

**FHS 2018**

**History  
Examiners' Report**

# REPORT OF THE EXAMINERS IN THE FINAL HONOUR SCHOOL OF HISTORY 2018

## A. EXAMINERS' REPORT

### Overall Performance

45.9% of candidates were awarded Firsts. This compares with 38.7% in 2017, 34.8% in 2016, 29.61% in 2015, 31.44% in 2014, 24.22% in 2013, 22.22% in 2012, and 29.4% in 2011. One 2ii and one Pass were awarded. 53.2% of candidates were classified in the Upper Second Class (61.3% last year).

The following general comments can be made:

An unprecedented number of first-class degrees were awarded this year (108). 51% of these were awarded to women candidates (56 Firsts to women, 52 to men), and the highest First this year was gained by a woman (76.86%). Overall, 41.8% of women achieved Firsts, the highest percentage ever, exceeding 41.3% in 2017, and well above the 32.6% in 2016, 22.7% in 2015, 28.6% in 2014, and 18.7% in 2013. Entirely unprecedented was that over 50% of male candidates gained Firsts (51.5%). The equivalent figures for men were 35.9% in 2017, 37.4% in 2016, 36.0% in 2015, 35.3% in 2014. The top twenty first-class degrees saw, as in most previous years, a predominance of men: 13 to 7, compared to 14 to 6 in 2017.

29 women and 28 men got their highest mark on the thesis, which is fully comparable with previous years. At the other end of the scale, 40 women and 21 men got their lowest marks here, once again arguing strongly for the importance of formulating and answering a specific question when choosing a thesis topic, and the effective management of research and writing-up.

The 2.ii mark is still infrequently used. The highest use of the 2.ii mark this year was for Disciplines of History, where 5.9% of candidates were awarded a 2ii mark, and the second-highest was for the Compulsory Undergraduate Thesis, where 4.79% of candidates were awarded a 2.ii. The lowest use was for the General History papers, where 1.73% of candidates were awarded a 2.ii mark.

## B. REPORTS ON INDIVIDUAL PAPERS

### History of the British Isles I: c.370-1087

Twenty five candidates took this paper. Ten were adjudged first class, fourteen 2.1 and one 2.2. A wide range of questions was tackled (21 out of 25) and there was little evidence of bunching on particular regions or topics. The examiners were impressed by the quality of the scripts awarding a significantly higher proportion of first class marks than was the case for HB12. A hallmark of the good scripts was the way candidates engaged with detailed evidence in a serious way and used it to open up, inform and challenge the historiography rather than simply repeating received mantras from the latter; many displayed real expertise on particular topics which they had made their own and they had clearly been enthused by close reading and analysis of primary sources or artefacts such as coins. There was some splendid work on Ireland and the Picts and there were few grounds for the normal examiners' complaints about well-worn essays on Offa, Alfred and the like – indeed at least one candidate succinctly dismissed Alfred, noting that his learned kingship went nowhere. Work on gender was well-represented on specific questions about the role of women in the conversion, the agency of queens or abbesses, and the study of emotion, but also informed answers on more general topics. Candidates' marks on the gender specific questions were broadly in line with those they secured on other answers and did not detract from their overall performance.

(J. Nightingale)

### **History of the British History Isles II: 1042-1330**

There were 31 candidates for this paper, and the distribution of marks were as follows: firsts, 6 (17%); 65-69, 17 (48%); 60-64 (24%); below 50-60, 3 (10%). There were no third or fails. The proportion of first was therefore considerably lower than the average for the degree as a whole and although this sample is small, this perhaps vindicates the decision to switch to a take-home paper. Four questions were not answered: questions 6 (on peasants), 15 (popular participation in politics), 23 (Henry III), 24 (Edward I) and 27 (parliament) were not answered. Relatively few candidates seemed willing to explore the British dimension to the paper: questions 1-4 (on disunited Britain, Scotland, Wales and Ireland, and national identity) attracted 8 answers in total, but those who tackled these tended to do so in lively and refreshing ways. The most popular answers were questions 5 on authority and gender, which attracted 11 answers, question 19 on the Norman conquest) which attracted 13 answers; and 22 (Magna Carta) which attracted 11 answers. There was otherwise a reasonable balance between the asterisked thematic questions in the first half of the paper and more chronological focused questions on the second. There were strong essays on Jews, the commercial revolution and saints' cults. In general, the best work displayed breadth of knowledge across the, engaged with controversy, were sustained with plentiful use of well-deployed detail, developed case studies, answered the question directly and ended with a distinctive conclusion, not a summary. (S. Baxter)

### **History of the British Isles III: 1330-1550**

Thirty-four candidates sat the paper, and as in recent years the overall standard was very good. There were seven first-class scripts and twenty-seven upper second-class scripts; there were no lower second-class scripts. In common with the clear trend over the past six or seven years, candidates answered a wide range of questions in social, political, and cultural history, and were – for the most part – able to adapt their knowledge to the question set. There was very little 'dumping' of pre-prepared answers diverging from the terms of the question. The better answers relied upon a wider range of reading and demonstrated knowledge of how the individual topics fitted into broader developments of the period, as well as showing a good knowledge of historiographical developments of the past thirty years or so. The weaker answers adopted fixed positions, sometimes relying on older and less analytical historiography without apparent awareness of more recent developments in the field. The most popular questions were those on popular revolts (15), marriage and women's lives (14), and heresy (14), with political topics such as kingship, elites, national identity, and warfare, as well as the Reformation, receiving a handful of answers each. More questions than usual (mainly in social, economic, material and cultural history) went unanswered. Candidates who develop interests and expertise in – for example – architecture, literature, economic change, monasticism, crime, towns and other less popular topics will find that their enthusiasms can lead to excellent exam answers, and they should feel emboldened to ask for tutorial guidance on such things. (I Forrest)

### **History of the British Isles IV: 1500-1700**

A total of 67 candidates sat this paper, with 21 (32%) gaining First Class marks, 41 (61%) attaining a 2:1, and 5 (under 8%) a 2:2 or lower. The most popular responses were to the questions on popular rebellions (17 answers), female agency (16), resistance to Charles I (15), the king-in-parliament (14), gendered ideals (14), and radicalism in the civil wars (14). Only the questions on state finance and criminal justice found no takers. The best candidates showed excellent breadth and depth of knowledge, and were able to deploy arguments which were both striking and nuanced. Specific and critical awareness of key (and recent) historiography distinguished many of the strongest candidates, as did a clear sense of the themes and dynamics of the period as a whole. Many of the best answers were also comfortable going beyond England, and showed good knowledge of the internal dynamics of Scotland and Ireland. Candidates who thought carefully about the wording of the question also invariably outperformed those who took it as a mere general prompt. The most successfully answered question was also the most popular: in answering on rebellions, many candidates showed an excellent grasp of the wider historiography on popular politics and were thus able to

critique some of the more conventional accounts of rebellion. Candidates here also showed a strong understanding of change over time, and of how protest could take multiple forms. Oddly, though, candidates answering on resistance to Charles I were often much less nuanced in their understanding of 'resistance', which was commonly taken simply to mean armed opposition. This points to a wider weakness across the run of scripts when it came to a confident handling of concepts. The 'king-in-parliament' was often interpreted too literally to mean specific interactions between a given monarch and their legislature; 'radical ideas' commonly became a generic synonym for people doing unusual things; and 'royalists and parliamentarians' were treated as the two sides on a battlefield more often than as shifting identities, or positions which contained over-lapping and sometimes internally contradictory ideas. The two questions on gender proved very popular, and were ably handled. However, the examiners could not help but be struck by the contrast in how the historiography was handled: where in other essays the great and good of early modern scholarship all received a good (and welcome) kicking at times, one was left with the impression from this run of scripts that Alexandra Shepard and Laura Gowing write their books while walking on water. It is a little disappointing that students' critical engagement with the gendered lens here didn't seem to have moved much beyond how great it all is. It is interesting to note, though, that candidates were often a good deal, more lively in their answers to the question on art, which had a gendered dimension, perhaps suggesting that the more abstract gender questions attracted safer, pre-conceived responses.

(L. Dixon)

### **History of the British Isles V: 1685-1830**

Thirty-four candidates sat this paper, 28 in the main school, and six in the joint-schools. Nine (26.5%) gained a first-class mark, 24 an upper 2.1, and only one 2.2. Many of the 2.1 candidates clustered in the 66-68 bracket, and lower-scoring candidates were more likely to have suffered from mistiming rather than misunderstanding in their answers. The overall performance was thus good, although there were familiar frailties in the cohort which students of the new portfolio paper will wish to avoid.

