe a few 'destructive' campaigns. Less developed responses would have benefited from consideration of the more positive aspects of Ottoman rule, in terms of tolerance, administration and culture. In general, the responses lacked balance.

Question 10

The best answers set out clearly the 'internal challenges' which Ferdinand and Isabella faced and considered their responses before reaching supported judgements on their success. They weighed up the importance of these challenges to help come to an overall conclusion, rather than offering a conclusion which hinged on the idea that they enjoyed more or fewer successes. Some answers would have been strengthened by discussion of the challenges Isabella faced at the start of her reign, and by consideration of the Reconquest.

Question 11

There were some effective analyses but some did not go beyond 1521, or the 1520s. Better answers considered Luther as a reluctant revolutionary and emphasised the transition between protest and full-blown reformation. Consideration of reform being taken out of Luther's hands, particularly by the German princes, was a fruitful route of investigation. Similarly, development of the wider context in Germany helped to demonstrate why Luther's initial criticism became a much larger movement. Discussion of the link between Lutheranism and the German Peasants' War allowed sophisticated analysis. There were sound points about: how he was forced to harden his position, his stubborn personality, his theology, the general atmosphere of anticlericalism, the printing press, Charles V's other commitments, but, above all, princely protection which proved to be the key. Less successful answers listed the means by which Luther's ideas spread but did not reflect on the difference between protest and reformation. Discussion of the roles of the German princes was limited to their protection of Luther. Where the wider context in Germany was considered, less developed answers were characterised by generalisation.

Question 12

More developed answers successfully weighed the impact of Spanish decision-making against other factors. Reflection on the nature of the revolt and its wider context produced deeper evaluation. Some candidates chose to answer on the reasons for the outbreak of the Dutch revolt rather than the difficulty of its suppression and, as a result, factors were only loosely linked to the question.

Question 13

'Rapid expansion' – the conquest of Mexico and Peru – was dealt with satisfactorily, though the influx of silver was over emphasised in some responses, as this did not really start to arrive until the 1540s in any great quantity, and it was often not appreciated that it went straight to bankers to repay loans. What was not always dealt with satisfactorily was 'prosperity'. The term was sometimes equated with general success. Many responses would have benefited from more consideration of the state of the Spanish economy in terms of commerce and agriculture.

Question 14

Better answers distinguished clearly the interests of France and integrated the development of the monarchy into that assessment. Discussion of residual and longer-term problems produced a more measured response, as did answers which evaluated the achievements of the monarchs in terms relative to the context and the gravity of their problems. Weaker answers were less able to differentiate between the interests of the monarchy and those of France. Their concentration tended to be on short-term gain without a wider appreciation of consequences. Less successful answers offered weak conclusions regarding the degree of success and failure.

Question 18

Consideration of tensions within the Catholic reform movement and nuanced assessment of its aims tended to produce more successful answers. Discussion of its wider mission in South America and the Far East was fruitful. Consolidation and adaptation of its ideology also allowed a measured evaluation. Answers which discerned the differences in effect across different regions of Europe gave a particularly effective analysis. Candidates who were less able to define what was meant by 'scope and impact' found it difficult to produce evaluative answers. Similarly, less successful answers were imprecise about the aims of the Catholic Reformation and their consideration was limited to the contest with Protestantism.

Question 19

Reflection on Henry IV's dependence on others and the negative effects of otherwise beneficial reforms enabled candidates to produce a sophisticated evaluation. Likewise, consideration of immediate versus longer-term consequences produced a deeper measure of Henry's effectiveness. While it was suggested by less successful answers that Henry did restore royal authority, the true extent of his achievement was not appreciated by virtue of a limited range of knowledge and their discussion was often confined to about three areas: the end of the civil war, the Edict of Nantes and Sully. Other answers tended to comprise of a list of Henry's reforms without meaningful analysis of their effectiveness. Where an assessment was offered, it was confined to short-term gain and little reflection was given to the gestation of longer-term problems.

Question 20

Better answers identified different measures of decline and assessed their degree. Discussion of continuing Ottoman strengths enabled candidates to evaluate the gravity of decline and to place its failings in a wider context. Answers, which linked the Ottoman domestic system with its dependence on expansion, tended to list a disconnected series of failings. Limited treatment of Ottoman success meant that some answers did not produce a convincing assessment of the severity of decline.

Question 21

More successful candidates described social, religious and economic reasons for attitudes towards 'outcasts in society'. Commonalities were clearly established and these allowed candidates to produce a persuasive argument in favour of their chosen priority. Weaker responses avoided prioritisation and often listed instances of attitudes towards outcasts rather than analyse the reasons for them. In consequence, they tended to be generalised and assertive. The range of causes was limited and often focused on religious reasons alone.

Question 26

Better answers discussed the changing conception of magic over time and the variation in the persecution of witches across Europe. The role of the elites was particularly useful in establishing a coherent and convincing evaluation. Likewise, setting the persecutions in the context of Reformation and heresy enabled candidates to produce a complex evaluation. Weaker answers were characterised by extended narrative

examples of witchcraft. Focus on economic distress tended to be simplistic or generalised with little awareness that witch trials continued into more prosperous times. Persecution was often viewed as a uniform experience across Europe.

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- Read questions carefully and consider their implications and demands.
- Remember to offer your own supported opinions and not rely on learnt answers.
- Make sure that your handwriting is legible.

General comments

Many responses were supported by sound factual knowledge and showed an ability to explain factors, but fewer showed developed judgements. All the questions invited higher-level thinking and assessment rather than description and explanation, however full. Candidates need to be sure to give balanced arguments, weighing the different factors rather than explaining them, and developing critical judgements. Historiography can help to further an answer where the references made are relevant to the question and argument and the evidence is used critically, but candidates can reach the highest marks without historiographical references. The description of different views is not a shortcut to an informed judgement based on sustained thought about the period. Some references to historians were too broad to qualify as evidence used to help answer the question. For example, the idea that ‘the Marxist school’ had distinct views about a range of topics was often unsupported.

When responding to questions that are specifically focussed around a specific event, individual or factor, such as **Question 18** ‘How important was Bismarck’s diplomacy in securing German Unification by 1871,’ candidates should recognise that the question is focused on Bismarck and their responses should consider the actual diplomacy conducted by Bismarck. An answer structured so that it contained one paragraph about Bismarck generally, followed by paragraphs assessing other factors in turn, presented without further reference to Bismarck would not be a successful response.

The examination requires candidates to think about the issues raised in the questions therefore it is not sufficient to reproduce learnt material. Through clearly expressed argument, candidates should offer their own opinions and judgements rather than just recount their knowledge. Candidates should also write legibly. When each word is a struggle to read, the flow of an argument is made very difficult to follow by poor handwriting.

The range of questions answered and the understanding shown were often impressive. There was much writing which showed an engagement with the past and some rigorous thinking. By stressing the need to respond to the questions, there is no suggestion that answers should be straightjacketed or be forced to take a particular line. Examiners are open to all sorts of supported arguments and judgements and, indeed, would like to encourage candidates to take risks and give their own supported views, and to demonstrate their reading and thinking about the past with vigour and enthusiasm. That is the opposite approach to reproducing a list of reasons common to all the candidates in a centre and containing common material and views.

Comments on specific questions

Questions with a very small number of responses are not included.

Question 6

Stronger answers had a very strong sense of what it meant to be 'enlightened' and 'despotic' in the context of eighteenth century Russia, and rigorously compared Catherine's actions with their definitions of those terms. Often answers discussed foreign policy, serfdom, education, and reforms to local government. Weaker responses tended to consider whether Catherine was successful or make broad assertions which were then ineffectively linked back to the terms in the question. These answers need to be firmly based on the key terms in the question.

Question 8

Better answers saw the link between 'the failure to reform' and the calling of the Estates General that acted as a platform for long-term grievances. Many answers would have benefited from more knowledge about the tax system – what the taxes were, who paid, how they were collected – and attempts at reform. Often the named factor was not touched upon in any depth rather listing the reasons for the Revolution. Some answers gave a superficial survey of factors, and sometimes influences such as the Enlightenment were dismissed as unimportant but without much justification. Historiographical descriptions were often unhelpful, rather candidates should offer a clear argument with concrete factual support. Many candidates wrote about the social structure (though the Estates was often not explained), the debt, the economic crisis (distinguishing the economy from finance) and Louis XVI's failings. Several responses argued a good case for blaming Louis both for the debt and the failure to reform.

Question 10

Stronger responses focused on the effects of the Peninsular campaign to make a good case for its importance, particularly in terms of how it represented Britain's continuous opposition to Napoleon. However, some of the responses which stated that it was the most important factor in his demise needed to produce more convincing support. The few responses that tied it to the Continental System and then went on to discuss the Russian campaign made a good point. Most responses understandably saw the Russian campaign as the real reason for Napoleon's demise, but some would have benefited from consideration of 1813, 1814 and indeed 1815. Better responses which discussed these years made the good point that Napoleon could have avoided full defeat if he had been prepared to make a compromise peace. Britain's insistence on removing Napoleon is, of course, important here. Generally successful responses focused on the key issue, explained its impact in relation to Napoleon's downfall and made a sustained comparative analysis with a clear judgement. Weaker responses often outlined features of various 'reasons for Napoleon's fall' and offered limited material on Spain.

Question 17

Better responses had a very good understanding of the *ad hoc* nature of the Congress System and its reliance on personal relationships forged in the campaign against Napoleon. Ultimately, it was correctly pointed out, the desire of the autocracies to stop the clock did not gel with Britain's more flexible approach to change. Weaker responses tended to describe developments or to offer quite generalised comments on divisions, which would have benefited from more precise reference to both the issues and the conferences.

Question 18

To answer this question, candidates needed to show strong knowledge and understanding of the key elements concerning German unification and Bismarck's diplomacy. However, many answers were lists of the reasons for unification (nationalism, the Zollverein, the economy, the favourable international situation and discussed whether Bismarck planned it or whether he was an opportunist). Some answers showed an understanding of the word 'diplomacy'. Weaker answers would have been improved by addressing key diplomatic elements and the central importance of ensuring that Prussia's enemies did not gain more allies. Much more consideration should have been given to the relations with Russia, the Italian Alliance, the 'soft' Peace of Prague and the dealings with the southern states. Many answers mentioned how Bismarck 'doctored' the Ems telegram, but few explained what actually happened, i.e. how he turned a diplomatic defeat into a *casus belli*.

Question 19

There were some effective analyses of how Unification was undertaken but many answers did not focus on the situation by 1871 and there were some descriptive accounts of how unification actually occurred (for example, by war, by plebiscite, by conquest). Some answers appreciated, however, that: Lombardy was given by France; much of the south was gifted from Garibaldi; Venetia arrived courtesy of Prussia; and, Piedmont 'conquered' the Papal States and defeated the Neapolitans. Better answers understood the

imposition of Piedmontese institutions and policies in the 1860s, including the somewhat misleadingly named 'Brigands' War. Greater awareness of the political geography of the peninsula would have benefited many answers.

Question 21

Better answers engaged with 'style' and offered evaluation of Napoleon III's domestic and foreign policies in terms of them being either 'substantial' or 'insubstantial'. A few hinted that he was a pale imitation of his uncle but this point was not always developed. Weaker answers were content with a run-through of his successes and failures and many answers would have benefited from greater focus on actual policies as opposed to general developments in the reign. The moves towards a more liberal empire were not often considered.

Question 22

Less-developed responses surveyed Alexander II's policies (though often not all of them) and asserted they were 'too little, too late'. Better responses attempted to define what was meant by the phrase and many of those made a good case for 'too little'. What was actually meant by 'too late', however, was often ignored. More knowledge of the effects of the reforms would have been helpful. Some judgements lacked balance and coverage of the emancipation was more fully treated than other changes by some answers. However, there was assessment of the strengths and limitations of the reforms. Better responses dealt with whether the reforms were too little to meet the problems Russia faced in the mid-century and whether they were too late to allow Russia to catch up, or to bring about changes which might have revitalised and strengthened the monarchy.

