

HISTORY

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

Key Messages

The best answers:

- Considered the implications of the exact words of the question;
- Responded to the questions as set rather than adapt previous essays;
- Used knowledge flexibly and with discrimination.

General Comments

There were some very well supported, direct and analytical responses which offered considered judgements and showed evidence of wide reading. The best answers grappled with judgements and assessments, rather than just offering a list of explanations or extensive description. Many showed an understanding of the issues which needed to be engaged with and were not content with a 'one way' argument but showed awareness of different possible explanations. There was some very strong use of historians' views which were evaluated and discussed, not merely used to illustrate arguments or described. Historiography in itself is not necessarily a sign of a strong answer and insertion of quotations is less convincing than solid argument and supported evaluation and discussion. Answers which appeared to be adaptations of previous essays and which missed the exact wording of the question or dealt with the issues in the question intermittently were less convincing than answers which were fully engaged with the requirements of the actual questions on the paper. For example, **Question 37** on paper 1(c) did not ask how radical the Labour governments of 1945-51 were but whether they were a 'great reforming ministry'. Some answers were intent on demonstrating the extent of change, rather than dealing with whether in the context of aims and achievements, the change was 'great'. Those who tried to establish criteria for greatness in the immediate post-war context and then chose knowledge selectively were responding well to the question. Similarly, those who offered sustained comparisons, for example in **Question 14** paper 1(b) when asked to do so, showed an ability to make use of knowledge and to use it flexibly. Other candidates included sequential information which indicated knowledge but this needed to be adapted to the question. When questions ask for judgement as in key command words such as 'What best explains' or 'How far?' or 'Discuss' then better answers will offer a view and reflect thought and consideration of key issues and areas of different possible explanations and interpretations.

Knowledge was often very strong, although there were areas where it needed to be greater to offer convincing responses to the particular question tackled and it is important that the programme of study undertaken by candidates is broad enough to offer a choice if a particular question on a topic studied is not exactly what has been prepared. This examination does encourage breadth of study and some answers did suggest that too much revision time had been spent on too narrow a range of topics. Many answers clearly showed preparation for answers on Lloyd George (1c **Question 34**) had been focused on the Coalition and not the way that he had come to power and the split with Asquith. The study of the decline of Liberalism had stopped for some at 1918 and more knowledge was needed to sustain an analysis of the whole period from 1916 to 1929.

Answers often achieved considerably fluency and maturity of style. The best answers offered a very developed and sophisticated understanding of the period studied, with firm and relevant argument and some strong and detailed supporting knowledge. Importantly, good answers showed a real interest in and involvement with the past.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

There was better knowledge of the problems of fourth-century Britain rather than analysis of their causes. Generally, answers would have benefited from more consideration of the Emperors - the factor in the question.

Question 2

Answers showed knowledge of a good range of factors, although they tended to make judgements by examining for how long each aspect had an impact, rather than the extent of the effect. Hence Christianity was often argued to have been the greatest legacy and towns, roads and villas were discounted because they were soon ruined. There was mention of trade and coinage as other longer lasting legacies. Better answers offered some good analysis, strong argument and a judgement about the relative importance of towns.

Question 3

Some answers analysed the sparse evidence with thoroughness and good knowledge. Others would have been more effective with stronger understanding of the battles in which Penda was involved. There was good critical use of Bede as a source about the pagan king. Some answers could have assessed Penda's power in more ways than just as a military leader.

Question 4

There was good assessment of the results of Augustine's mission and some balance in the argument suggesting that the Roman mission was not able to be all-conquering and that Bede might be to blame for its strong reputation. The end date for this question needed to be observed more strictly and events like the Synod of Whitby and its impact excluded.

Question 6

This required a greater understanding of the nature of Wilfred's work and the limits to his achievement than some of the responses demonstrated.

Question 7

Some answers could have given more consideration to the achievements of the monasteries. Some were very dismissive of the work of Bede, the greatest scholar of his day; The Codex Amiatinus was rarely mentioned. However, there was plenty of argument that the Lindisfarne Gospels, *Beowulf*, the Rothwell Cross, *The Dream of the Rood* and the Franks' Casket showed a bigger contribution from outside the monasteries.

Question 11

There was a good balance in these answers, with evidence to show Ethelred was to blame countered by arguments that circumstances were against him and his nobility unsupportive. Discussion about the wisdom of paying Danegeld was particularly well-informed. Ethelred was much blamed for the St Brice's Day massacre and the outcome was seen as unavoidable. Good knowledge was displayed and used analytically.

Question 13

The variety of responses was encouraging and showed that there had not been reliance on a 'set response'. Some answers needed to explain why the Godwins were a problem and avoid description of their accession to power. There was some good assessment of whether they really were a problem, and the ascendancy of Harold at the end of the reign was often seen as a period of strong and stable rule. Some argued that a problem for the king was not necessarily a problem for the country. Others suggested that Edward's Norman

outlook, the circumstances he faced, his personal character and the ambitions of other noble houses were equally problematic. Another view was that there were good and bad Godwins.

Question 14

Some responses needed to make a clearer judgement. Some were more accounts of William's doings, rather than sustained assessments of whether his activities were beneficial or not. Some instances were straightforward. No-one suggested that the 'Harrying of the North' was in any way good for the English people. But other features could be, and were, interpreted in different ways. Castles were viewed as providing security and so good, or as symbols of oppression and so harmful. Candidates also suggested that much depended on who you were and showed that English nobles were largely recipients of harmful treatment. The Domesday Book was lauded as an administrative marvel, but its less happy effects regarding taxation not always noted. This was a question where a range of material was used effectively.

Question 15

Answers generally were not impressed by the record of William II, although some recognised that his poor relationship with the church had coloured the way he was presented by the chroniclers. The better responses tried to find a way to judge effectiveness, usually by suggesting some aims William had. There was also the view that he was little bothered by affairs in England and that his priorities lay in Normandy and maintaining his position there.

Question 16

There were some strong answers to this question, with a good range of kings being considered. The usual conclusion was that change came in the conversion to Christianity, the development of trade and in the establishment of an administrative system, while the military role remained much the same. General discussion with minimal examples did occur but not often.

Question 21

Some responses mainly considered the period before 871, whereas the question related to late Anglo-Saxon England, namely the ninth and tenth centuries. It is always important to look carefully at what the question requires.

Question 22

Explanations of how the quarrel with the church was a challenge to Henry's control of his empire could have been more developed. Generally it was Henry's relationships in his family and the threat from the French which were seen as major threats. However, some answers argued convincingly that the French were able to gain credibility by sheltering Becket and this amplified their challenge. The final rebellion against Henry needed to be included to show the situation to which he was reduced. Candidates clearly appreciated his dying words to his illegitimate son - one of the few at his deathbed.

Question 23

This question led to some very strong responses which argued with plenty of support that Richard brought prestige to England by his crusading prowess and so his absence was less crucial. Equally the sound administration he left behind him won plaudits. But there was a counter view that he weakened the country financially for a dream which he then failed to achieve. Better answers offered a balanced view.

Question 24

The debate about whether John or Philip Augustus had the greater resources is well established, but the views could have been better dealt with in the answers to this question. More focus on the factor in the question would have improved some responses. John's quarrel with the church and the events in England leading to Magna Carta were not of relevance. John's own responsibility, notably his refusal to answer to his feudal lord for his abduction of another's man's bride, needed fuller analysis. The advantages on Philip's side were better covered. The view that the break-up of the Angevin Empire was inevitable, or that it was not, in fact, an Empire at all, was well explained.

Question 33

There was some strong knowledge and good judgement in the better answers which assessed the nature and seriousness of the threat rather than simply describing and explaining Glyndwr's actions.

Question 36

Where the term 'overmighty subjects' was defined and understood, answers were stronger than when there was an account of the conflicts, with comments added on about the role of powerful nobles.

Question 37

Answers often began by stating that as Edward was overthrown in 1460 then he was obviously not secure, but then went on to be more perceptive in their analysis. The main factors hindering his security were seen as the position of the earl of Warwick, Edward's injudicious marriage and his wayward younger brother. Once these all combined against him he was lost. The counter argument that he had laid the foundations for security in this period was put forward, although it was more difficult to make it convincing. His lack of a male heir was also viewed as a problem. Some answers were very well supported.

Question 39

The word *conservative* sometimes needed more focus and some answers seemed more apt for a question on whether Henry was a modern or medieval monarch. Most answers tried to consider Henry's aims and would have benefited from always analysing them in terms of conservatism. There was good deal of material which could be used here and better responses were more discriminating in the examples deployed. Narrative on the pretenders was rarely seen. Henry's governmental methods, his relationships with the nobility and his foreign policy were examined in most responses. There was some description of his methods and then the judgement that he was or was not conservative. The stronger answers took the view that he was conservative with a range of supporting evidence, and then the opposing interpretation, and so reached a judgement. Final verdicts varied but on balance favoured conservative. More answers could have given thought to *deeply*. However, there were some strong evaluations of historical views which integrated them into the analysis and did not rely on describing different opinions.

Question 40

Responses were characterised by good knowledge of a complex period and the strength of their feeling about Henry VIII's hopeless ambitions. Most argued that Henry VIII was a lightweight in Europe and had unrealistic aims, so could not hope to succeed. Most compounded their denunciation by asserting that he would not recognise the reality and took advantage of Wolsey as a scapegoat. Candidates could have mounted more of an alternative argument; even the much-vaunted Treaty of London failed to impress them, though better answers were aware of a counter-view.

Question 41

Answers needed to engage with the terms of the question and specifically consider *serious*. There was some lengthy description of opposition; more analysis of how much of a challenge it posed would have improved responses. The opposition of Fisher and More was discounted as negligible, by some, rather bypassing their status as scholars with a European reputation. But others suggested that their execution indicated that Henry, at least, took them seriously. Most of the emphasis was on the Pilgrimage of Grace and here there was better assessment of the extent to which it was serious. Some candidates moved on to show why the opposition was muted, but this was widening out the question further than was justified.

Question 45

Some answers needed more detailed knowledge about the Lollards as they claimed they were not much of a threat and went on to write about other factors which were. This was a question clearly based on Lollardy and other manifestations of discontent with the church were not relevant. Answers which did confine themselves to Wycliffe and his followers gave varying assessments. Some claimed that a movement which was driven underground with comparative ease could not be a threat. Others saw the impact on the later Reformation and evidence suggesting the Lollards survived to a considerable extent, as indicating they played their part in the dismantling of the medieval church, even if not in their own time as such.

HISTORY

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

The best answers:

- Considered the implications of the exact words of the question;
- Responded to the questions as set rather than adapt previous essays;
- Used knowledge flexibly and with discrimination.

General Comments

There were some very well supported, direct and analytical responses which offered considered judgements and showed evidence of wide reading. The best answers grappled with judgements and assessments, rather than just offering a list of explanations or extensive description. Many showed an understanding of the issues which needed to be engaged with and were not content with a 'one way' argument but showed awareness of different possible explanations. There was some very strong use of historians' views which were evaluated and discussed, not merely used to illustrate arguments or described. Historiography in itself is not necessarily a sign of a strong answer and insertion of quotations is less convincing than solid argument and supported evaluation and discussion. Answers which appeared to be adaptations of previous essays and which missed the exact wording of the question or dealt with the issues in the question intermittently were less convincing than answers which were fully engaged with the requirements of the actual questions on the paper. For example, **Question 37** on paper 1(c) did not ask how radical the Labour governments of 1945-51 were but whether they were a 'great reforming ministry'. Some answers were intent on demonstrating the extent of change, rather than dealing with whether in the context of aims and achievements, the change was 'great'. Those who tried to establish criteria for greatness in the immediate post-war context and then chose knowledge selectively were responding well to the question. Similarly, those who offered sustained comparisons, for example in **Question 14** paper 1(b) when asked to do so, showed an ability to make use of knowledge and to use it flexibly. Other candidates included sequential information which indicated knowledge but this needed to be adapted to the question. When questions ask for judgement as in key command words such as 'What best explains' or 'How far?' or 'Discuss' then better answers will offer a view and reflect thought and consideration of key issues and areas of different possible explanations and interpretations.

Knowledge was often very strong, although there were areas where it needed to be greater to offer convincing responses to the particular question tackled and it is important that the programme of study undertaken by candidates is broad enough to offer a choice if a particular question on a topic studied is not exactly what has been prepared. This examination does encourage breadth of study and some answers did suggest that too much revision time had been spent on too narrow a range of topics. Many answers clearly showed preparation for answers on Lloyd George (1c **Question 34**) had been focused on the Coalition and not the way that he had come to power and the split with Asquith. The study of the decline of Liberalism had stopped for some at 1918 and more knowledge was needed to sustain an analysis of the whole period from 1916 to 1929.