The most popular thematic questions this year related to social distinctions and consumerism (qu. 2), women and property rights (qu. 5), religious nonconformity (qu. 15), Britons and the Enlightenment (qu. 17), empire and abolitionism (qu. 19), and public support for the Unions (qu. 22). Political topics (qu. 24-27) continued to attract many takers, although in common with the social and cultural questions there was little interest shown in early nineteenth-century developments. Beyond these ten questions, students appeared more reticent to venture, even in previously popular areas such as criminal justice, industrialization, sexuality, and the arts. Popular questions elicited lively and well-informed answers, and stronger candidates were duly rewarded for productive engagement with the historiography, a clear line of argument and effective illustration. The examiners also welcomed ambition in the temporal and geographical range of the best answers, and were pleased to see candidates gain greater authority of analysis through comparative study over time and space. Less impressively, some candidates still seek to re-cycle their tutorial work rather uncritically, and struggled to adapt it to the needs of the question. Several answers to qu.28, for example, contrived almost entirely to avoid talking directly about the post-1800 period, instead focusing on the 1790s. It was striking how many scripts saw qu. 25 as an opportunity to discuss the causes of Walpolean political supremacy with little detailed consideration of Whig/Tory ideology, while answers to qu. 26 were at times really a rehearsal of debates about the constitutionality (or otherwise) of George III's actions in the early part of his reign. More generally, candidates frequently needed to supply stronger frameworks of reference to examine broader socio-cultural trends, and were too often narrowly focused on the elites. There appeared to be little interest in and knowledge of the experiences of the majority of the population. Scripts which conveyed a confident sense of the shifting dynamics and character of social order and hierarchy stood out, especially if they could embrace non-metropolitan perspectives. Hopefully, the portfolio paper will give candidates more opportunities to eradicate such weaknesses, to engage more directly and broadly with the questions, and to demonstrate greater chronological and geographical breadth as well as analytical ambition.

(P. Gauci)

### **History of the British Isles VI: 1815-1924**

32 candidates took this paper. A reasonably good range of questions was attempted (although – perhaps surprisingly – nobody tackled the penultimate question on 1918; nor did the final question on Britain’s global role after the First World War elicit a response). The asterisked questions were particularly popular, and on the whole candidates made effective use of the opportunity to shape their answers distinctively (the weaker scripts failed sufficiently to delineate or justify their chosen area of focus). The general impression of the run of scripts was positive: it was evident that the majority of candidates had engaged thoughtfully and critically with the paper, and had risen to the intellectual challenge of combining breadth with sharp specificity of focus. There were some outstanding essays, which demonstrated cultural depth and sophistication built on wide reading and mature reflection (evidently enhanced by lateral thinking across period and transnationally). The best scripts showed a capacity to differentiate and break down categories and perspectives – by gender, class, nationality, ethnicity, religion, region. This was particularly evident in answers to qu. 1 (on history), qu 3 (on immigration), qu 5 (on domesticity), qu 14 (on the aristocracy), qu 15 (on religion) and qu 17 (on imperial culture). The questions about politics and the constitution received some of the most one-dimensional responses. Qu 2 on understandings of the nature of politics produced strikingly uncritical answers; qu 19 on the reforms of the 1830s was in several cases answered solely with reference to a (very outdated) view of 1832. At the same time (whilst there were some excellent exceptions, focused on different dimensions of ideology and practice), qu 11 (on gender) produced some reductive responses. Moreover, several of the candidates who answered qu 11 failed completely to consider gender as a relevant variable in analysing other questions. Answers to qu 4 on class also suffered from lack of conceptual nuance or complexity. In order to engage with the complexities of this period, and to excel in the paper (as in any other paper), candidates need to reflect more intersectionally throughout, thinking more rigorously and imaginatively about diverse and overlapping vantage-points, experiences, identities and forms of consciousness.

(J Garnett)

### **History of the British Isles VII: since 1900**

Forty nine candidates sat this paper. Almost all achieved either a First or a solid Upper Second Class mark overall. Particularly pleasing was the wide range of questions that candidates tackled. The examiners also noted that questions which required candidates to draw on social, political, economic and cultural history (for example on the permissive society and on war) were both popular and were tackled very well indeed. The question on secularisation was very popular but tended to produce quite generic responses. The question on the 1918 Reform Act was reasonably popular but tended to result in responses that dealt only with the impact on women and missed the extension of the franchise to all adult men.

There were some worrying gaps in candidates’ knowledge about political movements and structures. For example, the question on institutional racism was reasonably popular but resulted in fairly weak responses because candidates did not understand what ‘institutional’ meant and lacked the skills to analyse power in this manner. Discussion of ‘elites’, most notably in the question on the permissive society, often resulted in the conclusion that elites are shadowy groups who wield a lot of power but are hard to define. Most seriously, many questions that invited – implicitly or not – considerations of sex equality and/or feminism, did not result in responses that dealt with women or feminism in any robust way. For example, the question on the 1918 Reform Act resulted in responses that suggested that feminism had purely social and cultural consequences, rather than having a profound impact on the British state and on mainstream political life. In general, both women and black people were dealt with as playing relatively marginal parts in British political and social life.

(S. Todd)

### **General History I (285-476)**

Six candidates took the paper (three History, two AMH, one HP); four obtained marks of 70 or above. The overall quality was as high as the results suggest: there was much good, accurate (and pertinent) citation of primary material (including arcane aspects of Eusebius and John Cassian, which had the examiners consulting their authorities), well-informed and confident discussion of modern scholarship (with candidates mounting objections variously to Peter Brown, Timothy Barnes and Glen Bowersock; a pugnacious tendency which brought the reverence shown uniformly to Peter Heather and Conrad Leyser into striking focus), and close engagement with the terms of the questions set.

The main disappointment about the exercise was the very narrow range of topics covered. Only eight of the twenty questions were attempted, and questions 1 (on Tetrarchic ideology) and 2 (on Diocletian's control of prices and Christians), with four takers apiece, absorbed nearly half of the total output. Answers to both questions, moreover, tended to the conventional; even the strongest candidates struggled to do more than tick the appropriate boxes (none of the takers for qu. 2 chose to deal with the control of price inflation). Far more creative and interesting were the answers where candidates could be seen to be thinking their way through an argument, with material that clearly had not been the basis for a tutorial essay—the highest marks awarded were thus for the questions on Christianity and gender politics (qu. 7) and on Christian extremism (qu. 14).

(N. McLynn)

### **General History II (476-750)**

Six candidates sat this paper (five Single Hons, one Joint Schools). Two obtained first class marks, the rest II.I marks (with two very high in the class). A healthy range of questions was attempted—twelve out of the twenty set on the paper. A question on urban life proved most popular, and was well-answered, although candidates tended to conflate 'urban life' with 'towns'. Candidates who challenged themselves by taking on a range of types of question (chronologically, geographically, and thematically) tended to do better than those who narrowed their bandwidth. Overall, the scripts attested to the independence of mind of the candidates, who showed a readiness to think in 'big picture' terms, without reinventing the wheel. In other words, their answers were grounded in the relevant secondary literatures, and showcased some acute readings of primary sources. None of this is 'rocket science': all of it bodes well for the future of the new European and World History paper, spanning the period 250-650.

(C. Leyser)

### **General History III (700-900)**

Five candidates took this paper, answering a total of ten questions out of the 23 set. Most of the answers showed a knowledge of the period ranging from the decent to the strong, but candidates prepared to stretch themselves geographically were in the tiny minority. The two questions which attracted the most answers were, predictably, the Vikings and iconoclasm (here recast as the problem of orthodoxy)—but these also generated routine answers and hence lower marks than some other questions. Historiographical awareness was uneven, and not all the candidates showed any real willingness to wrestle with what the questions were really asking. Instead, there was a significant element of answers which didn't quite fit the question, some which betrayed a failure to rethink on the spot, and others which wilfully twisted the questions into hooks for interesting but irrelevant essays.

(J. Smith & E. Screen)

### **General History IV (900-1122)**

Four candidates sat this paper. Two secured first class marks, one a 2.1 at the upper end of the mark range, and one a 2.2. The small numbers taking the paper (far lower than in previous years) means that generalisations about performance are necessarily of limited value. But suffice to say that the best scripts were informed by a sustained engagement with primary and secondary evidence, with some fine answers on Byzantium, Norman Sicily and Ottonian Germany, whereas at the other end, answers displayed some awareness of historiographic debates but made little or no effort to engage with evidence of any kind. As

this paper bites the dust, one might also observe that its strength has been the way its short time frame has allowed candidates to get to grips in a serious way with both specific territories and big themes that cut across the period as a whole. Their interest and engagement has regularly been fired by a close reading of primary sources and a forensic analysis of detailed evidence, with the result that they have come to write about aspects of the period with real confidence, expertise and understanding. Hopefully students will still find a way to pursue similar paths in the replacement papers with their broader time frames.

(J. Nightingale)

### **General History V (1100-1273)**

There were 8 candidates for this paper, 6 main school and 2 joint school. Of these 3 achieved first-class marks, and 5 a 2:1 grade. Only 8 of the 20 questions attracted answers, with that on heresy attracting most responses. Mongols, Byzantium, the Papacy, frontiers and monarchy were also popular. Candidates exhibited very little interest in answering those questions most obviously slanted towards intellectual culture, visual culture, cities, crusade or religious orders. That said, these themes were sometimes addressed in answers that candidates gave to other questions. It was also the case that although the range of questions tackled by the cohort as a whole was somewhat limited, there was considerable variation in the ways in which candidates chose to approach the eight questions that did attract responses. Most candidates demonstrated sound knowledge and executed their essays with enterprise and energy; some displayed remarkable range and precision. The better answers tended to be those where candidates had thought carefully about the terms of the question (and the ways in which those terms interconnected) before rushing to download the information and analysis which they had prepared in advance. It was unfortunate that some very well informed answers undershot a little when provision of data drowned out clarity of argument.

