

HISTORY

Paper 9769/11
British History Outlines c300-1547

Key Messages

Candidates should:

- Read the question and note every key word and concept
- Avoid reproducing answers which have been done to similar questions
- Think carefully about judgements about the relative importance of explanations
- Make judgements if the question calls for this
- Avoid writing overlong answers which include factual material for its own sake – knowledge should be used flexibly
- Pace themselves for three full and focused essays
- Try to give equal weight to each answer and avoid rushing the planning of the third answer.

General Comments

In the essay papers, knowledge was often strong, and the best candidates were those who addressed the question directly. Other candidates seemed eager to show knowledge and understanding of issues related to the question, but would have benefited from reading the question with sufficient care to notice key words and concepts which had to be addressed. Generally, stronger answers showed that the question had been ‘unpacked’ and any concepts considered before the essay was started. Less successful answers began with prepared knowledge and arguments and attempted to link the question to what sometimes seemed to be material which would have been set down regardless of the precise question on the topic concerned.

In general, explanation was stronger than evaluation and judgement. There is a difference between a question which asks ‘why?’ and a question which asks ‘what best explains?’ Better candidates take more time to think and plan how to deal with questions which require a judgement of the relative importance of causes or consequences. Any concepts in questions have to be tackled directly – the ‘national interests’ of foreign policy do need to be defined before any meaningful discussion of statesmen’s success in meeting them, for instance. Whether a policy is successful often depends on understanding what it was trying to achieve. Some candidates attempted to write too much, sometimes including factual information at the expense of explanation. Rather than weight of facts, their flexible use in support of arguments and judgements will produce good responses. The communication of supported argument is vital and good, legible handwriting helps the examiners to follow the flow of candidate arguments. Style was often a very strong point and there was elegant and mature expression which showed that candidates had read some good models. The comments below do have recurrent themes – the presence of excellent, thoughtful and well-expressed work is an important one. Also, there is the need to read questions carefully and respond to the exact wording. Questions are very carefully considered and candidates should weigh up every word of the question set. It is essential to respond in a fresh way to the question rather than to reproduce an answer done previously to what seems a similar question, but which turns out to have a different thrust.

Stronger candidates gave themselves time to reflect on the precise requirements of the question and did not feel impelled to begin conveying information about the topic at the very start but instead took time to plan and to establish the requirements and parameters of the question. Of course, strong factual support is needed to back up these well planned and organised essays, but it needs to be deployed with discrimination.

It was encouraging that candidates did not often offer a fragmentary and hurried final answer and did plan their time. Inevitably, there was often some unevenness in the three essays – but the stronger answers were not always done first and the weaker ones not always last. Some sign of haste was seen when candidates did not always grasp the implications of the final question as well as they had for the first. So perhaps there is some benefit in looking at the three questions chosen at the start.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

There were some sound explanations of the debate and good argument was put forward for both points of view, with the contrasts between archaeological and other evidence noted.

Question 2

Most candidates questioned the completeness of the evidence and were able to show the difficulties in using sources like Gildas and the early Anglo - Saxon Chronicle. They were generally aware of recent debate on this issue and suggested that the settlements were gradual and in some cases, relatively peaceful.

Question 4

Most candidates focused on the question but some tended to describe the supremacy of Northumbria, rather than accounting for it and some concentrated on the control of the north as opposed to power further south. There was some good use of evidence from Bede about the links with Kent and the campaigns fought in quite distant parts to illustrate the extent of Northumbrian penetration.

Question 5

Some of the answers to this question would have been improved with a more detailed knowledge of what the kings achieved beyond bringing in the churchmen. The churchmen were well covered from Augustine to Wilfred and they had universal support as the main conveyors of Christianity in England. Some candidates diverged into the Synod of Whitby and associated problems.

Question 7

Candidates generally voted for Offa and not just because of the Dyke. They saw Aethelbald as the layer of the foundations of the Mercian state but Offa as taking it to 'a whole new plane,' as a result of his encouragement of trade, relations with Charlemagne and the Papacy and, of course, defences through the Dyke. Evidence from written sources and artefacts such as coins was well used.

Question 8

Alfred's military successes were well known and explained but the conclusion drawn was often that it was his cultural achievements which set him apart from the other powerful Anglo-Saxon rulers, who were not, therefore, termed 'Great'. The detail on his contribution to the advance of learning and the arts could have been stronger.

Question 12

There was generally a sound focus on the terms of the question with varying judgements being reached about the wisdom of Harold's actions. Some candidates identified a series of actions and assessed them, while others chose to outline well-judged and then ill-judged decisions. There was some debate about whether his reactions to the threat and invasion of William of Normandy were wise or not.

Question 13

Better candidates wrote about William's success and not the methods he used to crush opposition. Some candidates seemed to want to answer the latter and there was a good deal of description of how William dealt with rebels at Exeter, in East Anglia and in the North, with the Harrying of the North featuring strongly. More successful candidates tried to evaluate William's success, pointing out that his earlier, more lenient reactions had led to more rebellion, whereas the later draconian measures stopped uprisings, but were a disaster in economic and social terms, as the Domesday Survey revealed.

Question 15

Candidates found it easier to write about Henry I as the 'Lion of English Justice' and most were able to explain clearly how this was an accurate description. They were less confident with Henry 'preying upon his people', not being convinced that his methods of government quite merited such an extreme term.

Question 22

Candidates seemed to tackle this question with enthusiasm and had plenty of ideas about the answer. They largely blamed the personalities of the chief protagonists, the one too easy going and the other too arrogant. The evenness of the two factions and the volatility of some of their support were further factors and the church came in for some criticism in not doing as much as it could to end the strife. Candidates pointed out that the final resolution depended a good deal on random events such as the death of Stephen's son and on the fierce determination of the young Henry (II to be). As these did not come into play earlier, they helped to explain why neither side could win.

Question 24

This question produced some very strong responses which argued with plenty of support that Richard was not needed in England, since his bureaucracy functioned well without him, perhaps even better than when he was present. In addition his reputation as a renowned soldier boosted the reputation of the crown. The ability of the English to pay his ransom and then later, heavy taxation raised by both Richard and John, further demonstrated the underlying strength of the crown. There was an alternative viewpoint based on some traditional arguments and Robin Hood was not entirely written out of the scenario.

HISTORY

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

Key Messages

Candidates should:

- Read the question and note every key word and concept
- Avoid reproducing answers which have been done to similar questions
- Think carefully about judgements about the relative importance of explanations
- Make judgements if the question calls for this
- Avoid writing overlong answers which include factual material for its own sake – knowledge should be used flexibly
- Pace themselves for three full and focused essays
- Try to give equal weight to each answer and avoid rushing the planning of the third answer.

General Comments

In the essay papers, knowledge was often strong, and the best candidates were those who addressed the question directly. Other candidates seemed eager to show knowledge and understanding of issues related to the question, but would have benefited from reading the question with sufficient care to notice key words and concepts which had to be addressed. Generally, stronger answers showed that the question had been ‘unpacked’ and any concepts considered before the essay was started. Less successful answers began with prepared knowledge and arguments and attempted to link the question to what sometimes seemed to be material which would have been set down regardless of the precise question on the topic concerned.

In general, explanation was stronger than evaluation and judgement. There is a difference between a question which asks ‘why?’ and a question which asks ‘what best explains?’ Better candidates take more time to think and plan how to deal with questions which require a judgement of the relative importance of causes or consequences. Any concepts in questions have to be tackled directly – the ‘national interests’ of foreign policy do need to be defined before any meaningful discussion of statesmen’s success in meeting them, for instance. Whether a policy is successful often depends on understanding what it was trying to achieve. Some candidates attempted to write too much, sometimes including factual information at the expense of explanation. Rather than weight of facts, their flexible use in support of arguments and judgements will produce good responses. The communication of supported argument is vital and good, legible handwriting helps the examiners to follow the flow of candidate arguments. Style was often a very strong point and there was elegant and mature expression which showed that candidates had read some good models. The comments below do have recurrent themes – the presence of excellent, thoughtful and well-expressed work is an important one. Also, there is the need to read questions carefully and respond to the exact wording. Questions are very carefully considered and candidates should weigh up every word of the question set. It is essential to respond in a fresh way to the question rather than to reproduce an answer done previously to what seems a similar question, but which turns out to have a different thrust.

Stronger candidates gave themselves time to reflect on the precise requirements of the question and did not feel impelled to begin conveying information about the topic at the very start but instead took time to plan and to establish the requirements and parameters of the question. Of course, strong factual support is needed to back up these well planned and organised essays, but it needs to be deployed with discrimination.

It was encouraging that candidates did not often offer a fragmentary and hurried final answer and did plan their time. Inevitably, there was often some unevenness in the three essays – but the stronger answers were not always done first and the weaker ones not always last. Some sign of haste was seen when candidates did not always grasp the implications of the final question as well as they had for the first. So perhaps there is some benefit in looking at the three questions chosen at the start.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 8

Good candidates focused on stability. Others gave a list of the achievements of Henry VII and some included long accounts of foreign policy, in trying to argue that its successes contributed to stability at home. This had possibilities but there were plenty of other aspects to consider. On the issue of descriptions of the pretenders and their activities, the defeat of these aspirants to the throne was relevant but Warbeck's tour of Europe was not. The best answers looked at aspects of Henry's policies which promoted stability and then those which tended to lead to unrest. The uncontested succession of Henry VIII was often seen to be the proof that Henry VII had been successful.

Question 9

Candidates picked up the word *entirely* and mostly argued that Henry had other motives in addition. There was good exposition of the dynastic motives, with varying opinions as to exactly what this encompassed. Some argued that Henry's desire for Anne Boleyn was dynastic, while others saw it as purely lustful. Financial gain was less fully explored, with candidates aware that the Break with Rome produced little benefit. The Dissolution may have been far more profitable, but candidates felt it was not part of the original motivation. There was sound analysis of the extent to which Henry was influenced by political theory and some argued that becoming Head of the Church held a huge appeal for him and that this could thus be defined as dynastic since it enhanced the power of his dynasty.

Question 11

Candidates did need to engage with the terms of the question and specifically consider damage to the Tudor Monarchy. Too many focused on the problems of the period and some considered how seriously they impacted on the government, without examining the effect on monarchical power. There was a good deal of description of the policies of the various regimes. Those who did understand the implications of the question mostly argued that the Tudor monarchy emerged largely unscathed and the long reign of Elizabeth ensured this condition was permanent.

Question 12

Some candidates could have improved their responses by appreciating that the reasons changed over the period of the reign. Others needed to adjust their focus so that it was not too much on the early part of the period and the lack of papal action and general inertia in England, while the failure of an alternative monarch to win support and the limited achievement of the Jesuit and Seminary priests could have been better covered. The length of Elizabeth's reign was often quoted as a reason and, where ranking was attempted; most candidates felt this was the prime cause.

Question 14

Good candidates assessed the seriousness of problems, rather than just describe them. Some were able to argue that the problems largely arose from the fading regime of an ageing queen and so were not endemic. The futility of Essex's rebellion and the easy accession of James I proved their case. The alternative view was that Elizabeth's loss of control put the state in real danger from discontent over a wide range of the population.