Answers often achieved considerably fluency and maturity of style. The best answers offered a very developed and sophisticated understanding of the period studied, with firm and relevant argument and some strong and detailed supporting knowledge. Importantly, good answers showed a real interest in and involvement with the past.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 2

There was some strong knowledge and good judgement in the better answers which assessed the nature and seriousness of the threat rather than simply describing and explaining Glyndwr's actions.

Question 5

Where the term 'overmighty subjects' was defined and understood, answers were stronger than when there was an account of the conflicts, with comments added on about the role of powerful nobles.

Question 6

Answers often began by stating that as Edward was overthrown in 1460 then he was obviously not secure, but then went on to be more perceptive in their analysis. The main factors hindering his security were seen as the position of the earl of Warwick, Edward's injudicious marriage and his wayward younger brother. Once these all combined against him he was lost. The counter argument that he had laid the foundations for security in this period was put forward, although it was more difficult to make it convincing. His lack of a male heir was also viewed as a problem. Some answers were very well supported.

Question 8

The word *conservative* sometimes needed more focus and some answers seemed more apt for a question on whether Henry was a modern or medieval monarch. Most answers tried to consider Henry's aims and would have benefited from always analysing them in terms of conservatism. There was good deal of material which could be used here and better responses were more discriminating in the examples deployed. Narrative on the pretenders was rarely seen. Henry's governmental methods, his relationships with the nobility and his foreign policy were examined in most responses. There was some description of his methods and then the judgement that he was or was not conservative. The stronger answers took the view that he was conservative with a range of supporting evidence, and then the opposing interpretation, and so reached a judgement. Final verdicts varied but on balance favoured conservative. More answers could have given thought to *deeply*. However, there were some strong evaluations of historical views which integrated them into the analysis and did not rely on describing different opinions.

Question 9

Responses were characterised by good knowledge of a complex period and the strength of their feeling about Henry VIII's hopeless ambitions. Most argued that Henry VIII was a lightweight in Europe and had unrealistic aims, so could not hope to succeed. Most compounded their denunciation by asserting that he would not recognise the reality and took advantage of Wolsey as a scapegoat. Candidates could have mounted more of an alternative argument; even the much-vaunted Treaty of London failed to impress them, though better answers were aware of a counter-view.

Question 10

Answers needed to engage with the terms of the question and specifically consider *serious*. There was some lengthy description of opposition; more analysis of how much of a challenge it posed would have improved responses. The opposition of Fisher and More was discounted as negligible, by some, rather bypassing their status as scholars with a European reputation. But others suggested that their execution indicated that Henry, at least, took them seriously. Most of the emphasis was on the Pilgrimage of Grace and here there was better assessment of the extent to which it was serious. Some candidates moved on to show why the opposition was muted, but this was widening out the question further than was justified.

Question 11

Focus on *consistently troubled* was variable. There was argument that Somerset was beset by numerous problems to which he responded inadequately, but the question needed a more direct answer. Answers mostly then argued that Northumberland's government was more stable and explained why and then showed how the events of July 1553 undermined his reputation as a safer pair of hands. Better answers assessed the extent of the problems and some concluded that, apart from 1549 and the aforementioned 1553 crisis, the reign was not always troubled and had some positive features.

Question 12

There were some good answers which focused sharply on the terms of the question and some made a good argument that, had Mary survived and provided a Catholic heir, she could easily have fulfilled her dream. Others took a different view and this was a question which elicited different responses which showed that the issues had been considered and the debates engaged with.

Question 13

This question led to some description of the methods Elizabeth used and more analysis of their effectiveness would have led to better responses. The question needed some assessment of what Elizabeth was aiming for in order to evaluate her degree of success. Some candidates did this and argued that the granting of supply, the passing of legislation, the relatively short periods when parliament met, the survival of the Settlement intact and the control over subjects discussed showed she was effective, while the existence of opposition in whatever form suggested her effectiveness was not totally successful.

Question 14

Generally, this was very well answered, with good analysis of the different types of threat, without too much diversion into how Elizabeth met such threats. The only real challenge for candidates appeared to be in selecting material from the wide range available which was clearly well-known to candidates.

Question 17

Some answers needed more detailed knowledge about the Lollards as they claimed they were not much of a threat and went on to write about other factors which were. This was a question clearly based on Lollardy and other manifestations of discontent with the church were not relevant. Answers which did confine themselves to Wycliffe and his followers gave varying assessments. Some claimed that a movement which was driven underground with comparative ease could not be a threat. Others saw the impact on the later Reformation and evidence suggesting the Lollards survived to a considerable extent, as indicating they played their part in the dismantling of the medieval church, even if not in their own time as such.

Question 19

Better answers could explain the impact of the Renaissance, the need for trained lawyers, the example from the court, the expansion of literature, printing and a whole range of factors. Grammar Schools, home schooling and the universities were all mentioned. Those which were limited to the royal family or offered only generalisations needed to have included a wider range of factors and deployed more detailed knowledge.

Question 27

There were some well-informed answers to this question showing that candidates had disentangled a complex period of political history and were able to give a range of explanations. Royal attitudes, the taint of Jacobitism, the role of individual Tories (Bolingbroke was universally condemned), and the continuing French wars were seen as the major factors.

Question 28

Answers to this question were well focused and there was no narrative of the course of the war. The outcome was generally seen as good for Britain, although not all the initial war aims were achieved in that Philip V remained King of Spain. There was some good analysis of how far this really mattered to Britain in the changed circumstances of 1715. The colonial and commercial benefits were suitably explained. Most candidates reached the required judgement, without which higher levels could not be attained.

Question 29

The general consensus was that the quotation was apt, but *adequate* was challenging for some candidates. There was discussion as to why the Whigs were supreme, mostly explaining Tory weakness and the attitude of the crown. There was less reference to the continuing Whig control after the fall of Walpole and some candidates needed stronger knowledge of this aspect.

Question 32

This led to some strong responses. Few candidates wrote a narrative of the period. Most appeared to have mastered the detail of the various ministries. The blame was about equally apportioned between George III and the political set-up of the period. Bute came in for much hostile comment, but the other ministers fared only a little better and there was scant sympathy for Chatham. One deciding argument that it was George III was the view that, once he found a minister to his taste in Lord North, the instability ceased.

Question 33

Candidates could have given more attention to the factor mentioned in the question and a more detailed knowledge of the role of France and Spain would have helped responses. Candidates did know about why the British lost the war but the reasons given required differentiation. They pointed up the irony that the result of the French involvement was the collapse of the *ancien regime*.

Question 34

Answers were often full and well-informed. The prevailing view was that Fox was his own worst enemy and his refusal to conciliate the king in any way meant he was bound to be out of office. But there was a minority argument that he was very unfortunate to be faced with Pitt as an alternative minister and a man of great ability and commitment. More analysis of 'so rarely' would have been welcome.

Question 35

Some answers needed to be less concerned with why the radicals were not a threat and more ready to assess the extent of the threat. Some argued well and there was a range of responses offering varying answers which showed how similar material could be advanced in support of different points of view. Thus the repressive legislation was instanced to show how serious a threat the government felt there was and also to support the view that radicals were too downtrodden to be any kind of threat. The chief conclusion was that the political order was not in much danger, but some candidates showed how radical groups from this period spawned the protest movements of the post-war years and even Chartism, thus suggesting that there was a good deal of potential for disruption, if not overthrow, there.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9769/13</p> <p>British History Outlines c.1689-2000</p>
--

The best answers:

- Considered the implications of the exact words of the question;
- Responded to the questions as set rather than adapt previous essays;
- Used knowledge flexibly and with discrimination.

General Comments

There were some very well supported, direct and analytical responses which offered considered judgements and showed evidence of wide reading. The best answers grappled with judgements and assessments, rather than just offering a list of explanations or extensive description. Many showed an understanding of the issues which needed to be engaged with and were not content with a 'one way' argument but showed awareness of different possible explanations. There was some very strong use of historians' views which were evaluated and discussed, not merely used to illustrate arguments or described. Historiography in itself is not necessarily a sign of a strong answer and insertion of quotations is less convincing than solid argument and supported evaluation and discussion. Answers which appeared to be adaptations of previous essays and which missed the exact wording of the question or dealt with the issues in the question intermittently were less convincing than answers which were fully engaged with the requirements of the actual questions on the paper. For example, **Question 37** on paper 1(c) did not ask how radical the Labour governments of 1945-51 were but whether they were a 'great reforming ministry'. Some answers were intent on demonstrating the extent of change, rather than dealing with whether in the context of aims and achievements, the change was 'great'. Those who tried to establish criteria for greatness in the immediate post-war context and then chose knowledge selectively were responding well to the question. Similarly, those who offered sustained comparisons, for example in **Question 14** paper 1(b) when asked to do so, showed an ability to make use of knowledge and to use it flexibly. Other candidates included sequential information which indicated knowledge but this needed to be adapted to the question. When questions ask for judgement as in key command words such as 'What best explains' or 'How far?' or 'Discuss' then better answers will offer a view and reflect thought and consideration of key issues and areas of different possible explanations and interpretations.

Knowledge was often very strong, although there were areas where it needed to be greater to offer convincing responses to the particular question tackled and it is important that the programme of study undertaken by candidates is broad enough to offer a choice if a particular question on a topic studied is not exactly what has been prepared. This examination does encourage breadth of study and some answers did suggest that too much revision time had been spent on too narrow a range of topics. Many answers clearly showed preparation for answers on Lloyd George (1c **Question 34**) had been focused on the Coalition and not the way that he had come to power and the split with Asquith. The study of the decline of Liberalism had stopped for some at 1918 and more knowledge was needed to sustain an analysis of the whole period from 1916 to 1929.

Answers often achieved considerably fluency and maturity of style. The best answers offered a very developed and sophisticated understanding of the period studied, with firm and relevant argument and some strong and detailed supporting knowledge. Importantly, good answers showed a real interest in and involvement with the past.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

There were some well-informed answers to this question showing that candidates had disentangled a complex period of political history and were able to give a range of explanations. Royal attitudes, the taint of Jacobitism, the role of individual Tories (Bolingbroke was universally condemned), and the continuing French wars were seen as the major factors.

Question 2

Answers to this question were well focused and there was no narrative of the course of the war. The outcome was generally seen as good for Britain, although not all the initial war aims were achieved in that Philip V remained King of Spain. There was some good analysis of how far this really mattered to Britain in the changed circumstances of 1715. The colonial and commercial benefits were suitably explained. Most candidates reached the required judgement, without which higher levels could not be attained.

Question 3

The general consensus was that the quotation was apt, but *adequate* was challenging for some candidates. There was discussion as to why the Whigs were supreme, mostly explaining Tory weakness and the attitude of the crown. There was less reference to the continuing Whig control after the fall of Walpole and some candidates needed stronger knowledge of this aspect.

Question 6

This led to some strong responses. Few candidates wrote a narrative of the period. Most appeared to have mastered the detail of the various ministries. The blame was about equally apportioned between George III and the political set-up of the period. Bute came in for much hostile comment, but the other ministers fared only a little better and there was scant sympathy for Chatham. One deciding argument that it was George III was the view that, once he found a minister to his taste in Lord North, the instability ceased.

Question 7

Candidates could have given more attention to the factor mentioned in the question and a more detailed knowledge of the role of France and Spain would have helped responses. Candidates did know about why the British lost the war but the reasons given required differentiation. They pointed up the irony that the result of the French involvement was the collapse of the *ancien regime*.

Question 8

Answers were often full and well-informed. The prevailing view was that Fox was his own worst enemy and his refusal to conciliate the king in any way meant he was bound to be out of office. But there was a minority argument that he was very unfortunate to be faced with Pitt as an alternative minister and a man of great ability and commitment. More analysis of 'so rarely' would have been welcome.

Question 9

Some answers needed to be less concerned with why the radicals were not a threat and more ready to assess the extent of the threat. Some argued well and there was a range of responses offering varying answers which showed how similar material could be advanced in support of different points of view. Thus the repressive legislation was instanced to show how serious a threat the government felt there was and also to support the view that radicals were too downtrodden to be any kind of threat. The chief conclusion was that the political order was not in much danger, but some candidates showed how radical groups from this period spawned the protest movements of the post-war years and even Chartism, thus suggesting that there was a good deal of potential for disruption, if not overthrow, there.