Question 23

Better answers appreciated why Bismarck's other domestic policies – especially his economic achievements – might be seen as notable; some cited his unitary measures in conjunction with the Liberals, and some made mention of his ongoing battle to control the Reichstag as an achievement of sorts. Most answers mentioned his welfare measures and offered judgements on whether they were futile as attempts to control socialism or notable for their modernity. Less developed answers simply agreed with the quote and focused on describing the *Kulturkampf* and anti-socialism (strangely starting in the 1880s and then going backwards). More limited answers would have been improved by more engagement with 'futile'.

Question 26

Better responses focused on Germany and tended to blame it or Austria; some blamed Russia for mobilisation, but more awareness of the actual outbreak of the war would have benefited many responses. An appreciation of the Schlieffen Plan might have helped too, particularly the fact that Russia's Great military programme would render the plan obsolete by 1917–1918. Rather than engaging directly with the question as set, some responses merely offered a series of factors, such as imperialism, the arms race, the alliance system, the Balkans, and so on, with varying degrees of detail and explanation, or thoughtful and individual analysis. Historiography was considered but often mechanistically and with limited explanation.

Question 33

Most responses, understandably, chose the Western Front and concentrated on 1917–1918, though more knowledge of how victory was achieved in 1918 would have helped. What was missing, however, was a full appreciation of the events of 1914: many responses did not consider the point that Germany lost the war at the very start by not getting their quick victory and here the Eastern Front was crucial as troops had to be transferred to the east to cope with Russia's unexpected invasion. Some responses did not confine themselves to the two fronts but instead discussed the war at sea, Gallipoli and the Italian front, and thus lost the focus of the question. Undiscriminating reproduction of a list of reasons was often counterproductive.

Question 34

Some responses felt October 1917 was the 'greater achievement': others felt that this was hard to argue given that it was merely a coup in a power vacuum. Weaker responses focused on one great achievement and only wrote about that, but most looked at both and there was some careful though defective comparative analysis. Nevertheless, Lenin's determination despite opposition within the Party and the unique position he took, rejecting cooperation with other groups, for instance, and his decision to adapt the ideology to skip the 'bourgeois phase' of the revolution were points well made. There were some strong arguments that the

relatively limited support for relatively little-known leaders and the challenges from foreign and domestic opposition made retaining power more challenging and that ruthless determination compared with flexibility were achievements. There were some balanced judgements that Trotsky's contribution might have been greater and that Lenin faced quite divided opposition. Less developed responses simply described what he did after 1917 and many stopped at the end of the civil war, when in fact the switch to the NEP and the crackdown on factionalism were essential steps to preserve Bolshevik power in the face of real difficulties in 1921. Responses here went beyond stereotyped lists of reasons or consequences to a greater degree than in other questions.

Question 35

More successful answers were able to identify Hitler's growing influence over NSDAP policy and question the division between Nazi success and Hitler personally. Answers identified why Nazi ideas resonated more effectively after the Wall Street Crash and Hitler's role in raising the profile and credibility of the NSDAP. Better answers referred to the debate over Hitler being 'helped into power' by interest groups being a victory neither for Hitler nor Nazism. Answers which looked at Hitler's first two years as Chancellor almost entirely missed the intention of this question. Less successful answers were generally unclear about the Nazi political programme. Analysis of why Germans voted for the NSDAP tended to be simplistic or limited, and little consideration was given to the change in German voting patterns after 1929. Weaker answers made little connection between Hitler, his leadership of the Party or his influence over policy.

Question 36

Better answers were able to challenge the question and establish that some of Mussolini's enemies remained strong throughout, including the Catholic Church, conservative interest groups and the monarchy. These discussed the more sophisticated approach by Mussolini than violence and propaganda, which used concession, incentives and exploitation of other concerns as additional weapons in his armoury. Better answers also questioned the extent to which Mussolini's regime was consolidated by 1929 and highlighted residual weaknesses. Less successful answers were limited in their understanding of who Mussolini's enemies were and their consideration tended to focus on how Mussolini was able to establish his regime by force and propaganda. They also did not examine the full date range of the question and tended to stop in 1924. As a result, they lacked sufficient breadth and balance.

Question 37

More successful responses established a sound balance between Republican divisions and Nationalist strengths, particularly evaluating how that balance shifted over time. More sophisticated responses challenged the extent of the Nationalist victory and questioned whether it could be termed 'a triumph'. Difficulties in identifying the divisions among Republicans tended to produce limited responses. Less successful responses devoted a disproportionate time to considering fascist strengths and particularly the importance of foreign intervention. As a result, they either lost focus on the question or lacked balance.

Question 39

Answers which identified long-term and short-term causes were best able to make a relative judgement, particularly in evaluating the importance of Gorbachev's policies or the role of economics. Some strong answers established a clear line of priorities and could both separate the events in Eastern Europe and connect them effectively to those occurring in the USSR. A lack of prioritisation weakened the answers of less successful candidates; these answers relied on a list of contributory factors with little evaluation of what might be argued to be the primary causes. Where 'best' factors were mentioned, they were made cursorily without the grounds for their selection being established. Weaker answers made little distinction between the component countries of the Warsaw Pact and the USSR, and consequently lost focus on the question posed.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/03
United States History Outlines,
c. 1750–c. 2000

Key messages

- Look carefully at exactly what questions require.
- Develop judgements rather than offering a series of explanations.
- If there is a factor in the question, then that should be the focus of the answer and other factors need to be compared to it.
- Make sure that your handwriting is legible.

General comments

The supporting evidence in answers was often strong and many candidates showed good subject knowledge and understanding. There is a need to read questions carefully and respond to their exact terms. This is particularly noticeable when comparative judgements about the importance of a particular factor is required, and when questions ask for judgement and not merely explanation. It is also important that when there is a concept in the question, then it should be addressed. For example, if the question asks for a discussion of 'great' – whether it is Nixon's residency or the US as an imperial power - then it is important to consider how greatness is going to be assessed. If a question asks whether aims have been achieved, then those aims should be explained. It is important that answers should be well informed. Responses which also engage with high level thinking skills, and go beyond description and explanation towards effective and supported judgement, will gain higher level marks.

There was a wide range of questions answered, though the themes sections did not attract many responses. There was also evidence of independent thinking. Finally, but importantly, handwriting was not always legible. When writing is too hard to read, the flow of the argument becomes difficult to follow. Candidates need to ensure that they communicate clearly and this includes legible handwriting.

Comments on specific questions

Questions with a very small number of responses are not included.

Question 1

There was generally sound knowledge of taxation. Strong answers explained the significance of the increased impositions and compare the immediate resentment over taxes with both longer term developments and subsequent causes of deterioration. Weaker responses described clashes and offered limited explanation both of the significance of taxation and later disputes. Some answers were more inclined to attribute blame than to assess the relative importance of this issue. There was often little material after 1770.

Question 2

There was more knowledge of the American Enlightenment than has been the case previously, but there was a tendency to offer generalised accounts of European philosophers or political thinkers, possibly studied in relation to influences on the revolution or the constitution. The question said 'intellectual achievements' but few candidates discussed the work of colonial intellectuals. More awareness of important American figures would have benefited answers.

Question 3

Better responses were able to isolate geographical factors and compare them with other reasons for Britain's defeat. There were some effective judgements made, some of which challenged the importance of factors such as distances or terrain. Lists of the 'causes of British defeat' did not score as highly because they failed to engage with the key element of 'to what extent' and, having considered some geographical factors in the opening section of the answer, failed to return to them or link other factors to them. Weaker answers offered some uninformed comments about the terrain which might have been more applicable to the Vietnam War.

Question 5

There were some strong responses which dealt with the extent of slavery in both the north and south, and weighed economic factors against wider social and political developments. This produced some wide ranging and perceptive responses which dealt with 'what best explains' and went beyond a list of factors. Less successful responses offered too much description of the nature of slavery or merely listed possible explanations with variable support.

Question 6

There were some strong answers which engaged with the concept of 'democratic' and made that the focus of the answer, rather than describing various elements of the presidency and offering comments about how democratic they were. Better answers offered a sustained and balanced judgement. Some answers needed greater consideration of the Nullification crisis and clearer arguments about the charter of the Bank of the United States.

Question 8

The secession of the Southern States involved distinct political decisions by different states. These decisions were influenced by long-term factors, but they took place in a specific context after the election of Lincoln. Better answers weighed longer and shorter term factors, but some included either a narrative of events only to 1860 or a list of differences between the sections. Greater knowledge of the situation following the election and the events which actually led to secession would have benefited many answers. Those answers which could discuss the actual decisions to secede showed greater perception and understanding than has sometimes been the case in the past when this topic has been examined.

Question 9

This question produced a considerable diversity of responses. In general, there was often strong knowledge and understanding. The level of discussion was often high, and the point was often made effectively that economic factors did not prevent southern victories and were more important when the war became more attritional. Weaker answers dismissed the factor in the question and wrote about the factors which they thought were key, often military leadership or the inadequacies of Davis. If there is a named factor in the question, then this must be given adequate consideration and other explanations should be firmly related to it. The argument that the key factor was the failure of Lee to resort to guerrilla warfare from the start, in the manner of Ho Chi Minh, seemed unconvincing given the circumstances and attitudes of the time.

Question 17

There were some well informed and thoughtful answers which balanced the remarkable changes brought about by Reconstruction with the obvious reaction after 1877 and the reestablishment of white control. Some strong answers considered the long-term consequences and balanced lost hopes against constitutional rights being eventually recovered. Thus the implications of 'complete' were considered.

Question 19

Answers were more descriptive than was the case in many of the other questions and tended to give accounts of US acquisitions and policies. There was some drift towards a discussion of whether the US truly embraced imperialism, often based on accounts of its policies towards Cuba. The concept of 'great' was not always at the heart of answers, though some dealt directly with this.

Question 20

Those answers which engaged directly with the idea of 'missed opportunity' were more successful than those which read this question as 'Assess the successes and limitations of Theodor Roosevelt's domestic policies'. The wording of the question should lead answers. What opportunities did Roosevelt have and were they taken or not? Better answers considered the context of his presidency and the reasons why many saw this as a time of hope for change, with some good supporting knowledge. Many candidates offered balanced judgements though not always sufficiently linked to the precise question, for example sometimes straying into foreign policy.

Question 22

This question produced a wide variety of responses. The best responses were those which dealt directly with 'how extensive' and balanced their consideration of change and continuity. 'Social change' by its nature can embrace a wide variety of topics and comprehensive surveys were not expected. The best explained topics were the changing role of women and the effects of urban growth. Stronger responses offered consistent judgement about the extent of change and the gap between perception of change and the reality. Weaker responses used the question for a lengthy consideration of Prohibition or a description of elements of the 'jazz age' without much estimation of the extent of social change. There was also a tendency to see the question as one based on economic change. While this could have relevance, in some cases economic developments were not linked to social change.

Question 23

There were some perceptive answers which looked at a range of consequences of the Crash and some challenged the link between the Crash and Depression. Many answers, however, assumed that the Crash led to the New Deal and then offered lengthy accounts of the changes brought about from 1933 to 1941, losing sight of the question. Candidates need to be sure to give a careful consideration of the question rather than assume what is being asked. It is also always important that clear explanatory links should be made and that the whole period of the question should be considered. The period from 1929 to 1933 was often passed over.

Question 24

There were well informed and balanced analyses which challenged the view of the 1920s being isolationist and covered the whole period. However, the later part of the period tended to be neglected and, even though the US went to war with Japan, the Far East was often barely considered, if at all. Many answers did not recognise that the distinction between American attitudes and economic policy and actual foreign policy. Answers generally would have been improved by more consideration of policy in the 1930s towards Latin America and the Far East.