Question 16

This question elicited answers which argued the case for both viewpoints quite effectively. The evidence that it needed reform came from examples like Wolsey, monastic wealth, the Hunne case and the presence of critics within it. The alternative view was rooted in the general satisfaction perceived by worshippers and the various ways in which this was shown. The Papacy was more marginal, except where it impinged on the English church and the many deficiencies of Alexander VI were not relevant, although widely known.

Question 19

This question could have been answered better, as candidates argued that religion was the prime mover in rebellions and discounted dynastic challenges, once the reign of Henry VII was over. There was some description of rebellions and these answers tended not to score highly as there was too much material to be covered in this way. The more successful answers grouped their examples around a variety of factors, having dealt first with the factor in the question.

Question 22

Candidates needed to focus on difficulties. Some argued that James, especially early in his reign, had quite good relations with Parliament, but this was not where the question was focused. Better answers tried to apportion blame and the best were able to argue that the Stuart monarchs were not solely responsible, citing the sabotage of the Great Contract and the refusal to grant Charles I traditional revenues among other evidence. The unresolved problems inherited from Elizabeth I could have been better analysed.

Question 23

While some challenge to the assumptions of a question is welcome, many candidates asserted that people were not especially divided on religious issues in this period. As the question referred to British people, Scotland and Ireland were relevant and, indeed, crucial in the latter part of the period. The development of Puritanism to become less tolerant towards mainstream practices and the spread of Arminianism were seen as important factors, along with the attitudes of the monarchs. Here Charles I was seen as far more divisive than his father.

Question 28

Candidates would have benefited from greater knowledge on this question and by providing more explanation - beyond lingering prejudice and economic fears. Some candidates spent longer on why, despite this antagonism, the Union was achieved, which was less central to the argument.

Question 29

Better answers suggested that ideas mattered far more than politics which became irrelevant once tainted with Jacobitism.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/13

British History Outlines c.1689-2000

Key Messages

Candidates should:

- Read the question and note every key word and concept
- Avoid reproducing answers which have been done to similar questions
- Think carefully about judgements about the relative importance of explanations
- Make judgements if the question calls for this
- Avoid writing overlong answers which include factual material for its own sake – knowledge should be used flexibly
- Pace themselves for three full and focused essays
- Try to give equal weight to each answer and avoid rushing the planning of the third answer.

General Comments

In the essay papers, knowledge was often strong, and the best candidates were those who addressed the question directly. Other candidates seemed eager to show knowledge and understanding of issues related to the question, but would have benefited from reading the question with sufficient care to notice key words and concepts which had to be addressed. Generally, stronger answers showed that the question had been ‘unpacked’ and any concepts considered before the essay was started. Less successful answers began with prepared knowledge and arguments and attempted to link the question to what sometimes seemed to be material which would have been set down regardless of the precise question on the topic concerned.

In general, explanation was stronger than evaluation and judgement. There is a difference between a question which asks ‘why?’ and a question which asks ‘what best explains?’ Better candidates take more time to think and plan how to deal with questions which require a judgement of the relative importance of causes or consequences. Any concepts in questions have to be tackled directly – the ‘national interests’ of foreign policy do need to be defined before any meaningful discussion of statesmen’s success in meeting them, for instance. Whether a policy is successful often depends on understanding what it was trying to achieve. Some candidates attempted to write too much, sometimes including factual information at the expense of explanation. Rather than weight of facts, their flexible use in support of arguments and judgements will produce good responses. The communication of supported argument is vital and good, legible handwriting helps the examiners to follow the flow of candidate arguments. Style was often a very strong point and there was elegant and mature expression which showed that candidates had read some good models. The comments below do have recurrent themes – the presence of excellent, thoughtful and well-expressed work is an important one. Also, there is the need to read questions carefully and respond to the exact wording. Questions are very carefully considered and candidates should weigh up every word of the question set. It is essential to respond in a fresh way to the question rather than to reproduce an answer done previously to what seems a similar question, but which turns out to have a different thrust.

Stronger candidates gave themselves time to reflect on the precise requirements of the question and did not feel impelled to begin conveying information about the topic at the very start but instead took time to plan and to establish the requirements and parameters of the question. Of course, strong factual support is needed to back up these well planned and organised essays, but it needs to be deployed with discrimination.

It was encouraging that candidates did not often offer a fragmentary and hurried final answer and did plan their time. Inevitably, there was often some unevenness in the three essays – but the stronger answers were not always done first and the weaker ones not always last. Some sign of haste was seen when candidates did not always grasp the implications of the final question as well as they had for the first. So perhaps there is some benefit in looking at the three questions chosen at the start.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 7

Better answers assessed factors and some suggested that diplomatically Britain had not lost that much ground in any case. Most answers ran the two aspects together, but some tried to differentiate. Some found it hard to analyse and instead described advances in India and Canada, and also used the fact that Britain recovered her naval superiority quite quickly.

Question 9

Candidates knew plenty about the achievements of Pitt and wrote readily about them. Some would have benefited from looking at the dual threats in a more coherent way, most preferring to take each threat separately. Some pointed out that the increasing excesses of the revolutionaries and the outbreak of war made his repression at home and his financial expedients more acceptable.

Question 10

There were some good answers to this question, taking up different viewpoints. Some candidates looked at events in Ireland to prove coercion, while others concentrated on the British angle to argue the opposite. The outcome was generally felt to be better for Britain than for Ireland.

Question 17

There were good answers which focused on the leadership qualities of Liverpool and his ability to maintain unity, adapt to changing circumstances and deal with key cabinet personalities. There was an understanding here of the political realities of the period and the role of prime minister. This is a different question to 'write about the successes and failures of Liverpool' and the question says 'assess', which implies a judgement and not just a description of some elements of policies followed with a comment. Clearly, good candidates had read enough to be 'inside' the Liverpool period and to be able to judge him as prime minister, rather than offering indiscriminating material on the whole period. His long period of office deserves to be analysed in terms of his political leadership and it was pleasing that some did see the thrust of the question clearly.

Question 18

Good candidates engaged directly with objectives and offered a clear overall judgement based on an understanding of what the two men were trying to achieve. Less successful candidates outlined the policies and offered some comments. The question did not rule out a comparison, but the main element was linking policy to aims. Canning's statements were often better known than what they actually referred to, and there was some misunderstanding of policy towards Greece, and also of the Congress System and Castlereagh's attitudes to it.

Question 19

Some definition of terms helped better candidates to offer a balanced judgement. For others, this question would have been more effectively tackled if they had concentrated less on material about the degree of change achieved by the Act. The concept of 'great' needed to be more fully engaged with and hence some answers were over reliant on explaining how far the act changed the system and assuming that 'great' referred to how far change was effected or how far Britain became 'democratic'. Candidates could have improved their answers by showing an awareness of why the Act was seen as necessary by its supporters and by a greater focus on the terms of the question.

Question 20

Better answers engaged with this at a very good level. There were some thoughtful responses which challenged the view behind the question, arguing that Peel pursued Conservative if not Tory principles. Political ideas and principles can be a challenge for candidates and some were hazy about what 'liberal principles' meant. Rather than outlining some policies and then trying to say whether they were liberal or not, candidates' factual material would be better deployed in supporting arguments. There was some uncertainty about the measures that should be discussed and oddly, the Repeal of the Corn Laws was neglected by some and others clearly showed their wish to discuss 'Peel the Great Betrayer'.

Question 22

This showed some sound knowledge about the possible reasons for the outcome of the election and the best responses offered a judgement, thereby responding to 'to what extent'. The best candidates are those who have moved on from the list approach whereby explanations are rehearsed at the expense of genuine assessment. Gladstone thought that he had been borne down in a torrent of gin and beer but few answers offered much about the licensing act or the education act. The view that aristocratic discontent had much sway in terms of votes seemed rather unlikely but occupied a disproportionate number of lines in some essays. There were strong analyses of Disraeli's tactics and electoral appeal, as well as knowledge of the Tory reorganisation. Some were less certain how to relate Ireland to the question, despite some lengthy accounts of the reforms.

Question 24

Answers to this question tended to be descriptions of how the Labour party emerged. The role of the trade unions was mentioned but this would have benefited from fuller analysis.

Question 26

The two possible motives in the question would have benefited from more equal coverage, with hatred of the aristocracy figuring as important for Lloyd George, but fear of the working classes, or, at least, that they would vote for the Labour party, playing a larger role. Some suggested that even Lloyd George used the aristocracy as a convenient stalking horse without being implacably opposed to them. Domestic policies could be seen as encompassing Ireland, but other motives were generally viewed as being at work there. Some candidates argued that humanitarian considerations were paramount.

Question 27

There were some sound and balanced analyses at the top end, with a discussion of elements which had been successful and elements which seemed less so. Some could have covered more fully the later period after the Famine and some went beyond the end date, so once again a reading of the question is vital. Some candidates did not observe that this question ended in 1870, and ran over into the 1880s. The Phoenix Park Murders often featured. There was plenty of material, and better candidates made a judicious selection. Most were able to discuss the success of Catholic Emancipation and the failure of efforts to deal with the famine of the 1840s. Some went on to consider the Manchester martyrs and the impact of the early Gladstonian legislation. There were some who argued that there was mostly success, while others felt that the grudging granting of emancipation, the slow response to the famine, the failure of the Maynooth grant and the inadequacy of Gladstone's Land Act all pointed to a lack of success.

Question 33

This question produced some strong knowledge, with answers going beyond Haig to commanders who did not conform to the stereotype, like Allenby. Sometimes revisionism seemed to go too far – defenders of Haig should engage with the Passchendaele campaign and there might be more discussion of tactical abilities, even if the view is taken that strategic opportunities were limited and progress was made in developing the skills of the army and its weaponry. Some became a little caught up in discussion about the use of new technology and whether the generals helped or hindered this.

Question 34

This was a popular and well answered question, where candidates really focused on the terms of the question. Better answers offered a genuine and sustained discussion of the key element in the question, seeing the implications of the precise wording and offering different possible ways of looking at the issues. Sometimes, greater coverage of the post-war issues might have made the arguments more convincing. Some, however, did argue vigorously that Lloyd George had plenty of freedom of action, with numerous examples, so much so that in the end, his policy making became so independent that it brought his fall. Others felt that he was constrained by the lack of a party to back him and that this became worse as the ministry proceeded. One candidate felt the word *merely* could never be accurately applied to Lloyd George.

Question 35

This question did not require an account of the events of the General Strike, but some candidates provided one. Others explained the causes and consequences clearly and one or two made the point that the miners caused the strike and that the worst consequences fell on them.

Question 36

This question invited analysis of the policy's popularity and whether it was 'misconceived'. Some candidates found it a challenge to 'unpack' this question. They would have benefited from looking at *politically popular*, and some just analysed how far appeasement was *popular* with the general public. *Fundamentally misconceived* was better done, but rarely well covered as candidates could argue for and against *misconceived* but did not often engage with *fundamentally*. Better answers broke down possible areas of 'misconception'. There were some good responses, one arguing that the policy was popular with all parties, with the exception of Churchill, and rooted in a concern for British interests and so far from being fundamentally misconceived. Some good answers discussed the ideas behind the policy and whether it is fair to see them as misconceived given Chamberlain's low private opinion of Hitler and the way that Britain was rearmed. There were some well sustained discussions, and candidates should notice 'How far do you agree?' and see that this is different from 'Explain why Chamberlain appeased Hitler'. Some candidates would have been better advised to look at the question more closely, rather than advancing justifications for appeasement, or what appeared to be pre-prepared treatments of the issue.