Question 17

This question needed an early definition of Castlereagh's aims in order for an answer to be successful. Most answers could have included more on his articulation of policy. A clear focus was needed to prevent responses from lapsing into an account of the Congress System. A more accurate idea of the exact timing of some of the events of the period would have been helpful in some cases. Most tried to make a judgement and, in general, felt Castlereagh had done his best in increasingly difficult circumstances.

Question 18

Again, this was a question where some kind of measurement was required to determine how *great* Peel was. Some answers needed a wider knowledge base about what Peel did. There was some treatment of Peel's later work as prime minister which lacked relevance. Most concentrated on penal reform, the Metropolitan Police and Catholic Emancipation. The strongest answers put these aspects in context and showed how the improvements in the penal system and the development of the situation in Ireland stemmed from Peel's initiatives

Question 19

Candidates needed to get to grips with *effectively* in relation to Melbourne. Answers could describe the measures passed in his premiership and even analyse them to a degree, but they needed to engage with assessment more. There was some need for a more secure grasp of the main legislation of these years and, indeed, of the exact dates of Melbourne's time in office. There was some strong evaluation of the impact of the ecclesiastical measures and of Melbourne's role in nurturing the young, inexperienced queen. Otherwise, a greater sense of argument beyond suggesting that the failure to carry on with the reforming zeal of Lord Grey's government was a limitation to success, would have improved some responses.

Question 23

There were some good treatments which established clear criteria for success and offered a balanced judgement. More discrimination in the selection of material would have further improved responses. Accounts of the legislation required an analytical, rather than a descriptive approach. A sequential explanation of measures sometimes left insufficient time for a clear comparison and judgement. There was some uneven treatment, with the balance being either towards domestic policy or towards foreign policy.

Question 24

Though some answers would have benefited from less description and comment on policies generally and more focus on the question, some did offer impressive analyses of the links between Gladstone's domestic preoccupations and ambitions and his Irish policy, and were aware of different arguments, balancing political expediency and idealism.

Question 25

In general, answers needed more knowledge about the role of trade unionism and there was more discussion in some answers about the formation of the Labour Party than its development.

Question 34

Effective answers required sufficient knowledge about the role of Asquith and weaker responses tended to concentrate on Lloyd George. Some candidates needed to be aware that the question gave them a choice between two factors and that other possible explanations were not necessary. They needed, too, to note the dates in the question. Most began with the quarrel of 1916 but few pursued its impact as far as 1929. In general, there seemed to be a number of 'prepared' responses to why Lloyd George fell from power which were amended to try to fit this question with various degrees of success. Most answers would have benefited from more knowledge of the wartime splits.

Question 35

Better answers focused very directly on the question and offered some perceptive comparison. There might have been more consideration of why newer industries were not located in the north, but there was some well-informed explanation of the differences. The level of economic analysis was strong in many answers. Attempts to merely explain Britain's inter-war economic problems, while showing some understanding of the period, offered a less convincing response.

Question 37

This was a question where there needed to be some means of assessing *great reforming administration*. Some answers concentrated on the welfare state, and putting its instigation in context achieved some sound analysis. Others relied on description and a final statement that these measures therefore were a sign of a great reforming ministry. Other candidates equated long-lasting with greatness. Some arguments were focused not on greatness, but on how radical or innovative measures were. To build on past achievements is not necessarily a sign that reforms are limited or a failure. Though it is a matter of debate as to how far the reforms amounted to 'socialism' and at the time they were attacked for being both too radical and not radical enough, the issue here was 'great' which required more consideration of the criteria for this judgement. There was analysis but it could have been better focused and less restricted in range.

Question 38

The key to the question was in considering different possible explanations for the decline of Britain's influence, but focusing on the factor offered, the assumption that Britain remained a world power against all the evidence. Better answers had a clear idea of the nature of the decline and were able to discuss the proposition in the title and suggest alternatives. Some focused too much on elements in Britain's changing world role, such as loss of Empire, or failure to join the EEC and a stronger focus and balance would have helped.

Question 39

This produced some effective comparisons and thoughtful responses. Some answers needed more balance, sometimes knowing more about Labour than the Conservatives, whose policies were rather dismissed in general terms. Though there was some irrelevant material on foreign policy, generally answers were focused appropriately and few failed to offer some comparative analysis.

Question 42

This question elicited some strong judgements and though there might have been more focus on Blair as a prime minister, nevertheless knowledge was used to support arguments and better answers offered a balanced treatment of both strengths and weaknesses. The answers suggested that candidates had considered their views and they wrote in an interested and interesting way.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/21

European History Outlines c.300-c.1516

Key Messages

It is important to respond to the demands of the questions for judgements.

In questions with quotations, it is important to explain the meaning of the quotation.

In questions involving the importance of a key issue, that issue must be central to the answer.

General Comments

There was a great deal of sound knowledge and developed analysis. Many answers showed a real interest in the period studied and much of the writing was fluent and showed an engagement with the issues. Most candidates offered three full answers and there were few issues of poor time planning. Some answers were of uneven quality, although this appeared to be because key elements within topics were not sufficiently well known. An example of this was Paper 22 **Question 11**, where there were some lengthy answers which knew little about Zwingli, but a lot about Luther, which was not what the question demanded. The best responses were aware of the implications of the questions and did not reproduce answers to questions which had been considered previously. Stronger answers used knowledge flexibly and selectively to support relevant points. It is important that the demands of the question take priority. If the command is to 'discuss' a view, then discussion, rather than just explaining, needs to occur. If a question asks about the outbreak of a war, then it is not necessary to write about the events in that war. If dates are given, then there is the expectation that answers should deal with the period within those dates. The starting point for effective answers is always the question and better answers avoid using the topic in the question to convey information and arguments that only broadly relate to that topic. The careful reading of the question to ascertain precisely what is required and responding to those requirements is essential for higher marks.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 7

The answers to this question generally agreed that Charlemagne was much motivated by religion, with a range of evidence to support the view. Other motives such as expansion and the acquisition of booty were also assessed. The question demanded discrimination in the choice of material and most candidates achieved this.

Question 8

Answers largely agreed with the view in the question but had some other possible explanations such as the quality of Charlemagne's successors. There was analysis about how far Charlemagne intended his empire to survive intact.

Question 11

Responses were well-informed about the reign of Otto but some needed to offer a more balanced appraisal rather than a general account.

Question 12

There was some useful discussion here, well directed at the question. The weaknesses of their enemies, their tactics in picking off attackers one by one, their characters and the support of the church were all put forward as explanations. Most answers were thematic, but one or two worked through the kings in turn, which was less rewarding. Some answers needed to cover a wider range of material, and the church was a surprising omission.

Question 14

Several answers pointed out that Gregory's death in exile hardly supported the view that he had achievements, which was a fair point. They mostly went on to discuss his views on the role of the church and how far he was able to impose them. His becoming Pope at all was seen by some as an achievement, given his background. Judgements on the extent of his success often took a long view and argued that the power of the church eventually reached a level similar to that for which he had striven.

Question 17

Better answers were able to distinguish between Frederick's military and diplomatic achievements and so assess him as a statesman. Not all took this approach, and some described what he did and then argued that this proved he was a great statesman or diplomat. His activities in Italy were often the subject of a lengthy account, which could have been better aimed at the question.

Question 18

Candidates seemed to enjoy answering this question. The discussion centred on how far Louis VII was pious, with examples from the Crusade and his subservience to Bernard of Clairvaux and Abbot Suger, contrasted with his willingness to fight for his rights and to acquire territory if he had to. Answers then often argued that piety was a useful trait in a medieval king and that Louis won much praise for going on the Crusade and giving refuge to Becket and Alexander III, which translated into growing support. His relationship with Eleanor of Aquitaine was a surprising omission in some answers, but was generally well analysed. Louis could be seen as pious in ridding himself of a possibly unfaithful wife, but also hard-headed in pursuing his need for a male heir. Hence the conclusion offered by some responses that, pious or not, he made a good medieval king.

Question 19

Some answers needed to be more flexible with the information deployed, which needed to be better adapted to answer the question. When faced with two alternatives of this type, candidates should try to come to a judgement, one way or the other. Some attempted a largely chronological approach, whereas the question required analysis of the two sides. Philip's financial resources could have been more fully considered. On the Angevin side, answers were aware of the view that the Empire was imploding and there was some effective argument that it was not really an empire in any case. Most concluded, with some of the chronicles of the time, that Philip would never have defeated Richard. His luck lay in the Lionheart's unexpected death in 1199 and the accession of a far easier target in the form of John, whose errors and lack of action did Philip's work for him.

Question 20

Innocent's success was mostly discussed in general terms and answers would have been improved by concentrating more on his relationships with Western European rulers. King John was hardly mentioned.

Question 38

Candidates seemed to enjoy this question and not only because it gave them the chance to detail the misdeeds of the papacy. There was some effective analysis and different points of view were expressed. Some argued that the Popes were nothing more than Italian rulers with examples of their use of armies to maintain the Papal States and their promotion of their own family interests. But others suggested that even so, no other Italian ruler had the prestige of being the Head of the Church and that the papacy was thus bound to be set apart. This was often very convincingly conveyed and the role of popes as peacemakers quoted. It must be stressed that no particular answer is expected and Examiners hope that candidates will offer their own supported views.

Question 42

There was some good knowledge about the literature of the period, the courts where chivalry flourished and its view of women. The point that chivalry was largely aspirational and did not often reflect reality was well made.

Question 44

Candidates needed to address *fundamental* specifically. This was not a question about whether the church needed reform - an issue on which there was little debate, but an issue about whether it needed a total overhaul. Those arguing that on the one hand it was corrupt and on the other it was popular and vibrant needed to focus more clearly to the key aspect of the question. Stronger answers suggested that in 1517 some tinkering could have solved the problems but that once the opportunity was missed, then root and branch reform was much more likely. The recognition by many within the church from Erasmus onwards that time was running out was also well discussed by some.

Question 46

There was sound knowledge of the developments of the period, although answers had a tendency to describe them. There was some assessment of how far new, as opposed to reborn, techniques emerged in the visual arts.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/22

European History Outlines c.1378-c.1815

Key Messages

It is important to respond to the demands of the questions for judgements.

In questions with quotations, it is important to explain the meaning of the quotation.

In questions involving the importance of a key issue, that issue must be central to the answer.

General Comments

There was a great deal of sound knowledge and developed analysis. Many answers showed a real interest in the period studied and much of the writing was fluent and showed an engagement with the issues. Most candidates offered three full answers and there were few issues of poor time planning. Some answers were of uneven quality, although this appeared to be because key elements within topics were not sufficiently well known. An example of this was Paper 22 **Question 11**, where there were some lengthy answers which knew little about Zwingli, but a lot about Luther, which was not what the question demanded. The best responses were aware of the implications of the questions and did not reproduce answers to questions which had been considered previously. Stronger answers used knowledge flexibly and selectively to support relevant points. It is important that the demands of the question take priority. If the command is to 'discuss' a view, then discussion, rather than just explaining, needs to occur. If a question asks about the outbreak of a war, then it is not necessary to write about the events in that war. If dates are given, then there is the expectation that answers should deal with the period within those dates. The starting point for effective answers is always the question and better answers avoid using the topic in the question to convey information and arguments that only broadly relate to that topic. The careful reading of the question to ascertain precisely what is required and responding to those requirements is essential for higher marks.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 7

Candidates seemed to enjoy this question and not only because it gave them the chance to detail the misdeeds of the papacy. There was some effective analysis and different points of view were expressed. Some argued that the Popes were nothing more than Italian rulers with examples of their use of armies to maintain the Papal States and their promotion of their own family interests. But others suggested that even so, no other Italian ruler had the prestige of being the Head of the Church and that the papacy was thus bound to be set apart. This was often very convincingly conveyed and the role of popes as peacemakers quoted. It must be stressed that no particular answer is expected and Examiners hope that candidates will offer their own supported views.

Question 11

Some answers needed more precise knowledge about Zwingli and Calvin. Arguing that they continued the reforms of Luther and then setting out Luther's ideas was not sufficient as an answer in itself. Better responses dealt with both Zwingli and Calvin, although in general, knowledge of the former was not strong.

Question 12

Charles V generally had a sympathetic hearing. Few answers argued that he achieved much, but credit was given to him by some for trying in difficult circumstances. Others were more ready to condemn him for obstinately adhering to outdated ideals. Most candidates were able to assess his achievement in terms of stated aims, which was a helpful approach to the question. While many answers were well-balanced, some gave events in the Netherlands too much consideration at the expense of other aspects.