(C. Holmes)

### **General History VI (1273-1409)**

Seven candidates sat the paper, with four achieving first-class marks. With such a small number of candidates many questions went unanswered, but there was nonetheless a good breadth and depth of knowledge on display. The most popular questions were those on the Byzantine commonwealth, Ottoman expansion, gendered identities and the Black Death, with some good answers on crusades, the Mongols, classical antiquity, religious experience, revolts and intellectual history. This breadth is encouraging, and candidates ought to feel emboldened to pursue whatever thematic and geographical interests they develop in the course of their studies. Most answers addressed directly the question set and there was relatively little 'dumping' of pre-prepared off-topic answers.

(I Forrest)

### **General History VII (1409-1525)**

Four candidates sat the paper: one from the main school and three from different joint schools. Between them they answered nine questions (three questions were answered by two candidates). So the scripts dealt with a relatively wide range of topics; and the overall marks ranged too, with one first-class paper, two upper-second, and one lower-second. The best essays were impressively knowledgeable, detailed, and relevant; those marked in the upper second band were also well informed, but failed to focus sufficiently closely or fully on the questions asked to reach a mark in the 70s. A small number of weaker answers were characterized by significant errors and misapprehensions.

(N. Davidson)

### **General History VIII (1517-1618)**

Twenty-one candidates took this paper in 2018, twenty from the main school and one JS candidate (AMH). This represents a slight increase on the total for 2017 (seventeen). Of these candidates five were awarded first class marks, and no candidate gained lower than 62%.

By far the most popular question (11 answers) concerned the failure to heal the schism opened up by Luther's attack on Catholicism. Other popular questions included the Catholic Reformation (8 answers),

witch persecution (7 answers), noble factionalism (5 answers, mostly answered in relation to the French Wars of Religion), and 3 answers each on the German Peasants War, Calvinism, Social Discipline and Gender, the Dutch Revolt, Toleration. Ten questions attracted no takers (Italy, Military Transformation, Ivan IV, Philip II and Personal Rule, European Agriculture, Education, Political Theory, Copernicus and Versalius, Europe and Asia, Material Culture), but given the number of takers the range (18 questions attempted) was quite pleasing.

Despite the introduction of step marking to encourage more generous marking of strong performance, both markers felt that the first class scripts (23%) were highly competent rather than outstanding, and the range of agreed first-class marks fell between 70 and 72%. Popular questions such as those on Luther's schism, witchcraft and the Catholic Reformation received a fair number of answers pitched as general discussions rather than focused attempts to answer the specific question. This was particularly the case with the question on witchcraft persecution, where the question setters had hoped that the responses would be focused on the structures of local communities (and indeed gender relations within them) rather than on the familiar territory of what factors led to and/or limited the amount of witch hunting. It was no less the case that many of the answers to the Lutheran Schism question assumed that it was enough to discuss the growth of Lutheranism under princely protection. Elsewhere, there were some excellent answers on some of the less familiar topics – the Union of Lublin, urban prosperity, social discipline, and toleration – though this threw into sharper relief the larger number of answers pitched in broad-brush terms, demonstrating knowledge but inadequate engagement with the question.

(D. Parrott)

### **General History IX (1618-1719)**

There were 16 candidates who scored overall 4 first class, one 69% borderline, and 11 in the 2.1 class. The paper offered 28 questions, of which ten received no responses. The latter included three questions which were broadly on political themes, two which addressed global topics, two which were broadly social/economic, and one each on gender, religion and military/technological issues. Responses were fairly evenly spread across the other 18 questions, with the one on Peter the Great attracting the most (6), followed by the baroque (5), Dutch Republic (5), and gender relations (4). The broad spread indicates the good health of the subject, with candidates willing to tackle questions ranging from Europe to Asia, and on a wide variety of themes and issues. Some candidates took a rather narrow approach to the questions on authority and on gender relations, with several of those tackling the latter restricting their discussion to women only. Otherwise, candidates generally squarely addressed the questions asked and marshalled their material to support articulate and relevant arguments. There was a reluctance to explore what 'greatness' might mean in the answers to the question on Peter the Great, but those tackling this generally displayed a good command of detail. Several of the answers on the Dutch Republic and on the baroque perceptively probed these questions' implications.

(Peter Wilson)

### **General History X (1715-1799)**

This paper happily attracted its usual committed array of hard-working and hard-thinking candidates, with a very pleasing proportion of good First Class scripts and none that proved less than entirely satisfactory. A number of topics maintained their popularity, with pretty much every candidate tackling the question concerning the Enlightenment, and often basing their argument on the same premises. Students should try to think a little more independently when contemplating the Enlightenment, and ought to be particularly encouraged to prefer analysis over a survey of the existing secondary literature. The best answers referred to examples rather more than to what Jonathan Israel or Peter Gay had had to say about the phenomenon. Prussia and Russia remain popular subjects, as does revolutionary France. All too few candidates think about the extra-European elements at work throughout the paper, still less question any ready separation between 'Europe' and the wider world. Those who did write about the non-European cultures did so with conviction and no little authority. In an age of considerable overseas expansion, and with America declaring



independence, this was indeed a 'global' century. It was good to see a few adventurous candidates take on the art historical question, as well as appealing to evidence culled from material culture more generally. It would be good to see people reflecting on gender and allied socio-cultural topics rather more than they currently do; there is a tendency to treat the paper as an exercise in high politics, particularly when writing about Prussia and Russia, when far much more is in play historically. When thinking about republicanism, for example, candidates should focus appreciably more than they do about the masculine nature of so much republican theory and practice. There were some excellent answers to the question about social structure; more in future, please! It would be unfair, however, to emphasise criticism in reporting on this year's crop of widely and deeply impressive scripts, which were a pleasure and even, occasionally, an education to read. As ever, it is good to see people so fully and effectively familiarise (and consequently de-familiarise) themselves with a period of history with which very far are anything like conversant before formally studying the paper.

(B. Young)

### **General History XI (1789-1870)**

This paper was taken by 9 candidates, 4 in joint schools. The overall standard was disappointing. Scripts clustered around a few predictable topics (Napoleon, Romanticism, 1848, German Unification), which scarcely do justice to what is a rich and lively field. We hope that the complete reinvention of this paper will improve the quality (and quantity) of those who chose it.

(A. Green & O Zimmer)

### **General History XII (1856-1914)**

6 candidates took this paper, of which 2 achieved a first, and the remaining 4 students got marks in the 2.1 range.

Candidates answered a fairly wide range of questions, including country-specific as well as thematic and comparative ones. (The two most frequently answered questions were nos 6 and 14. No one answered questions 1, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 21-23, 25-29. The remaining questions were answered 1-2 times.) It was striking that no one answered a question about international relation or the economy.

As regards the answers themselves, most of them were solid and a few were outstanding. The most common reason preventing candidates from writing very good essays was that they did not show the flexibility of mind needed to engage closely with the questions set, but instead recycled prepared essay plans which addressed the topic in the widest sense, but failed to answer the question. This was quite pronounced in the case of question 14, where a number of candidates showed that they had learned a fair amount about cultural nationalism, but refused to think outside of that format and thus failed to address the question. Another weakness present in a number of essays was the lack of critical engagement with important terms and the historiography. Constructing a convincing argument backed by appropriate examples also provided difficulties at times, as some candidates made arguments that were contradicted by the examples they advanced.

The better candidates, however, answered the questions set, and they constructed nuanced arguments that were backed up by examples. They also related their arguments to the scholarship and showed a real understanding of the period, thus going far beyond simple summaries of a textbook-style nature. We encourage future candidates to follow their example.

(J. Mannherz)

### **General History XIII (Europe Divided, 1914-89: Crises, Conflicts, identities (new)**

This was the first year that this paper was sat in its new format as 'Europe Divided 1914-89', now renamed EWF 13.

The paper follows a new structure, with Section A (1914-45), Section B (1945-89) and Section C (Themes covering the whole periods). It marks a very clear break from the previous format of the paper.

It was pleasing to see that 25 of the 30 questions on the paper were answered by at least one candidate. Exceptions which attracted no answers were questions 3 (Successor states in east central Europe after 1918),

question 5 (interwar democracy), question 26 (working-class collective action) and question 28 (modernism and post-modernism). No one answered question 10 (experience of defeat and occupation in ww2), but one of the most popular questions (13: Europeans' sense of victimhood in the wake of ww2) clearly overlapped with this one. Other very popular questions were 6 ('totalitarianism'), 9 (the Holocaust), 21 (east European revolutions of 1989), 23 (gender relations) and 30 (liberalism). This pattern suggests that the new structure of the paper has proved successful and appealing, and the overall standard of answers was good, with no clear areas of particular weakness.

[Going forward, the Faculty ought to review the success of the paper, particularly in terms of the balance between specific problems and comparative questions and in terms of the prescriptive rubric that candidates must answer all three sections of the paper.]