Question 37

Stronger answers addressed why independence was granted so rapidly after 1945. There were some good explanations which dealt with factors both in post-war Britain and in India, which led Britain to withdraw. Some answers saw some very long term causes, going back to Amritsar; these were of less relevance, given the terms of the question. Some did manage to analyse the situation in 1945, mostly arguing that the economic situation at home, coupled with the violence in India, were the decisive motivating forces. Some of the short term factors such as the roles of individuals like Mountbatten and Jinnah could have featured in more responses.

Question 38

Answers to this question mostly showed understanding, although the supporting material could have been fuller in some cases. Better responses offered both long-term analysis of Britain's view of her relations with the Commonwealth, and with the USA. Some offered some rather anachronistic reasons, but generally this produced quite well focused if rather thin answers.

Question 39

Answers tended to be descriptive of the end of empire. The long time period and a wide range of material required could have been better handled by some.

Question 42

There were some rather generalised responses offered here, and these would have been improved by better factual support.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/21

European History Outlines c.300-c.1516

Key Messages

Candidates should:

- Respond to the question set and read every word carefully
- Avoid rushing to offer knowledge and explanation for its own sake – make sure everything is closely related to the question
- Make judgements clear – especially if asked about the relative weight of explanation
- Make key elements in the question (if there are any) the focus of the response, rather than quickly dismissing them in order to write about other factors
- Try to offer three answers of consistent standard
- Understand that quantity is much less important than a thoughtful and considered response to the question set.

General Comments

Comments made on the essay answers to the British Outlines papers are applicable to these papers. Many thoughtful and well organised answers were seen and these were a pleasure to read. There was some excellent historical writing and candidates did clearly show an interest in the subject. In general, where questions invited judgements, these were offered, and few candidates produced excessively descriptive answers. There were times when there was a need for the questions to be read more carefully and 'unpacked', and some candidates made too many assumptions, not responding directly enough to what was being asked. For example, if a question asks if reforms created more problems than they solved, the essential starting point is, 'what problems were the changes intended to solve'? Some candidates rushed into explanation or even description of the main elements and left the analysis either to the end of each section or at the end of the answer. Better responses started with the possible discussion, and organised answers round that, so that information was being deployed to support arguments. Thus an answer about Germany's responsibility for the First World War would begin with outlining the points at issue, rather than an account of the Moroccan Crises and the comment that this shows Germany was to blame. Also, the pre-prepared list of causes or consequences which lacks a sense of discrimination between elements is not as effective a way of answering the question 'What best explains?' as addressing arguments about relative importance, and using information to support evaluation. Few 'ran out of steam' in the third answer, but sometimes final answers could have been better supported, so an aim might be to produce consistently strong answers.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 8

Answers to this question largely felt Charlemagne was effective and used the success of his campaigns apart from the Roncesvalles disaster as evidence. Some suggested that the length of time it took him to vanquish the Saxons showed he was not entirely successful. Detail could have been fuller and assertions of success would have benefited from the inclusion of examples.

Question 9

There was some debate in the answers to this question. The Treaty of Verdun was viewed as crucial by some, but others felt that the Carolingian Empire was unsustainable in the long run and so was bound to break up. Answers were well focused on possible explanations and reached a supported judgement.

Question 11

This question attracted a good deal of description of Otto's relationship with the German duchies and then some evaluation of his success in the conclusion. Better answers were able to show that Otto enjoyed some success in getting his supporters into key roles, but that separatist tendencies remained strong.

Question 14

Candidates generally felt that Gregory VII's intransigence was the main factor in provoking the Investiture Contest, although others indicated that some of his opponents were equally determined. Some candidates wrote about the Papal Reform movement as a whole, rather than keeping to the focus of the question. In some responses, the Investiture Contest needed to feature much more prominently.

Question 16

The most successful answers to this question established at the start what Frederick Barbarossa's aims were in Italy, and then assessed how far he pursued them consistently. Most concluded that after attempting to reduce the Lombards by force over many years, his policies changed to being more conciliatory, but his aims remained much the same. Some candidates described Frederick's invasions of Italy in some detail, but often this approach would have benefited from a better focus and greater coherence.

Question 17

Most candidates felt that the advance of the French monarchy in this period was the result of the hard work and persistence of the monarchs themselves. This question was well answered, as candidates used an analytical approach and tried to evaluate the importance of the factors. The counter-argument was usually that the great rivals of the Capetians, namely the Angevins, were, in the end, undone by their family quarrels. Good supporting detail was deployed.

Question 18

Most candidates thought Philip Augustus deserved all the praise heaped on him and some described him as the best king the French have ever had. Some outlined his achievements, and they would have improved their responses by explaining why these made him so great. Others made assertions, without showing the impact of his policies. His success, despite being a less skilful soldier than Richard I, was especially applauded.

Question 19

Candidates tended to concentrate more on *how* Innocent III enforced his views than on *how effectively*. Some attempted judgements which would have been better if they had first made clear what Innocent's views were. The main examples quoted were the Pope's dealings with Philip II and with King John, as both of these cases involved challenges to papal claims, and Innocent was felt to have come off best in these encounters. Some candidates considered the long term impact of Papal intervention in secular matters.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/22

European History Outlines c.1378-c.1815

Key Messages

Candidates should:

- Respond to the question set and read every word carefully
- Avoid rushing to offer knowledge and explanation for its own sake – make sure everything is closely related to the question
- Make judgements clear – especially if asked about the relative weight of explanation
- Make key elements in the question (if there are any) the focus of the response, rather than quickly dismissing them in order to write about other factors
- Try to offer three answers of consistent standard
- Understand that quantity is much less important than a thoughtful and considered response to the question set.

General Comments

Comments made on the essay answers to the British Outlines papers are applicable to these papers. Many thoughtful and well organised answers were seen and these were a pleasure to read. There was some excellent historical writing and candidates did clearly show an interest in the subject. In general, where questions invited judgements, these were offered, and few candidates produced excessively descriptive answers. There were times when there was a need for the questions to be read more carefully and 'unpacked', and some candidates made too many assumptions, not responding directly enough to what was being asked. For example, if a question asks if reforms created more problems than they solved, the essential starting point is, 'what problems were the changes intended to solve'? Some candidates rushed into explanation or even description of the main elements and left the analysis either to the end of each section or at the end of the answer. Better responses started with the possible discussion, and organised answers round that, so that information was being deployed to support arguments. Thus an answer about Germany's responsibility for the First World War would begin with outlining the points at issue, rather than an account of the Moroccan Crises and the comment that this shows Germany was to blame. Also, the pre-prepared list of causes or consequences which lacks a sense of discrimination between elements is not as effective a way of answering the question 'What best explains?' as addressing arguments about relative importance, and using information to support evaluation. Few 'ran out of steam' in the third answer, but sometimes final answers could have been better supported, so an aim might be to produce consistently strong answers.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 7

Whilst the motives of young ambitious rulers were well assessed, some candidates missed opportunities in answering this question. A better appreciation of the justification put forward by France and Spain for their invasions, or the various factors which made Italy so attractive to invaders, would have improved responses. Much of the focus of less successful responses was on events in the 1520s and the interventions of the fifteenth century could have been more widely covered.

Question 8

Candidates answering this would have improved their responses by displaying more sufficient knowledge. Once candidates had explained the significance of the fall of Constantinople they needed to extend their analysis beyond a list of other conquests.

Question 16

The motives behind Philip II's foreign policy were often fully discussed in answer to this question. His religious and dynastic ambitions were considered. The material could have been better related to the idea of a *grand strategy*, and some responses seemed unsure as to what the term meant. Better answers analysed evidence which supported the idea, often drawn from later in his reign, and then the alternative view, often based on his truce with the Turks. Some candidates included material on the Dutch Revolt, but this was a domestic concern.

Question 17

Some candidates chose to focus on identifying the methods used by the monarchs and then to evaluate their effectiveness. This worked well, as it enabled candidates to look at examples of conciliation and more forceful methods. Most answers argued that none of the attempts were very successful until Henry IV conceded the Edict of Nantes, which largely settled the issue for the next century. Less successful answers concentrated on a few key events and some got no further than the Massacre of St Bartholomew.

Question 19

Candidates could argue quite readily that the church was, indeed, slow to respond, but their answers then needed to go on and consider whether this tardiness had disastrous outcomes. There were some better responses which mostly suggested that the motives for secular rulers were so strong that reform would not have stopped them from throwing off papal authority. Some answers missed the fact that the question referred to the sixteenth century and included material about attempts at reform before 1500. This was not relevant, unless it was used to argue that these efforts had failed then to stem discontent and they were unlikely to be any more effective later.

Question 21

This was a popular and generally well answered question. Candidates had plenty of relevant information and could group their material effectively into strengths and weaknesses. They were aware of debates about this issue. Some answers could have been more balanced, often spending too long on the weaknesses, and some needed more exemplification to support their general points. Most candidates were able to reach a supported judgement about whether the church had more strengths than weaknesses.

Question 24

Answers to this question mostly concluded that there were other important motives and usually identified religion as a key factor. For some, the factors in the question could have been more adequately addressed, and in particular, the acquisition of slaves needed more discussion. Prester John and the legends surrounding him were frequently mentioned.

Question 25

Candidates needed to develop their answers beyond the fact that rising populations led to stress all round, to a shortage of jobs and to increases in poverty. Some answers would have been improved with the inclusion of more detail on the consequences in different locations and also more assessment of the seriousness of the problem and the impact on discontent.

Question 26

This question was very popular and many candidates were very well informed on the topic. A series of factors ranging from misogyny in general, to fear of lone women, to the social role of women in situations where sudden death could occur, were outlined. Some candidates pointed out that there were parts of Europe where the statement was not true. There were a few answers of a sensationalist nature but most of the analysis was well-founded and enlightening.

Question 29

The general consensus in the answers to this question was that Gustavus Adolphus had addressed the short term interests of Sweden but that in the longer term the outcome of his reign was less successful. Some candidates suggested his main failing was his premature death. Some also missed the fact that the question was about his foreign ambitions and not focused on his domestic policies. One conclusion was that the brief exaltation of Sweden to great power status was worthwhile, even if it proved transient.

Question 30

This question led to responses which focused well on change over time. Candidates argued that in any lengthy conflict the issues are unlikely to remain unchanged and so suggested that the war began over religion and ended as a power struggle. Some responses spent too long on analysing the factors leading to war in 1618 and so lacked sufficient time to develop discussion of the ambitions of the French from the 1630s. Several candidates indicated that the war did at least solve the religious issues and lead to the decline of Spain and so could be judged as unusually decisive. Unresolved issues such as control of the Baltic were also identified.