Question 21

Candidates needed to address *fundamental* specifically. This was not a question about whether the church needed reform - an issue on which there was little debate, but an issue about whether it needed a total overhaul. Those arguing that on the one hand it was corrupt and on the other it was popular and vibrant needed to focus more clearly to the key aspect of the question. Stronger answers suggested that in 1517 some tinkering could have solved the problems but that once the opportunity was missed, then root and branch reform was much more likely. The recognition by many within the church from Erasmus onwards that time was running out was also well discussed by some.

Question 22

There was sound knowledge of the developments of the period, although answers had a tendency to describe them. There was some assessment of how far new, as opposed to reborn, techniques emerged in the visual arts.

Question 23

Some answers concentrated on marginal aspects and some on areas more generally considered as social history such as attitudes to outcasts, including lepers and homosexuals, the role of women and developments within the family. Some offered unbalanced treatment of the spread of witch-hunting. The challenge for some lay in the term *substantial*, which needed to be addressed more often. Candidates should be aware of key words in questions such as this and offer a direct response to them.

Question 26

Answers agreed that inflation was the most important change, but some would have been improved by referring to a wider range of other changes in order to justify the judgement.

Question 28

In general answers agreed with the judgement in the question, although some needed to mount a more convincing alternative view.

Question 32

This was thoughtfully tackled. Candidates were often divided about the answer to this question so that a genuine debate emerged. Some cited Frederick William's building up of Prussia at home, notably his construction of a powerful military force, as an achievement which made expansion abroad possible. Others argued that his activities outside Prussia made the duchy count in European politics and helped lay the foundations for future greatness.

Question 33

Some answers would have been improved by sharper focusing on the role of Louis's ministers. Theories about government and debate about Louis' despotism or not were side-issues. Stronger answers concentrated on the practicalities and argued that little happened without Louis' knowledge in central government, but that fine detail could not be mastered by any one man in a country the size of France. Indeed, they suggested, a good ruler knows when to delegate. Hence they concluded that Louis set much of the tone, and his attitude to his ministers was quoted by many, but that Colbert and his colleagues carried out the work. Louis' personal interests in the army, foreign policy and in religion were noted. Some answers required more specific detail and more reference to ministers by name.

Question 34

Answers were divided in their opinions on this question. Some suggested that Peter's reforms in Russia spearheaded his expansionism and that without this stronger base at home, he would have failed. Others assessed the outcome of his domestic policies and argued that, despite his westernising tendencies, Russia was very resistant to organic change. They went on to promote the view that Europe only woke up to the potential of Russia when Peter appeared as a powerful player in the Baltic and beyond and so his expansionism was his greatest achievement. There was little description in these answers and some strong analysis.

Question 36

There were different approaches to this question. Some assessed how far Louis' foreign policy and thus the participation in Spain resulted from his ambition or from other motives. Others divided the blame for the war between Louis and other European powers that became involved and felt the Emperor was the real culprit. It was encouraging that there was diversity of opinion and supported argument.

Question 37

Some answers needed some more accurate knowledge about the events of the regency. Others challenged the view in the question strongly and suggested that the final debacle in France in 1789 just showed how little reform there was in reality, even if some was projected.

Question 38

Frederick the Great remains a popular topic. Candidates enjoyed quoting some of his pithier sayings, usually to show his practical side. Some dismembered the quotation in the question and examined *enlightened* and *despot* separately. They mostly concluded that he was not totally enlightened and not wholly despotic. Other candidates defined the term and then analysed Frederick's policies and achievements in the light of their original explanation. Both approaches were valid and some good discussion was forthcoming.

Question 39

There was good knowledge of the events preceding and during the Seven Years War and some responses argued well that for some countries the war in America, India and on the seas was the main purpose, but that for others, dominance of mainland Europe was a considerable concern. Even Britain had interests in Hanover, or at least its king did. Answers were effectively structured.

Question 44

Some responses offered a series of explanations for the Revolution which included reference to the Philosophes. In general, knowledge of the Enlightenment could have been stronger and the comparative element more developed.

Question 46

Though some strayed into Napoleon's career as a whole, most focused on military elements; the distinction between 'luck' and general circumstances beyond Napoleon's control could have been made by more candidates. There was some good specialised knowledge of some elements of Napoleon's generalship.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/23

European History Outlines c.1715-2000

Key Messages

It is important to respond to the demands of the questions for judgements.

In questions with quotations, it is important to explain the meaning of the quotation.

In questions involving the importance of a key issue, that issue must be central to the answer.

General Comments

There was a great deal of sound knowledge and developed analysis. Many answers showed a real interest in the period studied and much of the writing was fluent and showed an engagement with the issues. Most candidates offered three full answers and there were few issues of poor time planning. Some answers were of uneven quality, although this appeared to be because key elements within topics were not sufficiently well known. An example of this was Paper 22 **Question 11**, where there were some lengthy answers which knew little about Zwingli, but a lot about Luther, which was not what the question demanded. The best responses were aware of the implications of the questions and did not reproduce answers to questions which had been considered previously. Stronger answers used knowledge flexibly and selectively to support relevant points. It is important that the demands of the question take priority. If the command is to 'discuss' a view, then discussion, rather than just explaining, needs to occur. If a question asks about the outbreak of a war, then it is not necessary to write about the events in that war. If dates are given, then there is the expectation that answers should deal with the period within those dates. The starting point for effective answers is always the question and better answers avoid using the topic in the question to convey information and arguments that only broadly relate to that topic. The careful reading of the question to ascertain precisely what is required and responding to those requirements is essential for higher marks.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

Some answers needed some more accurate knowledge about the events of the regency. Others challenged the view in the question strongly and suggested that the final debacle in France in 1789 just showed how little reform there was in reality, even if some was projected

Question 2

Frederick the Great remains a popular topic. Candidates enjoyed quoting some of his pithier sayings, usually to show his practical side. Some dismembered the quotation in the question and examined *enlightened* and *despot* separately. They mostly concluded that he was not totally enlightened and not wholly despotic. Other candidates defined the term and then analysed Frederick's policies and achievements in the light of their original explanation. Both approaches were valid and some good discussion was forthcoming.

Question 3

There was good knowledge of the events preceding and during the Seven Years War and some responses argued well that for some countries the war in America, India and on the seas was the main purpose, but that for others, dominance of mainland Europe was a considerable concern. Even Britain had interests in Hanover, or at least its king did. Answers were effectively structured.

Question 8

Some responses offered a series of explanations for the Revolution which included reference to the Philosophes. In general, knowledge of the Enlightenment could have been stronger and the comparative element more developed.

Question 10

Though some strayed into Napoleon's career as a whole, most focused on military elements; the distinction between 'luck' and general circumstances beyond Napoleon's control could have been made by more candidates. There was some good specialised knowledge of some elements of Napoleon's generalship.

Question 17

There was some good knowledge of elements of success and failure, and stronger answers tackled 'the interests of the nation'. Some argued that the circumstances of his accession led him to equate the power of the autocracy with national interest and there were some able arguments which offered a balanced view, seeing that the reign was more than simply reactionary.

Question 18

There were some very strong comparative analyses which managed to sustain a focus on Louis XVIII but also to use knowledge about the other two rulers effectively and flexibly. Some argued that he was the only one not to finally lose his throne to revolution. Better answers considered success criteria; weaker responses tended to offer a general description of the period, or to deal sketchily with the comparison.

Question 19

This was, in general, well understood. Better answers offered some estimation of the economic factors. There was better understanding than is sometimes the case with questions on this topic that the Zollverein was not the only element. There was some effective linking of Bismarck's diplomatic and military resources to the economic strengths and influence of Prussia. Few adopted a narrative approach, but some did offer a rather indiscriminating list of factors.

Question 20

Many responses did offer a judgement here. Some were more intent on comparing the two leaders, but there were many attempts to assess the contributions and knowledge was used well in analytical answers. Generally, the level of support was high.

Question 21

Some answers offered impressive thematic answers to this question, using examples from the different revolutions and attempting some judgement about the most significant feature. Given the considerable material on this topic, there was some well-controlled and effectively-organized analysis here. Less effective responses tended to generalise and lacked exemplification of the reasons, or focused too much on one country, particularly Italy.

Question 22

There was a most encouraging response to this question by many who did really consider which sections of Russian society gained. There was a tendency to concentrate a little too much on the Emancipation, but the level of detailed knowledge about this was often impressive. Some started well, but then struggled in explaining the reforms. Some argued that it was the Tsarist regime who gained the most – a tenable view, and some balanced this by considering other possible beneficiaries. Encouragingly, relatively few simply offered an account of the reforms or merely explained their strengths and weaknesses.

Question 23

This is a well established debate, but only better answers looked at the period as a whole. Some focused almost exclusively on the Constitution; they needed to look forward to see its ramifications. Others, surprisingly, neglected the constitutional issues but did deal with the relations with the Catholic Church and

the Socialists. The terms 'liberal' did need to be considered – better answers were aware that anti-clericalism was a 'Liberal' cause in the period, while many Liberals were hostile to universal suffrage.

Question 26

This produced a variety of responses. A requisite was an understanding of 'military planning' and not just 'militarism' in general. Some answers would have benefited from more certainty about what the planning was and also about what long-term rivalries existed. Stronger answers focused well on these and did not just offer a sort of list of causes of the war.

Question 33

Some answers offered analyses of the weaknesses of leadership and did challenge the reputation of the generals. Generally the links between leadership and casualties could have been more strongly established.

Question 34

The crucial concept here is whether the nature of the League and the context in which it operated meant that there was never a chance of success. Some good answers grasped this; other responses were focused on explaining why it failed, which was not really the question.

Question 35

Although good responses were seen, some candidates offered material on the rise of Stalin which was not required, and others would have benefited from a greater engagement with the concept of 'ideals'.

Question 36

There were some effective discussions about whether favourable circumstances or Hitler's own abilities were more important. 'Luck' was somewhat broadly interpreted by some, but better answers went beyond generalisations about Weimar Germany and looked at the events of 1930-34, particularly the fall in support for the Nazis in 1932 and the machinations of von Papen. Hitler's own skills were often seen in rather general terms.

Question 37

Though some candidates offered a judgement about responsibility, for higher marks answers needed to be more consistently relevant or well developed. Answers to this question tended to stray into the war itself and required more knowledge of the events of 1936 or the military coup itself.

Question 38

There was some well-supported analysis, although the range was sometimes limited and some responses needed to stretch beyond the economic causes of the rise of Hitler. More answers could have considered economic pressures on revisionist powers or weighed purely economic factors with other causes.

Question 39

Though there were some strong judgements offered by better answers which looked at different explanations, some tended towards descriptions of historiography with limited reference to the evidence behind different views.

Question 41

The few attempts to explain the lack of effective opposition to Franco would have been improved by more knowledge of Spain itself after 1939 and there were some unbalanced explanations which dealt mainly with Franco's foreign relations.

Question 43

Explanations of different factors were offered. In some cases more focus was needed on parliamentary democracy and fuller explanations of the relationship between greater prosperity and political stability would have improved responses. In some answers, there was more about the weaknesses of Italian political life without sufficient explanation of why those weaknesses did not bring about the collapse of democracy. Generally, answers would have been stronger if some sort of judgement about the relative importance of different possible reasons had been offered.

HISTORY

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

Key Messages

- It is important to respond to the precise wording of the question
- Answers should offer sustained judgement and evaluation for higher level marks
- Selection of relevant supporting factual material is essential

General Comments

There were many answers which showed strong factual knowledge and there was a strong sense of real interest in the topics. There were few very weak final answers and indications that candidates had planned their time effectively. Reference to historians was usually appropriate and answers did not become over-descriptive of different views. The impression was given that the study of US History had been rewarding.

Better answers maintained a strong clear focus on the question set. Sometimes it seemed that answers to a different, if related question were being relied on quite heavily, and that the exact terms of the question needed to be given more attention. The command words should be carefully addressed. 'Assess the impact of the Seven Years War on relations between Britain and the American colonies before 1776' is different to 'Describe the impact...' or even 'Explain the impact...'. Better answers considered key words in questions and made them the basis of the analysis. For example, **Question 30** required full treatment of the idea of 'divisions in US society', rather than an outline of Nixon's policies or personality.

Better answers engaged with the possible explanations or offered sustained supported judgements. There were strong analyses of the domestic policy of Kennedy, for instance, which went beyond lists of policies which were labelled successes and lists of policies which were labelled failures, to more balanced judgements about the different aspects of domestic policy which took into account the aims, limitations and realistic criteria for assessing success. Less successful answers started with descriptions of policies, rather than considering the basis on which judgements could be made.

