

FHS 2019

**History
Examiners' Report**

REPORT OF THE EXAMINERS IN THE FINAL HONOUR SCHOOL OF HISTORY 2019

A. EXAMINERS' REPORT

Overall Performance

48.7% of candidates were awarded Firsts. This compares with 45.96% in 2018, 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 2.2 was awarded, as last year (none were awarded in 2017 and 2016). 50.9% of candidates were classified in the Upper Second Class, which compares with 53.2% in 2018, 61.3% in 2017, and 65.2% in 2016.

The following general comments can be made:

The proportion of first-class degrees awarded this year rose again this year, to nearly 49%, with a commensurate drop in the Upper Seconds. The most evident reason for the further increase in the Firsts awarded was a rise in the average mark awarded for theses, from a consistent circa 67.5 in the three years 2016-18, to 70.4 this year.

Within these figures, there is a notable gender gap, with nearly 56.3% of men gaining Firsts, compared with 42.2% of women. In 2018 the gap was comparable but narrower, at 50.98% and 42.1%, whereas in 2017 the gender gap was reversed with 41.67% of women gaining Firsts, as against 35.9% of men. This year there was, however, one positive change in the gender balance: the top 20 Firsts were divided equally between men and women, whereas in 2018 the ratio was 13:7 in favour of men, and in 2017 14:6.

The average mark attained by men was 68.14 as against 67.71 by women, a difference of under half a mark. This small but influential gap ran more or less consistently across all the papers. The exceptions were: the new take-home British and Irish History paper, where the gap widened to 1.35 in favour of men (which is however a smaller difference than the 1.82 gap registered in 2018, the last time the paper was sat as a conventional exam paper); the Disciplines of History paper, in which for the first time in five years women scored more highly than men; and the Special Subject extended essay where they also (if very narrowly) outperformed men.

Marks of under 60 are rarely used; this year the most per paper (but still only 13) were awarded for the British History take-home paper. Indeed even marks between 60 and 65 are comparatively infrequent. 224 students took Finals in the main School this year, and when ranked in order, only at Candidate 192 had an average mark of 65 or below been awarded.

B. REPORTS ON INDIVIDUAL PAPERS

(BIF) History of the British Isles I: c.370-1100 (Essay)

14 candidates sat this paper (13 in the main School, one in History and Politics). The most striking feature of several of the candidates' work was its broad geographical range, with some excellent essays submitted on Wales, Ireland and Scotland. Thematically, as in previous years, essays clustered around politics (particularly kingship) and the church, with a smattering of answers on cultural themes, and almost nothing on social issues (the peasantry still awaits its renaissance).

There was plenty of evidence that candidates were generally well-versed in the latest scholarship, with, for instance, a good grasp of recent findings and theories in archaeology. The very best scripts were seriously impressive in both the range of evidence used, and the sophistication of arguments deployed. There were, however, some weaker scripts, based on limited reading and with more conventional arguments. As always,

a key determinant of quality was the degree to which the candidate focused on the precise question asked: there were some weaker essays which did seem to be adapting the questions to fit pre-existing tutorial essays. But overall, on the basis of the essays submitted for this paper, the move to a take-home exam appears to have been successful.

(B Ward-Perkins)

(BIF) History of the British History Isles II: 1000-1330 (Essay)

The markers of this strand of the new British assessment adjudged it a success. Eight of the twenty candidates were awarded a first-class mark, and there were no poor submissions. The base level was that all candidates wrote three decent essays: they demonstrated close engagement with the questions, at least solid levels of reading, and competent essay-technique, as well as generally good presentation – and the better submissions did these things very well.