Question 32

Many responses to this question largely agreed that the factor in the question was the main explanation. The geographical situation of Brandenburg-Prussia was also an asset in the view of some, but it was the Great Elector who won the plaudits from most candidates. This was a question where analysis prevailed over description and a supported judgement was reached by most candidates.

Question 33

Some answers suggested that Louis liked to be in control and to have one faith in France and this explained his policies. Others were more nuanced and recognised that his motives altered as he grew older and the influence of Madame de Maintenon was often noted. His relationship with the Papacy could have been more clearly explained by some candidates. There was some description of his policies, notably with regard to the persecution of the Huguenots.

Question 34

Candidates had no problems in outlining the reforms that Peter the Great made. The extent to which they *transformed* Russia could have been better addressed. Answers which did consider this were divided in their opinions. Some argued that reform had begun in Russia before Peter became Tsar and so he was not responsible for transformation, while others suggested that the starting point in Russia was so backward that his changes were indeed transforming. The building of St Petersburg, his financial exactions, his treatment of the nobility and his promotion of trade and industry were all quoted as being examples of great changes.

Question 36

This question elicited some well-focused and clearly argued answers. The general consensus was that Britain was the main beneficiary but that France and Spain lost far less than might have been expected. Some of the minor players were also brought into the discussion. These answers were wide ranging and appropriately illustrated.

Question 38

Candidates were fully informed about Frederick the Great and opinion was divided between his military success and his domestic achievements. Some candidates diverged into another debate about how far he was truly enlightened, but most were focused on the question. There was some description of his policies but the responses were mostly evaluative.

Question 41

Better answers argued that there was decline but that it did not necessarily stem from a fading of Louis XIV's system. There was a robust suggestion that the reign had its successes and that it was the following reign and the disasters which overtook Louis XVI that coloured interpretations of his predecessor. Some candidates were unsure about what the quotation meant, and some focused on *absolutism* and others on *decline*, but rarely on both together. Selection of material from a long period such as this could have been better.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/23

European History Outlines c.1715-2000

Key Messages

Candidates should:

- Respond to the question set and read every word carefully
- Avoid rushing to offer knowledge and explanation for its own sake – make sure everything is closely related to the question
- Make judgements clear – especially if asked about the relative weight of explanation
- Make key elements in the question (if there are any) the focus of the response, rather than quickly dismissing them in order to write about other factors
- Try to offer three answers of consistent standard
- Understand that quantity is much less important than a thoughtful and considered response to the question set.

General Comments

Comments made on the essay answers to the British Outlines papers are applicable to these papers. Many thoughtful and well organised answers were seen and these were a pleasure to read. There was some excellent historical writing and candidates did clearly show an interest in the subject. In general, where questions invited judgements, these were offered, and few candidates produced excessively descriptive answers. There were times when there was a need for the questions to be read more carefully and 'unpacked', and some candidates made too many assumptions, not responding directly enough to what was being asked. For example, if a question asks if reforms created more problems than they solved, the essential starting point is, 'what problems were the changes intended to solve'? Some candidates rushed into explanation or even description of the main elements and left the analysis either to the end of each section or at the end of the answer. Better responses started with the possible discussion, and organised answers round that, so that information was being deployed to support arguments. Thus an answer about Germany's responsibility for the First World War would begin with outlining the points at issue, rather than an account of the Moroccan Crises and the comment that this shows Germany was to blame. Also, the pre-prepared list of causes or consequences which lacks a sense of discrimination between elements is not as effective a way of answering the question 'What best explains?' as addressing arguments about relative importance, and using information to support evaluation. Few 'ran out of steam' in the third answer, but sometimes final answers could have been better supported, so an aim might be to produce consistently strong answers.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 17

There were some strong answers which looked at the long-term durability of the settlement and knowledge of the terms was often impressive. Better answers made effective use of what they knew. The crucial concept here was the 'problems of peacemaking' and answers which simply reflected on the main elements in the settlement with some comment about 'success' did less well than those which considered what the problems facing the statesmen were and how far they were more than short-term.

Question 18

There were some good responses here which distinguished between the long-term limitations of the ruler and his support base and the shorter term effects of economic and social problems. Most answers attempted some judgement and discrimination in explanations and answers were well-supported.

Question 19

The question produced many thoughtful and – important here – well-structured analyses. Most answers offered some comparison, although some candidates wrote what appeared to be two separate essays – one on 1848-9 and one on 1859-61. Some assumed that Garibaldi was only an important participant in 1859-60, and others would have benefited from making the point that foreign participation was a key element.

Question 20

This produced some good responses. The question was generally well understood and few offered long narratives. There was a tendency for 'reasons for German unification' to be listed and for Bismarck to appear almost in passing, but generally the key element in the question was addressed and judgements were made. It was pleasing to see the effects of the Zollverein treated critically by some good answers and also to see some neat summaries of Bismarck's skills which showed an ability to use material flexibly.

Question 21

Good answers to this established criteria to assess success, and employed a thoughtful analysis, rather than the description and comment approach which was seen in some scripts.

Question 22

This question produced a wide range of responses from descriptions of aspects of the reforms to really well focused analyses which analysed what problems the reforms were intended to solve. Sometimes policies were considered critically in terms of 'success' or 'failure' without reference to the problems they were addressing. This crucial element in historical understanding should not be overlooked and those who related the reforms to the situation facing the Tsar achieved some good results. As is often the case, emancipation dominated the answers – perhaps rightly – but few neglected other changes, though these were sometimes rather tacked on and descriptive.

Question 23

Much depends on what was meant by 'Liberalism' and better responses related analysis to what contemporary Liberals believed. Some equated Liberalism with democracy, ignoring the reality that many saw democracy as allied to reaction and universal suffrage as counter revolution. Candidates are advised to have a clear view of these key terms, especially when their modern meaning has changed somewhat, for example in relation to views about religion and economic *laissez faire*.

Question 24

Answers offered some judgements and generally argued for continuing divisions after 1860. Some would have been improved by less generalised writing about regional and linguistic differences and more awareness of change over quite a long period.

Question 26

There were very varied answers to this question. This included impressive analysis and focus at the top end. Some organised their material well and kept a focus on arguments. Others tended to produce a list of causes which started with Germany and then ran quickly through everything else. There were few purely narrative responses, although some did offer a list of theories which were not very well justified by evidence or integrated into the answer. It was not always clear that the historians had actually been read rather than simply being read about.

Question 29

This was on railways and some answers displayed impressive knowledge and addressed the question directly.

Question 35

In general, the period after 1914 did not attract so many responses as the period 1815-1914. The strengths and weaknesses of Lenin received less attention than the success and failures of key policies. The key word is 'leadership' and better answers broke down elements of leadership and used their knowledge to discuss this. Others simply assessed Lenin's role or how effective policies were, rather than focussing more closely on the requirements of the question.

Question 37

Though there were some discussions of Mussolini's rule, more answers could have dealt with the 'fortunes of war' and more preferred 'successful' than 'popular'. Pre-prepared lists of successes and failures were rather apparent in some cases.

HISTORY

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

Key Messages

Candidates should:

- Respond to the question set and read every word carefully
- Avoid rushing to offer knowledge and explanation for its own sake – make sure everything is closely related to the question
- Make judgements clear – especially if asked about the relative weight of explanation
- Make key elements in the question (if there are any) the focus of the question, rather than quickly dismissing them in order to write about other factors
- Try to offer three answers of consistent standard
- Understand that quantity is much less important than a thoughtful and considered response to the question set.

General Comments

Some thoughtful and well organised answers were seen, and these were a pleasure to read. There was some excellent historical writing and candidates did clearly show an interest in the subject. Few 'ran out of steam' in the third answer, but sometimes final answers were less well supported, so an aim might be to produce consistently strong answers.

In general, where questions invited judgements, these were offered, and few candidates produced excessively descriptive answers. Some candidates could have read more carefully and 'unpacked' questions, making fewer assumptions and responding more directly to what was being asked. For example, if a question asks about which president was most responsible for the failure in Vietnam, then candidates should make the failure the focal point of the answer, rather than assuming that the question is asking about involvement. Some candidates rush into explanation or even description of the main elements and leave the analysis either to the end of each section or at the end of the answer. Better responses start with the possible discussion and organise answers round that, so that information is being deployed to support arguments.

If there is a named factor in the question, then candidates need to focus on that factor and relate other possible explanations to it. Thus, if asked whether the American War of Independence was largely sustained because of the strength of American patriotism, candidates should regard patriotism as the key element and not offer a list of reasons why the colonists won the war.

When considering explanations of topics about which candidates do have historiographic knowledge, it is important to be able to integrate that knowledge into arguments which address that question. Recitations of different views with limited critical sense do not generally make for convincing arguments about the relative importance of different causes.

Also, the pre-prepared list of causes or consequences which lacks a sense of discrimination between elements is not as effective a way of answering the question 'What best explains?' as addressing arguments about relative importance and using information to support evaluation.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

Better answers showed an awareness of competing perspectives and offered a sustained discussion about the blame on each side. This was more effective if elements were discussed, rather than a list of factors showing British responsibility being followed by a list showing colonial responsibility. Better answers also showed a sense of judgement throughout and an ability to criticise arguments for or against one side being to blame; candidates do need to engage with the concept of blame at the start, rather than allowing answers to become descriptions of clashes, with some comment on the question. Other answers started with a good focus on blame, only to drift into simply to explaining a series of disagreements. The level of knowledge displayed by candidates varied considerably.

Question 2

To answer this question convincingly, knowledge of the conduct and events of the war needed to be strong and candidates needed to respond to the exact terms of the question and to deploy knowledge flexibly. The question invited a consideration of 'sustained' but some used material on the causes. There was, from some candidates, a cursory treatment of the main issue and then an explanation of why the colonists won, rather than an answer to the question as set.

Question 6

Some did assess the nature and extent of the movement. There were also some diffuse answers which tended to describe elements of the abolitionist movement or the nature of slavery, without responding precisely or directly to the question.

Question 7

Better answers considered the nature of US politics and unpacked some of the implications of the question in terms of parties, democracy, appeals to the electorate, and the style of leadership. Others were more interested in looking at the issues of Jackson's presidency.

Question 9

Those who attempted to explain why Lincoln's election could be seen as so important and then set this against other factors, keeping the focus on the key issue, but evaluating it, did well, and there were some well supported answers. Other answers dealt with the key issue in a more summary fashion or in some cases not at all, and wrote mostly about long term causes of the war, with limited reference to Lincoln or his election. If there is a specific factor in the question, then it must be the basis of the answer. The question was not 'What caused the Civil War?'

Question 10

Better answers isolated qualities of generalship and were able to offer not only good supporting examples but also a sustained argument about relative importance. Some answers started with attempts to consider generalship; there were others which offered what appeared to be pre-prepared lists of reasons for the Union victory. Those who did focus on generalship were often hazy as to the contribution that it might have made and there seemed to be some weaknesses in knowledge about the military aspects of the war and an eagerness to talk about Lincoln's leadership or resources or foreign recognition. This question was primarily one which involved military history. Those who talked about elements of warfare and referred to some leaders, performed better.