Question 25

There were some well supported answers which compared The Berlin Blockade to other challenges and problems faced by Truman, and offered clear judgements about its relative importance. What marked out stronger responses was an understanding of 'challenge'. Less successful answers offered accounts of foreign policy, or Truman's successes and failures, or his responsibility for the Cold War. Candidates need to remember the importance of responding to the particular wording of the question as a persistent error was to think that the Berlin Wall was built in 1948.

Question 26

This was a popular question and showed a wide range of responses. Better responses remained focused on 'the extent of support' rather than reproducing a list of factors which explained the anti-communist hysteria. There were some thoughtful analyses which discriminated between contextual explanations outlining the spread of communism and more purely political factors. However, some candidates relied on lists and some gave insufficient response to 'what best explains'.

Question 27

Most responses focused on change 'during Eisenhower's presidency' though some were narrowly based on Eisenhower's policies. Many balanced the apparent growth of the economy and the effects of prosperity with elements which showed less change, particularly in agriculture. The persistence of discrimination in the

South was often contrasted with greater social mobility and change elsewhere. The question was fairly wide and elicited some thoughtful responses when the focus was understood. Candidates who offered 'successes and failures' of domestic policy did not respond to the question directly.

Question 28

The question demanded an understanding of the aims of foreign policy rather than inviting comments on general success and failure. Answers which showed an understanding of specific aims were more successful than those which began by outlining aspects of policy and then offered comments on general success or failure. There was often lengthy treatment of the Cuban crisis but these responses would have benefited, generally, from more consideration of the aims of US policy. Answers were often quite wide ranging, though consideration of Central and South America and Asia was often absent or dealt with sketchily. Some responses would have been strengthened by more developed analysis of the aims and achievements of improving relations with the USSR.

Question 29

The knowledge of Johnson's Great Society reforms was often impressive. Better responses balanced achievements with limitations and established some sort of success criteria. Less developed responses outlined the measures and offered implied comment on their achievement and significance. Such responses sometimes did not go beyond outlining the measures and then saying they were a success because of what they contained. With any consideration of reforms, it is often difficult for candidates to see that description, explanation and assessment are different 'stages' of analysis. The wide range of measures passed was often challenging, but a successful study of Johnson's administration should consider how effective the reforms were. Many made the point that Johnson was distracted by Vietnam, but this argument needs to demonstrate how this impacted on the actual reforms.

Question 30

This produced some strong responses which dealt with Nixon's personal inadequacies and offered balanced judgements about his presidency, engaging with 'great' and going beyond listing his successes and failures. There were some interesting discussions about whether his foreign policy successes could be seen as 'great' given the ruthlessness which his actions showed and without a strong sense of morality. More limited answers saw the question more narrowly in terms of his effectiveness. Answers were generally well informed though knowledge was not always well used.

Question 34

There were few answers to this question. 'Imperial presidency' is a particular concept and the question is in the themes section, therefore an analysis of Kennedy's foreign policy was not an adequate response. Before themes questions are tackled, candidates are advised to think carefully what makes them thematic.

HISTORY

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

Key Messages

- Read questions carefully and consider their implications and demands.
- It is important to respond to the requirements for judgement and assessment.
- Make sure that your handwriting is legible.

General Comments

In many responses, there was some very well informed historical writing which showed understanding of some demanding topics and there was much fluent explanation. Candidates exhibited a wide range of factual knowledge, although in some cases answers were too reliant on reproducing lists of factors without ensuring or showing that the factors were pertinent to the specific question asked. Some of the explanations offered were full and detailed but they did not offer an answer to the actual questions set. There were many responses that were of very great length and detail, but did not contain developed analysis and judgement. Questions demanded the exercise of historical judgement in considering, for example, not only what explains a key development, but what ‘best’ explains. Better responses went beyond a series of explanations and engaged with the higher level skills of judgement. Alternatively, in a minority of cases, some work was limited by the lack of support for an assessment made. In other cases, work would have benefited from closer consideration of the questions; there was some misreading. Some responses included material that was aimed at answering a different question from that set, rather than looking at the demands of the specific question set as a starting point for their answer. Overwhelmingly, responses to questions on this paper were strong on factual detail, but they often needed to focus more on forming a sustained judgement in response to the questions asked.

An issue of concern with some responses was legibility and this should be a matter which candidates with poor handwriting should consider. Pre-U questions invite thoughtful and varied answers. Examiners engage with the personal response of candidates and are judging the quality of argument, but when the flow of that argument is impeded by illegible writing, the candidates put a barrier between themselves and the reader.

Comments on Specific Questions

Questions with a very small number of responses are not included.

Question 6

Many answers demonstrated a lot of knowledge about the background to the Second Boer War, but answers would have been improved by more focus on the actual outbreak and the parts played by the individuals named in the question. Chamberlain’s role was not considered enough and there tended to be more on Kruger.

Question 7

There were some attempts in answers to engage with what was meant by the term ‘well governed’ in this context and there was some exemplification of where this may, or may not, have been achieved. But many answers tended to be generalised, without specific references, and several responses included arguments

that were pertinent to years outside the inter-war period defined in the question. It is important for the period in the question to be the focus of the answer.

Question 9

Answers generally sustained focus on the question, but there was a tendency to explain long term conflicts rather than balance these historical conflicts with the more immediate causes of the genocide. Factual support was variable and there was some tendency to include narrative in less developed analyses.

Question 10

This was one of the best tackled of the questions about Africa. Most answers responded directly and considered both internal and external factors. Better responses came to a supported judgement. Some answers would have benefited from more coverage of the later period and some largely stopped after the 1970s. Responses which narrated the development of apartheid did not score highly.

Question 15

In nearly all answers to this question, candidates interpreted the question in terms of the Cold War and the aims of western and communist countries in giving aid. Other aspects of aid could also have been considered. There was knowledge of some of the ways that aid met the aims defined and some of the exemplification was effective. Weaker responses needed to be clearer about what the aims were and not just write generally about the problems involved.

Question 17

There were some strong answers which engaged with the reforms and the movement for change, and offered a supported analysis of the reform movement's achievements. Other answers would have benefited from more knowledge of the attempts to change and more accurate focus on the question. There were some long accounts of the Boxer rebellion and the post-1911 period, and answers containing these passages needed to focus more on making a supported judgement rather than on narrating events.

Question 18

Better answers offered a clear judgement about which was the greater threat and showed some developed understanding and judgement. In less successful answers, candidates demonstrated awareness of the threats but tended to explain the problems caused by the Japanese and the Communists in turn, writing sub-essays on each though offering only limited comparison. These answers needed to offer a sustained judgement about which argument and evidence was preferred. Some answers would have benefited from better balance, particularly by including more material about the Japanese and looking beyond Manchuria in 1931.

Question 19

The strongest answers dealt directly with what could be considered 'effective leadership' and considered different aspects of the political and military strategies of the CCP leaders. Many answers concentrated on Mao and some challenged the effectiveness of his leadership, arguing that it was the ineffective opposition he faced that was more important rather than his strengths. Other answers would have benefited from assessing the evidence more critically; as some took Mao at his own estimation and discussed the strengths of his leadership against lists of other factors, offering limited judgement but often sound explanation of a number of reasons for the Communist victory. Some candidates included lists of factors and information that were not directly pertinent to the question or to the arguments presented. Inclusion of this material at times occluded the presentation of relevant knowledge and obstructed what was otherwise a fluent writing style. Answers to this topic would be improved by the inclusion of more knowledge of the period from 1945 to 1949, which was often treated in some answers only as a minor adjunct to the struggles of the 1930s.

Question 20

There were some strong responses which focused on the aims of the Cultural Revolution and linked an analysis of the outcomes to this. Most responses showed sustained and focused judgements. In weaker responses, candidates sometimes assumed that the destruction of culture was an unintended consequence and some tried to link the economic consequences to aims, assuming that the Cultural Revolution was part of the Great Leap Forward. Less successful responses contained descriptive passages about the brutality of

the Cultural Revolution that were not linked to the terms of the question. These responses would have benefited from a stronger and more persistent focus on the relationship between aims and outcomes.

Question 22

The great majority of answers were lists of reasons with limited attempt to answer ‘what best explains’ or to offer any comparative analysis. Knowledge was often strong but discussion and judgement were limited and some answers included material clearly beyond the time-limit of the question (1914). In answers that were stronger, a wide variety of explanations offered and the period was covered well, only a few going beyond 1914. There was a lot of detail and some answers were very full but these responses needed to show evidence of reflection and judgement on what was the most important element or elements in order to respond effectively to the question set.

Question 23

Answers to this question were varied and demonstrated a range of arguments. There were analyses which compared the longer term development of political demands for a separate Muslim state with the circumstances of 1945–1947 and the actions of the Congress Party after the passage of the Government of India Act. Answers offered some strong supported judgements. Less successful answers offered a series of explanations but these answers needed to form a judgement. In general, answers would have benefited from more knowledge of the post-war situation.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/52
Special Subject: The Crusades,
1095–1192

Key messages

- Careful attention should be paid to the exact content of the documents in **Section A** so that direct contrasts and comparisons can be made supported by evidence from the text.
- Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the documents in **Section B**.
- Essay questions should be read very carefully to ensure that the question being answered is that which is set.

General Comments

Most candidates demonstrated good understanding of the content of the documents, though there were a small number of instances in which candidates writing answers to the questions in Section A using contextual knowledge as a base and used the sources only as illustration. Many candidates made more appropriate use of contextual knowledge to help inform their analysis of the sources. However, this was a relative weakness, and only a few candidates were able to offer extensive or detailed contextual support for their assessment of the evidence in the documents, even though candidates are aware of the topic area to be examined in **Question 1**. Most answers grouped the documents logically; while this is not a requirement, many candidates used this device successfully to aid evaluation and argument. There were few cases in which candidates omitted to refer to one of the documents, but there were examples of a document not being fully considered. Some answers could have been improved had each of the documents been assessed more evenly or more in relation to its relative importance. In some responses, all of the documents were assessed but there was very limited attention given to what some of the passages said about the key issue; the aspects of the document that were assessed were tangential to the issue whilst more central evidence was not addressed. In stronger responses, the analysis of the sources, the argument and the inclusion of contextual knowledge were all integrated. In other responses, candidates wrote substantial sections of contextual information entirely separately to the sections of their answer that analysed the documents, such that the two were not fully linked.

In some cases, scripts which had good responses to **Question 1(b)** and the essay question scored reliably less highly on **Question 1(a)**. It may be helpful to summarise what is required by the mark scheme and how this is most often achieved by those candidates attaining the highest marks: the differences and similarities relating to the issue in the question should be explained (this is most easily done on a point by point basis) and clearly supported by reference to the documents. Answers in which there is a long treatment of one document followed by a long, separate treatment of the other are unlikely to score highly. Answers must be focused on the exact terms of the question and the comparisons and differences between the documents in relation to those terms. Higher-level marks are awarded for answers which also explain the differences by reference to the nature of the documents. Detailed context is not required except when it explains the differences, such as by noting changes which had occurred between the production of the two texts. Contextual knowledge is valuable when it helps to explain comparison and contrast but is not creditworthy on its own. The key task is comparing and contrasting two closely-studied and comprehended texts.