Moreover, most candidates spread their essays between different kinds of topic in terms of theme, geography and chronology: clearly they took seriously the rubric on this point, both in their preparation and in question-choice. Nevertheless, there was some bunching, in that eleven of the thirty questions attracted no answers, and nearly half of the essays answered on Magna Carta (12), Women (8) and Jews (8). Ireland (4), Scotland (4) and Wales (2) accounted for another ten; learning (3) and Norman assimilation (3) were the only other questions to attract more than two answers. This includes the Anarchy, languishing at one essay. It can no longer be said that this is a purely English-political paper, as is demonstrated by the wide range of thematic material in the figures above and in the questions which attracted one or two answers, and by the fact that more than half the candidates engaged with explicitly non-English topics (although one slight gripe is that the continental context is generally rather weak).

Getting the balance between addressing a broad question and engaging with detailed information is a challenge in this format. Some essays resembled a mini-thesis, focusing on a somewhat narrow slice of the available material and thus addressing too small a perspective. Others adopted a broad approach but didn't deploy enough detailed information – as essays of this length permit, compared with exam-essays – to demonstrate their points persuasively. The most successful essays, needless to say, got this balance right, a point which future cohorts should note.

Overall, these markers thought that this had been a pleasingly successful first iteration of the new exercise.

(B Thompson)

(BIF) History of the British Isles III: 1330-1550 (Essay)

Thirty-one candidates sat the paper. There were ten firsts, mostly in the lower 70s, sixteen 2.1s (spread across the class) and five 2.2s, all in the upper 50s. By comparison to performance on the three-hour papers of previous years, the examination was done rather well, with most candidates producing thoughtful, textured and well-illustrated essays which reflected good work for (and in) tutorials. The quality of writing was generally high (though the widely-used words 'homogeneous' and 'heterogeneous' were typically misspelled).

With thirty questions, the paper was longer than usual and as many as nine questions attracted no answers at all (landscape and climate; colonialism and empire; representative institutions; government financing; the court; the terms 'Lancastrian' and 'Yorkist'; the end of the Hundred Years' War; social regulation; community cohesion). The examiners found this disappointing, as there is lively and up-to-date literature on all of these topics, most of them appear in the lecture course, and several tutors say they teach them; we felt that, overall, the candidates had taken a fairly conservative view of the potential range of the paper. As has been the case in recent years, the most popular topics were kingship and English politics, religious life and gender, but reasonable numbers wrote on vernacular literature, men and women's wages, national identity, landlords' incomes and popular politics.

The best papers were written by students who appeared to have read widely and discerningly ahead of the exam period, who had thought out their own positions on the topics, and who were capable of writing analytical, argumentative and relevant answers. The whole idea of the new form of assessment was that it should allow students to show what they had learned through their tutorial work, and our impression was

that it did this well. Less successful papers typically showed signs of cramming – undigested information; limited reading (including excessive reliance on textbooks); lack of overall understanding; lack of clear argument – and perhaps some of these candidates were trying to make up in a week what they ought to have learned over a term. Candidates who made significant errors of fact or designingly re-framed the questions were punished more severely than they would have been in three-hour exams. We encountered three other weaknesses that it might be worth bringing to candidates' attention:

- Undigested lecture material and/or tutor opinion. Some candidates downloaded lecture notes and/or appeared to be channelling *obiter dicta* from their tutors, without integrating either into their own perspectives;
- Introductions which contained a digest of the candidate's argument, but did nothing to explain or break down the question, indicate why it arises and/or give a sense of why it was being tackled in a particular way;
- Excessive quoting from secondary sources ('As X says' etc), when candidates would have been better off advancing their own views on the basis of their own discussion of the sources.

Overall, however, we felt that candidates had acquired and reproduced a good understanding of the later medieval British Isles (including Wales, Scotland and Ireland), and that they were as ready to deal with social and cultural questions as political ones.