Question 11

There was some strong knowledge of why the West was settled. Some answers would have been improved if they had engaged with both parts of the question and the essential word, 'mainly'. There were quite a few descriptions or lists of factors. Land hunger was, on the whole, treated more fully than 'the greed of the railway companies', and some did not really see the force of 'greed' and wrote more blandly about railways in general and their role in opening the west. Candidates studying this topic need a grasp of chronology and to consider whether different elements might have been more or less important at different times.

Question 17

Some candidates seemed uncertain about what was meant by 'the era of Redemption' and offered some description and explanation of the problems of African Americans, sometimes going into the 1950s and beyond. Had 'tyranny' been considered rather more, then there might have been fewer descriptions, with some comment on oppression. Candidates would have benefited from offering more of a balanced judgement and thus an attempt to 'discuss'. Instead, the question which some appeared to be answering might have read 'explain'. Candidates are strongly advised to consider the implications of key words in questions.

Question 20

This was a popular question and it produced a range of responses. Better answers engaged with the concept of 'imperialism' and drew distinctions between the different possible interpretations of the concept in terms of US overseas policy. There were some helpful distinctions made between different parts of the period and some engaged with the key command 'how valid' and offered a real discussion about the significance of policies which could be seen as imperialist. Again, more limited answers were example led, or became narratives of the policies of different presidents.

Question 22

This was popular, but some candidates' responses suggested that a question asking for the causes of the Great Depression would have been preferable. This question involved isolating key elements of the economy and offering a discussion and a judgment. There was much description, especially of market speculation and government policy at the expense of considering vital aspects of the economy, particularly agriculture. Some offered lists of strengths and weaknesses and stronger answers offered an ongoing assessment of different elements and a sense of engagement with different possible views on this issue. Long accounts of the Wall Street Crash did not score highly.

Question 26

There were some interesting answers which looked at various theories about the Red Scare and were aware of some modern writing on the topic. Better answers engaged with the requirement of the question of how something is best explained. Such answers went beyond lists of historical theories to assess the relative importance of the context of the spread of Communism and the genuine concerns that this gave rise to in the USA, the opportunism of rabid anti-Communists, and the political advantages that politicians found in supporting the scare. Though there may, for example, be explanations that the 'elites were being attacked under the guise of anti-Communism', these theories do need sustained evidence to avoid being assertions or information about different views.

Question 29

Better answers did engage with the relative responsibility of different presidents and there was some good knowledge. The question referred to failure. Some answers read this as involvement, so what followed was an analysis of the relative responsibility of the presidents for committing forces to Vietnam - essentially a different question. There was some imbalance in some answers and a tendency to outline events.

Question 30

This produced some well-focused answers and most of these addressed 'reputation', rather than writing generally about the policies and personalities of the presidents. Some did attempt a balanced analysis and there were a variety of opinions.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/04

African and Asian History Outlines

c.1750 - 2000

Key Messages

Candidates should:

- Respond to the question set and read every word carefully
- Avoid rushing to offer knowledge and explanation for its own sake – make sure everything is closely related to the question
- Make judgements clear – especially if asked about the relative weight of explanation
- Make key elements in the question (if there are any) the focus of the question, rather than quickly dismissing them in order to write about other factors
- Try to offer three answers of consistent standard
- Understand that quantity is much less important than a thoughtful and considered response to the question set.

General Comments

Much of the comment on other Outlines papers is applicable to this paper, although here the range of questions answered was more restricted with China, Japan and India the only countries studied. It would have been good to see answers to a wider range of questions. Having said that, it is very much to the credit of teachers who prepared candidates that they were able to develop a broader perspective by engaging with aspects of world history, and on the whole the answers had sound knowledge and made a good attempt to address the questions. There were instances when candidates appeared to have been prepared for another question, rather than responding to the exact demands of the question on the paper. The importance of reading the question, considering its demands and its precise wording and responding directly to it, cannot be over stated. Some of the responses to questions on India lacked the confident grasp of material that was apparent in answers to questions on China. However, Centres should not be discouraged from studying Indian history – especially as India is increasingly important in the world economy and political life. Candidates should spend time considering the question, rather than rushing into a series of explanations. It is particularly important to note the significance of a common format of question, 'What best explains?' which is different from 'Give reasons for', and requires a degree of judgement and assessment of causes or consequences. Essays which engaged with key concepts and used factual knowledge in support of arguments did better than those which were excessively example led and started with factual content, adding some comment and analysis in passing. The flexible use of knowledge is more important than writing very long answers which are not always closely enough linked to the actual questions. It is important, too, to keep enough time for thinking and planning of final answers. Few offered fragments or note form but there was some inconsistency in standards of argument and relevance in final answers. There was much enjoyable, well written and well-supported writing in this paper which was a credit to the initiative of both candidates and their teachers, but it is important to note the thrust of the comments on specific questions.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 17

Better answers focused on 'modernisation', rather than offering a biography of Sun Yat-sen, and they made some judgement about his importance, sometimes weighing his influence against other elements or personalities. Other answers seemed to be trying to adapt more general knowledge about the Chinese revolution and the subsequent changes.

Question 18

There was some strong and sometimes detailed knowledge about the warlords and some saw that there were differences between them. Generally, the key factor was addressed and better answers assessed this element against other obstacles, showing a good understanding of the situation after the end of the Empire. Some offered rather a list of problems and candidates are advised that answers should engage with the question of relative importance from the start.

Question 19

The main factor in this question was dealt with by candidates, and there were some good discussions which weighed the strengths of the CCP and Mao against the weaknesses of the Jiang regime. Some candidates could have improved their responses by not neglecting the post-war period and over-focusing on the 1930s. Less successful answers reproduced a list of factors and some material seemed somewhat marginal – Jiang's military shortcomings in the early 1930s, for example, whereas the prolonged period of war after 1945 was often hardly mentioned.

Question 20

The Great Leap Forward sometimes dominated the answers to this question, depriving candidates of an opportunity to discuss whether previous policies had been more successful. Better answers offered some success criteria. Knowledge was often stronger than analysis and answers might have been more convincing if there had been more awareness of the problems that Mao's policies were addressing. There seemed to be some signs of determination to impart information, rather than to use it to support arguments and analysis.

Question 22

There were some strong answers which saw the debate clearly and addressed the issues. Some offered rather lengthy explanations of the grievances of the Indian troops, but generally the 'mutiny' elements were set against the broader reaction against British rule and the scope and nature of the unrest were discussed.

Question 23

Comparison was attempted by most candidates who answered this question. Some responses would have benefited from a greater knowledge of Jinnah and better attempts to establish criteria for 'great political leader'. Many answers became accounts of aspects of the leadership of both men, with some comment.

Question 24

The candidates who answered this question included some explanation in their responses, although it needed to be rather less general. The key developments of 1971 could have been considered in more depth.

Question 26

Some candidates wrote mainly about Nehru's economic policies - possibly a topic they had good knowledge of. As a result, these answers did not really address the issues as directly and thoroughly as they could have done. Others offered generalised comments on rural life, and would have benefited from engaging with 'so persistent' to a greater degree.

Question 28

This question produced some supported explanation in responses. Some candidates were aware that there were economic pressures on Japan, and more could have made the link with nationalism – why did hardship lead to more support for nationalist and expansionist policies? Opportunities to consider the relative importance between long-term resentments and attitudes to traditional values and shorter-term developments which led to a more virulent sense of national mission, were missed by some. However, there were well supported explanations which sometimes could have been taken as the basis for more judgement about the relative importance of different factors.

Question 37

There was some good knowledge shown. Candidates should consider the implications of questions which ask 'what best explains?' The balance between internal weakness and the confidence and military strength of the Europeans might have been considered more by some, and there might also have been more consideration of whether explanations varied within the century, and how important certain elements, such as the prolonged civil wars, were. More reflection would have helped here and some answers tended to concentrate on conveying information.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/51

The Norman Conquest, 1051-1087

Key Messages

Candidates should:

- Compare documents point by point and avoid sequential description
- In Part **(b)**, make the documents the focus of the answer
- Ensure that the analysis of the documents is closely related to the issue in the question
- Understand that Part **(b)** requires contextual knowledge
- Read the essay questions carefully
- Refer to their study of documents in the essay, where possible.

General Comments

There was a greater focus on the documents than was sometimes the case last summer. Candidates would have further enhanced answers by attempting to use knowledge more to evaluate the evidence, and making more reference to the passages as historical evidence. In **(a)** questions there was much effective point by point comparison, though some candidates do need to focus on the comparison more and should avoid writing about the documents sequentially. Most attempted to isolate differences and similarities, though the balance could have been better in some cases. More candidates could have offered explanations of the differences or attempted to consider the nature of the evidence, when deciding to what extent one document corroborated another. However, there were strong answers which offered effective point by point comparison and contrast, understood the issue and showed an awareness of the documents as evidence, and so were able to offer convincing analysis. It is important for candidates to be aware of the need for sustained comparison and contrast. Importing elements of factual information for its own sake is not necessary.

In **(b)**, most candidates considered all the documents and candidates should make every effort to consider each passage. It is helpful to group the passages and to ensure that comment on them is linked to their relevance to the key issue in the question. Candidates should remember the need to use contextual knowledge to assess the views. In some cases, though passages were interpreted well, candidates would have further enhanced responses with a fuller deployment of knowledge and candidates should aim at a reasonable balance between passage analysis and use of knowledge to evaluate the evidence. Better answers did treat the passages as a set and did relate them carefully to the issue under consideration, offering a judgement that emerged out of the critical study of the texts. Candidates should not just write an essay with reference to the passages and their knowledge, but ensure that answers are driven by the passages.

The essays do need to show that the special subject has been the subject of special study. Better answers were aware of different views and made some attempt to refer to evidence studied. Candidates should aim to offer strong factual support and, wherever possible, refer to evidence to make this essay sufficiently detailed and enriched by source study. In some cases essays seemed quite general and descriptive. However, there were some impressive arguments offered at the higher end of the mark range and some relevant and thorough analyses which showed a balanced approach to the issue in the questions and reflected a study that had been made in depth.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a) This was a straightforward comparison and candidates needed to always stick to the terms of the question and make the required comparisons. They were generally aware that the documents came from different perspectives and used these to explain some of the differences.
- (b) Candidates answered this question well and came to varied conclusions. Some agreed with the factor in the question, while others used the documents to argue that Harold was unlucky rather than outgeneraled, thus challenging Document E. Several suggested that the impact of the famous scene where William raised his helmet to show he was alive, was likely to have been of minimal effect on a noisy and busy battlefield, whatever the documents or other evidence from the Bayeux Tapestry might indicate.

Question 2

Most candidates argued well, and with good support, that the Godwins were crucial in Edward's reign, however much he tried to reduce their power. The accession of Harold in 1066 with general approval backed up this argument.

Question 3

There was a tendency to describe rebellions but there was also assessment and some sound argument. It could be suggested that William's vigorous reaction to some risings indicated that he thought they were serious, and that his high-handed punishment of rebels to discourage others pointed in the same direction.

Others argued that the rebels rarely had support from the noble classes and were easily put down. Even Hereward was defeated eventually, and the point was made that a threat from Ely was hardly likely to worry the Conqueror.