(N. Stargardt)

### **General History XIV (1941-1973) (Old Regs)**

General History XIV, 1941-1973, was sat for probably the final time in Schools this Trinity Term. Five candidates took the paper, and answers focused heavily on the international politics of the Cold War. Question 14 concerning the socialist regimes of East-Central Europe received two answers, question 19 on the Vietnam War one, question 21 on the Middle Eastern Conflict two, and question 3 'To what extent did local conditions shape the Cold War', two. Question 20 on decolonization received one answer, and question 26 on women one. It's striking that no essays whatsoever were written in responses to questions 1 and 2 on the Second World War, and none penned on European integration, Christian Democracy, the Iberian dictatorships, American Civil Rights Movement, Cuban Revolution or Maoist China. Cultural topics also proved unpopular- no essays were written on intellectuals, secularization or artistic trends.

I suspect one benefit of the new division of 20<sup>th</sup> century GH papers between European and Global options will be that students are provided with courses which confer clearer geographic or thematic pathways through the period.

(T. Brodie)

### **General History XIV (The Global 20<sup>th</sup> Century 1930-2003)**

This is the first time the new GHXIV has been examined. I had several concerns in composing the exam script. A couple were specifically related to the rubric's chronological structure: namely, how to deal with the chronological imbalance between sections A (1930-1989, or 59 years) and B (1989-2003, or 14 years); and how to incorporate the 'stub' interwar decade of the 1930s. A more general concern, given the vast scope of the paper, was constructing questions that were capacious enough to allow students to use a wide variety of case-studies from different periods and regions.

In terms of chronology, evidence from the exam (as well as anecdotal evidence from tutors) suggests that many have de facto approached the paper as starting in 1945. In a sample of 29 scripts, there were no answers to Question 1 (on the global Great Depression) and only three to Question 3 (on World War II). This could suggest a need to rethink the paper's chronological boundaries; these could either be shortened (to the post-WWII period) or lengthened (to the short 20<sup>th</sup> century + the millenium). One could also re-balance sections A and B (breaking at 1970 or 1980, for instance) or merge A and B into a single section, giving correspondingly more weight to the thematically-based section C. Under the current rubric, I think it will be increasingly difficult year on year to achieve sufficiently variety in section B, and the earlier part of the paper will routinely be neglected.

On the other hand, candidates coped well with the challenge of matching specific, geographically-grounded case studies to the relatively open-ended questions; only in a handful of scripts did students rely excessively on a single case or clearly draw on other coursework or outside knowledge (e.g., British history).

A less encouraging trend was candidates' disinclination to answer questions about social, cultural, gender, and/or intellectual history, and to keep to the safety of international/diplomatic history. This was especially

true in section A, where by far the most popular questions were 4 (Did superpowers create or merely escalate Cold War conflicts in other countries?) and 10 (To what extent did international organizations represent the interests of the great powers?). Section B was slightly better: the most popular questions were 11 (Who [or what] 'won' the Cold War?), 14 (What was the relationship between nationalism and religious fundamentalism from ca. 1975?), and 16 (To what extent did the end of empire transform national identities in former colonial powers?). In section C, questions on ethnic violence (23) and the environment (25) were most popular. Candidates, however, completely eschewed forms of global protest (24); consumption and US hegemony (24); and urbanization (29). Only three candidates responded to the single question on gender/sex (28), and practically none incorporated a gender or women's history angle into their other answers.

(K Lebow)

### **General History XV (Britain's North American Colonies from Settlement to Independence, 1600–1812)**

The Candidates who took this paper answered a pleasing range of the questions, suggesting that tutors teaching it were encouraging students to study a broad range of topics across the temporal and geographical range of this rich and diverse paper. Most papers showed consistent strengths and weaknesses across a range of questions. In the case of two candidates, all of the answers were so short as to be almost short-weight — candidates must be encouraged to practice examinations and (if there is physical difficulty in writing a full-length essay) to seek relevant help. In the first class range of marks, the performance of candidates was disappointing, and the examiners were not able to award the highest first class marks. Many scripts seemed to have been written with 'stock' answers in mind and candidates did not adapt their material to the particular questions set. In the past few years the examiners setting GH15 have made an effort to make the paper less predictable than it has been at some periods in the past, and candidates should not expect to be able to write pre-prepared answers. Perhaps the biggest flaw in most scripts was the reliance on extremely outmoded historiography or answers that entirely ignored important historiographical debates. A closer attention to such issues would have helped many scripts achieve higher marks, and might well have assisted many candidates to better organize the material they presented.

(N. Cole)

### **General History XVI (From Colonies to Nation: the History of the United States, 1776–1877)**

21 Candidates took General History 16 (USA, 1776-1877) this year, including an unusually high proportion of joint school students (9). Four candidates secured a first-class mark, while the remainder all performed in the Upper Second range. The examiners were pleased by the lack of 'bunching' of answers this year--all but one question attracted at least one candidate, and a higher than usual percentage attempted at least one 'starred question', i.e. a question that can be answered with reference to any part of the period. As in previous years, this latter strategy often yielded rich dividends, generating a higher proportion of fresh and interesting essays. The other quality that differentiated the first-class scripts from the remainder was the adeptness with which the best candidates related the particular problem that was under examination to grander themes in American historical development.

(G. Davies)

### **General History XVII (History of the United States since 1863)**

There were 34 takers for GH 17 this year. Students covered a broad range of topics -- most of the questions had at least one taker (although, unusually, there were no answers on the Civil War, the Vietnam War, or the history of the West this year).

10 gained first class marks, 33 gained 2.1s. The best answers often made connections across the paper as a whole. The better answers also tended to be more up to date with recent historiography. The lecture series provides a good opportunity to learn about topics beyond those studied for tutorials, and to hear about the most recent historiography.

Few students attempted the asterisked general questions at the start of the paper. There is no need to attempt one or more of these questions in order to gain a high mark, but they do provide a good opportunity to address general themes of modern American history.

A very large number of students attempted questions on the Jim Crow era, the New Deal and the Civil Rights movement. Students should be reassured that all topics on the paper are equally likely to be examined, so there is no need to restrict their revision to supposedly 'banker' topics.

(S. Tuck)

### **General History XVIII (Eurasian Empires, 1450-1800)**

This was taken in healthy numbers (41) and it was pleasing to report that in general scripts were answered rather well, and a large number of firsts were awarded. The bias in the rubric towards Section B (comparative and thematic) did not lead to any neglect of the Section A topics, with the answers fairly evenly balanced between the two. Indeed, there was a good spread of answers across the whole of the paper, with only 4 of the 29 questions going unanswered. The Ottomans and millenarianism both attracted notably large numbers of answers, some of which seemed to follow a rather familiar structure – candidates should avoid recycling prepared answers, which leave little room for real achievement on the paper. It was good, however, to see that candidates were generally able to attend to both chronological and systemic aspects of the case studies in Section A questions while also drawing on specific evidence to build wider generalisations in Section B. . Candidates who were able to show an awareness of broader global patterns or extend their comparative reflections beyond two neighbouring cases were particularly well rewarded. For example, the question on monotheism and the imperial management of religion was clearly assisted by having some non-monotheistic imperial elites to draw into the analysis. The early modernity question produced some of the weaker responses: students should be prompted to think through the difficult conceptual questions surrounding this issue – and its use by historians of particular states as well as global historians – throughout the course and not just for one week at the beginning or end of the term.

(A. Strathern)

### **General History XIX (Imperial and Global History, 1750-1914)**

There were thirty two takers for this paper. Marks were fairly conventionally distributed across classes; there were relatively few outstandingly good scripts but some very solid ones, and few grave disappointments. There was, unfortunately and unusually, one outright fail. Answers tended to cluster very strongly in both parts of the paper, with questions 4 (religion and empire, 11 answers) and 9 (ideas of civilisation, 14 answers) in Part A, 20 ('self-strengthening' doomed to fail, 19 answers) and 21 (1857 in India, 16 answers) in part B proving especially popular. Areas attracting very few or no answers included such major aspects of the paper as the global economy, ecology and settlement, medicine, race, geography and exploration, the influence of empire on metropolitan culture, slavery and labour, Islam, Latin America, constitutionalism and nationalism. On the other hand, there were good and well-read answers on technology and narratives of progress, 'civilisation' as a gendered category (although candidates tended to refer to the same set of cases on this, and were generally unable to offer a conceptual history of 'civilisation' as a key idea in this period), and on 1857, for which some candidates displayed a good, critical awareness of the recent historiography. A general weakness was a tendency to make answers that were cogent and reasonably well-read but schematic and unoriginal (and frequently replicated across the cohort), e.g. on Q4 and Q20. The most frequently encountered weaknesses were a lack of accurate empirical detail and insufficient reference to the literature: in some cases, it was unfortunately apparent that candidates' answers recycled commonplaces and assumptions, or polemical arguments about e.g. postcolonialism (sometimes very poorly understood, on the basis of cribbing or gleaning some general notions from hostile commentary rather than on the basis of serious reading), rather than actually engaging in critical discussion of themes through a close familiarity with the literature. Candidates who did well were, as ever with an outline paper, able to display a grasp of the detail of a question within the major thematic issues of the period as a whole and relate their arguments closely to the scholarship. Less successful scripts focused too narrowly on the questions they had covered without this fuller contextualisation, or with little or only superficial reference to the literature.