Good answers used knowledge with discrimination in support of clear arguments. It is, of course, very important that answers are relevant. Answers which continued, for example, to consider events after 1776 or which wrote about US foreign policy with little reference to Cuba were not being guided enough by the demands of the question. Answers which included Kennedy's foreign policy were hindered by not leaving enough time for a full consideration of the real focus of the question which was domestic policy. However, where knowledge was well focused, results were often impressive and there was some excellent and detailed support.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

Many answers were well informed about the events from 1763 to 1776. Others were descriptions or chronologies of events. Better responses assessed the way these events were a consequence of the Seven Years War and some of these responses showed awareness that their impact on Anglo-American relations can be interpreted in different ways.

Question 2

Some answers were unsure about the impact of Washington's leadership but many offered some treatment of the key issue in the question, even if the analysis could have been more extensive. Weaker answers focused on other factors and commented on Washington's contribution only later in their response. Stronger answers analysed Washington's qualities, being aware of his limitations and mistakes, and the relative importance of other factors. Knowledge of the military history of the war was often less developed than the understanding of the causes of the war.

Question 3

Some answers could have been improved by a greater focus on the aims of those who drafted the Constitution and by analysing the context in which they worked.

Question 4

There was sometimes better knowledge shown of other factors than of the factor in the question. There was often a good general awareness of the general situation as regards slavery in the period, and answers would have benefited from more analysis of the importance of the factor given in the question.

Question 5

This produced some thoughtful responses, and there were examples of different approaches. Some compared his first with his second terms and others adopted a more thematic approach. Most were mindful of the need to assess the record and there was a focus on judgement here.

Question 6

Better answers drew a distinction between social and economic importance and went beyond broad generalisations.

Question 9

Most answers ranged over the inherent and persistent differences between the two sections. While there was general understanding of the issues, the question required a focus on the actual Compromise and whether it might have stood a chance of being a lasting solution. Better answers considered arguments that it was not in itself flawed but overtaken by later events and balanced this by considering the counter view that in the context of the time there was, in fact, little chance of it working. This was a stronger approach than to just offer a list of causes of the sectional disputes.

Question 10

Many responses showed knowledge of the resources of the North; some considered the poverty of the resources of the South. Better answers considered the relative importance of this in relation to other factors and the different aims of the two sides. There were some perceptive comments about the importance of resources in different stages of the war, some arguing that Grant's war of attrition made resources the key, for instance. Answers which went beyond simply explaining the different resources, or offering a list of reasons for the outcome of the war which started with resources and then moved on to other factors without offering a clear judgement, showed more awareness of the requirement of the question.

Question 11

Most answers showed knowledge about the Louisiana Purchase. Better responses were characterised by consideration of the relative importance of this, set against other factors.

Question 12

A small number of candidates attempted this question and while there was knowledge of how the way of life of the Native Americans was affected, better answers distinguished between the deliberate and accidental. The importance of responding to the exact wording of the question was shown here.

Question 20

Those responses which showed awareness of the demands of the question contained well focused analyses, mainly by adopting a thematic approach. Answers offering a response to a question about whether the US was an imperial power - without much reference to Cuba, scored less well. It is important for answers to show a direct response to the question set.

Question 22

Questions which offer a view in a quotation are best tackled by explanations of the basis on which the view could be held and a discussion of the key arguments. Though there was some understanding of the focus of the question, some answers would have been improved by more development and support for judgements to be convincing.

Question 23

This was answered by many candidates. Most answers provided a standard assessment of the main features of the period, with better responses producing an analysis which was closely related to the implications of prosperity. There were some strong points made about the lack of prosperity among key groups being as important as the encouragement of over-production and stock-market speculation by greater prosperity. The explanatory links between the different factors described and the actual Depression could have been more developed.

Question 24

There was knowledge shown in many answers on the effectiveness of the New Deal in providing jobs or relieving poverty or, in general, dealing with the problems of the time. Better answers attempted an analysis of whether capitalism was saved.

Question 26

Better answers were able to distinguish between national and broader interests. It would have been helpful for some answers to have considered alternative explanations, for example to discuss whether the Berlin airlift was exclusively concerned with out-facing the USSR, rather than providing humanitarian aid to Berliners. It is important that not all Cold War questions should be answered exclusively in terms of 'blame' or 'revisionism against orthodoxy', but in terms of the question actually asked.

Question 27

There was knowledge shown of the details of McCarthy's witch-hunt and most considered the different factors that explain anti-Communism in the period. Better responses focused on the key wording of the question which was 'widespread fear' and offered judgement about the relative importance of different factors, considering earlier manifestations of concern about communism.

Question 29

There were some strong answers to this question, with judgements being offered which were aware of the limitations facing Kennedy and assessing whether or not he did enough to overcome them. Some presented the argument that Kennedy's intentions were realised by Johnson, to help justify the case for success. Many answers would have been improved if the aims of the policies had been more firmly established as criteria against which to judge achievements.

Question 30

There was knowledge shown of particular areas of policy – civil rights, Vietnam, poverty, the economy and Nixon's style and fall. Better answers went beyond a general consideration of successes and failures to relate knowledge to the key concept in the question – division. Again, where the question was addressed directly, answers were far more successful and convincing. Given that there was good knowledge, more time reflecting on the needs of the question would have been helpful for some.

Question 32

There were some good judgements here and some perceptive analyses of the Reagan era. It is important that the question should be read carefully as some answers included material about foreign relations, which was not required.

Question 33

There were some relevant analyses of the greater scope for independent action offered by war to the Presidents. Some compared this to the problems encountered in peacetime reforms. Better answers did not adopt a run through of Presidents and did offer coverage of the period as a whole.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/04

African and Asian History Outlines c.1750-2000

Key Messages

It is important for answers to respond to all the implications of questions.

There should be a clear judgement offered if questions require an assessment of different explanations.

If a period is specified in a question, then answers should deal with the whole of that period.

General Comments

Some excellent answers were offered. At the higher end, answers were factually impressive and engaged in a very sophisticated and insightful way with the issues in the question. Asian history attracts more answers than African history and it is questions on China, Japan and India which attract the most responses. Candidates clearly rose to the challenge of Asian history and often wrote with a high level of interest and commitment. The comments below are intended to offer some guidance on improving performance, but overall, there was much pleasing and enjoyable writing on this paper.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 17

There was much sound explanation; answers which distinguished longer term weaknesses and the weaknesses of the later period sometimes went further towards explaining the relative importance of the different elements. Better answers engaged with judgements, addressing 'What best explains', rather than just offering a series of explanations.

Question 18

There were some good answers which considered how far it was the strength of the CCP – the dedication and heroism of its followers, its organisation and its leadership which allowed it to survive against the considerably more numerous forces of the GMD, and how far its enemies were distracted by other problems and by poor strategy and limited support. The Long March might have been given more attention in some cases.

Question 19

Some balanced and effective judgements were reached. Some answers were more focused on general 'success and failure' and were uncertain of which policies fell within the time limit set by the question. Better answers stopped to consider the implications of the concept of 'benefit the people', rather than just looking at the outcomes of CCP rule generally.

Question 20

Better answers saw the implications of the question and discussed whether the Cultural Revolution was primarily about the ambitions of Mao and power politics or whether it had genuine ideological aims. There was some strong knowledge about its origins and nature which showed very strong understanding in some answers. Weaker responses reproduced knowledge on the 'causes and consequences of the Cultural Revolution', without really getting to grips with the debate behind the question.

Question 22

Detailed knowledge of Indian History was generally less impressive than that offered on Japan and China and though there were some perceptive responses, answers needed to be less general in order to be more effective.

Question 23

Better answers attempted to establish some criteria for success, relating Nehru's policies to the problems of an independent India and offering a balanced judgement. Less successful answers started with a description of some policies, with some comments added. The aims and nature of economic planning were sometimes areas which could have been better done by candidates.

Question 28

There was some strong knowledge of the reforms of the Meiji period. Better answers engaged fully with the implications of 'modernisation', as opposed to general comments on the effectiveness or success of reforms. Encouragingly, few offered just a catalogue of changes and most attempted some judgement.

Question 40

Though most made some reference to the key issue in the question, some responses would have benefited from more knowledge of the nature of the military superiority, and there was some tendency to pass over this and offer a list of reasons for foreign dominance. There were also better responses which avoided this. It is important that answers to questions with a 'named issue' do address that issue.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/52

Special Subject - The Crusades, 1095–1192

Key Messages

- Responses to Part **(a)** and **(b)** questions must be firmly based on full analyses of the documents
- A range of knowledge should be deployed to assess the documents in **(b)**
- There should be a very careful reading of the questions and consideration of their implications and requirements

General Comments

The comparison of two documents should be based firmly on a detailed study of their content and points of similarity and difference should be well supported by reference to the texts. Stronger answers offered firm and clear comparison and contrast and then moved on to explain this by reference to the nature of the two pieces of evidence. Without that firm analysis it is more difficult to use consideration of provenance to offer explanation. Speculation and generalised comments on the provenance of the documents - especially when not related to explaining the extent to which one document corroborates another, is less effective than analysis which follows a clear estimation of how far the two documents support each other.

It is essential in **(b)** that passages are linked to the issue in the question and not simply described or paraphrased. Answers gained credit for interpreting the documents, that is explaining what they said about the key issue. It was often helpful when the documents were grouped and there were cross references between them. However, there is a requirement for contextual knowledge to be deployed and stronger responses were able to assess the documents in the light of their own knowledge. A full understanding of each passage and a supported judgement on each should be the aim. Knowledge should be used with flexibility and discrimination. Candidates do know in advance which general topic area will be asked about, so there is the chance to ensure that they have a good range of subject knowledge and this should be employed appropriately for higher marks. Weaker responses often were heavily balanced towards explanation of the documents. It is essential that all the documents are considered. The overall aim is to use both the documents and knowledge applied to them to reach a conclusion. Answers which treated **(b)** as another essay question with minimal reference to the documents had not grasped the point of the question; answers which merely referenced the passages to illustrate an argument about the issue in the question had, too, shown insufficient awareness of the importance of the documents in this question. Good answers offered a well balanced argument and made good and critical use of the passage by deploying knowledge of a high quality and level of relevance to the texts.

This is called a Special Subject because candidates are expected to have studied it in depth. In some essay answers, material was more generalised and less supported than in the outlines paper. Many answers did indeed deploy excellent knowledge and showed a level of understanding that was impressive, sometimes making reference to sources. Though not a requirement, it did enrich some responses and indicate that there had been a study in depth. The knowledge, understanding and argument in essay answers did vary quite considerably, not only between the different special subjects, but also in relation to specific questions. As with the outlines papers, it is very important that questions are read carefully and that supporting material is relevant and the answers as a whole sustain a focus on the exact terms of the questions.

Comments on Specific Questions

9769/52- The Crusades

Question 1

- (a) The comparison was usually well made and few candidates dealt with the documents separately. The differences were easier to find than the similarities with *cheerful and confident* being contrasted with *treacherous* and Richard's *love of God* hardly being borne out in the slaughter of prisoners. Some candidates missed the winning of the Holy Cross in both documents and the aims of Richard in Syria. The comparison of provenance was straightforward and most answers recognised that A was prepared to see some military sense in Richard's apparent brutality.
- (b) More effective answers considered both *effective* and *respected*. Successful approaches concluded that the documents showed Richard as respected, using evidence from all the documents, but not necessarily effective. Document E was used well in many answers to make balanced judgements. Some answers needed more supporting knowledge here.

Question 2

Stronger answers made a direct comparison between the two waves of the First Crusade rather than explaining why the first wave was a failure and the second a success separately. By looking at aspects such as leadership, motivation, personnel, supplies, attitudes to Alexius and fighting capability, some candidates wrote impressive answers.

Question 3

To be effective, responses needed to explain which of the two factors was dominant. It would have been helpful if answers had offered more precise knowledge about developments in the kingdoms up to 1144, as some included events after that date, but in general it was very well answered.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/54

Special Subject - Reformation Europe, 1516–1559

Key Messages

- Responses to Part **(a)** and **(b)** questions must be firmly based on full analyses of the documents
- A range of knowledge should be deployed to assess the documents in **(b)**
- There should be a very careful reading of the questions and consideration of their implications and requirements

General Comments

The comparison of two documents should be based firmly on a detailed study of their content and points of similarity and difference should be well supported by reference to the texts. Stronger answers offered firm and clear comparison and contrast and then moved on to explain this by reference to the nature of the two pieces of evidence. Without that firm analysis it is more difficult to use consideration of provenance to offer explanation. Speculation and generalised comments on the provenance of the documents - especially when not related to explaining the extent to which one document corroborates another, is less effective than analysis which follows a clear estimation of how far the two documents support each other.