Question 4

There were some good answers to this question which were well-informed and able to show that William made a few changes such as trial by battle, but that mostly he continued the governmental methods of the Anglo-Saxon rulers, since their bureaucracy was both efficient and experienced. The legal system was less fully covered, but equality in the two aspects was not expected.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/52

Special Subject - The Crusades, 1095–1192

Key Messages

Candidates should:

- Compare documents point by point and avoid sequential description
- In Part **(b)**, make the documents the focus of the answer
- Ensure that the analysis of the documents is closely related to the issue in the question
- Understand that Part **(b)** requires contextual knowledge
- Read the essay questions carefully
- Refer to their study of documents in the essay, where possible.

General Comments

There was a greater focus on the documents than was sometimes the case last summer. Candidates would have further enhanced answers by attempting to use knowledge more to evaluate the evidence, and making more reference to the passages as historical evidence. In **(a)** questions there was much effective point by point comparison, though some candidates do need to focus on the comparison more and should avoid writing about the documents sequentially. Most attempted to isolate differences and similarities, though the balance could have been better in some cases. More candidates could have offered explanations of the differences or attempted to consider the nature of the evidence, when deciding to what extent one document corroborated another. However, there were strong answers which offered effective point by point comparison and contrast, understood the issue and showed an awareness of the documents as evidence, and so were able to offer convincing analysis. It is important for candidates to be aware of the need for sustained comparison and contrast. Importing elements of factual information for its own sake is not necessary.

In **(b)**, most candidates considered all the documents and candidates should make every effort to consider each passage. It is helpful to group the passages and to ensure that comment on them is linked to their relevance to the key issue in the question. Candidates should remember the need to use contextual knowledge to assess the views. In some cases, though passages were interpreted well, candidates would have further enhanced responses with a fuller deployment of knowledge and candidates should aim at a reasonable balance between passage analysis and use of knowledge to evaluate the evidence. Better answers did treat the passages as a set and did relate them carefully to the issue under consideration, offering a judgement that emerged out of the critical study of the texts. Candidates should not just write an essay with reference to the passages and their knowledge, but ensure that answers are driven by the passages.

The essays do need to show that the special subject has been the subject of special study. Better answers were aware of different views and made some attempt to refer to evidence studied. Candidates should aim to offer strong factual support and, wherever possible, refer to evidence to make this essay sufficiently detailed and enriched by source study. In some cases essays seemed quite general and descriptive. However, there were some impressive arguments offered at the higher end of the mark range and some relevant and thorough analyses which showed a balanced approach to the issue in the questions and reflected a study that had been made in depth.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a) The comparison was usually well made and few candidates dealt with the documents separately. The similarities were clearly identified and a number of candidates saw that whereas in C abandoning possessions was a motive, in D taking possessions was a reason.
- (b) Candidates needed to give serious consideration to the factor in the question and could find evidence for greed in Documents B, C and D, although sometimes more by implication than by explicit references. Other factors were well covered and a range of explanations were given. Most candidates agreed with Document E that religious zeal was a main motivator and some had good contextual support. Others tended to assert that Document E was right.

Question 2

Louis VII was a popular scapegoat as his military and personal failings were denounced by candidates. The Emperor came in for some criticism, but less of it. More specific knowledge and less general discussion would have helped some candidates.

Question 3

Not enough responses to comment.

Question 4

This was the most popular question and candidates usually agreed with the judgement given. Philip Augustus was most often the main focus of blame. One or two felt Barbarossa was at fault in being drowned early on in the campaign. Richard I had his detractors as well. His failure to capture Jerusalem was considered to outweigh his success at Acre. The revival of the Saracens under Saladin was the most frequently quoted alternative explanation. Some candidates argued that the Crusade was not a failure anyway. This could be a relevant point in the assessment, but was not the focus of the question.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/54

Special Subject - Reformation Europe, 1516–1559

Key Messages

Candidates should:

- Compare documents point by point and avoid sequential description
- In Part **(b)**, make the documents the focus of the answer
- Ensure that the analysis of the documents is closely related to the issue in the question
- Understand that Part **(b)** requires contextual knowledge
- Read the essay questions carefully
- Refer to their study of documents in the essay, where possible.

General Comments

There was a greater focus on the documents than was sometimes the case last summer. Candidates would have further enhanced answers by attempting to use knowledge more to evaluate the evidence, and making more reference to the passages as historical evidence. In **(a)** questions there was much effective point by point comparison, though some candidates do need to focus on the comparison more and should avoid writing about the documents sequentially. Most attempted to isolate differences and similarities, though the balance could have been better in some cases. More candidates could have offered explanations of the differences or attempted to consider the nature of the evidence, when deciding to what extent one document corroborated another. However, there were strong answers which offered effective point by point comparison and contrast, understood the issue and showed an awareness of the documents as evidence, and so were able to offer convincing analysis. It is important for candidates to be aware of the need for sustained comparison and contrast. Importing elements of factual information for its own sake is not necessary.

In **(b)**, most candidates considered all the documents and candidates should make every effort to consider each passage. It is helpful to group the passages and to ensure that comment on them is linked to their relevance to the key issue in the question. Candidates should remember the need to use contextual knowledge to assess the views. In some cases, though passages were interpreted well, candidates would have further enhanced responses with a fuller deployment of knowledge and candidates should aim at a reasonable balance between passage analysis and use of knowledge to evaluate the evidence. Better answers did treat the passages as a set and did relate them carefully to the issue under consideration, offering a judgement that emerged out of the critical study of the texts. Candidates should not just write an essay with reference to the passages and their knowledge, but ensure that answers are driven by the passages.

The essays do need to show that the special subject has been the subject of special study. Better answers were aware of different views and made some attempt to refer to evidence studied. Candidates should aim to offer strong factual support and, wherever possible, refer to evidence to make this essay sufficiently detailed and enriched by source study. In some cases essays seemed quite general and descriptive. However, there were some impressive arguments offered at the higher end of the mark range and some relevant and thorough analyses which showed a balanced approach to the issue in the questions and reflected a study that had been made in depth.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a) Most answers attempted some comparison. Some could have been stronger on contrasts. The provenance of the two passages was commented on but not all saw that there had been some deterioration between 1554 and 1555. There was often an attempt to consider the difference between a private letter and a public statement. Generally, relatively few dealt with the passages in an excessively discrete or descriptive way, although levels of explanation of similarities and differences varied.
- (b) This referred to a commonly expressed reason for Charles's failure, but there are, of course, other factors to consider and thus a chance to evaluate the importance of the evidence presented in the set of documents. Despite A clearly outlining the weight of commitments, some candidates missed this and offered some rather less straightforward explanations, particularly of B. E could have received fuller treatment from some and candidates should be aware of the expectation that the passages will be used thoroughly and form the basis of the answer, with knowledge being applied to assess the evidence that they contain. Some answers became rather like essays with illustrations from the passages and weighted to an account of Charles V's difficulties. Better answers integrated knowledge with an assessment of the passages, which were often effectively grouped and considered as a set.

Question 2

Better answers assessed, rather than merely listed, strengths and weaknesses. The question did include 'inheritance', and 'Spanish kingdoms'. Some wrote in general terms about policies towards Spain or Charles' reign.

Question 3

Generally, candidates would have benefited from more focus on 1521 as a turning point, and on whether there were convincing signs that before then, Luther did or did not want to break with the Church. There was some indication that events after 1517 were somewhat hazy for candidates, but in general there were some convincing arguments that showed that Luther was driven by the church's reaction and the speed of events to break with Rome, rather than by a real intention to do so. The element of 'reform' might in some cases have received more attention.

Question 4

Not enough responses to comment.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/55

The Reign of Charles I, 1625-1649

Key Messages

Candidates should:

- Compare documents point by point and avoid sequential description
- In Part **(b)**, make the documents the focus of the answer
- Ensure that the analysis of the documents is closely related to the issue in the question
- Understand that Part **(b)** requires contextual knowledge
- Read the essay questions carefully
- Refer to their study of documents in the essay, where possible.

General Comments

There was a greater focus on the documents than was sometimes the case last summer. Candidates would have further enhanced answers by attempting to use knowledge more to evaluate the evidence, and making more reference to the passages as historical evidence. In **(a)** questions there was much effective point by point comparison, though some candidates do need to focus on the comparison more and should avoid writing about the documents sequentially. Most attempted to isolate differences and similarities, though the balance could have been better in some cases. More candidates could have offered explanations of the differences or attempted to consider the nature of the evidence, when deciding to what extent one document corroborated another. However, there were strong answers which offered effective point by point comparison and contrast, understood the issue and showed an awareness of the documents as evidence, and so were able to offer convincing analysis. It is important for candidates to be aware of the need for sustained comparison and contrast. Importing elements of factual information for its own sake is not necessary.

In **(b)**, most candidates considered all the documents and candidates should make every effort to consider each passage. It is helpful to group the passages and to ensure that comment on them is linked to their relevance to the key issue in the question. Candidates should remember the need to use contextual knowledge to assess the views. In some cases, though passages were interpreted well, candidates would have further enhanced responses with a fuller deployment of knowledge and candidates should aim at a reasonable balance between passage analysis and use of knowledge to evaluate the evidence. Better answers did treat the passages as a set and did relate them carefully to the issue under consideration, offering a judgement that emerged out of the critical study of the texts. Candidates should not just write an essay with reference to the passages and their knowledge, but ensure that answers are driven by the passages.

The essays do need to show that the special subject has been the subject of special study. Better answers were aware of different views and made some attempt to refer to evidence studied. Candidates should aim to offer strong factual support and, wherever possible, refer to evidence to make this essay sufficiently detailed and enriched by source study. In some cases essays seemed quite general and descriptive. However, there were some impressive arguments offered at the higher end of the mark range and some relevant and thorough analyses which showed a balanced approach to the issue in the questions and reflected a study that had been made in depth.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a) Astute candidates pointed out that Charles would have felt that he had refuted the charges made against him, while his accusers would have held a different view. Some other candidates found the question challenging because they had not appreciated this perspective and some tended to move into discussion of how justified the charges were, rather than focusing on the actual documents.
- (b) Those with the requisite knowledge were able to use the documents effectively, since only C had no reference to divine providence. Most concluded that it was his opponent's view that Charles was the Man of Blood which led to his trial and execution. Some candidates thought divine providence was the same as divine right. These answers were confused and they struggled to gain high marks.

Question 2

Most were aware of the suspicions aroused by Arminianism. More could have picked up on the fears of the opposition that Charles' financial exactions might make him independent of Parliament. The wars with Scotland were usually seen as the decisive moment when opposition climaxed. Some candidates did not confine themselves to the period stated but diverged into 1625-9. In some cases, candidates barely reached 1629. Others found it easier to describe the policies Charles followed, rather than to show why they were unpopular.

Question 3

Better answers were analytical and selective, choosing examples to show Cromwell's influence such as Marston Moor and the Self-Denying Ordinance, and also aspects earlier in the war where he was less crucial. They thus concluded that his role in 1646 was vastly greater than it had been in 1642. Only a few candidates moved beyond 1646 to the Second Civil War, and some candidates described Cromwell's achievements.