## **Disciplines of History**

The paper was prepared and reviewed in the usual manner by the main FHS Board in collaboration, at all stages, with the Joint School of Ancient and Modern and with the History Externals. No complaint or other response inviting comment has been received from AMH.

254 students in the Main School sat the Disciplines of History paper, 111 men and 143 women. This is an increase of 29 students over the total in 2017, and the relative proportions of men/women also shifted: in 2017 116 men sat the paper and 109 women. 44 men were awarded a first on this paper (39.5%), while 4 (3.6%) received an overall 2ii mark. For 13 of the male students DofH was their highest mark, and for 29 it was their lowest. Among the 143 women, 40 (28%) gained first-class marks, and 11 (7.7%) received 2ii marks. For 15 of the women DofH was their highest mark, and for 27 their lowest. The percentage of first-class marks awarded to both men and women candidates was considerably higher than in 2017, when the respective figures were 21% and 19%. The improvement in top-end women's performance is encouraging at around 9%; that of men reflects a near 20% increase in firsts. The larger number of women candidates receiving 2ii marks this year (11 v. 6) is probably not statistically significant, especially given the larger number of women candidates overall.

In setting the Disciplines paper, the FHS Board paid careful attention to the concerns and issues raised by the Gender Equality Working Group in relation to the range of questions on the 2017 paper. Informal feedback received from various markers involved in this year's DofH paper suggests that, by adding more questions relating to gender history, sexuality, history of the emotions, it managed to avoid some of the excessive 'bunching' of answers around a couple of gender-related questions seen in the previous year. Indeed at least two of the markers noted that overall there seemed fewer answers specifically on gender and sexuality this year, despite a wider choice of questions on these subjects. Another marker commented favourably that candidates were usefully deploying ideas about identity, gender and the body elsewhere in the paper, in the context of questions that were not specifically on these topics.

More generally the markers commented on the wide range of answers across each of their batches of scripts. Global history (Q. 35), empires, religion, collective identities, oral history, material culture, intellectual history, identity, regulating sexualities, the linguistic and the spacial turns, all attracted significant numbers of answers. Though some other mainstream topics were unexpectedly neglected: criminal justice, political history, government, art and politics, postcolonial history, literacy, frontier regions, microhistory. In one or two cases, candidates seem to have been discouraged by the formulation of the question – Revolutions was a case in point (Q. 8), as was Globalization (Q. 18). Some other questions required more rigorous thought than some candidates gave them: a question about "religious enthusiasm" (Q. 4) is not simply an opportunity to compare societies in which religion is a conspicuous presence. A regular weakness, especially in section A, was the failure to define central concepts, thus allowing meaning to shift and slip throughout essays: empire, rebellion, elites, agency, were all victims of loose – or simply assumed – definitions.

In a broader context in which a large number of candidates performed strongly on the paper, the markers took the view that section B was answered better than the comparative history section A. Comparative history remains conceptually challenging for many candidates, and weaker answers suggest little grasp of the underlying point of the comparative method. One marker suggested that the rubric for section A should perhaps be changed to read "Candidates must COMPARE and display knowledge of...", since many answers demonstrated a good knowledge of two or more societies, periods, etc., but in a unitary and non-comparative way. Recognizing that it is the differences, often embedded in apparent similarities, which are telling and provide historical insight is missing, and some candidates, by no means lacking in historical knowledge, are assuming that an answer in this section is an exercise in classification not comparison. A perennial criticism is the choice of inappropriately divergent case-studies, often compounded by a

reluctance to explain why these particular two or more examples have been chosen in response to the question. At the other extreme, there was some concern about comparative answers, often well-executed in their own right, in which the two or more case-studies were obviously drawn from material studied in the same outline course. At present there is no ruling or formal advice about this, and of course the problem of whether this is/is not in the spirit of this paper will become a much greater issue now the Theme papers have been introduced.

Candidates have a clearer idea of what is required of them in Section B, but as ever there is tension between the extent to which answers should flow directly from concepts, methodologies and materials drawn out of courses that students have studied, and the temptation to pre-fabricate answers in anticipation of questions on agreed topics. Once again, for example, an excellent lecture on oral history produced a flurry of answers from candidates whose own work has seemingly never engaged with the methodology; the result can all-too easily be the regurgitation of a handful of examples and case-studies that grow all the more familiar to markers as they reach their fifth or sixth essay on the topic. Similar issues were noted in relation to the linguistic turn, material culture, global history and identity. To some extent this reflects the inevitable tension within a methodology section which rightly lays stress on the importance of deploying material from the study of other courses, but at the same time requires thorough knowledge of often sophisticated and convoluted theoretical debates in order to make effective and critical use of that material. Too often candidates, lacking confidence that they properly understand the latter, take refuge in an uncritical, indeed positively whiggish, enthusiasm for their chosen methodology, even when their own historical examples and acquired historical experience would provide scope for a more thoughtful and nuanced answer.

All of that said, the higher percentage of first-class marks awarded on this paper indicates that many, and perhaps a rising proportion of, candidates have grasped the essential issues raised by both sections A and B. They have managed to negotiate the challenging path between demonstrating their close understanding of the range of history they have studied in other courses, and deploying this in making effective comparisons and in examining historical methodologies and approaches.

(David Parrott, Chair)

**APPENDIX A. REPORT ON FHS RESULTS AND GENDER (Main School only)**

<b>GENDER STATS BY PAPER FHS 2018</b>											
Paper	F Avrg	M Avrg	DIFF	F High	M High	F Low	M Low	F 70 +	M70 +	F< 60	M< 60
ALL	67.29	68.21	0.92					27 (20.2)	28 (27.7)	4 (2.9)	0
BH	66.14	67.61	1.82	15	11	37	20	32 (23.9)	34 (33.7)	9 (6.7)	2 (2)
GH	66.98	67.91	0.93	24	13	22	13	42 (31.3)	41 (40.6)	4 (2.9)	1 (1)
FS	67.84	68.14	0.3	32	19	11	17	49 (36.6)	44 (43.6)	2 (1.5)	4 (4)
SSg	68.02	68.44	0.42	27	15	12	15	50 (37.3)	46 (45.5)	4 (2.9)	4 (4)
SSEE	68.63	69.25	0.62	41	24	14	13	61 (45.5)	50 (49.5)	5 (3.7)	3 (3)
DH	66.63	67.45	0.82	15	13	27	29	39 (29.1)	39 (38.6)	11 (8.2)	4 (4)
TH*	66.77	68.59	1.82	29	28	40	21	41 (30.6)	41 (40.6)	11 (8.2)	1 (1)
<b>GENDER STATS BY PAPER FHS 2017</b>											
Paper	F Avrg	M Avrg	DIFF	F High	M High	F Low	M Low	F 70 +	M70 +	F< 60	M< 60
ALL	67.21	67.31	0.1					18	23	2	0
BH	66.26	66.99	0.73	12	17	23	14	27	35	5	5
GH	66.19	67.6	1.41	7	19	21	21	22	32	8	4
FS	67.55	67.63	0.08	18	21	19	13	36	45	2	1
SSg	67.67	67.36	0.31	19	17	11	15	41	35	3	4
SSEE	68.86	68.42	0.44	40	28	10	14	46	46	2	4
DH	65.87	66.26	0.39	12	17	30	33	21	25	6	3
TH	67.97	66.6	1.37	32	26	23	34	43	37	6	16
<b>GENDER STATS BY PAPER FHS 2016</b>											
Paper	F Avrg	M Avrg	DIFF	F High	M High	F Low	M Low	F70 +	M70+	F< 60	M< 60
ALL		67.39	0.1					19	19	0	1
BH	65.65	67.18	1.53	17	22	32	19	24	35	7	7
GH	67.29	67.14	0.15	18	18	16	19	34	30	3	6
FS	66.94	67.68	0.74	17	25	17	15	31	42	4	4
SSg	67.89	67.91	0.02	23	21	12	11	44	40	4	2
SSEE	68.47	68.18	0.29	32	36	12	14	51	48	1	3
DH	66.25	66.7	0.45	21	17	33	30	23	34	5	6
TH	68.12	67	1.16	34	24	27	28	49	34	6	7
<b>GENDER STATS BY PAPER FHS 2015</b>											
Paper	F Avrg	M Avrg	DIFF	F High	M High	F Low	M Low	F70 +	M70 +	F < 60	M < 60
ALL	66.56	67.09	0.53					11	22	2	2

BH	64.25	66.51	2.26	13	18	32	27	20	36	12	10
GH	66.04	66.3	0.26	14	11	20	18	20	34	5	6
FS	66.82	67.82	1	25	19	11	8	31	45	0	3
SSg	66.25	67.58	1.33	14	17	14	13	29	38	5	5
SSEE	67.66	67.9	0.24	32	31	9	19	38	46	2	7
DH	65.75	66.15	0.4	15	14	29	27	26	28	9	7
TH	66.77	66.88	0.11	20	20	29	22	29	37	12	8