In the **essay** questions, in the context of a special study, documents studied could illuminate and inform arguments, but many candidates did not enrich their essay responses by giving textual references. There were some responses which made very good use of historiography and evaluated different historical views about the issue in the question. However, as with the Outline Papers, historiography is not a prerequisite for any mark band and adding decontextualised references to historians did not help to further responses.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Stronger answers focused entirely on the relationship between the Christians and the Muslims and used the documents comparatively. They recognised that both documents showed hostility in varying degrees but that Document D showed a degree of alliance. The difference was often explained in terms of the date of the documents and the reasons for writing for each author. Weaker answers needed to use the disunity of the Muslims as part of the relationship with the Christians and not as a separate point of comparison. They also needed to make a direct comparison, rather than describing the content of the documents and to give some explanation of the reasons for the differences.
- (b) Stronger answers used all the documents, whereas weaker answers needed to make fuller use of Document A. Weaker answers also showed a need to read the documents carefully as the meaning of both Document C and Document D was not understood in some cases. Better answers grouped the documents and dealt with cooperation and confrontation in turn, and were aware that some of the documents could be used for both interpretations. Some candidates assumed that the reference in Document A to 'wild beasts' was metaphorical rather than literal and accused the Muslims of bestial behaviour. Contextual knowledge was not very marked in many answers, but stronger answers used examples from other writers about life in the Crusader States. There was some sound evaluation of the Muslim sources.

Question 2

Strong answers focused on what it meant to be a pilgrim and discussed such issues as remission of sins and the pull of Jerusalem for devout Christians. Some then couched their alternative arguments in similar terms, suggesting that the Crusaders were warriors, conquerors or adventurers, with some development of these motivations referring to individuals like Bohemond. Weaker answers needed to focus directly on the definition of a pilgrim, rather than write about motives for joining a Crusade in general terms. Some argued reasonably that those going on the Peoples' Crusade were pilgrims, but needed to consider the motives of those joining the Crusade proper in more detail. Some used well the sermon of the Pope at Clermont, to show how Urban viewed the Crusade, but weaker answers needed to have a better balance in their answers, with too much time devoted to the papal call.

Question 3

Stronger answers focused on the terms of Quantum predecessors and how it whipped up feeling and promised remission of sins, but did not have an exact target and thus was not linked to the factor in the question. They often referred to the preaching of St. Bernard and argued that he too was not very specific in explaining the aims of the Crusade. Stronger answers also tended to use the different aims of Louis VII and Conrad III as evidence for a lack of clear aims and continued this theme, citing the disastrous decision of Louis VII to attack Damascus, which was never envisaged in the initial planning. These responses then considered some other factors, such as the diversion of the Crusade into other parts of Europe, the attitude of Emperor Manuel Comnenus and the row between Lois and Raymond of Antioch. Weaker answers provided a list of reasons for the failure of the Crusade but needed to aim their answers directly at the question.

Question 4

Stronger answers assessed both the successes and failures citing: the capture of Acre, the battle of Arsuf, the securing of the coastline and the treaty with Saladin allowing access to Jerusalem to pilgrims, as successes; and, not taking Jerusalem as the main failure. There was some good discussion weighing up just how far this could count as an overall success or failure. Some stronger answers also explored the longer-term impact of the Crusade and argued that the death of Saladin enhanced the view that the Crusade had succeeded. Weaker answers diverted into why the Crusade failed and needed to focus on the terms of the question. Some discussed the rivalries between Guy and Conrad at great length and so needed to spend more time on the outcome of the Crusade, rather than the events leading to it.

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- Careful attention should be paid to the exact content of the documents in **Section A** so that direct contrasts and comparisons can be made supported by evidence from the text.
- Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the documents in **Section B**.
- Essay questions should be read very carefully to ensure that the question being answered is that which is set.

General Comments

Most candidates demonstrated good understanding of the content of the documents, though there were a small number of instances in which candidates writing answers to the questions in Section A using contextual knowledge as a base and used the sources only as illustration. Many candidates made more appropriate use of contextual knowledge to help inform their analysis of the sources. However, this was a relative weakness, and only a few candidates were able to offer extensive or detailed contextual support for their assessment of the evidence in the documents, even though candidates are aware of the topic area to be examined in **Question 1**. Most answers grouped the documents logically; while this is not a requirement, many candidates used this device successfully to aid evaluation and argument. There were few cases in which candidates omitted to refer to one of the documents, but there were examples of a document not being fully considered. Some answers could have been improved had each of the documents been assessed more evenly or more in relation to its relative importance. In some responses, all of the documents were assessed but there was very limited attention given to what some of the passages said about the key issue; the aspects of the document that were assessed were tangential to the issue whilst more central evidence was not addressed. In stronger responses, the analysis of the sources, the argument and the inclusion of contextual knowledge were all integrated. In other responses, candidates wrote substantial sections of contextual information entirely separately to the sections of their answer that analysed the documents, such that the two were not fully linked.

In some cases, scripts which had good responses to **Question 1(b)** and the essay question scored reliably less highly on **Question 1(a)**. It may be helpful to summarise what is required by the mark scheme and how this is most often achieved by those candidates attaining the highest marks: the differences and similarities relating to the issue in the question should be explained (this is most easily done on a point by point basis) and clearly supported by reference to the documents. Answers in which there is a long treatment of one document followed by a long, separate treatment of the other are unlikely to score highly. Answers must be focused on the exact terms of the question and the comparisons and differences between the documents in relation to those terms. Higher-level marks are awarded for answers which also explain the differences by reference to the nature of the documents. Detailed context is not required except when it explains the differences, such as by noting changes which had occurred between the production of the two texts. Contextual knowledge is valuable when it helps to explain comparison and contrast but is not creditworthy on its own. The key task is comparing and contrasting two closely-studied and comprehended texts.

In the **essay** questions, in the context of a special study, documents studied could illuminate and inform arguments, but many candidates did not enrich their essay responses by giving textual references. There were some responses which made very good use of historiography and evaluated different historical views about the issue in the question. However, as with the Outline Papers, historiography is not a prerequisite for any mark band and adding decontextualised references to historians did not help to further responses.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Stronger answers selected relevant points about the attitude of Henry VIII from both the Documents, indicating both his desire to punish traitors and to show mercy. Some more observant answers noted how Henry took the view that the people had been 'persuaded' to join the rebellion. Most of the stronger answers explained the differences between the documents by considering the different audiences for which they were designed. Some weaker answers paraphrased the documents though did not make a direct comparison or missed the subtle differences between Henry's wish to set a clear example of terror in Document B, but to be generally merciful in Document C with the hint of terror being more nuanced.
- (b) Stronger answers took the view that the rebellions could be explained by: religion, social discontent, a desire for reform in the government, and the people being deceived and enjoined to rebel by men of a higher class. They then showed how the documents could be used to support these explanations and saw that some, like Documents A and D could be used to back up more than one explanation. Weaker answers considered the documents in turn and so their arguments were less well structured. Some answers needed to make better use of Document B to show the monks were restored and that the people were persuaded to do so, and of Document C to show how rumour had played a part in the coming of the rebellion. Better answers used contextual knowledge to support this point and many referred to the Pontefract Articles. There was a variety of conclusions with religion and social discontent both being put forward as the main factors.

Question 2

Stronger answers outlined a series of explanations and came to a view about which was the most vital. These tended to be factionalism, Cromwell's religious beliefs and the Cleves marriage. The best answers showed how these factors all worked together to convince Henry VIII that Cromwell should go. Weaker answers did not focus sufficiently on 1540 and gave too much detail about Cromwell's activities in the early 1530s. There was also some exaggeration about the role played by Catherine Howard in Cromwell's downfall. But most answers to this question showed a sound understanding of the mechanics of Tudor politics and the perils that awaited those enmeshed in its coils.

Question 3

This question was not answered as well as the other questions. The responses needed to show a clearer idea of what the significant religious changes were and a better understanding of the impact of the dissolution of the monasteries. They were often too descriptive, both of the legislation of the 1530s and of the dissolution.

Question 4

There were well-informed answers to this question, but the material given was not always apposite. Stronger answers argued either way. Some answers suggested that Henry VIII's greater interest in foreign policy than domestic policy meant that he was better served there; they cited examples from the pre-1525 period to show how he shone on the European stage. Other answers suggested that the preservation of law and order and the raising of the subsidy were greater services which Wolsey provided. Weaker answers were less well focused and often needed to be less descriptive of Wolsey's actions and to relate these precisely to how well he served the King. Some weaker answers barely mentioned Henry VIII except in passing. The issue of the Church featured more often in weaker answers, whereas stronger responses recognised that this was more marginal to the terms of the questions. Some answers argued that Wolsey served Henry by keeping the Church in order.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/54
Special Subject: Reformation Europe,
1516–1559

Key messages

- Careful attention should be paid to the exact content of the documents in **Section A** so that direct contrasts and comparisons can be made supported by evidence from the text.
- Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the documents in **Section B**.
- Essay questions should be read very carefully to ensure that the question being answered is that which is set.

General Comments

Most candidates demonstrated good understanding of the content of the documents, though there were a small number of instances in which candidates writing answers to the questions in Section A using contextual knowledge as a base and used the sources only as illustration. Many candidates made more appropriate use of contextual knowledge to help inform their analysis of the sources. However, this was a relative weakness, and only a few candidates were able to offer extensive or detailed contextual support for their assessment of the evidence in the documents, even though candidates are aware of the topic area to be examined in **Question 1**. Most answers grouped the documents logically; while this is not a requirement, many candidates used this device successfully to aid evaluation and argument. There were few cases in which candidates omitted to refer to one of the documents, but there were examples of a document not being fully considered. Some answers could have been improved had each of the documents been assessed more evenly or more in relation to its relative importance. In some responses, all of the documents were assessed but there was very limited attention given to what some of the passages said about the key issue; the aspects of the document that were assessed were tangential to the issue whilst more central evidence was not addressed. In stronger responses, the analysis of the sources, the argument and the inclusion of contextual knowledge were all integrated. In other responses, candidates wrote substantial sections of contextual information entirely separately to the sections of their answer that analysed the documents, such that the two were not fully linked.

In some cases, scripts which had good responses to **Question 1(b)** and the essay question scored reliably less highly on **Question 1(a)**. It may be helpful to summarise what is required by the mark scheme and how this is most often achieved by those candidates attaining the highest marks: the differences and similarities relating to the issue in the question should be explained (this is most easily done on a point by point basis) and clearly supported by reference to the documents. Answers in which there is a long treatment of one document followed by a long, separate treatment of the other are unlikely to score highly. Answers must be focused on the exact terms of the question and the comparisons and differences between the documents in relation to those terms. Higher-level marks are awarded for answers which also explain the differences by reference to the nature of the documents. Detailed context is not required except when it explains the differences, such as by noting changes which had occurred between the production of the two texts. Contextual knowledge is valuable when it helps to explain comparison and contrast but is not creditworthy on its own. The key task is comparing and contrasting two closely-studied and comprehended texts.

In the **essay** questions, in the context of a special study, documents studied could illuminate and inform arguments, but many candidates did not enrich their essay responses by giving textual references. There were some responses which made very good use of historiography and evaluated different historical views about the issue in the question. However, as with the Outline Papers, historiography is not a prerequisite for any mark band and adding decontextualised references to historians did not help to further responses.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Answers to document questions were generally well-structured and focused on the question asked although they would have benefited from more evaluation of the provenance of documents. Clear evidence of contextual knowledge for the most part was well deployed.

- (a) The best answers demonstrated that the documents were well understood and interpreted. These answers made clear contrasts and comparisons between the view of Calvin in both documents with well-deployed contextual knowledge regarding attitudes towards Calvin in Geneva. Strong answers noted the negative view Calvin faced in Document B compared to Document A, and used contextual knowledge and analysis of the provenance of the documents to explain this. Weaker answers were well structured but some candidates misread Document A and interpreted it on the basis of being written in 1536 (rather than 1557), consequently their evaluation was incorrect. Candidates are reminded to read document ascriptions very carefully.
- (b) The best answers clearly grouped documents according to those that indicated that Calvin did hold authority and those that showed that he did not. Particularly strong answers were able to see the nuanced views of Document E, recognising that calling on the Duchess of Ferrara was a sign of being well connected, as well as evidence of having faced some opposition in Geneva. The best answers noted that this document was also evidence of him having dealt well with that opposition, thus having authority ultimately. The error in the interpretation of Document A from 1(a) was carried forward to this answer by some candidates, weakening their overall answers. The best answers used contextual knowledge and provenance to consider which set of sources presented the most convincing argument. Weaker answers used the documents mostly at face-value with context only used to extend them.