Question 4

Of the few answers seen, most would have been improved by referring to John Lilburne.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/56

Special Subject - The French Revolution, 1774–1794

Key Messages

Candidates should:

- Compare documents point by point and avoid sequential description
- In Part **(b)**, make the documents the focus of the answer
- Ensure that the analysis of the documents is closely related to the issue in the question
- Understand that Part **(b)** requires contextual knowledge
- Read the essay questions carefully
- Refer to their study of documents in the essay, where possible.

General Comments

There was a greater focus on the documents than was sometimes the case last summer. Candidates would have further enhanced answers by attempting to use knowledge more to evaluate the evidence, and making more reference to the passages as historical evidence. In **(a)** questions there was much effective point by point comparison, though some candidates do need to focus on the comparison more and should avoid writing about the documents sequentially. Most attempted to isolate differences and similarities, though the balance could have been better in some cases. More candidates could have offered explanations of the differences or attempted to consider the nature of the evidence, when deciding to what extent one document corroborated another. However, there were strong answers which offered effective point by point comparison and contrast, understood the issue and showed an awareness of the documents as evidence, and so were able to offer convincing analysis. It is important for candidates to be aware of the need for sustained comparison and contrast. Importing elements of factual information for its own sake is not necessary.

In **(b)**, most candidates considered all the documents and candidates should make every effort to consider each passage. It is helpful to group the passages and to ensure that comment on them is linked to their relevance to the key issue in the question. Candidates should remember the need to use contextual knowledge to assess the views. In some cases, though passages were interpreted well, candidates would have further enhanced responses with a fuller deployment of knowledge and candidates should aim at a reasonable balance between passage analysis and use of knowledge to evaluate the evidence. Better answers did treat the passages as a set and did relate them carefully to the issue under consideration, offering a judgement that emerged out of the critical study of the texts. Candidates should not just write an essay with reference to the passages and their knowledge, but ensure that answers are driven by the passages.

The essays do need to show that the special subject has been the subject of special study. Better answers were aware of different views and made some attempt to refer to evidence studied. Candidates should aim to offer strong factual support and, wherever possible, refer to evidence to make this essay sufficiently detailed and enriched by source study. In some cases essays seemed quite general and descriptive. However, there were some impressive arguments offered at the higher end of the mark range and some relevant and thorough analyses which showed a balanced approach to the issue in the questions and reflected a study that had been made in depth.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a) There were some perceptive points made about the provenance of these two documents which showed an awareness of when they were written and the different perspectives of the authors. Some misread B and assumed that the Princes agreed that there was a financial crisis which required the calling of the Estates-General, rather than seeing the summoning of that body as being part of the peril facing the state. Generally, however, this was directly tackled, with most responses offering a direct comparison and many attempting an explanation.
- (b) There were some strong answers which used all the documents and focused well on the relative importance of irreconcilable differences between the Estates. Other answers seemed more intent on finding different causes for the Revolution in general and writing short essays on why the Revolution occurred-using parts of the documents and some contextual knowledge. It is important for candidates to address the key issue in the question and to interpret the documents.

Question 2

There were some strong responses which sustained an informed discussion about the relative importance of the king and the darkening context which led to his downfall. Some answers would have been improved if the focus had been on 1792 rather than on 1789, and the selection of material was sometimes skewed to the earlier part of the reign. This led to some implausible arguments. Some answers would have benefitted from going beyond the Flight to Varennes and knowledge of the period 1789-91 was sometimes better than that of 1792.

Question 3

There was some doubt in the minds of some candidates as to what constituted 'revolutionary governments' and 'provinces'. Some read the latter as just 'peasants', and the developing counter revolution could have received fuller treatment. There were some long accounts of the unrest of the summer of 1789, while the provincial revolts of the later revolutionary period needed more attention.

Question 4

Better answers attempted to address 'best explained'. There were also some list-like responses. Opportunities to assess the influence of the radical leaders and groups against the context of growing unrest, war, economic problems and fears of invasion and counter revolution were taken by some candidates. Other answers were more narrow and general.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/58

Gladstone and Disraeli, 1867-1886

Key Messages

Candidates should:

- Compare documents point by point and avoid sequential description
- In Part **(b)**, make the documents the focus of the answer
- Ensure that the analysis of the documents is closely related to the issue in the question
- Understand that Part **(b)** requires contextual knowledge
- Read the essay questions carefully
- Refer to their study of documents in the essay, where possible.

General Comments

There was a greater focus on the documents than was sometimes the case last summer. Candidates would have further enhanced answers by attempting to use knowledge more to evaluate the evidence, and making more reference to the passages as historical evidence. In **(a)** questions there was much effective point by point comparison, though some candidates do need to focus on the comparison more and should avoid writing about the documents sequentially. Most attempted to isolate differences and similarities, though the balance could have been better in some cases. More candidates could have offered explanations of the differences or attempted to consider the nature of the evidence, when deciding to what extent one document corroborated another. However, there were strong answers which offered effective point by point comparison and contrast, understood the issue and showed an awareness of the documents as evidence, and so were able to offer convincing analysis. It is important for candidates to be aware of the need for sustained comparison and contrast. Importing elements of factual information for its own sake is not necessary.

In **(b)**, most candidates considered all the documents and candidates should make every effort to consider each passage. It is helpful to group the passages and to ensure that comment on them is linked to their relevance to the key issue in the question. Candidates should remember the need to use contextual knowledge to assess the views. In some cases, though passages were interpreted well, candidates would have further enhanced responses with a fuller deployment of knowledge and candidates should aim at a reasonable balance between passage analysis and use of knowledge to evaluate the evidence. Better answers did treat the passages as a set and did relate them carefully to the issue under consideration, offering a judgement that emerged out of the critical study of the texts. Candidates should not just write an essay with reference to the passages and their knowledge, but ensure that answers are driven by the passages.

The essays do need to show that the special subject has been the subject of special study. Better answers were aware of different views and made some attempt to refer to evidence studied. Candidates should aim to offer strong factual support and, wherever possible, refer to evidence to make this essay sufficiently detailed and enriched by source study. In some cases essays seemed quite general and descriptive. However, there were some impressive arguments offered at the higher end of the mark range and some relevant and thorough analyses which showed a balanced approach to the issue in the questions and reflected a study that had been made in depth.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a) Candidates were usually able to explain why the two views were very different. Disraeli's fascination with royalty was well known and Liberal views were understood.
- (b) Candidates were familiar with the speeches of Disraeli in which he outlined his view of Conservatism and were able to use this knowledge, alongside the documents, to analyse the centrality of the factors in the question. Some suggested that Disraelian Conservatism was so ill-defined that it was hard to decide what its main tenets were. The documents could be effectively deployed to support this argument.

Question 2

More effective answers focused on analysis and were able to show that much of the legislation tried to follow liberal principles but fell short in various ways. The Licensing Act was universally condemned as illiberal. Some candidates used examples from foreign policy, such as the Alabama arbitration, to illustrate liberal principles at work, although the question specified domestic policies. There was some description of the policies.

Question 3

Not enough answers were seen to comment.

Question 4

Candidates tended to outline the policies of each Prime Minister in turn, and would have benefited from using more direct comparison. When there was analysis, it needed to say more on the similarities, in that both men were opposed to forward movements, despite the evidence from events. The differences were more clearly understood. The Eastern Question crept in to answers on the grounds that it affected imperial policies, but this needed to be carefully worked in to arguments.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/06 Personal Investigation

The work seen was of a good standard and the Examiners enjoyed reading such a diverse range of essays. There was a wide variation in the titles chosen and some of the less common topics investigated featured President Tudjman, Cosimo de Medici, socialism and the Kingdom of Mercia. There were also a number of Centres where significant numbers of candidates undertook almost identical topics, the content of which was very similar. It was clear that candidates who could write about a topic which really enthused them almost always performed very well.

There were also plenty of more 'mainstream' topics and it was equally possible for candidates to achieve a high standard on such questions. Various individuals were analysed for leadership or achievements, including Margaret Thatcher, Nelson Mandela, Mussolini, Ulysses S Grant, William Cecil, Edward I, Peter the Great, Gustavus Adolphus, Charles XII of Sweden and Frederick the Great. America in the interwar years, Ireland and German unification seemed to be particularly popular this year.

Often, the more successful answers included a range of explanations; less successful answers were those where only one explanation was put forward - some candidates would have improved their investigations by exploring other factors after explaining the contribution of their chosen factor, thereby enhancing the sense of a relative evaluation of factors. There was also quite a lot of listing of factors. Those candidates whose chosen titles allowed enough scope for the development of counter arguments, often scored well. Titles which encompassed a clear debate or where there was good primary evidence available, often led to better outcomes.

Some titles attempted a slightly new approach to a familiar topic, such as assessing the view that appeasement was the only logical policy at the time, or asking how important the Irish Rebellion was in creating conflict between Charles I and his subjects, and these were often well done.

Examiners saw both high and variable arguments. To score well, candidates needed to put forward different views, and to evaluate them with some evidence. Some candidates would have benefitted from omitting long introductions about how a person came to power, or their early life; in some investigations, two or even three sides were devoted to setting the scene. The introductions which focussed on the debate contained within the question were the most successful. Candidates should also seek to avoid topics which cover a very long historical period, as well as topics which ask for a judgement between two alternatives, which are not, in fact, all that different.

Some candidates organised their material impressively; others would have improved their investigations by marshalling their arguments better or more coherently. Rather than arguing first in one way and then another, candidates could have first developed all the positive points and then all the negative points, if it was that type of question. Candidates needed to undertake some careful planning to ensure their arguments were logically developed and the paragraphs were inter-connected, and the best ones came to a clear final judgement with support. Conclusions which summarised the foregoing arguments were often sound, and the best conclusions aimed for a synthesis and something emerging from this to suggest new ways of looking at the problem.

Many candidates had clearly referred to an impressive range of primary and secondary sources and used these to exemplify their arguments; for others, a greater sense of the critical use of such sources would have helped. The lack of a critical sense was most often the case in the use of websites, which should be used critically in the same way as all other sources. Some of the quotes used were very long indeed, and in some cases candidates could have been more selective about the material they included.

No candidates produced work of more than 4100 words, with most fairly close to the word limit of 4000. There was a group of candidates whose work was significantly below the word limit. These answers did not achieve as many marks as they could have because the range and depth of the material covered was

seriously curtailed. The specification materials offer advice on footnoting and bibliographies, but there was still a very wide range of approaches. A number of candidates attempted to put extra points to their arguments in the footnotes because they were close to the word limit; this is not acceptable. Some candidates made very good use of tables or charts of statistical information, whilst others simply used these as illustration.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/73 Special Subject - Germany 1919-1945
--

Key Messages

Candidates should:

- Compare documents point by point and avoid sequential description
- In Part **(b)**, make the documents the focus of the answer
- Ensure that the analysis of the documents is closely related to the issue in the question
- Understand that Part **(b)** requires contextual knowledge
- Read the essay questions carefully
- Refer to their study of documents in the essay, where possible.