GENDER STATS BY PAPER FHS 2017											116 M	109 W						
Paper	F Avrg	M Avrg	DIFF	F High	M High	F Low	M Low	F 70 +	F%	M70 +	M%	F< 60	F%	M< 60	M%			
ALL	67.21	67.31	0.1					18	16.5	23	19.8	2	1.8	0				
BH	66.26	66.99	0.73	12	17	23	14	27	24.8	35	30.2	5	4.6	5	4.3			
GH	66.19	67.6	1.41	7	19	21	21	22	20.2	32	27.6	8	7.3	4	3.5			
FS	67.55	67.63	0.08	18	21	19	13	36	33.1	45	38.8	2	1.8	1	0.9			
SSg	67.67	67.36	0.31	19	17	11	15	41	37.6	35	30.1	3	2.8	4	3.5			
SSEE	68.86	68.42	0.44	40	28	10	14	46	42.2	46	39.7	2	1.8	4	3.5			
DH	65.87	66.26	0.39	12	17	30	33	21	19.3	25	21.6	6	5.5	3	2.6			
TH	67.97	66.6	1.37	32	26	23	34	43	39.5	37	31.9	6	5.5	16	13.8			

GENDER STATS BY PAPER FHS 2016											115 M	129W						
Paper	F Avrg	M Avrg	DIFF	F High	M High	F Low	M Low	F 70 +	F%	M70 +	M%	F< 60	F%	M< 60	M%			
ALL	67.29	67.39	0.1					19	14.7	19	16.5	0	0	1				
BH	65.65	67.18	1.53	17	22	32	19	24	18.6	35	30.4	7	5.4	7	6.1			
GH	67.29	67.14	0.15	18	18	16	19	34	26.4	30	26	3	2.3	6	5.2			
FS	66.94	67.68	0.74	17	25	17	15	31	24	42	36.5	4	3.1	4	3.5			
SSg	67.89	67.91	0.02	23	21	12	11	44	34.1	40	34.8	4	3.1	2	1.7			
SSEE	68.47	68.18	0.29	32	36	12	14	51	39.5	48	41.7	1	0.8	3	2.6			
DH	66.25	66.7	0.45	21	17	33	30	23	17.8	34	29.6	5	3.9	6	5.2			
TH	68.12	67	1.16	34	24	27	28	49	38	35	30.4	6	4.7	7	6.1			

GENDER STATS BY PAPER FHS 2015											115 M	119W						
Paper	F Avrg	M Avrg	DIFF	F High	M High	F Low	M Low	F70 +	F%	M70+	M%	F< 60	F%	M< 60	M%			
ALL	66.56	67.09	0.53					11	9.2	22	19.1	2	1.7	2	1.7			
BH	64.25	66.51	2.26	13	18	32	27	20	16.8	36	31.3	12	10.1	10	8.7			
GH	66.04	66.3	0.26	14	11	20	18	20	16	34	29.6	5	4.2	6	5.2			
FS	66.82	67.82	1	25	19	11	8	31	26.1	45	39.1	0	0	3	2.6			
SSg	66.25	67.58	1.33	14	17	14	13	29	24.4	38	33.1	5	4.2	5	4.3			
SSEE	67.66	67.9	0.24	32	31	9	19	38	31.9	46	40	2	1.7	7	6.1			
DH	65.75	66.15	0.4	15	14	29	27	26	21.8	28	24.3	9	7.6	7	6.1			
TH	66.77	66.88	0.11	20	20	29	22	29	22	37	32.2	12	10.1	8	6.9			



## APPENDIX B

### FHS RESULTS AND STATISTICS

Note: Tables (i) – (iii) relate to the Final Honour School of History only. Statistics for the joint schools are included in tables (iv) and (v).

#### (i) Numbers and percentages in each class

Class	Number			
	2018	2017	2016	2015
I	108	87	85	69
II.1	125	138	159	160
II.2	1	-	-	4
III	-	-	-	-
Pass	1			
Fail	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>233</b>

Class	Percentage			
	2018	2017	2016	2015
I	45.96	38.67	34.8	29.61
II.1	53.20	61.33	65.2	68.67
II.2	0.40	-	-	-
III	-	-	-	-
Pass	0.40	-	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-

(ii) Numbers and percentages of men and women in each class

(a) 2018

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	108	45.96	52	50.98	56	42.10	51.85
II.1	125	53.20	50	49.02	75	56.40	60.0
II.2	1	0.42	-	-	1	0.75	100.
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pass	1	0.42	-	-	1	0.75	100.
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>100</b>	-

(b) 2017

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	87	38.67	42	35.90	45	41.67	51.72
II.1	138	61.33	75	64.10	63	58.33	45.66
II.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>100</b>	-

(c) 2016

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	85	34.8	43	37.4	42	32.6	49.4
II.1	159	65.2	72	62.6	87	67.4	54.7
II.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>100</b>	-

(d) 2015

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	69	29.61	41	35.96	28	23.53	40.57
II.1	160	68.67	71	62.28	89	74.79	55.62
II.2	4	1.72	2	1.76	2	1.68	50.0
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>100</b>	-

(iii) Performance of Prelims. Candidates in Schools (First and Thirds) and Vice Versa (HIST only)

Prelims Nos 2016	FHS Results in 2018					Finals not taken in 2018
	I	II.1	II.2	III	Pass	
Distinction: 87	59	20				8
Pass:	-	--	-	-	-	

Finals Nos 2018	Prelims results in 2015/2016		Prelims not taken in 2015/16
	Distinction	Pass	
Class I: 108	59	40	9
Class III/Pass: 1	-	-	1

(iv) Performance of candidates by paper

a) Thesis (Sex/Paper showing marks for that paper)

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	115	36.74	54	38.02	61	35.68	53.04
II.1	183	58.47	85	59.86	98	57.30	53.55
II.2	15	4.79	3	2.12	12	7.02	80.00
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pass	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>100</b>	-

b) Special Subject Extended Essay (sex paper showing marks for that paper)

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	132	47.65	62	52.54	70	44.02	53.03
II.1	137	49.45	53	44.91	84	52.84	61.32
II.2	8	2.90	3	2.55	5	3.4	62.50
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>100</b>	-

c) Disciplines of History (Sex/Paper showing marks for that paper)

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	84	33.08	44	39.64	40	27.98	47.61
II.1	155	61.02	63	56.76	92	64.33	59.35
II.2	15	5.90	4	3.60	11	7.69	73.33
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pass	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>100</b>	-

d) History of the British Isles (Sex/Paper showing marks for that paper)

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	76	27.94	39	33.33	37	23.87	48.68
II.1	182	66.92	74	63.25	108	69.67	59.34
II.2	12	4.41	4	3.42	8	5.16	66.66
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pass	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	2	0.73	-	-	2	1.30	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>100</b>	-

e) General History (Sex/Paper showing marks for that paper)

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	103	35.64	56	43.08	47	29.56	45.63
II.1	180	62.29	72	55.38	108	67.92	60.0
II.2	5	1.73	2	1.54	3	1.89	60.0
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	1	0.34	-	-	1	0.63	100.
<b>Total</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>100</b>	-

f) Further Subjects (Sex/Paper showing marks for that paper)

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	116	37.79	55	40.44	61	35.68	52.59
II.1	182	59.29	74	54.42	108	63.16	59.34
II.2	8	2.60	7	5.14	1	0.58	12.50
III	1	0.32	-	-	1	0.58	100.
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>100</b>	-

g) Special Subjects Gobbets (sex paper showing marks for that paper)

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	112	40.58	53	44.92	59	37.34	52.67
II.1	156	56.52	61	51.70	95	60.13	60.90
II.2	8	2.90	4	3.38	4	2.53	50.0
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>100</b>	-

**(v) History and Joint Schools' candidates taking each paper**

(Figures include both Main and Joint Schools' candidates – bracketed figures indicate the number of joint schools' candidates) (withdrawn candidates have not been taken into account here)

	2018	2017	2016	2015
<b>History of the British Isles</b>				
1. c.300-1087	25 (1)	12 (2)	18 (5)	19 (5)
2. 1042-1330	31 (1)	27 (3)	37 (2)	28 (1)
3. 1330-1550	34 (4)	32 (3)	27 -	32 (3)
4. 1500-1700	67 (9)	69 (12)	64 (7)	75 (9)
5. 1685-1830	34 (6)	30 (1)	24 (8)	34 (7)
6. 1815-1924	32 (6)	25 (4)	37 (2)	40 (8)
7. Since 1900	49 (10)	60 (6)	65 (6)	49 (11)
<b>General History</b>				
(i) 285-476	6 (3)	8 (1)	7 (1)	6 (1)
(ii) 476-750	6 (1)	4 (1)	5 (1)	4 (1)
(iii) 700-900	5 (1)	5 (1)	7 -	6 (1)
(iv) 900-1122	4 (1)	11 (3)	5 (2)	6 -
(v) 1100-1273	8 (2)	8 (2)	- (1)	4 (1)
(vi) 1273-1409	7 (1)	12 (4)	5 (1)	6 -
(vii) 1409-1525	4 (3)	3 -	14 (5)	8 (1)
(viii) 1517-1618	21 (1)	17 (2)	23 (6)	21 -
(ix) 1618-1715	16 (4)	13 (2)	12 (4)	15 -
(x) 1715-1799	21 (10)	13 (6)	12 (5)	21 (8)
(xi) 1789-1870	9 (4)	21 (6)	13 (6)	13 (2)
(xii) 1856-1914	6 -	7 (3)	5 -	6 (1)
(xiii) Europe Divided, 1914-89 : Crises, Conflicts, Identities ( <i>new</i> )	9 (3)	- -	- -	- -
(xiii) 1914-1945 ( <i>Old Regs</i> )	- (1)	33 (9)	28 (5)	25 (6)
(xiv) The Global 20th century 1930-2003 ( <i>new</i> )	29 (7)	- -	- -	- -
(xiv) 1941-1973 ( <i>Old Regs</i> )	5 (4)	41 (12)	40 (7)	35 (12)
(xv) (3028) History of the U.S. 1600-1812	13 (2)	9 (3)	18 (4)	15 (2)
(xvi) History of the U.S. 1776-1877	21 (9)	11 (3)	22 (5)	28 (6)
(xvii) History of the U.S. since 1863	34 (10)	30 (8)	39 (10)	39 (9)
(xviii) Eurasian Empires, 1450-1800	41 (12)	54 (20)	45 (14)	
(xix) Imperial and Global History 1750-1914	32 (6)	15 (5)	24 (6)	40 (14)