Question 2

Most answers in **Section B** were on this question. Their factors were chosen well and most answers included well-selected evidence, especially regarding the constraints presented by the Spanish Empire. There was some good treatment of the weaknesses of other candidates for the position and Charles' strong standing among the German princes and electors. Stronger answers weighed up the competing arguments as to whether Charles should have sought election and reached clear conclusions. Weaker answers laboured later issues such as the growth of Lutheranism and other forms of Protestantism as an argument for him being ill-advised in seeking election, but did not expand on the fact that this was not yet fully underway by 1519. Most answers convincingly argued that he was not ill-advised to seek election; as many of the later problems he faced could not have been foreseen in 1519 and that in many ways he was the most suitable candidate at the time.

Question 4

Better answers offered some discrimination in their analysis of the factors which led to the 'enthusiasm' for the publication of the 95 Theses, focusing on the messages they contained and the vigorous way that they were addressed. Weaker answers used the question to write a series of general causes of the Reformation, sometimes without adequate focus on the Theses themselves.

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- Careful attention should be paid to the exact content of the documents in **Section A** so that direct contrasts and comparisons can be made supported by evidence from the text.
- Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the documents in **Section B**.
- Essay questions should be read very carefully to ensure that the question being answered is that which is set.

General Comments

Most candidates demonstrated good understanding of the content of the documents, though there were a small number of instances in which candidates writing answers to the questions in Section A using contextual knowledge as a base and used the sources only as illustration. Many candidates made more appropriate use of contextual knowledge to help inform their analysis of the sources. However, this was a relative weakness, and only a few candidates were able to offer extensive or detailed contextual support for their assessment of the evidence in the documents, even though candidates are aware of the topic area to be examined in **Question 1**. Most answers grouped the documents logically; while this is not a requirement, many candidates used this device successfully to aid evaluation and argument. There were few cases in which candidates omitted to refer to one of the documents, but there were examples of a document not being fully considered. Some answers could have been improved had each of the documents been assessed more evenly or more in relation to its relative importance. In some responses, all of the documents were assessed but there was very limited attention given to what some of the passages said about the key issue; the aspects of the document that were assessed were tangential to the issue whilst more central evidence was not addressed. In stronger responses, the analysis of the sources, the argument and the inclusion of contextual knowledge were all integrated. In other responses, candidates wrote substantial sections of contextual information entirely separately to the sections of their answer that analysed the documents, such that the two were not fully linked.

In some cases, scripts which had good responses to **Question 1(b)** and the essay question scored reliably less highly on **Question 1(a)**. It may be helpful to summarise what is required by the mark scheme and how this is most often achieved by those candidates attaining the highest marks: the differences and similarities relating to the issue in the question should be explained (this is most easily done on a point by point basis) and clearly supported by reference to the documents. Answers in which there is a long treatment of one document followed by a long, separate treatment of the other are unlikely to score highly. Answers must be focused on the exact terms of the question and the comparisons and differences between the documents in relation to those terms. Higher-level marks are awarded for answers which also explain the differences by reference to the nature of the documents. Detailed context is not required except when it explains the differences, such as by noting changes which had occurred between the production of the two texts. Contextual knowledge is valuable when it helps to explain comparison and contrast but is not creditworthy on its own. The key task is comparing and contrasting two closely-studied and comprehended texts.

In the **essay** questions, in the context of a special study, documents studied could illuminate and inform arguments, but many candidates did not enrich their essay responses by giving textual references. There were some responses which made very good use of historiography and evaluated different historical views about the issue in the question. However, as with the Outline Papers, historiography is not a prerequisite for any mark band and adding decontextualised references to historians did not help to further responses.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Answers in the top band showed sharp awareness of similarities and differences, by critically evaluating the documents as well as their provenance. Most candidates avoided the most obvious pitfalls in the document, in particular the distinction in Document B between what Mr. Hampden's lawyer had to say and Sir Robert Berkeley's views on the matter. It is important that candidates make full use of the captions above the documents, as several did not reflect on the significance of Document A in recording the reactions of people in Kent. The strongest answers did justice to the precise wording of the question, 'the King's *rights to tax his subjects*'.
- (b) The strongest candidates clearly understood the documents and related the contents and provenance to the demands of the question. Such candidates treated the documents as a set and made a critical and accurate judgement as to how convincing each document was for the view that the main issue over ship-money was the 'role and rights of Parliament'. However, many introductions ignored the sources and were presented as if this was a normal essay. The best introductions and conclusions were source-driven, and sought to group the sources and treat them as a set, identifying the specific emphasis in individual sources. The strongest answers did justice to the key words in the question: assessing the ways in which the documents indicated that the main issue over ship-money was the *role* and *rights* of Parliament; and considered alternative views (in particular that of the King and his role and rights, and indeed the role, significance and interpretation of the law).

Question 2

There were some strong responses which isolated key elements in Pym's role; for instance, in leading political demands in the Short Parliament that redress should come before supply, and then the way in which he brought about Strafford's fall and led increasingly radical demands in the Long Parliament. Many saw him as responsible for the formation of a royal party in reaction to changes which seemed to go too far and argued that that was his greatest significance. Some compared his significance with that of the Charles I and offered a supported comparison while maintaining the focus on Pym. Weaker answers fell back on describing events and were not always certain what Pym did. For some the question was an invitation to explain the causes of the Civil War, but these were a minority and most tried to focus on Pym himself.

Question 3

The stronger answers examined critically the significance of the army revolt by dwelling on their impact (particularly political), as well as assessing the ways in which their influence was limited. For a fuller and more wide-ranging answer, candidates explored alternative factors, such as the actions of Charles I, to explain the overall significance of the army revolt in 1647.

Question 4

Many answers began with a historiographical survey, but failed to present and make their own judgement. The stronger answers tended to structure their ideas thematically, especially religious and political, though any evidence that was presented from the 1650s could not be rewarded. In presenting the different pieces of evidence for radical ideas (e.g. Levellers, New Model Army), there was an occasional tendency to describe and narrate, rather than to analyse the reasons for the proliferation of radical ideas. Weaker answers tried to use this as a way of outlining the causes of the war and failed to engage with the concept of 'radical', describing instead various ideas about religion and monarchy which led to war.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/56
Special Subject:
The French Revolution, 1774–1794

Key messages

- Careful attention should be paid to the exact content of the documents in **Section A** so that direct contrasts and comparisons can be made supported by evidence from the text.
- Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the documents in **Section B**.
- Essay questions should be read very carefully to ensure that the question being answered is that which is set.

General Comments

Most candidates demonstrated good understanding of the content of the documents, though there were a small number of instances in which candidates writing answers to the questions in Section A using contextual knowledge as a base and used the sources only as illustration. Many candidates made more appropriate use of contextual knowledge to help inform their analysis of the sources. However, this was a relative weakness, and only a few candidates were able to offer extensive or detailed contextual support for their assessment of the evidence in the documents, even though candidates are aware of the topic area to be examined in **Question 1**. Most answers grouped the documents logically; while this is not a requirement, many candidates used this device successfully to aid evaluation and argument. There were few cases in which candidates omitted to refer to one of the documents, but there were examples of a document not being fully considered. Some answers could have been improved had each of the documents been assessed more evenly or more in relation to its relative importance. In some responses, all of the documents were assessed but there was very limited attention given to what some of the passages said about the key issue; the aspects of the document that were assessed were tangential to the issue whilst more central evidence was not addressed. In stronger responses, the analysis of the sources, the argument and the inclusion of contextual knowledge were all integrated. In other responses, candidates wrote substantial sections of contextual information entirely separately to the sections of their answer that analysed the documents, such that the two were not fully linked.

In some cases, scripts which had good responses to **Question 1(b)** and the essay question scored reliably less highly on **Question 1(a)**. It may be helpful to summarise what is required by the mark scheme and how this is most often achieved by those candidates attaining the highest marks: the differences and similarities relating to the issue in the question should be explained (this is most easily done on a point by point basis) and clearly supported by reference to the documents. Answers in which there is a long treatment of one document followed by a long, separate treatment of the other are unlikely to score highly. Answers must be focused on the exact terms of the question and the comparisons and differences between the documents in relation to those terms. Higher-level marks are awarded for answers which also explain the differences by reference to the nature of the documents. Detailed context is not required except when it explains the differences, such as by noting changes which had occurred between the production of the two texts. Contextual knowledge is valuable when it helps to explain comparison and contrast but is not creditworthy on its own. The key task is comparing and contrasting two closely-studied and comprehended texts.

In the **essay** questions, in the context of a special study, documents studied could illuminate and inform arguments, but many candidates did not enrich their essay responses by giving textual references. There were some responses which made very good use of historiography and evaluated different historical views about the issue in the question. However, as with the Outline Papers, historiography is not a prerequisite for any mark band and adding decontextualised references to historians did not help to further responses.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Answers in the top band showed sharp awareness of similarities and differences, by critically evaluating documents as well as their provenance. Better answers considered the implications of the differing provenance of each source, particularly the contextual understanding of the respective roles played by Robespierre and Brissot during the French Revolution, though some candidates provided too much contextual detail to the detriment of effective comparative analysis of the documents. Most candidates dealt with the differences effectively (most obviously Brissot's support for war contrasted by Robespierre's reluctance to get embroiled in a foreign expedition); though, a number of answers did not do justice to the similarities (particularly noting the dangers of a foreign war). In the interests of clarity, candidates who devoted separate paragraphs to similarities and differences tended to fare better. Many candidates dedicated an entire paragraph to the provenance, but sometimes without relating it explicitly to the precise wording of the question.
- (b) The strongest candidates clearly understood the documents and related the contents and provenance to the demands of the question. Such candidates treated the documents as a set and made a critical and accurate judgement as to how convincing each document was for the view that the decision to go to war in 1792 was misguided. However, many introductions ignored the sources and were presented as if this was a normal essay. The best introductions and conclusions were source-driven, and sought to group the sources and treat them as a set, identifying the specific emphasis in individual sources. Some historiographical surveys were not directly linked to the demands of the question so could not be rewarded. Some sources were unaccountably neglected, while others were only mentioned in passing and not properly evaluated. The strongest answers did justice to the key word in the question 'misguided' and related their analysis to the provenance as well as the broader context of the documents. They may, for example, have identified that the shared sentiments from Document A and Document C came from different political viewpoints, or set the contents of each source alongside the domestic and foreign background of the early 1790s.

Question 2

Some answers began with a historiographical survey, but the candidate did not present and make their own judgement. Some answers divided their paragraphs according to Louis XVI's different finance ministers, which led to a more descriptive answer. Those candidates who structured their ideas in a more thematic fashion (such as Louis' ministers, Louis' actions, the French fiscal system, social structures) tended to do greater justice to the question. The strongest answers paid close attention to all of the following: 'what *best* explains'; adhering closely to the specific timeframe (1774–1788); and addressing the notion of 'a *lasting* solution'. Rather than concentrating on the quality of their arguments, some candidates presented a large quantity of description and an enormous range and depth of evidence.

Question 3

Structurally, the majority of answers took a chronological and/or events-based approach, which led some to describe, rather than analyse the reasons why the French monarchy was weakened. Many answers did not distinguish between popular discontent and popular unrest; there was an assumption that the two are synonymous, rather than perhaps explaining that popular unrest was a clear manifestation of popular discontent.