It is essential in **(b)** that passages are linked to the issue in the question and not simply described or paraphrased. Answers gained credit for interpreting the documents, that is explaining what they said about the key issue. It was often helpful when the documents were grouped and there were cross references between them. However, there is a requirement for contextual knowledge to be deployed and stronger responses were able to assess the documents in the light of their own knowledge. A full understanding of each passage and a supported judgement on each should be the aim. Knowledge should be used with flexibility and discrimination. Candidates do know in advance which general topic area will be asked about, so there is the chance to ensure that they have a good range of subject knowledge and this should be employed appropriately for higher marks. Weaker responses often were heavily balanced towards explanation of the documents. It is essential that all the documents are considered. The overall aim is to use both the documents and knowledge applied to them to reach a conclusion. Answers which treated **(b)** as another essay question with minimal reference to the documents had not grasped the point of the question; answers which merely referenced the passages to illustrate an argument about the issue in the question had, too, shown insufficient awareness of the importance of the documents in this question. Good answers offered a well balanced argument and made good and critical use of the passage by deploying knowledge of a high quality and level of relevance to the texts.

This is called a Special Subject because candidates are expected to have studied it in depth. In some essay answers, material was more generalised and less supported than in the outlines paper. Many answers did indeed deploy excellent knowledge and showed a level of understanding that was impressive, sometimes making reference to sources. Though not a requirement, it did enrich some responses and indicate that there had been a study in depth. The knowledge, understanding and argument in essay answers did vary quite considerably, not only between the different special subjects, but also in relation to specific questions. As with the outlines papers, it is very important that questions are read carefully and that supporting material is relevant and the answers as a whole sustain a focus on the exact terms of the questions.

Comments on Specific Questions

9769/54 – Reformation Europe

Question 1

- (a) Candidates were generally able to see similarities in the general concerns and specifically in the ordination of unsuitable persons. The differences lay in the precise defects, simony and sexual immorality in B and irreverence and absenteeism in C. The extent of agreement was thus considerable and stronger answers noted that the passage of 20 years had not witnessed much improvement. Some answers argued, using the provenance, that both documents stemmed from the church itself, thus testifying to some recognition for the need to reform, if not much urgency in carrying it out.
- (b) The factor in the question was generally addressed, but the grouping of the documents with A and E supporting the view, B and C with a hint from E contradicting it, and D putting forward another explanation, needed to be made clearer. Document D could have been better used. Paul III was blamed for being slow to act rather than secular leaders. Supporting knowledge was good, although it threatened to take over at times. A lot of examples of absentee bishops were not needed to prove the point.

Question 2

Answers argued that Charles certainly lacked authority but that he was not to blame as the system and his circumstances were too much for anyone to overcome. Detailed knowledge of the way the empire was governed would have improved some responses.

Question 3

This question was generally well answered, with Francis I being credited with personal jealousy and ambition and a refusal to observe truces and treaties. A narrative of the wars was a less effective way to approach the question. Answers needed to select appropriately and relevantly from the available material. The alternative view that Francis was provoked was dismissed a little too readily by some.

Question 4

Some of the answers to this question were stronger on the social and political appeal of Lutheranism than on its religious attractions. Better answers avoided description of the events of 1517-21, which was not directly relevant. Some went on to consider Zwingli and Calvin and argue their religious appeal was greater, which, again, was not a useful development. But some responses showed a good grasp of Lutheran theology and explained it clearly. They also made reference to the unexpected nature of Luther's appeal in 1517 and argued that it could not be categorised artificially. Valid challenges to the question are always welcome.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/55

The Reign of Charles I, 1625-1649

Key Messages

- Responses to Part **(a)** and **(b)** questions must be firmly based on full analyses of the documents
- A range of knowledge should be deployed to assess the documents in **(b)**
- There should be a very careful reading of the questions and consideration of their implications and requirements

General Comments

The comparison of two documents should be based firmly on a detailed study of their content and points of similarity and difference should be well supported by reference to the texts. Stronger answers offered firm and clear comparison and contrast and then moved on to explain this by reference to the nature of the two pieces of evidence. Without that firm analysis it is more difficult to use consideration of provenance to offer explanation. Speculation and generalised comments on the provenance of the documents - especially when not related to explaining the extent to which one document corroborates another, is less effective than analysis which follows a clear estimation of how far the two documents support each other.

It is essential in **(b)** that passages are linked to the issue in the question and not simply described or paraphrased. Answers gained credit for interpreting the documents, that is explaining what they said about the key issue. It was often helpful when the documents were grouped and there were cross references between them. However, there is a requirement for contextual knowledge to be deployed and stronger responses were able to assess the documents in the light of their own knowledge. A full understanding of each passage and a supported judgement on each should be the aim. Knowledge should be used with flexibility and discrimination. Candidates do know in advance which general topic area will be asked about, so there is the chance to ensure that they have a good range of subject knowledge and this should be employed appropriately for higher marks. Weaker responses often were heavily balanced towards explanation of the documents. It is essential that all the documents are considered. The overall aim is to use both the documents and knowledge applied to them to reach a conclusion. Answers which treated **(b)** as another essay question with minimal reference to the documents had not grasped the point of the question; answers which merely referenced the passages to illustrate an argument about the issue in the question had, too, shown insufficient awareness of the importance of the documents in this question. Good answers offered a well balanced argument and made good and critical use of the passage by deploying knowledge of a high quality and level of relevance to the texts.

This is called a Special Subject because candidates are expected to have studied it in depth. In some essay answers, material was more generalised and less supported than in the outlines paper. Many answers did indeed deploy excellent knowledge and showed a level of understanding that was impressive, sometimes making reference to sources. Though not a requirement, it did enrich some responses and indicate that there had been a study in depth. The knowledge, understanding and argument in essay answers did vary quite considerably, not only between the different special subjects, but also in relation to specific questions. As with the outlines papers, it is very important that questions are read carefully and that supporting material is relevant and the answers as a whole sustain a focus on the exact terms of the questions.

Comments on Specific Questions

9769/55 – The Reign of Charles I

Question 1

- (a) Some answers used the second part of Document D, although the question referred only to the origins of the Irish Rebellion, which lay in a period before 1642. The reference to the Queen's army appeared to confuse some candidates, who claimed this was different from the view in Document B, although both documents suggested royal support for the rebellion. Some recognised that Document B was one of the testimonies mentioned in Document D. The implications in B about where the rebellion originated were missed. The provenance was better assessed.
- (b) Candidates analysed A as not favouring a religious motive and some compared this with the second part of D and the first sentences of E. The religious angle on B and the first part of D was reasonably well tackled. More difficulties came in interpreting C and E. Some answers turned to contextual knowledge which was not applied to the documents though often detailed, especially on religious grievances. Careful reading of the documents was needed to disentangle their various elements.

Question 2

Answers explained Charles I lost the First Civil War but needed to be more adept at considering the extent to which it was his fault. Stronger answers were able to give examples of his ineptitude and poor decision making. There was some variation in final judgements. Some candidates felt the abandonment of London in the first place and the failure of the 1643 campaign to regain the capital was entirely down to Charles and was the crucial moment of the war, while others felt that the resistance of London left him no choice. These responses generally argued that the formation of the NMA was the key factor. Those who wished to defend Charles made reference to his lack of resources which worsened as the war continued. A minority decided that Prince Rupert was the real villain.

Question 3

The first requirement of this question was knowledge of what happened in the defined period, and this was not always present. There was some description of the various groups vying for influence, without making clear just how these factions contributed to the stalemate. Some judgement was needed about overall responsibility and answers divided between Charles I and the army, when they provided a definite conclusion.

Question 4

The author of the phrase *cruel necessity* did not seem to be widely known. To answer this question well, candidates needed to appreciate that the question was about the reasons for the execution, as opposed to some other means of restriction, of the king. Some candidates used knowledge from earlier in the reign - some going right back to 1625-9, when they needed to concentrate on a more limited period. Of the three essay questions, this was the least well answered, although some responses got to grips with the essence of the question, namely the debate as to whether any other means could be found to rein in the power of the monarch in view of Charles' reputation for double-dealing and his inception of the Second Civil War.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/56

Special Subject - The French Revolution, 1774–1794

Key Messages

- Responses to Part **(a)** and **(b)** questions must be firmly based on full analyses of the documents
- A range of knowledge should be deployed to assess the documents in **(b)**
- There should be a very careful reading of the questions and consideration of their implications and requirements

General Comments

The comparison of two documents should be based firmly on a detailed study of their content and points of similarity and difference should be well supported by reference to the texts. Stronger answers offered firm and clear comparison and contrast and then moved on to explain this by reference to the nature of the two pieces of evidence. Without that firm analysis it is more difficult to use consideration of provenance to offer explanation. Speculation and generalised comments on the provenance of the documents - especially when not related to explaining the extent to which one document corroborates another, is less effective than analysis which follows a clear estimation of how far the two documents support each other.

It is essential in **(b)** that passages are linked to the issue in the question and not simply described or paraphrased. Answers gained credit for interpreting the documents, that is explaining what they said about the key issue. It was often helpful when the documents were grouped and there were cross references between them. However, there is a requirement for contextual knowledge to be deployed and stronger responses were able to assess the documents in the light of their own knowledge. A full understanding of each passage and a supported judgement on each should be the aim. Knowledge should be used with flexibility and discrimination. Candidates do know in advance which general topic area will be asked about, so there is the chance to ensure that they have a good range of subject knowledge and this should be employed appropriately for higher marks. Weaker responses often were heavily balanced towards explanation of the documents. It is essential that all the documents are considered. The overall aim is to use both the documents and knowledge applied to them to reach a conclusion. Answers which treated **(b)** as another essay question with minimal reference to the documents had not grasped the point of the question; answers which merely referenced the passages to illustrate an argument about the issue in the question had, too, shown insufficient awareness of the importance of the documents in this question. Good answers offered a well balanced argument and made good and critical use of the passage by deploying knowledge of a high quality and level of relevance to the texts.

This is called a Special Subject because candidates are expected to have studied it in depth. In some essay answers, material was more generalised and less supported than in the outlines paper. Many answers did indeed deploy excellent knowledge and showed a level of understanding that was impressive, sometimes making reference to sources. Though not a requirement, it did enrich some responses and indicate that there had been a study in depth. The knowledge, understanding and argument in essay answers did vary quite considerably, not only between the different special subjects, but also in relation to specific questions. As with the outlines papers, it is very important that questions are read carefully and that supporting material is relevant and the answers as a whole sustain a focus on the exact terms of the questions.

Comments on Specific Questions

9769/56 The French Revolution

Question 1

- (a) Answers did show generally good understanding of the ideas in these documents and there were effective comparisons and contrasts. Impressively, there was good application of contextual knowledge to explain the background to Olympe de Gouges' Declaration. Some answers might have achieved a better balance between the similarities and differences and the different tone and nature of the two documents. However there were some thoughtful answers and most responses did focus on the documents.
- (b) Generally, the documents were the focus of the answer more than in answers to other special subjects, with sound interpretations being offered. The level of supporting knowledge varied but better responses were able to offer judgements about the texts and about the proposition in the question.

Question 2

The financial problems of the crown were not neglected in answers, although the quality of the explanation of the importance of the problems in bringing about the breakdown of authority was variable. There was, from some candidates, too much explanation of the problems themselves, rather than their importance. Other factors were considered and there were some attempts made to consider their relative importance, but some responses seemed to be a list of elements which brought about the revolution, and they would have benefited from better explanation as to how.

Question 3

Better responses offered a judgement about the relative importance of different factors; less effective responses listed different developments and causes without developing judgements or assessing elements such as war, radicalism and the lack of trust engendered by the King. Some did consider the wider context, although it might have been helpful to have considered whether the events before 1791 had made any sort of constitutional monarchy possible, given that such an arrangement had little precedent.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/58

Gladstone and Disraeli, 1867-1886

Key Messages

- Responses to Part **(a)** and **(b)** questions must be firmly based on full analyses of the documents
- A range of knowledge should be deployed to assess the documents in **(b)**
- There should be a very careful reading of the questions and consideration of their implications and requirements

General Comments

The comparison of two documents should be based firmly on a detailed study of their content and points of similarity and difference should be well supported by reference to the texts. Stronger answers offered firm and clear comparison and contrast and then moved on to explain this by reference to the nature of the two pieces of evidence. Without that firm analysis it is more difficult to use consideration of provenance to offer explanation. Speculation and generalised comments on the provenance of the documents - especially when not related to explaining the extent to which one document corroborates another, is less effective than analysis which follows a clear estimation of how far the two documents support each other.