	2018	2017	2016	2015
<b>Further Subjects</b>				
1. Anglo-Saxon Archaeology of the Early Christian period	2 -	4 -	2 (1)	3 -
2. The Near East in the Age of Justinian and Muhammad, c. 527–c.700	11 (1)	8 (5)	11 (3)	9 (2)
3. The Carolingian Renaissance	6 -	4 (2)	4 (1)	4 (1)
4. The Viking Age: War and Peace c.750-1100 (abolished)	- -	7 (4)	3 -	5 (1)
5. The Crusades	9 (1)	17 (2)	16 (5)	12 (4)
6. Culture and Society in Early Renaissance Italy, 1290-1348	8 (5)	3 -	2 (1)	3 (1)
7. Flanders and Italy in the Quattrocento, 1420–1480	3 -	1 -	3 (1)	6 -
8. The Wars of the Roses	11 (3)	7 (1)	8 (4)	14 (2)
9. Women, Gender & Print Culture in Reformation England, c.1530-1640	5 (2)	10 (2)	6 (2)	7 (1)
10. Literature and Politics in Early Modern England (A10711W1)	16 (2)	10 -	18 (1)	
Representing the City, 1558-1640 (A13762S1) (Bridge essay only, no longer an FS) (HENG)	-	9 (2)	7 (1)	6 (4)
11. Writing in the early Modern period, 1550-1750 (new) (A15060S1)	3 -	1 -		
12. Court, Culture & Art in Early Modern Europe, 1580-1700	9 (2)	5 (1)	7 -	10 (1)
13. The Military & Society in Britain & France, c. 1650-1815	4 (1)	11 (2)	2 -	5 (1)
14. The Metropolitan Crucible, London 1685-1815	8 -	8 (4)	6 (1)	9 (2)
15. First Industrial Revolution 1700-1870 (suspended in 2017-18)	- -	3 -	- -	- -
16. Medicine, Empire & Improvement, 1720 to 1820	- -	- -	4 (1)	- -
17. The Age of Jefferson	11 (5)	8 -	10 (1)	15 (2)
18. Culture and Society in France from Voltaire to Balzac	2 -	- -	- (2)	3 (1)
19. Nationalism in western Europe 1799-1890	10 (2)	11 (1)	11 (3)2	10 (4)
20. Intellect and Culture in Victorian Britain	4 -	4 -	2 -	7 -
21. The Authority of Nature: Race, Heredity & Crime 1800-1940	16 (4)	12 (1)	16 (2)	15 (3)
22. The Middle East in the Age of Empire	14 (3)	24 (5)	23 (5)	13 (5)
23. Imperialism and Nationalism, 1830–1966	19 (3)	14 (3)	18 (4)	23 (7)
24. Modern Japan, 1868–1972	9 (2)	11 (3)	12 (4)	- -
25. British Economic History since 1870 (PPE)	15 (14)	16 (15)	12 (8)	19 (14)
26. Nationalism, Politics and Culture in Ireland, c. 1870–1921	9 (1)	4 (1)	14 (5)	5 (1)

	2018		2017		2016		2015	
27. Comparative History of the First World War	8	-	-	-	15	(1)	16	(4)
28. China since 1900 (with old Regs)	23	(5)	24	(7)	23	(5)	13	(2)
29. The Soviet Union 1924–1941	8	(1)	10	(5)	14	(3)	4	(4)
Culture, politics & identity in Cold War Europe, 1945-68 (A10735W1) (old regs)	17	(3)	16	(3)	19	(5)	22	(4)
30. Culture, politics & identity in Cold War Europe, 1945-68 ( <i>New Regs</i> ) (A10735X1)	-	(2)	-	(1)				
31. Britain at the Movies: Film and National Identity since 1914 (FSEE)	12	(1)	10	(1)	16	(2)	8	(1)
32. Scholastic and Humanist Political thought	4	(2)	5	-	-	-	3	-
33. The Science of Society 1650-1800	10	(2)	8	(3)	4	(1)	-	(1)
34. Political Theory and Social Science	7	(3)	13	(7)	7	(2)	6	
35. Postcolonial Historiography: Writing the (Indian) Nation ) (A13763S1)	12	(4)	5	-	4	(2)	8	(4)
<b>Special Subjects</b>								
1. St Augustine & the last days of Rome, 370-430	8	(1)	8	(2)	7	-	6	(1)
2. Francia in the Age of Clovis and Gregory of Tours	8	(1)	3	-	3	-	4	-
3. Byzantium in the Age of Constantine Porphyrogenitus	6	(1)	6	(1)	6	(1)	10	(1)
4. The Norman Conquest of England	10	(2)	7	(1)	10	-	10	(1)
5. The Peasants' Revolt of 1381	2	(1)	5	(1)				
6. Joan of Arc & her Age, 1419-1435	6	(1)	10	-	6	-	7	(1)
7. Painting & Culture in Ming China	5	-	5	(1)	4	-	-	-
8. Politics, Art & Culture in the Italian Renaissance, Venice & Florence c.1475-1525	13	(2)	5	(1)	20	(3)	19	(3)
9. Luther & the German Reformation	12	-	12	-	8	-	7	-
10. The Trial of the Tudor State: Politics, Religion & Society, 1540-1560 ( <i>new</i> )	7	(1)						
11. The Crisis of the Reformation: Britain, France & the Netherlands 1560-1610 (suspended in 2017-18)	-	-	4	(1)	10	(2)	7	-
12. The Thirty Years Wars	6	-	12	(1)				
13. Scientific Movement in the Seventeenth Century (A10752W1)	2	-	13	(2)	8		15	(2)
14. Revolution & Republic, 1647-16558	15	(2)	10	-	3	-	15	(2)
15. English Architecture, 1660–1720	10	(4)	6	-	12	-	18	(3)
Debating social change in Britain & Ireland 1770-1825			2	-	-	-	5	(2)
16. Imperial Crisis & Reform, 1774-84 ( <i>new</i> )	6	-						

	2018	2017	2016	2015
Growing-up in the middle-class family: Britain, 1830-70		11 (1)	19 (4)	- -
17. Becoming a Citizen , c. 1860-1902	16 (3)			
18. Slavery and the Crisis of the Union, 1854–1865	13 (2)	18 (1)	19 (1)	13 (1)
19. Art and its Public in France, 1815-67	5 (1)	2 -	2 (1)	4 -
20. Race, Religion & Resistance in the United States, from Jim Crow to the Civil Rights	16 (2)	17 (2)	16 (2)	10 (2)
21. Terror & Forced Labour in Stalin’s Russia	5 (1)	6 (1)	3 -	
22. From Gandhi to the Green Revolution: India, Independence & Modernity 1939-69 (A15059W1)	13 -	18 (2)	19 (1)	16 (1)
23. Nazi Germany, a racial order , 1933-45	4 (2)	3 (2)	6 (1)	2 -
24. France from the Popular Front to the Liberation, 1936–44	1 -	6 (1)	4 (1)	3 (3)
25. War and Reconstruction, 1939-45	12 (3)	3 (1)	2 -	13 (3)
26. Britain from the Bomb to the Beatles, 1945-67	10 -	12 (2)	14 (2)	8 -
27. The Northern Ireland Troubles 1965–1985	18 (4)	15 (4)	17 -	15 (3)
28. Britain in the Seventies	20 (3)	8 (2)	19 (4)	17 -
29. Neoliberalism & Postmodernism: Ideas, Politics & Culture in Europe & North America, 1970-2000	15 (3)	16 -	15 (1)	13 (1)
30. Revolutions of 1989	11 (2)	13 (1)	12 (1)	7 (1)
Revolutions of 1989 ( <i>Old Regs</i> )	1 -	- -	- -	- -
Optional/Additional Theses	-	5 (2)	3 -	3 (1)
Princeton assessment (A10773V1) (8999)	- -	3 (1)	3 -	2 -
Disciplines of History	254 (19)	244 (19)	258 (14)	249 (15)
Compulsory Thesis (A10771S1)	286 (51)	270 (45)	244 (49)	281 (47)
Thesis in PPE (A12746S1) (HPol)	- (7)	- (11)	- (11)	- (8)
Thesis (A11024S1) (Heco)	- (14)	- (15)	- (8)	- (13)
Interd. Dissertation (HENG) (A14401S1)	- (6)	- (9)	- (9)	- (8)
Representing the City (A11026S1) (9092) (HENG only)	- (6)	- (2)	- (4)	- (3)
Postcolonial historiography (A11027S1) (9791)	- -	- (6)	- (5)	- (3)