General Comments

There was a greater focus on the documents than was sometimes the case last summer. Candidates would have further enhanced answers by attempting to use knowledge more to evaluate the evidence, and making more reference to the passages as historical evidence. In **(a)** questions there was much effective point by point comparison, though some candidates do need to focus on the comparison more and should avoid writing about the documents sequentially. Most attempted to isolate differences and similarities, though the balance could have been better in some cases. More candidates could have offered explanations of the differences or attempted to consider the nature of the evidence, when deciding to what extent one document corroborated another. However, there were strong answers which offered effective point by point comparison and contrast, understood the issue and showed an awareness of the documents as evidence, and so were able to offer convincing analysis. It is important for candidates to be aware of the need for sustained comparison and contrast. Importing elements of factual information for its own sake is not necessary.

In **(b)**, most candidates considered all the documents and candidates should make every effort to consider each passage. It is helpful to group the passages and to ensure that comment on them is linked to their relevance to the key issue in the question. Candidates should remember the need to use contextual knowledge to assess the views. In some cases, though passages were interpreted well, candidates would have further enhanced responses with a fuller deployment of knowledge and candidates should aim at a reasonable balance between passage analysis and use of knowledge to evaluate the evidence. Better answers did treat the passages as a set and did relate them carefully to the issue under consideration, offering a judgement that emerged out of the critical study of the texts. Candidates should not just write an essay with reference to the passages and their knowledge, but ensure that answers are driven by the passages.

The essays do need to show that the special subject has been the subject of special study. Better answers were aware of different views and made some attempt to refer to evidence studied. Candidates should aim to offer strong factual support and, wherever possible, refer to evidence to make this essay sufficiently detailed and enriched by source study. In some cases essays seemed quite general and descriptive. However, there were some impressive arguments offered at the higher end of the mark range and some relevant and thorough analyses which showed a balanced approach to the issue in the questions and reflected a study that had been made in depth.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a) Those who attempted a direct comparison usually focused on the different dates as the explanation for the different attitudes of the workers. There was good use of the detail in the documents to develop the comparison. Some candidates were not entirely sure what worker opposition entailed and some saw its problems as being how it caused problems for the Nazis, rather than the problems in organising opposition.
- (b) Candidates were divided about the answer to this question. Some argued that repression was very successful, although their evidence often came more from contextual knowledge than from the documents. Alternatively, others felt that the weakness of the opposition groups, well illustrated from contextual knowledge, in addition to the documents, was the chief factor. The documents were effectively evaluated in this question, with the provenance of all of them being fully discussed and even E criticised as a source covering a limited range of material.

Question 2

Candidates knew plenty about this topic and several showed some mastery of a complex period and the negotiations which brought Hitler to power. Others strayed into the years prior to 1929 and the Munich Putsch and its outcome were often mentioned. Other factors such as the economic crisis were seen as crucial, as well as the supposition of men like von Papen that Hitler could be used for the purposes of other parties. Examples of how his personal leadership was shown could have been more prolific.

Question 3

Not enough answers were seen to comment.

Question 4

This was a popular and well-prepared question. Some candidates outlined the debate on the Holocaust without focusing sufficiently on the factor in the question, but most were well able to assemble the evidence that war was the cause and then to consider the alternative view that Hitler has always intended to annihilate the Jews. Their conclusions varied, reflecting the divisions of opinion on this topic.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/74
Special Subject - China under Mao
Zedong, 1949–1976

Key Messages

Candidates should:

- Compare documents point by point and avoid sequential description
- In Part **(b)**, make the documents the focus of the answer
- Ensure that the analysis of the documents is closely related to the issue in the question
- Understand that Part **(b)** requires contextual knowledge
- Read the essay questions carefully
- Refer to their study of documents in the essay, where possible.

General Comments

There was a greater focus on the documents than was sometimes the case last summer. Candidates would have further enhanced answers by attempting to use knowledge more to evaluate the evidence, and making more reference to the passages as historical evidence. In **(a)** questions there was much effective point by point comparison, though some candidates do need to focus on the comparison more and should avoid writing about the documents sequentially. Most attempted to isolate differences and similarities, though the balance could have been better in some cases. More candidates could have offered explanations of the differences or attempted to consider the nature of the evidence, when deciding to what extent one document corroborated another. However, there were strong answers which offered effective point by point comparison and contrast, understood the issue and showed an awareness of the documents as evidence, and so were able to offer convincing analysis. It is important for candidates to be aware of the need for sustained comparison and contrast. Importing elements of factual information for its own sake is not necessary.

In **(b)**, most candidates considered all the documents and candidates should make every effort to consider each passage. It is helpful to group the passages and to ensure that comment on them is linked to their relevance to the key issue in the question. Candidates should remember the need to use contextual knowledge to assess the views. In some cases, though passages were interpreted well, candidates would have further enhanced responses with a fuller deployment of knowledge and candidates should aim at a reasonable balance between passage analysis and use of knowledge to evaluate the evidence. Better answers did treat the passages as a set and did relate them carefully to the issue under consideration, offering a judgement that emerged out of the critical study of the texts. Candidates should not just write an essay with reference to the passages and their knowledge, but ensure that answers are driven by the passages.

The essays do need to show that the special subject has been the subject of special study. Better answers were aware of different views and made some attempt to refer to evidence studied. Candidates should aim to offer strong factual support and, wherever possible, refer to evidence to make this essay sufficiently detailed and enriched by source study. In some cases essays seemed quite general and descriptive. However, there were some impressive arguments offered at the higher end of the mark range and some relevant and thorough analyses which showed a balanced approach to the issue in the questions and reflected a study that had been made in depth.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a) There were some effective and sustained comparisons. Less successful responses assumed that because Marcy was American he was hostile to Communism and some could have used Document D in more detail. Generally, the differences were well grasped, but there needed to be more on similarities and explanations of difference.
- (b) Most saw the point of the question and were able to distinguish between political and ideological. Some needed to apply more knowledge and judgements about the passages could have been more developed. Some evaluation was attempted – more meaningfully in the case of Documents B, C and D than in the case of E, which produced some limited ‘stock’ comments about historians in general being unreliable because they were not here. Evaluation of secondary sources should be based on the arguments and evidence put forward, rather than on generalisations.

Question 2

Most answers produced explanation. Knowledge of the campaigns in the renewed Civil War after the defeat of Japan could have been greater. It is valid to refer to Mao’s guerrilla strategy but some needed more awareness of how, when and where this was applied, and how the shifting balance of the war led to more open order conflict. There was sometimes too much background material and candidates needed a better balance between long and short-term factors, and more on the key issue. The question was not ‘Explain the Communist victory’, but rather to identify military factors and to offer a critical assessment.

Question 3

Most candidates engaged with the concept of ‘little economic benefit’, offering some judgement. Many focused on the effects of policies on the people. Better essays showed a balance and an awareness that policies and their impact changed during the period. Some focused exclusively on the Great Leap Forward, but most did attempt a wider coverage. Support and reference to evidence varied, and better answers showed a strong knowledge of the main economic policies, and were able to go beyond comments about success and failure to engage with the exact terms of the question.

Question 4

Too few answers to comment.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/75

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

Key Messages

Candidates should:

- Compare documents point by point and avoid sequential description
- In Part **(b)**, make the documents the focus of the answer
- Ensure that the analysis of the documents is closely related to the issue in the question
- Understand that Part **(b)** requires contextual knowledge
- Read the essay questions carefully
- Refer to their study of documents in the essay, where possible.

General Comments

There was a greater focus on the documents than was sometimes the case last summer. Candidates would have further enhanced answers by attempting to use knowledge more to evaluate the evidence, and making more reference to the passages as historical evidence. In **(a)** questions there was much effective point by point comparison, though some candidates do need to focus on the comparison more and should avoid writing about the documents sequentially. Most attempted to isolate differences and similarities, though the balance could have been better in some cases. More candidates could have offered explanations of the differences or attempted to consider the nature of the evidence, when deciding to what extent one document corroborated another. However, there were strong answers which offered effective point by point comparison and contrast, understood the issue and showed an awareness of the documents as evidence, and so were able to offer convincing analysis. It is important for candidates to be aware of the need for sustained comparison and contrast. Importing elements of factual information for its own sake is not necessary.

In **(b)**, most candidates considered all the documents and candidates should make every effort to consider each passage. It is helpful to group the passages and to ensure that comment on them is linked to their relevance to the key issue in the question. Candidates should remember the need to use contextual knowledge to assess the views. In some cases, though passages were interpreted well, candidates would have further enhanced responses with a fuller deployment of knowledge and candidates should aim at a reasonable balance between passage analysis and use of knowledge to evaluate the evidence. Better answers did treat the passages as a set and did relate them carefully to the issue under consideration, offering a judgement that emerged out of the critical study of the texts. Candidates should not just write an essay with reference to the passages and their knowledge, but ensure that answers are driven by the passages.

The essays do need to show that the special subject has been the subject of special study. Better answers were aware of different views and made some attempt to refer to evidence studied. Candidates should aim to offer strong factual support and, wherever possible, refer to evidence to make this essay sufficiently detailed and enriched by source study. In some cases essays seemed quite general and descriptive. However, there were some impressive arguments offered at the higher end of the mark range and some relevant and thorough analyses which showed a balanced approach to the issue in the questions and reflected a study that had been made in depth.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a) This was generally well tackled, with many candidates able to see both similarities and differences between the documents. Candidates should look at the provenance and there were some good answers that not only grasped the main issue of different views of success in the two passages but also noted the purpose of both texts and the changes between 1963 and 1966. Less successful answers treated the passages sequentially, but most offered point by point comparisons. It is important that keep the central task well in mind and candidates should avoid resorting to describing and commenting on the passages in turn.
- (b) Most answers sustained a focus on the key issue and related the documents to this; there was some sensible grouping of passages and some encouraging use of contextual knowledge to assess the documents. Few answers were essays with the passages used to illustrate points, and most took the documents as the starting point. Some took a while to see that Eisenhower being impelled to make a public statement could be a sign of the success of the tactics used; others argued that it was not so much protest but fear of the US image in the Cold War being tarnished that was revealed by the document. Both views were argued and could be seen as valid. Some good application of knowledge was offered, particularly to weigh the significance and importance of A and C. Oddly, D was somewhat neglected and E sometimes received rather cursory treatment.

Question 2

Candidates need to address the key issue in the question. The term ideology seemed to present problems for some. 'Coherent' was often separated from its context in the question and used as the focus of the answer which was often about splits and unity. Alternatively a few general comments on ideology were offered before 'other factors' were explained sequentially.

Question 3

Better answers offered a strong comparative analysis of reasons. More addressed the reasons for Black Power than the vital concept in the question of which explanation was 'best' – i.e. more convincing or important. The element of judgement required by the question could have been better tackled.

Question 4

This was in general answered with a good degree of knowledge – though some went back to the origins of the NAACP, while others focused on the 1950s and 1960s. The key success criterion was the ability to weigh the relative importance of the NAACP by analysis of its work in comparison with other organisations, and reach a balanced and supported judgement. Some were too eager to describe what was often strong knowledge of what the groups did and these candidates missed the comparisons, but there were some well-informed and satisfying comparisons and judgements – with different views emerging.