It is essential in **(b)** that passages are linked to the issue in the question and not simply described or paraphrased. Answers gained credit for interpreting the documents, that is explaining what they said about the key issue. It was often helpful when the documents were grouped and there were cross references between them. However, there is a requirement for contextual knowledge to be deployed and stronger responses were able to assess the documents in the light of their own knowledge. A full understanding of each passage and a supported judgement on each should be the aim. Knowledge should be used with flexibility and discrimination. Candidates do know in advance which general topic area will be asked about, so there is the chance to ensure that they have a good range of subject knowledge and this should be employed appropriately for higher marks. Weaker responses often were heavily balanced towards explanation of the documents. It is essential that all the documents are considered. The overall aim is to use both the documents and knowledge applied to them to reach a conclusion. Answers which treated **(b)** as another essay question with minimal reference to the documents had not grasped the point of the question; answers which merely referenced the passages to illustrate an argument about the issue in the question had, too, shown insufficient awareness of the importance of the documents in this question. Good answers offered a well balanced argument and made good and critical use of the passage by deploying knowledge of a high quality and level of relevance to the texts.

This is called a Special Subject because candidates are expected to have studied it in depth. In some essay answers, material was more generalised and less supported than in the outlines paper. Many answers did indeed deploy excellent knowledge and showed a level of understanding that was impressive, sometimes making reference to sources. Though not a requirement, it did enrich some responses and indicate that there had been a study in depth. The knowledge, understanding and argument in essay answers did vary quite considerably, not only between the different special subjects, but also in relation to specific questions. As with the outlines papers, it is very important that questions are read carefully and that supporting material is relevant and the answers as a whole sustain a focus on the exact terms of the questions.

Comments on Specific Questions

9769/58 Gladstone and Disraeli

Question 1

- (a) The 'why' aspects of this question were usually well answered, and it was good to note the willingness to evaluate the sources and really reflect on their provenance. There was a sound focus on 'impression', with some excellent comments on the very different tenor of each document. The 'extent' part often required more reflection and comment. It was good to note how well candidates not only made intelligent use of contextual knowledge, but also demonstrated clearly that they had reflected on the sources' provenance.
- (b) More answers could have considered more closely what 'Britain's best interests' might be. Candidates showed good understanding of all the sources, although there was a tendency to concentrate on A and B (which of course had to be mastered to deal with 1 (a)). The better responses reflected on all the sources and noted the time gap between C and D, and knew of the events which had occurred between the two dates. Better answers achieved a good balance between the evidence in the sources, source evaluation and contextual knowledge.

Question 2

The best responses took on the 'so comprehensively' aspect and really reflected on what might be the primary reasons for the outcome. Some did try and challenge the idea that it was that 'comprehensive', but lacked the statistics to back up that argument. There were some good debates on whether it was Conservative failings or Liberal qualities, and some reflected very perceptively as to whether the electorate were over influenced by the 'spin' of Gladstone, and went for image rather than substance. Those who avoided the 'list' approach went in for some very interesting debates, but some needed more detail to substantiate many of their ideas.

Question 3

There were some interesting answers, although more candidates could have tackled this question with the directness it needed. Some candidates adopted a rather narrative approach, going back to Disraeli the novelist and on to the Moneypenny/Buckle assertions. These responses put forward information and ideas but sometimes lacked the analysis needed for higher marks.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/06
Personal Investigation

Key Messages

A very pleasing variety of topics was chosen which reflect a huge diversity of interest within schools. The level of scholarship was generally very good; the majority of candidates were able to write with a clear level of engagement and enthusiasm on their chosen topic. The real discriminator was the quality of the argument. Candidates who sharply focused on the specific question and engaged with historical debate and perspective in an analytical way did very well. Candidates who found it more difficult to differentiate narrative from evaluation and analysis were less successful.

General Comments

Approaches to writing the investigation were variable; introductions and conclusions were sometimes very similar or neglected to address the specific question posed. Those which set the issue in context were the most successful, rather than those which outlined the argument to be advanced and then used the conclusion to summarise it again. The most successful pieces were very sharply focused on the debate and every paragraph demonstrably advanced the argument and analysis. Some candidates drifted off into interesting but tangential areas. It is clear that often candidates have done a great deal of research and reading but find it difficult to discriminate between the essential and the merely interesting. There were some examples of strong argument, often helped by the choice of question.

Most candidates made some use of sources both contemporary sources and the work of historians, although in some cases long quotes from sources were included without much comment - simply as a way to illustrate the argument or to describe events and this is best avoided. There were, however, some impressive pieces which sought to evaluate the sources used in a highly analytical way. This often depended to a degree on the type of question. Some Anglo-Saxon and medieval sources were more readily analysed in this way as the overall material available was more limited. Most of the critical use of sources was a genuine attempt to evaluate their reliability and usefulness and there was little reference to the background or achievements of historians as an evaluative tool. There was good use of cross reference in some work, using both contextual knowledge and other views to assess the validity of what was being argued. Some bibliographies were very basic, largely made up of general text books. Non-British topics seemed more prone to this problem. Some were meticulously recorded, while others followed their own individual pattern. The footnoting of websites could have been improved.

Very few candidates wrote significantly less than 3500 words, but a number wrote in excess of 4000 words. Centres are reminded that candidates who seriously breach the word limit cannot have all their work read - most often this means that the conclusion is not seen, which could certainly hamper the overall impression of the work. The Candidate Declaration Form is very clear on the word limit, although some appeared to have evaded this by excluding quotes or by continuing the debate in the footnotes which is not acceptable. Some Centres did not include a copy of the consultancy form; this is a requirement and it helps the Examiners to understand the original formulation of the question.

Comments on Specific Questions

There was a wide variation in the titles chosen. Although there were some less common ones, generally topics were mainstream and some clearly related to the periods being studied for the Outlines papers, though not those being studied for the Special Subjects. Various individuals were analysed for their achievements or success in a named aspect, including Catherine the Great, Thomas Clarkson, Richard III, Franco, Mussolini, Margaret of Anjou, Henry VI, Edward IV, George Washington, Benjamin Disraeli, William Pitt, Lord Liverpool, Robert Peel and George W Bush. Where candidates had chosen topics which were outside the areas being studied in the classroom, it was clear that there was real enthusiasm. Some investigations would have benefitted from a better understanding of perspectives and contexts, particularly in

relation to Irish history, religious history and Richard III. Some of the questions using quotes and then asking how far they were justified were more successful than in some previous sessions as candidates focused on the exact terms of the quotation. There were few questions embracing a long period, which can be difficult to tackle, apart from questions on early periods of history. The 'best explained' or taking a named factor and asking 'How far...?' remain sound approaches to formulating a question.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/71

Special Subject - Russia in Revolution, 1905-1924

Key Messages

- Responses to Part **(a)** and **(b)** questions must be firmly based on full analyses of the documents
- A range of knowledge should be deployed to assess the documents in **(b)**
- There should be a very careful reading of the questions and consideration of their implications and requirements

General Comments

The comparison of two documents should be based firmly on a detailed study of their content and points of similarity and difference should be well supported by reference to the texts. Stronger answers offered firm and clear comparison and contrast and then moved on to explain this by reference to the nature of the two pieces of evidence. Without that firm analysis it is more difficult to use consideration of provenance to offer explanation. Speculation and generalised comments on the provenance of the documents - especially when not related to explaining the extent to which one document corroborates another, is less effective than analysis which follows a clear estimation of how far the two documents support each other.

It is essential in **(b)** that passages are linked to the issue in the question and not simply described or paraphrased. Answers gained credit for interpreting the documents, that is explaining what they said about the key issue. It was often helpful when the documents were grouped and there were cross references between them. However, there is a requirement for contextual knowledge to be deployed and stronger responses were able to assess the documents in the light of their own knowledge. A full understanding of each passage and a supported judgement on each should be the aim. Knowledge should be used with flexibility and discrimination. Candidates do know in advance which general topic area will be asked about, so there is the chance to ensure that they have a good range of subject knowledge and this should be employed appropriately for higher marks. Weaker responses often were heavily balanced towards explanation of the documents. It is essential that all the documents are considered. The overall aim is to use both the documents and knowledge applied to them to reach a conclusion. Answers which treated **(b)** as another essay question with minimal reference to the documents had not grasped the point of the question; answers which merely referenced the passages to illustrate an argument about the issue in the question had, too, shown insufficient awareness of the importance of the documents in this question. Good answers offered a well balanced argument and made good and critical use of the passage by deploying knowledge of a high quality and level of relevance to the texts.

This is called a Special Subject because candidates are expected to have studied it in depth. In some essay answers, material was more generalised and less supported than in the outlines paper. Many answers did indeed deploy excellent knowledge and showed a level of understanding that was impressive, sometimes making reference to sources. Though not a requirement, it did enrich some responses and indicate that there had been a study in depth. The knowledge, understanding and argument in essay answers did vary quite considerably, not only between the different special subjects, but also in relation to specific questions. As with the outlines papers, it is very important that questions are read carefully and that supporting material is relevant and the answers as a whole sustain a focus on the exact terms of the questions.

Comments on Specific Questions

9769/71 The Russian Revolution

Question 1

- (a) The best responses got just the right mix of reasoned answer, source evaluation and sensible use of contextual knowledge. They also avoided a summary of the contents adopted by some, and decided early what the key differences and similarities were. Most got the point of Source B quite easily but could have used their own knowledge of what Stolypin was really trying to achieve more effectively. Some struggled a little to get the full meaning of Source A, and perhaps should have spent more time grasping exactly what it was implying and really trying to understand the whole tenor of the source.
- (b) The best answers reflected on the sources as a whole and thought carefully about the Tsar/Duma relationship as a possible key factor in Russian instability. Other answers seemed to show uncertainty of exactly how this sort of question should be tackled. Some got their focus on the reasons for the lack of stability in Russia in the period (others went into the war period which was not required). There was a tendency just to utilise contextual knowledge and spend a lot of time on other possible causes of instability. For the highest marks there has to be evaluation of the sources, some obvious reflection on their provenance and a reasonable, but not dominant, use of contextual knowledge.

Question 2

There were some competent answers to this question, although some essays became largely a narrative of events between 1914 and 1917. The best answers kept a highly analytical focus and really tried to link the events from 1914 onwards to the events of the October Revolution. Some argued that if Kerensky had managed to make better/more popular decisions, then Lenin would have been marginalised. Some insisted that Revolution was inevitable before 1914, although this approach could have been better supported. Historiography was sensibly utilised in some cases.

Question 3

This tended to produce strong arguments, which, in some cases, would have been improved with more support. The best responses tended to start with a premise, with some clear reasons why that conclusion had been reached and then proceeded to argue a strong case. Some argued for the divisions of the Whites, others arguing just as effectively for the appeal of the Reds and the work and leadership of Lenin and Trotsky.

Question 4

The most successful approach was to start with a clear definition of what a socialist revolution might entail, and then argue a case each way. Some went beyond 1924 which was not necessary. There was usually sound background knowledge when it came to War Communism and the NEP. Greater consideration of the structure of the Soviet state or any other of the social and political policies of the Bolsheviks would have improved some responses.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/73

Special Subject - Germany 1919-1945

Key Messages

- Responses to Part **(a)** and **(b)** questions must be firmly based on full analyses of the documents
- A range of knowledge should be deployed to assess the documents in **(b)**
- There should be a very careful reading of the questions and consideration of their implications and requirements

General Comments

The comparison of two documents should be based firmly on a detailed study of their content and points of similarity and difference should be well supported by reference to the texts. Stronger answers offered firm and clear comparison and contrast and then moved on to explain this by reference to the nature of the two pieces of evidence. Without that firm analysis it is more difficult to use consideration of provenance to offer explanation. Speculation and generalised comments on the provenance of the documents - especially when not related to explaining the extent to which one document corroborates another, is less effective than analysis which follows a clear estimation of how far the two documents support each other.

It is essential in **(b)** that passages are linked to the issue in the question and not simply described or paraphrased. Answers gained credit for interpreting the documents, that is explaining what they said about the key issue. It was often helpful when the documents were grouped and there were cross references between them. However, there is a requirement for contextual knowledge to be deployed and stronger responses were able to assess the documents in the light of their own knowledge. A full understanding of each passage and a supported judgement on each should be the aim. Knowledge should be used with flexibility and discrimination. Candidates do know in advance which general topic area will be asked about, so there is the chance to ensure that they have a good range of subject knowledge and this should be employed appropriately for higher marks. Weaker responses often were heavily balanced towards explanation of the documents. It is essential that all the documents are considered. The overall aim is to use both the documents and knowledge applied to them to reach a conclusion. Answers which treated **(b)** as another essay question with minimal reference to the documents had not grasped the point of the question; answers which merely referenced the passages to illustrate an argument about the issue in the question had, too, shown insufficient awareness of the importance of the documents in this question. Good answers offered a well balanced argument and made good and critical use of the passage by deploying knowledge of a high quality and level of relevance to the texts.