**(vi) Joint Schools - number of candidates taking each paper**

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
<b>British History</b>						
1. 300–1087	-	-	-	1	-	1
2. 1042–1330	-	-	-	1	-	1
3. 1330–1550	-	1	-	-	3	4
4. 1500–1700	3	-	1	1	4	9
5. 1685–1830	1	1	2	1	1	6
6. 1815-1924	-	-	2	3	1	6
7. Since 1900	1	1	1	2	5	10
<b>General History</b>						
(i) 285-476	2	-	-	-	1	3
(ii) 476–750	1	-	-	-	-	1
(iii) 700–900	--	-	-	1	-	1
(iv) 900–1122	1	-	-	-	-	1
(v) 1122–1273	-	-	-	1	1	2
(vi) 1273–1409	-	1	-	-	-	1
(vii) 1409–1525	-	1	1	1	-	3
(viii) 1517–1618	1	-	-	-	-	1
(ix) 1618–1715	-	-	-	3	1	4
(x) 1715–1799	2	1	-	3	4	10
(xi) 1789–1870	1	-	-	1	2	4
(xii) 1856–1914	-	-	-	-	-	-
(xiii) Europe Divided, 1914-89: Crises, Conflicts, Identities (new)	1	1	-	-	1	3
(xiii) 1914–1945 ( <i>Old Regs</i> )	-	-	-	1	-	1
(xiv) The Global 20 <sup>th</sup> Century 1930-2003 (new)	1	2	2	-	2	7
(xiv) 1941–1973 ( <i>Old Regs</i> )	-	-	-	4	-	4
(xv) History of the U.S. 1600–1812	1	-	-	-	1	2
(xvi) History of the U.S. 1776-1877	1	2	2	-	4	9
(xvii) History of the U.S. since 1863	1	1	-	1	7	10
(xviii) Eurasian Empires, 1450-1800	-	2	-	6	4	6

(xix) Imperial & Global History 1750-1914	1	3	-	1	1	6
--	---	---	---	---	---	---

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
<b>Further Subjects</b>						
1. Anglo-Saxon Archaeology of the Early Christian period	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. The Near East in the Age of Justinian and Muhammad	1	-	-	-	-	1
3. The Carolingian Renaissance	-	-	-	-	-	1
4. The Viking Age: War and Peace c.750-1100 ( <i>abolished</i> )	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. The Crusades, 1095-1291	-	-	1	-	-	1
6. Culture and Society in Early Renaissance Italy, 1290-1348	-	2	1	-	-	3
7. Flanders and Italy in the Quattrocento, 1420–1480	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. The Wars of the Roses	-	-	-	1	2	3
9. Women, Gender & Print Culture in Reformation England, c.1530-1640	-	-	-	2	-	2
10. Literature and Politics in Early Modern England	-	-	-	2	-	2
11. Writing in the early Modern period, 1550-1750 (A15060S1)	--	-	-	-	-	-
12. Court, Culture & Art in Early Modern Europe, 1580-1700	-	1	1	-	-	2
13. The Military & Society in Britain & France, c.1650-1815	-	-	-	-	1	1
14. The Metropolitan Crucible, London 1685-1815	-	-	-	-	-	-
15. The First industrial Revolution 1700-1870 ( <i>suspended in 2017-18</i> )	-	-	-	-	-	-
16. Medicine, Empire & Improvement, 1720 to 1820	-	-	-	-	-	-
17. The Age of Jefferson	1	1	-	-	3	5
18. Culture and Society in France from Voltaire to Balzac	-	-	-	-	-	-
19. Nationalism in western Europe	-	1	-	-	1	2
20. Intellect and Culture in Victorian Britain	-	-	-	-	-	-
21. The Authority of Nature: Race, Heredity & Crime 1800-1940	-	1	-	2	1	4
22. The Middle East in the Age of Empire	-	-	-	1	2	3

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
23. Imperialism and Nationalism, 1830–1966	-	2	-	-	1	3
24. Modern Japan, 1868–1972	-	-	1	1	-	2
25. British Economic History since 1870 ( <b>PPE</b> )	-	14	-	-	-	14
26. Nationalism, Politics and Culture in Ireland, c. 1870–1921	-	-	-	-	1	1
27. Comparative History of the First World War	-	-	-	-	-	-
28. China since 1900 (13392W1)	-	3	-	1	1	5
29. The Soviet Union 1924–1941	-	1	-	-	-	1
30. Culture, Politics & identity in Cold War Europe, 1945-68 ( <i>New Regs</i> ) (A10735X1)	-	-	-	2	-	2
Culture, Politics & identity in Cold War Europe, 1945-68 ( <i>Old Regs</i> )	-	1	-	-	2	3
31. Britain at the Movies: Film and National identity since 1914	1	-	-	-	-	1
32. Scholastic and Humanist Political thought	2	-	-	-	-	2
33. The Science of Society 1650-1800	1	-	1	-	-	2
34. Political Theory and Social Science	-	-	-	-	3	3
35. Postcolonial Historiography: Writing the (Indian) Nation (A13763S1)	-	1	-	2	1	4

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
<b>Special Subjects</b>						
1. St Augustine & the last days of Rome, 370-430	1	-	-	-	-	1
2. Francia in the Age of Clovis and Gregory of Tours	-	-	-	1	-	1
3. Byzantium in the Age of Constantine Prophyrogenitus	1	-	-	-	-	1
4. Norman Conquest of England	-	-	-	2	-	2
5. The Peasants' Revolt of 1381	-	-	-	-	1	1
6. Joan of Arc & her Age, 1419-1435	-	-	-	-	1	1
7. Painting & Culture in Ming China	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Politics, Art & Culture in the Italian Renaissance, Venice and Florence c.1475-1525	2	-	--	-	-	2

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
9. Luther & the German Reformation	-	--	-	-	-	-
10. The Trial of the Tudor State: Politics, Religion & Society 1540-1560 ( <i>new</i> )	-	-	-	1	-	1
11. The Crisis of the Reformation: Britain, France & the Netherlands 1560-1610 ( <i>suspended in 2017-18</i> )	-	-	-	-	-	-
12. The Thirty Years' War	-	-	-	-	-	-
13. Scientific Movement in the Seventeenth Century (A10735W1)	-	-	-	-	-	-
14. Revolution & Republic, 1647-1658 (A13773W1)	-	-	-	1	1	2
15. English Architecture, 1660–1720	3	-	-	1	-	4
16. Imperial Crisis & Reform, 1774-84 ( <i>new</i> )	-	-	-	-	-	-
17. Becoming a Citizen, c. 1860-1902	-	-	-	2	1	3
18. Slavery and the Crisis of the Union, 1854–1865	-	-	-	1	1	2
19. Art and its Public in France, 1815-67	1	-	-	-	-	1
20. Race, Religion & Resistance in the United States, from Jim Crow to Civil Rights	-	-	-	1	1	2
21. Terror & Forced Labour in Stalin's Russia	-	-	-	1	-	1
22. From Gandhi to the Green Revolution: India, Independence & Modernity 1939-69 (A14633W1)	-	-	-	-	-	-
23. Nazi Germany, a racial order, 1933-45	-	-	-	2	-	2
24. France from the Popular Front to the Liberation, 1936–44	-	-	-	-	-	-
25. War and Reconstruction, 1939-45	-	-	-	1	2	3
26. Britain from the Bomb to the Beatles, 1945-67	-	-	-	-	-	-
27. The Northern Ireland Troubles 1965–1985	-	-	-	1	3	4
28. Britain in the Seventies	1	-	-	-	2	3
29. Neoliberalism & Postmodernism: Ideas, Politics & Culture in Europe & North America, 1970-2000	-	-	-	-	3	3
30. Revolutions of 1989	-	-	-	1	1	2
Revolutions of 1989 ( <i>Old Regs</i> )	-	-	-	-	-	-

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
Bridge essays/Interdisciplinary papers/Exams	-	-	-	23	-	23
Theses (A10771S1)	19	-	-	3	29	51
Opt /BH/GH/FS/SS/Ad. Thesis	-	--	-	-	-	-
Disciplines of History	19	-	-	-	-	19
Politics theses	-	-	-	-	7	7
HECO theses (A11024S1)		14	-	-	-	14
Interdisciplinary Dissertation (HENG) (A14401S1)		-	-	6	-	6
Representing the City, 1558-1640 (A13762S1)(Bridge essay- only HENG)		-	6	-	-	6

Examiners:

Dr I.W Archer (Secretary)

Dr J. Garnett

Dr P. Gauci

Dr C. Holmes

Dr J. McDougall

Prof J. Nightingale

Dr D. Parrott (Chair)

Prof. O. Zimmer

External Examiners:

Prof M. Barcia Paz, University of Leeds

Prof H. Parish, University of Reading

Dr C. Watkins, Cambridge University

Prof J. Wright, University of Northumberland