Question 4

Better answers set up distinct criteria by which to assess Robespierre and were aware of competing interpretations, though there were some generalised historiographical surveys. A number of answers simply described Robespierre's actions rather than focusing on how they did or did not serve the Revolution. Several answers did not adhere strictly to the confines of the timeframe, which meant that they were not fully rewarded for the evidence presented.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/57
Special Subject: Napoleon and Europe,
1795–1815

Key messages

- Careful attention should be paid to the exact content of the documents in **Section A** so that direct contrasts and comparisons can be made supported by evidence from the text.
- Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the documents in **Section B**.
- Essay questions should be read very carefully to ensure that the question being answered is that which is set.

General Comments

Most candidates demonstrated good understanding of the content of the documents, though there were a small number of instances in which candidates writing answers to the questions in Section A using contextual knowledge as a base and used the sources only as illustration. Many candidates made more appropriate use of contextual knowledge to help inform their analysis of the sources. However, this was a relative weakness, and only a few candidates were able to offer extensive or detailed contextual support for their assessment of the evidence in the documents, even though candidates are aware of the topic area to be examined in **Question 1**. Most answers grouped the documents logically; while this is not a requirement, many candidates used this device successfully to aid evaluation and argument. There were few cases in which candidates omitted to refer to one of the documents, but there were examples of a document not being fully considered. Some answers could have been improved had each of the documents been assessed more evenly or more in relation to its relative importance. In some responses, all of the documents were assessed but there was very limited attention given to what some of the passages said about the key issue; the aspects of the document that were assessed were tangential to the issue whilst more central evidence was not addressed. In stronger responses, the analysis of the sources, the argument and the inclusion of contextual knowledge were all integrated. In other responses, candidates wrote substantial sections of contextual information entirely separately to the sections of their answer that analysed the documents, such that the two were not fully linked.

In some cases, scripts which had good responses to **Question 1(b)** and the essay question scored reliably less highly on **Question 1(a)**. It may be helpful to summarise what is required by the mark scheme and how this is most often achieved by those candidates attaining the highest marks: the differences and similarities relating to the issue in the question should be explained (this is most easily done on a point by point basis) and clearly supported by reference to the documents. Answers in which there is a long treatment of one document followed by a long, separate treatment of the other are unlikely to score highly. Answers must be focused on the exact terms of the question and the comparisons and differences between the documents in relation to those terms. Higher-level marks are awarded for answers which also explain the differences by reference to the nature of the documents. Detailed context is not required except when it explains the differences, such as by noting changes which had occurred between the production of the two texts. Contextual knowledge is valuable when it helps to explain comparison and contrast but is not creditworthy on its own. The key task is comparing and contrasting two closely-studied and comprehended texts.

In the **essay** questions, in the context of a special study, documents studied could illuminate and inform arguments, but many candidates did not enrich their essay responses by giving textual references. There were some responses which made very good use of historiography and evaluated different historical views about the issue in the question. However, as with the Outline Papers, historiography is not a prerequisite for any mark band and adding decontextualised references to historians did not help to further responses.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Most answers focused on the differences between the documents and showed the very different provenance as well as important differences in content. Better answers also saw that there was a similarity in Napoleonic rule across the different countries resulting in greater nationalism though for different reasons.
- (b) Answers were well structured for the most part, although there were some instances of candidates including a paragraph of their own knowledge divorced from the documents. There was generally sound understanding of the links between the documents and the issue in the question. However, some offered essays which were about the Napoleonic Empire and illustrated by references to the documents. The documents should be central to the answer and the use of knowledge should be to contextualise and evaluate the sources. Documents were well interpreted for the most part and candidates paid clear attention to the key issue in the question (in this case whether Napoleon's rule brought benefits). Most candidates attempted to evaluate the provenance of the documents although in some cases this was superficial with limited distinction between Documents B and D, both written by Napoleon.

Question 2

For the most part, factors were well chosen with candidates presenting strong supporting evidence. Some candidates had a weak understanding of the term 'political intrigue' which led to the selection of factors that were all aspects of political intrigue, thus limiting the overall argument. The best answers weighed the different competing factors and made sustained judgements throughout.

Question 3

The best answers addressed both elements of the question with detailed and focused analysis. However, the majority of answers were imbalanced, focusing on either 'an unoriginal commander' or 'the weakness of his enemies'. Candidates need to remember the importance of addressing the entire question. The majority of candidates presented detailed evidence with clear explanation.

Question 4

There were few answers to this question. Generally, the answers were well supported but tended to focus on whether the Hundred Days succeeded rather than whether it stood 'any chance of success'. Candidates are reminded of the importance of answering the set question.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/58
Special Subject: Russia in Revolution,
1905–1924

Key messages

- Careful attention should be paid to the exact content of the documents in **Section A** so that direct contrasts and comparisons can be made supported by evidence from the text.
- Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the documents in **Section B**.
- Essay questions should be read very carefully to ensure that the question being answered is that which is set.

General Comments

Most candidates demonstrated good understanding of the content of the documents, though there were a small number of instances in which candidates writing answers to the questions in Section A using contextual knowledge as a base and used the sources only as illustration. Many candidates made more appropriate use of contextual knowledge to help inform their analysis of the sources. However, this was a relative weakness, and only a few candidates were able to offer extensive or detailed contextual support for their assessment of the evidence in the documents, even though candidates are aware of the topic area to be examined in **Question 1**. Most answers grouped the documents logically; while this is not a requirement, many candidates used this device successfully to aid evaluation and argument. There were few cases in which candidates omitted to refer to one of the documents, but there were examples of a document not being fully considered. Some answers could have been improved had each of the documents been assessed more evenly or more in relation to its relative importance. In some responses, all of the documents were assessed but there was very limited attention given to what some of the passages said about the key issue; the aspects of the document that were assessed were tangential to the issue whilst more central evidence was not addressed. In stronger responses, the analysis of the sources, the argument and the inclusion of contextual knowledge were all integrated. In other responses, candidates wrote substantial sections of contextual information entirely separately to the sections of their answer that analysed the documents, such that the two were not fully linked.

In some cases, scripts which had good responses to **Question 1(b)** and the essay question scored reliably less highly on **Question 1(a)**. It may be helpful to summarise what is required by the mark scheme and how this is most often achieved by those candidates attaining the highest marks: the differences and similarities relating to the issue in the question should be explained (this is most easily done on a point by point basis) and clearly supported by reference to the documents. Answers in which there is a long treatment of one document followed by a long, separate treatment of the other are unlikely to score highly. Answers must be focused on the exact terms of the question and the comparisons and differences between the documents in relation to those terms. Higher-level marks are awarded for answers which also explain the differences by reference to the nature of the documents. Detailed context is not required except when it explains the differences, such as by noting changes which had occurred between the production of the two texts. Contextual knowledge is valuable when it helps to explain comparison and contrast but is not creditworthy on its own. The key task is comparing and contrasting two closely-studied and comprehended texts.

In the **essay** questions, in the context of a special study, documents studied could illuminate and inform arguments, but many candidates did not enrich their essay responses by giving textual references. There were some responses which made very good use of historiography and evaluated different historical views about the issue in the question. However, as with the Outline Papers, historiography is not a prerequisite for any mark band and adding decontextualised references to historians did not help to further responses.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Most responses identified the similarities and differences between the two documents; although, not all commented on these in the context of the question (i.e. the 'peasants' attitudes towards Communism') and most did not consider why there were these differences. All candidates attempted to compare point by point rather than sequentially.
- (b) The best responses started by grouping the sources into those that largely supported the key issue, that 'the Bolsheviks proceeded cautiously', and those that suggested otherwise. The advantage of this approach was that the focus of the response tended to remain on the key issue and not drift into generalities about Bolshevik or peasant behaviour. The better responses also offered some supporting detail from their own knowledge to support what individual documents said. Some responses, however, offered no more than the information that could be extracted from the documents (e.g. about the New Economic Policy or Stalin's position in the Bolshevik hierarchy). Few responses attempted any form of evaluation, and such as there were tended to be rather formulaic (for example, a commissar in Document A would be hostile to Kulaks so his testimony might be tainted, Sidney and Beatrice Webb were writing much later and had no direct knowledge of the events at that time).

Question 2

Many candidates used this (less popular) question as an opportunity to dwell on the relative significance of Lenin's ideas, rather than explicitly explaining why his ideas excited 'so much debate among revolutionaries'. The stronger answers were closely confined to the timeframe implied by the question (i.e. before 1914). Some weaker answers introduced evidence from the period 1914 to 1917 (and further beyond), which could not be rewarded. While most candidates were able to present a coherent, thematic paragraph structure, the range and depth of material was not always evident.

Question 3

Most considered the First World War with reference to alternative factors that might have brought about the fall of the Tsarist regime. The strengths of the responses were in considering the impact of the war where candidates were well versed in the battles, numbers of casualties and the impact on the socio-economic situation on the home front (grain shortages, strikes, falling morale, etc.). Some candidates saw the Tsar's decision to go to the front and take control as separate from the impact of the war itself, although this was not entirely convincing. Most were able, however, to show clearly the impact of the Tsar's actions on the war, on his reputation and on the management of government left in the hands of Alexandra and Rasputin. Most candidates developed the idea that events before 1914 (e.g. the 1906 Revolution and the Tsarist reaction to it; the failed Dumas and the decreasing amount of democracy; socio-economic strains) were also of significance but the strength of these arguments varied considerably. The best responses came to a conclusion about the relative importance of the different interpretations, and the very best attempted to determine which were the most significant factors within these interpretations (e.g. was the Tsar's decision to go to the Front more important than the incompetence that surrounded the management of war in general). There were references to the historiography but this rarely went beyond citing, or in some cases quoting, named historians.

Question 4

The strongest answers explored in full the concept of a 'popular' revolution and the seizure by a 'minority extremist group'. In terms of content, several candidates used evidence from the aftermath of the Bolshevik Revolution (more pertinent to Bolshevik consolidation), which could not be rewarded. Some candidates contextualised the situation in 1917 in some detail, especially by integrating primary evidence from Lenin's April Theses and from his actual works. In introducing historiographical debates, some candidates often did not present their own judgements and historiography was not always explicitly related to the question. In some cases, there were vague references to Soviet and Western historiography, without an allusion to specific historians.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/59
Special Subject: Germany 1919–1945

Key messages

- Careful attention should be paid to the exact content of the documents in **Section A** so that direct contrasts and comparisons can be made supported by evidence from the text.
- Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the documents in **Section B**.
- Essay questions should be read very carefully to ensure that the question being answered is that which is set.

General Comments

Most candidates demonstrated good understanding of the content of the documents, though there were a small number of instances in which candidates writing answers to the questions in Section A using contextual knowledge as a base and used the sources only as illustration. Many candidates made more appropriate use of contextual knowledge to help inform their analysis of the sources. However, this was a relative weakness, and only a few candidates were able to offer extensive or detailed contextual support for their assessment of the evidence in the documents, even though candidates are aware of the topic area to be examined in **Question 1**. Most answers grouped the documents logically; while this is not a requirement, many candidates used this device successfully to aid evaluation and argument. There were few cases in which candidates omitted to refer to one of the documents, but there were examples of a document not being fully considered. Some answers could have been improved had each of the documents been assessed more evenly or more in relation to its relative importance. In some responses, all of the documents were assessed but there was very limited attention given to what some of the passages said about the key issue; the aspects of the document that were assessed were tangential to the issue whilst more central evidence was not addressed. In stronger responses, the analysis of the sources, the argument and the inclusion of contextual knowledge were all integrated. In other responses, candidates wrote substantial sections of contextual information entirely separately to the sections of their answer that analysed the documents, such that the two were not fully linked.