This is called a Special Subject because candidates are expected to have studied it in depth. In some essay answers, material was more generalised and less supported than in the outlines paper. Many answers did indeed deploy excellent knowledge and showed a level of understanding that was impressive, sometimes making reference to sources. Though not a requirement, it did enrich some responses and indicate that there had been a study in depth. The knowledge, understanding and argument in essay answers did vary quite considerably, not only between the different special subjects, but also in relation to specific questions. As with the outlines papers, it is very important that questions are read carefully and that supporting material is relevant and the answers as a whole sustain a focus on the exact terms of the questions.

Comments on Specific Questions

9769/73 Germany

Question 1

- (a) Candidates generally were able to identify key points of similarity (the references to Czechoslovakia; the implicit corroboration of Document C's "sort things out in the West" by B's "the freeing of forces for other purposes"). They also identified areas of non-corroboration (e.g. the racial theme in B which is not in C; the reference to Austria in B not in C; the specific reference to Britain and France in C not in B, although relatively few appreciated that there was no reference to Austria in C because Anschluss had already happened).
- (b) The better responses clearly understood the difference between having general aims (e.g. lebensraum since the days of Mein Kampf) and specific plans. Better candidates also grouped documents and argued thematically – those who went through the documents sequentially generally had a less effective response. The strongest candidates also evaluated effectively (e.g. Document A was placed in context of time and audience; B was considered in the light of research into whether it was genuine or not and whether it should be taken seriously).

Question 2

Where candidates knew the detail, their responses were very good, and the intrigue was placed firmly in context. It is essential that there are at least two alternatives discussed (usually more) for there to be a 'discussion'. Most candidates devoted much of their answers to looking at other factors such as Hitler's own charisma and skills (which included building up the party after the Beer Hall affair); the economic context of the Wall street Crash and the Depression; Nazi appeal to a wide-ranging constituency (e.g. farmers; the bourgeoisie worried by the communists; the elites worried by lack of law and order). This provided scope for a wide ranging debate that some managed with considerable skill. It was, however, essential for a strong response that the issue of political intrigue be fully understood and then given some prominence as the key issue with which to agree or disagree. Most candidates concluded it was less due to intrigue (for different reasons) than to other factors.

Question 3

Very few candidates attempted this question. The better responses identified the aims of Nazi policy and approached their answer thematically. Consideration was given to the education of girls and how that would prepare them for their roles as wives and mothers (Kinder, Kirche, Küche). Some commented on the differences between Weimar - with its advances for women (without quite saying what these were), and the more conservative Nazi regime. None really addressed the war economy and the fact that rearmament and the war required a change in policy – women needed out of the home and in the factories. There were focused comments on the issue of on Lebensborn – that it was a contradiction of one policy (family values) but met the needs of another (racial purity and lots of children for the Führer).

Question 4

This was a more popular question which could be approached in a variety of ways as there was much that candidates could write. There were two main approaches. The first was to focus on reasons why there was little resistance (e.g. popularity of policies and of Hitler himself; respect for Nazis bringing sense of order to the streets; fear and terror) without addressing any examples of resistance. The other popular alternative was to focus on the examples of resistance (White Rose; bomb plots; KPD etc.) and why they were few and unsuccessful (army oath of loyalty; divided left wing; informers etc.). The best responses attempted to marry the two aspects and reach a conclusion. There was a tendency to describe many factors (often in good detail). This needed to be linked to the key issue to determine which of the many elements was the key one.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/74

Special Subject - China under Mao Zedong, 1949–1976

Key Messages

- Responses to Part **(a)** and **(b)** questions must be firmly based on full analyses of the documents
- A range of knowledge should be deployed to assess the documents in **(b)**
- There should be a very careful reading of the questions and consideration of their implications and requirements

General Comments

The comparison of two documents should be based firmly on a detailed study of their content and points of similarity and difference should be well supported by reference to the texts. Stronger answers offered firm and clear comparison and contrast and then moved on to explain this by reference to the nature of the two pieces of evidence. Without that firm analysis it is more difficult to use consideration of provenance to offer explanation. Speculation and generalised comments on the provenance of the documents - especially when not related to explaining the extent to which one document corroborates another, is less effective than analysis which follows a clear estimation of how far the two documents support each other.

It is essential in **(b)** that passages are linked to the issue in the question and not simply described or paraphrased. Answers gained credit for interpreting the documents, that is explaining what they said about the key issue. It was often helpful when the documents were grouped and there were cross references between them. However, there is a requirement for contextual knowledge to be deployed and stronger responses were able to assess the documents in the light of their own knowledge. A full understanding of each passage and a supported judgement on each should be the aim. Knowledge should be used with flexibility and discrimination. Candidates do know in advance which general topic area will be asked about, so there is the chance to ensure that they have a good range of subject knowledge and this should be employed appropriately for higher marks. Weaker responses often were heavily balanced towards explanation of the documents. It is essential that all the documents are considered. The overall aim is to use both the documents and knowledge applied to them to reach a conclusion. Answers which treated **(b)** as another essay question with minimal reference to the documents had not grasped the point of the question; answers which merely referenced the passages to illustrate an argument about the issue in the question had, too, shown insufficient awareness of the importance of the documents in this question. Good answers offered a well balanced argument and made good and critical use of the passage by deploying knowledge of a high quality and level of relevance to the texts.

This is called a Special Subject because candidates are expected to have studied it in depth. In some essay answers, material was more generalised and less supported than in the outlines paper. Many answers did indeed deploy excellent knowledge and showed a level of understanding that was impressive, sometimes making reference to sources. Though not a requirement, it did enrich some responses and indicate that there had been a study in depth. The knowledge, understanding and argument in essay answers did vary quite considerably, not only between the different special subjects, but also in relation to specific questions. As with the outlines papers, it is very important that questions are read carefully and that supporting material is relevant and the answers as a whole sustain a focus on the exact terms of the questions.

Comments on Specific Questions

9769/74 China under Mao

- (a) There were some good analyses of the documents and better answers noted both similarities and difference, noting the different nature of the two passages and the more fervent tone of C. There were some thoughtful explanations which noted the different context of the documents. It is important that the texts themselves are the basis of the answer: some responses assumed that the content of the documents were similar and wrote a lot about the times in which they were written. A careful reading was necessary to identify both similarities and differences and it is important that this is always undertaken in (a) questions.
- (b) There was some good understanding of the basic debate: were Communist ideas they key or was it Mao's personality and his adaptation or even distortion of those ideas? Generally, C and D were used better than the other passages and it is important that the texts as a whole are considered. E was often neglected or only used in part and there was some misunderstanding of what B was saying. There were some strong responses which used all the documents and interpreted them in the light of contextual knowledge, for example about the nature of the ideas in the Little Red Book. Given that the topic was known in advance, some candidates seemed less aware of Mao's ideology and its relation to Marxism than would be expected.

Question 2

There was a distinction between answers which engaged in the hopes of Mao's supporters in 1949 and how far they might have been fulfilled, and those who wrote an account of some of the policies followed accompanied by comments about their success or failure. This reinforces the advice given above that the demands of the question must be fully considered. Knowledge was often strong – it needs to be used to answer the question set.

Question 3

In contrast, many answers did offer sustained comparison and contrast and did not just describe or explain the two developments sequentially. There were some perceptive analyses which seemed to master the material and use it with discrimination. Less successful answers went on to consider the events of both. Some did make the point that the Cultural Revolution was linked to the failures of the Great Leap Forward.

Question 4

There was some explanation and knowledge, although fewer answers responded as directly to the question as was the case with **Question 3**. The factors needed more assessment and though there was understanding shown, responses would have benefited from more thought about the relative importance of different explanations at different parts of the period.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/75

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

Key Messages

- Responses to Part **(a)** and **(b)** questions must be firmly based on full analyses of the documents
- A range of knowledge should be deployed to assess the documents in **(b)**
- There should be a very careful reading of the questions and consideration of their implications and requirements

General Comments

The comparison of two documents should be based firmly on a detailed study of their content and points of similarity and difference should be well supported by reference to the texts. Stronger answers offered firm and clear comparison and contrast and then moved on to explain this by reference to the nature of the two pieces of evidence. Without that firm analysis it is more difficult to use consideration of provenance to offer explanation. Speculation and generalised comments on the provenance of the documents - especially when not related to explaining the extent to which one document corroborates another, is less effective than analysis which follows a clear estimation of how far the two documents support each other.

It is essential in **(b)** that passages are linked to the issue in the question and not simply described or paraphrased. Answers gained credit for interpreting the documents, that is explaining what they said about the key issue. It was often helpful when the documents were grouped and there were cross references between them. However, there is a requirement for contextual knowledge to be deployed and stronger responses were able to assess the documents in the light of their own knowledge. A full understanding of each passage and a supported judgement on each should be the aim. Knowledge should be used with flexibility and discrimination. Candidates do know in advance which general topic area will be asked about, so there is the chance to ensure that they have a good range of subject knowledge and this should be employed appropriately for higher marks. Weaker responses often were heavily balanced towards explanation of the documents. It is essential that all the documents are considered. The overall aim is to use both the documents and knowledge applied to them to reach a conclusion. Answers which treated **(b)** as another essay question with minimal reference to the documents had not grasped the point of the question; answers which merely referenced the passages to illustrate an argument about the issue in the question had, too, shown insufficient awareness of the importance of the documents in this question. Good answers offered a well balanced argument and made good and critical use of the passage by deploying knowledge of a high quality and level of relevance to the texts.

This is called a Special Subject because candidates are expected to have studied it in depth. In some essay answers, material was more generalised and less supported than in the outlines paper. Many answers did indeed deploy excellent knowledge and showed a level of understanding that was impressive, sometimes making reference to sources. Though not a requirement, it did enrich some responses and indicate that there had been a study in depth. The knowledge, understanding and argument in essay answers did vary quite considerably, not only between the different special subjects, but also in relation to specific questions. As with the outlines papers, it is very important that questions are read carefully and that supporting material is relevant and the answers as a whole sustain a focus on the exact terms of the questions.

Comments on Specific Questions

9769/75 Civil Rights

Question 1

- (a) Most candidates identified the similarities/difference. The better responses linked a general comparative comment with a specific example from each document. For example, a general remark about police hostility linked to the police agreement with the KKK (Document C) and the police arresting John Hardy for disorderly conduct after he had been assaulted by the registrar (Document D). It would strengthen all responses if there were evaluative comments about the sources to indicate whether they can be trusted or not. To be most effective, this requires the provision of some own, contextual knowledge. For example, Document D could be evaluated as unreliable as it is by a member of the NAACP, but contextual knowledge would suggest it may well be accurate as that kind of response by police was commonplace.
- (b) It was important to read this question carefully – the question is about States' rights. It relates to interference in the affairs of the States (i.e. federal interference or the incoming of northern liberals, whether white or black) rather than what the state authorities (e.g. Bull Connor, the registrar in Document D) did. The better responses used cross-referencing to indicate where different documents provided evidence of such interference (e.g. the two comments in Documents C and D about folk coming in and "telling us what to do in our State") or of an alternative (e.g. racism as indicated in Documents B and D).

Question 2

The better candidates assessed the key issue of the interpretation in the light of other factors. There were many different factors that could be considered. In addition to his organisational skills, candidates discussed King's oratory, his use of media and his espousal of non-violence. Many also challenged how important he actually was, although these responses did not always have the evidence to show who else was significant and what they did. Some chose to challenge his skill as an organiser. The Albany business was used as an example of his lack of organisational skill, as were his social projects towards the end of his life. It would be true to say, however, that the best responses used a thematic approach, with some sense of how relatively important his organisational skills were. Often the conclusion was that he had organisational skills, but he also had others too.

Question 3

The focus of all responses was almost entirely on TV. There were occasional references to the newspapers. Most set the role of the media against other factors that advanced the cause – leadership of King; direct action; non-violence; the input of the presidents; the role of the Supreme Court, although the evaluation of the factors as to relative importance was not as well done as the provision of ideas and information. The best candidates linked different examples of media involvement to a specific impact, for example, tying the reporting of the Selma march and other events to Johnson's legislative response, or Kennedy's response to King's arrest in Birmingham. Most candidates effectively linked media coverage with the Cold War and USA embarrassment in its international standing as home of liberty and equality, and also to the actions of the Supreme Court.