In some cases, scripts which had good responses to **Question 1(b)** and the essay question scored reliably less highly on **Question 1(a)**. It may be helpful to summarise what is required by the mark scheme and how this is most often achieved by those candidates attaining the highest marks: the differences and similarities relating to the issue in the question should be explained (this is most easily done on a point by point basis) and clearly supported by reference to the documents. Answers in which there is a long treatment of one document followed by a long, separate treatment of the other are unlikely to score highly. Answers must be focused on the exact terms of the question and the comparisons and differences between the documents in relation to those terms. Higher-level marks are awarded for answers which also explain the differences by reference to the nature of the documents. Detailed context is not required except when it explains the differences, such as by noting changes which had occurred between the production of the two texts. Contextual knowledge is valuable when it helps to explain comparison and contrast but is not creditworthy on its own. The key task is comparing and contrasting two closely-studied and comprehended texts.

In the **essay** questions, in the context of a special study, documents studied could illuminate and inform arguments, but many candidates did not enrich their essay responses by giving textual references. There were some responses which made very good use of historiography and evaluated different historical views about the issue in the question. However, as with the Outline Papers, historiography is not a prerequisite for any mark band and adding decontextualised references to historians did not help to further responses.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Most candidates were able to identify similarities between the documents (e.g. new values) but were more able to spot differences (e.g. the racial element of Document C missing in Document D; the narrow focus of Document D as opposed to the broad brush of Document C). Most responses referenced the broad nature of disagreement between the two documents: Document C positive, Document D negative. Some responses contrasted revolution from below (Document C – ‘longing in the blood’) with revolution from above (Document D – use of propaganda and twisted language). Candidates generally seemed to be aware of the differences in provenance but some did not use this understanding effectively to evaluate their relative reliability. Some evaluation was very formulaic (date of Document D as 1995 – therefore this must be a secondary source / Klemperer would not have remembered things despite the reference to his journal), but those who took care to read the attributions often made intelligent comments about the date and purpose of each. The best responses had a very clear insight into why they differed: the date/context being the start of the Nazi regime; the authors and their perspectives; the nature of the documents (public propaganda versus private diary). Not all candidates understood that a ‘journal’ was similar to a ‘diary’ and that therefore Document D was a primary source despite its publication date. Those who saw the date as that of its writing tended to make formulaic comments about long-term memory, etc.
- (b) Overall, many candidates felt there was in fact a revolution, cloaked in legality for the first part of the Nazi rule. In general, the documents were grouped convincingly. There were few diversions from Document A and Document E for the interpretation that there was not a revolution and Documents B, C and D for the idea there was, although Document D was occasionally used to show change over time. The better responses used the content of the documents in some detail to argue the two cases and then used their own contextual knowledge to evaluate their reliability or utility. It was clear that candidates had a high level of knowledge about the nature of the Nazi take-over and consolidation of power in the early 1930s. Less strong responses merely highlighted a salient point (e.g. the nature of the Day of Potsdam) and then focused most of their response on saying why the document was or was not reliable, etc. Contextual knowledge was often used to show that even though everything was legally carried out, there was an argument for saying that the methods used to secure the legal changes amounted to a revolution. Some candidates, however, allowed their own knowledge to overwhelm the documents when the question asks for contextual knowledge to be the central focus. Such responses often passed judgement on the topic and not the documents as a set. The responses to this question were also prone to listing near the end what the sources left out.

There were several mis-readings of attributions to Document A, which had a knock-on effect when evaluating the content. Ebermayer was not a public prosecutor but the ‘son of a former public prosecutor’ and ‘a dramatist’, therefore unlikely to be Nazi in sympathy. In fact, his diary shows him to be appalled by Hitler’s accession to power. Moreover, the fact that Ebermayer was a dramatist did not mean that he would automatically exaggerate his report for effect. This was a good example of where the use of contextual knowledge about the Day of Potsdam would, in fact, support Ebermayer’s account almost entirely. The only other document where this happened was the confusion over Document D’s dating.

Question 2

The best responses spent some time on the ‘Hitler myth’ and explained it, sometimes very effectively. This had two positive effects. Firstly, it ensured that the response showed engagement with the given factor (i.e. the nature of the Hitler myth), and secondly it ensured that there would be a debate. Better responses also realised that the myth and Hitler’s popularity, while linked, were not necessarily the same thing. The former was, in large part, a construct created by (among others) Goebbels to position Hitler as the ‘super human’, above the pettiness of politics and always ready to rectify that which was wrong once he knew of it. His popularity stemmed as much from the policies pursued by the regime as a whole (e.g. over unemployment, the Treaty of Versailles, restoring national pride through effective foreign policy and, later, successful war etc.). In the context of the myth, a few very effective responses differentiated quite clearly between opposition to the regime and to Hitler himself. Stronger responses began by outlining the nature of the debate and suggesting other factors that might be considered (e.g. the support for Nazism of the institutions of Church and army; the divided nature of the opposition; the role of the police state; the successful socio-economic and foreign policies) but also began with a focus on the Hitler myth, rather than tacking this onto the end of the answer. Finally, stronger responses not only summarised the different factors at the end but attempted to evaluate which of the many factors were the most significant. They also did not get too

distracted by the historiography, and used references to historians relatively sparingly, and then used their own knowledge to evaluate or comment on the interpretations.

Question 3

More successful responses compared and contrasted the two stated factors and, perhaps, placed them in the context of a continual development of policy. Less successful responses interpreted the question as a chance to speak about other factors which had greater significance than the two stated factors. There were some effective comparisons, some of which argued that while the Nuremberg Laws were the legal basis for further persecutions, the greater change was in the radicalisation which began in 1938 and was a forerunner of the tragic acceleration of the Holocaust. Other responses argued that the particular circumstances which led to *Krystallnacht* made it less of a deliberate turning point than the Nuremberg Laws and challenged the view that there was a straight line between the violence of that night and the Holocaust. Thus the question was not answered in a stereotyped way and different views were offered and defended.

Question 4

This was the least popular question. Most responses attempted an analytical approach, with a greater or lesser degree of detail. The best responses clearly had a sound knowledge of the strategy and tactics of both sides as well as an awareness of relative strengths and weaknesses. The less strong responses tended to focus on one or two factors and reiterate them. Most reached a judgement which was consistent with their arguments.

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- Careful attention should be paid to the exact content of the documents in **Section A** so that direct contrasts and comparisons can be made supported by evidence from the text.
- Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the documents in **Section B**.
- Essay questions should be read very carefully to ensure that the question being answered is that which is set.

General Comments

Most candidates demonstrated good understanding of the content of the documents, though there were a small number of instances in which candidates writing answers to the questions in Section A using contextual knowledge as a base and used the sources only as illustration. Many candidates made more appropriate use of contextual knowledge to help inform their analysis of the sources. However, this was a relative weakness, and only a few candidates were able to offer extensive or detailed contextual support for their assessment of the evidence in the documents, even though candidates are aware of the topic area to be examined in **Question 1**. Most answers grouped the documents logically; while this is not a requirement, many candidates used this device successfully to aid evaluation and argument. There were few cases in which candidates omitted to refer to one of the documents, but there were examples of a document not being fully considered. Some answers could have been improved had each of the documents been assessed more evenly or more in relation to its relative importance. In some responses, all of the documents were assessed but there was very limited attention given to what some of the passages said about the key issue; the aspects of the document that were assessed were tangential to the issue whilst more central evidence was not addressed. In stronger responses, the analysis of the sources, the argument and the inclusion of contextual knowledge were all integrated. In other responses, candidates wrote substantial sections of contextual information entirely separately to the sections of their answer that analysed the documents, such that the two were not fully linked.

In some cases, scripts which had good responses to **Question 1(b)** and the essay question scored reliably less highly on **Question 1(a)**. It may be helpful to summarise what is required by the mark scheme and how this is most often achieved by those candidates attaining the highest marks: the differences and similarities relating to the issue in the question should be explained (this is most easily done on a point by point basis) and clearly supported by reference to the documents. Answers in which there is a long treatment of one document followed by a long, separate treatment of the other are unlikely to score highly. Answers must be focused on the exact terms of the question and the comparisons and differences between the documents in relation to those terms. Higher-level marks are awarded for answers which also explain the differences by reference to the nature of the documents. Detailed context is not required except when it explains the differences, such as by noting changes which had occurred between the production of the two texts. Contextual knowledge is valuable when it helps to explain comparison and contrast but is not creditworthy on its own. The key task is comparing and contrasting two closely-studied and comprehended texts.

In the **essay** questions, in the context of a special study, documents studied could illuminate and inform arguments, but many candidates did not enrich their essay responses by giving textual references. There were some responses which made very good use of historiography and evaluated different historical views about the issue in the question. However, as with the Outline Papers, historiography is not a prerequisite for any mark band and adding decontextualised references to historians did not help to further responses.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Answers in the top band showed sharp awareness of similarities and differences, by critically evaluating the documents as well as their provenance. Better answers considered the implications of the differing provenance of each document, particularly the contrasting perspectives of the American John Fairbank and Chinese Premier Chou En-lai. Most candidates dealt with the similarities effectively (most obviously the US military presence, Chinese hostility to Taiwanese independence and the Japanese connection), though a number of answers did not do justice to the differences. In the interests of clarity, candidates who devoted separate paragraphs to similarities and differences tended to fare better. Many candidates dedicated an entire paragraph to the provenance, but sometimes without doing justice to the precise wording of the question (for example, some focused on Taiwan's importance in general, rather than evaluating its **importance to China** specifically).
- (b) The strongest answers clearly understood the documents properly and related the contents and provenance to the demands of the question. Such answers treated the documents as a set and made a critical and accurate judgement as to how convincing each document was for the view that US support for Taiwan was the main reason for tension between China and the USA in the period 1949–1972. However, many introductions ignored the documents and were presented as if this were a normal essay. The best introductions and conclusions were document-driven, and sought to group the documents and treat them as a set, identifying the specific emphasis in individual documents. Historiographical surveys that were not directly linked to the demands of the question could not be rewarded. Some documents were unaccountably neglected, while others were only mentioned in passing and not properly evaluated. The strongest answers did justice to all (or most) of the following: precise focus on 'US support for Taiwan'; evaluating the extent to which this was 'the *main reason* for tension between China and the USA'; covering the broad chronological range between 1949–1972.

Question 2

The stronger answer did justice to the nature of Communist ideals and how this contributed to the 1949 victory, as well as exploring the different aspects of Mao's personal contribution. Weaker answers presented essays on the reasons for the 1949 victory. Although this dealt with a range of well-selected evidence, it did not explicitly deal with the precise demands of the question and failed to explain whether that victory 'owed less to the ideals of Communism and more to the personal appeal of Mao'.

Question 3

The majority of answers approached this question with a logical and coherent structure, producing an essay that explored both the economic and social changes during the period 1949 and 1956. Some answers were descriptive in explaining Mao's economic and social policies without making clear judgements about the extent to which China benefited from them. The strongest answers presented wide-ranging material and were well balanced in addressing both the economic and social changes.

Question 4

Some answers began with a historiographical survey, these answers could have been improved had the candidate also made and presented their own judgement. A number of answers described the characteristics and key features of the Cultural Revolution; answers would have been better had they focused precisely on whether it was motivated more by Mao's 'desire to increase his personal power than by his ideological concerns'. Several candidates touched briefly on the nature and significance of 'his ideological concerns'.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/72

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

Key messages

- Careful attention should be paid to the exact content of the documents in **Section A** so that direct contrasts and comparisons can be made supported by evidence from the text.
- Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the documents in **Section B**.
- Essay questions should be read very carefully to ensure that the question being answered is that which is set.

General Comments

Most candidates demonstrated good understanding of the content of the documents, though there were a small number of instances in which candidates writing answers to the questions in Section A using contextual knowledge as a base and used the sources only as illustration. Many candidates made more appropriate use of contextual knowledge to help inform their analysis of the sources. However, this was a relative weakness, and only a few candidates were able to offer extensive or detailed contextual support for their assessment of the evidence in the documents, even though candidates are aware of the topic area to be examined in **Question 1**. Most answers grouped the documents logically; while this is not a requirement, many candidates used this device successfully to aid evaluation and argument. There were few cases in which candidates omitted to refer to one of the documents, but there were examples of a document not being fully considered. Some answers could have been improved had each of the documents been assessed more evenly or more in relation to its relative importance. In some responses, all of the documents were assessed but there was very limited attention given to what some of the passages said about the key issue; the aspects of the document that were assessed were tangential to the issue whilst more central evidence was not addressed. In stronger responses, the analysis of the sources, the argument and the inclusion of contextual knowledge were all integrated. In other responses, candidates wrote substantial sections of contextual information entirely separately to the sections of their answer that analysed the documents, such that the two were not fully linked.

In some cases, scripts which had good responses to **Question 1(b)** and the essay question scored reliably less highly on **Question 1(a)**. It may be helpful to summarise what is required by the mark scheme and how this is most often achieved by those candidates attaining the highest marks: the differences and similarities relating to the issue in the question should be explained (this is most easily done on a point by point basis) and clearly supported by reference to the documents. Answers in which there is a long treatment of one document followed by a long, separate treatment of the other are unlikely to score highly. Answers must be focused on the exact terms of the question and the comparisons and differences between the documents in relation to those terms. Higher-level marks are awarded for answers which also explain the differences by reference to the nature of the documents. Detailed context is not required except when it explains the differences, such as by noting changes which had occurred between the production of the two texts. Contextual knowledge is valuable when it helps to explain comparison and contrast but is not creditworthy on its own. The key task is comparing and contrasting two closely-studied and comprehended texts.

In the **essay** questions, in the context of a special study, documents studied could illuminate and inform arguments, but many candidates did not enrich their essay responses by giving textual references. There were some responses which made very good use of historiography and evaluated different historical views about the issue in the question. However, as with the Outline Papers, historiography is not a prerequisite for any mark band and adding decontextualised references to historians did not help to further responses.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) The stronger answers did justice to the precise wording of the question, which focused not on Martin Luther King's role in general, but instead 'the part played by Martin Luther King at major civil right demonstrations'. Most candidates identified a range of similarities between the two documents and, generally, related these to the key issue of King's part in 'major civil rights demonstrations'. Far fewer answers identified differences other than time and place (the references to Albany). Few answers commented on the fact that in Document B King talks about calling off the demonstration while in Document D it goes ahead, albeit in reduced form. Some candidates made attempts at using the provenances but the significance of the different points of view of the authors was rarely related to the content of the documents. Similarly, evaluation was often formulaic or asserted, although better candidates suggested how the writers 'bias' might have compromised their recollections.
- (b) The strongest answers did justice to the key word ('inspiration') in the question and related their analysis to the provenance as well as the broader context of the documents. In particular, the question was not asking whether Martin Luther King was inspirational in a general sense, but whether he was an inspiration 'to other civil rights activists'. These strongest answers also tended to group the documents (usually Documents A, C and E for the interpretation; Documents B and D, with parts of Documents A and E against it). This had the benefit of keeping the answer focused on the key issue – how inspirational Dr. King was. There were two clear views in the documents and the better responses used their own knowledge to support statements in the documents. Thus, the positive comments of Documents A and C could be supported by references to the March on Washington and the numbers involved, or the impact that King's oratory had on activists in various cities. Similarly, the comments in Documents B and D could be supported by reference to events on the Edmund Pettus Bridge or the situation in Albany, Georgia or to King's close relationship with the Kennedys and LBJ. Some responses cited historiography ('the Garrow school of thought', 'historical school of thought proposed by Payne') but, without any evidence to show whether that school is credible, and such comments lacked conviction. Better responses also evaluated the reliability of the five documents. The best responses went beyond the *ad hominem* evaluation (e.g. that Document C would be sympathetic, and thus unreliable, as Belafonte helped write King's speech) and used evidence to justify comments. Thus, Document C could indeed be seen as reliable, despite its hyperbole and date, because so many did hear the speech and it has resonated over the years. Likewise, Documents B and D needed to be treated with some care because, although the events they described did happen, both authors had reason to be less than charitable towards King. Weaker responses wrote essays about King's capacity to inspire others and used the documents to illustrate their answer.

Question 2

The stronger answers were precise in addressing the impact of non-violence and the effects it had on the development of the civil rights movement. Those answers that provided a greater chronological range (covering the whole period between 1954 and 1980) were rewarded, as long as the evidence (sit-ins, marches, boycotts, etc.) was not simply described. There was an occasional tendency only to consider the positive impact of non-violence to the relative neglect of the negative effects.

The best responses were clear about the themes that needed to be pursued in respect of non-violence in relation to the development of the movement and not merely in terms of general success: how it made it easier for whites and moderate blacks to support the demands for civil rights; how it won over the media. These responses tried to reach a judgement about the relative significance of non-violence versus violent direct action. Less strong responses commented on the impact of non-violence on different constituencies (the media, whites, etc.) but did so as part of a narrative or descriptions of the non-violent activities and events.

Question 3

Structurally, many candidates took an organisation-based approach, which led some to describe the various organisations, rather than analyse whether 'unity between different civil rights organisations was more apparent than real'. A thematic approach (such as dividing the evidence into organisations, leadership, etc.) tended to work better. Those with a better understanding of the material presented a more nuanced appreciation of the question.

Question 4

The stronger answers tended to structure the material thematically and also considered the extent to which whites supported civil rights (directly or indirectly). A number of answers simply described white opposition, without scrutinising how extensive it actually was.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/06
Personal Investigation

General comments

Personal Investigations this year were written on a wide array of subjects and historical periods, suggesting that candidates were not only ambitious but also made a choice of topic (often beyond the scope of the Outlines papers). Candidates at some Centres wrote their investigations about a narrower range of topics. For the most part, candidates followed the adviser's recommendations given on their Outline Proposal Forms, which was often with regard to the phraseology of questions. A small number of candidates wrote Investigations that differed significantly from the agreed title. Questions/titles that were too broad did not usually result in sharply focused analysis or sufficient depth of detail and explanation. Investigations based on the study of an individual were very popular, with a great enthusiasm for the 'great man' debate; Napoleon and Martin Luther King were the most popular subjects for this type of investigation. Whilst most studies are focused on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries there were also a range of other periods studied. Most studies focused on Europe or America, but work was also seen on China, India and Africa.

More effective Personal Investigations usually answered the question or proposed a line or argument directly and concisely in their introduction. In other cases, there was a tendency to offer either a scene-setting and descriptive paragraph and/or a historiographical review, without making a particular judgement or setting out a line of argument that would be taken to answer the question. In some cases, there was a page or more of introductory material, which did not work as effectively as a brief, direct and analytical paragraph.

Most candidates were careful in adhering to the word limit and so there were only a few cases in which the examiner was unable to read the conclusion (on account of a candidate exceeding the word limit). A very small number of candidates integrated more material in the footnotes which was more properly material that should have been in the body of the essay and went beyond the conventional academic use of footnotes. Such material would be counted within the word limit, unlike material that adhered to the conventional use of footnotes to cite references. Bibliographies can be quite revealing about the depth and breadth of research done by candidates. Those who used the internet extensively often underestimated the breadth and depth of research that was required, opting for rather basic historical websites rather than more demanding academic articles such as those available via JSTOR and other providers. Candidates should deploy great caution if consulting sources that are open-source and not subject to peer review or professional editing, such as Wikipedia, though there was some excellent use of online and print primary sources where documents were contrasted and compared, investigated, evaluated and unpacked in relation to the argument.

The stronger Investigations provided a clear sense of direction, with each paragraph advancing a new argument and sustaining it throughout the essay. In the most effective writing, the type of analysis that is generally evident in a conclusion was presented and maintained throughout the essay. The more effective essays provided wide-ranging evidence to support an argument that had already been clearly established. In less effective Investigations, the thread of the argument was lost in some writing, often because of the inclusion of a large volume of material that was not presented with clear connections to the argument, leading to causal narrative at best and in some cases simple description. Some Investigations could have been improved had the paragraph structure been coherent with the arguments being put forward. A number of essays divided paragraphs into events, key figures or chronological periods, which encouraged narration instead of evaluation. In some Investigations, candidates introduced some very well developed comparisons and links with other countries and periods, but in some cases the links or comparisons made did not advance the argument and were ahistorical. Where valid historical links can be made this can further an argument, but not making a comparison at all is preferable to making a superficial and/or anachronistic, perhaps in an effort to 'tick a box' and fulfil a perceived requirement. The mark scheme is intentionally flexible on this matter. Particularly in Investigations focussing on causation, some Investigations could have been improved if candidates carefully weigh up the significance of short term factors. For example, in some Investigations on the causes of the February revolution, for example, there was (curiously) greater focus on 1905 than 1917. The stronger Investigations presented a much sharper focus on the precise wording of the question, for

example, not elaborating on somebody's motives when this was clearly not the requirement. Equally significant is the way in which candidates introduced and interpreted sources. The best Investigations used the sources as part of an argument but in other Investigations there were many instances in which candidates substituted historian's words for their voice but did not unpack the meaning or context of the quote, such as exploring the reasoning and evidence used by that historian when he or she wrote their view, critiquing its relevance with reference to the Investigation's question/title and the argument being made. The best Investigations analysed the source material rather than just explaining or rephrasing its view.

Regarding the use of source material, it is also worth considering the following:

- The best investigations typically used brief quotes and used quotes from a range of sources. Weaker investigations sometimes included lengthy quotations from historians and/or a single historian or narrow range of historians overly dominated the footnotes, indicating that candidates had borrowed heavily from a single source. This approach typically leads to a narration or explanation of that historian's argument rather than an interrogation of it and its relevance to the Investigation's question/title or the argument being made in response to it, which is what characterised the stronger Investigations.
- Some Investigations featured a series of quotations that appeared to have been copied or cut and pasted, with minimal reflection and input from the candidate. Unanalysed quotes from historians do not contribute to or further the argument. In better Investigations all quotations were critically assessed in context.
- Quotations in some Investigations were not footnoted. In the strongest Investigations, footnoting was used clearly to establish the provenance of the source so that words/space in the body of the essay could be used for critical evaluation of the evidence contained within the quote and argument about how the approach, view or information embodied or exemplified in the quotation helped to further the argument made.
- In weaker Investigations, candidates sometimes used the phrase 'some historians argue' without specifying individual historians or their works. In stronger investigations the historians were typically specified but more importantly their approach and views and the evidence they used was analysed so that the relevance of the view(s) they express could be critically assessed in the context of the specific Investigation.
- In the best Investigations, analysis of source reliability was clearly contextualised, so that the candidates said in what ways a source could be considered relevant in the context of the specific argument being made. Weaker Investigations sometimes assessed the reliability of the sources separately to the argument, such as saying that 'historian x is reliable as a source because he is a professor at university y' rather than asking 'for what?' evidence might be considered reliable and why.

In some weaker Investigations, candidates alluded to historiographical debates that were not directly related to the demands of the question, for which they could not be rewarded. Where historiographical debates were used successfully in stronger Investigations it was because the context, approach and evidence used by proponents of these schools or historians was analysed and in doing so the relevance of the findings, views or approach to the specific question/title of the candidate's Investigation was clearly explained in such a way that it strengthened the argument being made so as to better answer the question in the title.

The strongest Investigations were those that thoroughly digested the literature and imposed their own stamp on the material and the argument in order to answer the question they had set themselves in the title. Some Investigations focussed almost entirely on the description of an historical debate but without focus on addressing the question directly and as such did not score well. The strongest Investigations were those in which very effective critical evaluation of sources tended to be focused directly on the precise demands of the question.