(J Watts)

(BIF) History of the British Isles IV: 1500-1700 (Essay)

71 candidates, 63 in the main school and 8 in the joint schools, sat this paper. 25 candidates (35%) received agreed marks of over 70, 41 (58%) agreed marks of between 60 and 69, and 5 (7%) agreed marks of between 50 and 59. The most popular questions were those on witchcraft and female monarchy which attracted 27 responses each; in the second division were the Scottish and Irish revolts (15), news (13), Charles I/James II (11), patronage of the arts (10), women and their bodies (10), and violence (10). Some candidates were able to write predominantly about social and cultural history, and there were many strong responses on this area; some adopted a mixed economy approach adding some political history; it was rare for candidates to write only on political history. Those with an interest in gender seemed to have their interests adequately covered by the paper, though only one candidate addressed the question on non-heterosexual relationships. Although the question on the British vision (22) was the only one not to be attempted by any candidate, and the question on sixteenth-century Ireland only got three responses, British themes were impressively covered elsewhere, particularly on witchcraft, James VI, the mid seventeenth century Scottish and Irish revolts, and the Glorious Revolution. It does not augur well for our future that candidates know little about the economy: only one attempted Q. 29; while the demography question (Q. 1) tended to be answered with reference to London only. There may be implications for lecture coverage here, though that might be to make false assumptions about the power of lectures, as most candidates appeared not to pick up on the fact that generational change and the reformation (Q. 15: four responses) had been a theme of the Ford Lectures.

The standard was generally high with candidates showing awareness of the relevant historiography, and achieving a decent balance between argument and evidence. It is true, however, that some responses were weakened by the tendency to invoke historians' opinions without an indication of the evidence on which they were based. It is also worrying that even on a take-home paper, with the opportunities for reflection that it provides, some candidates failed to engage with the terms of the question. This was most evident in the question on changes in the nature of violence which almost invariably was addressed with reference to rebellion (nothing from the literature on crime, homicide, rape, domestic abuse): that would have been fine provided that the responses were about violence and not merely about how the nature of rebellion changed, which was not the question asked. Sometimes candidates fell foul of definitional imprecision: candidates had little sense of what tyranny meant in contemporary terms (helpful for Q. 18); or lacked criteria for revolutions (Q. 28); or invoked the public sphere with little sense of what it might be (Q.13). Responses to Q. 24 on parliaments (8 candidates) would sometimes have benefited from a stronger sense of the constitutional issues involved. Some candidates could be rather one sided: Q. 27 attracted quite a few

hatchet jobs on Charles I without a sense that some historians might have argued differently. Some candidates could have improved their responses to Q. 26 on the Scottish and Irish revolts, if instead of listing factors serially, they showed how they should be prioritised or how they interacted. The examiners were pleased that some candidates opted to use visual sources to support their arguments. It should be noted, though, that visual sources cannot be expected to speak for themselves – they are not window-dressing, but historical evidence requiring analysis and contextualisation, and should be treated as such.

Finally, candidates sitting this paper in the future would do well to take advantage of the extra time and words that this format affords over a traditional exam. Non-committal essays which tick off a sensible range of angles but which lack structural or argumentative momentum are not going to get particularly high marks, given that the opportunity exists here to write distinctive, interesting essays which take a clear view. Future candidates are encouraged to take the occasional risk, and really explore what can be done in 2000 words. This year, some candidates did this and were richly rewarded, but while the overall standard was good there was also a tendency to play a little safe.

(I Archer & L Dixon)

(BIF) History of the British Isles V: 1685-1830 (Essay)

Twenty-one candidates sat the paper. Six achieved a first-class mark overall; 14 a 2.1; and one a 2.2. In contrast to previous years, there was relatively little bunching in terms of the choice of questions, which was a positive outcome of the new format of the examination. Questions 1 and 28, on the Glorious Revolution and the Enlightenment respectively, were the most popular, both attracting eight takers. Other relatively popular questions were 4 on the lives of middle-class women (4 takers); 8 on the influence of patriotism on the development of the arts (4 takers); 9 on attitudes towards empire (5 takers); 12 on the Union of 1707 (5 takers); and 18 on the aims of reformers (5 takers). Questions 3 on diplomatic and military policy; 11 on contemporary views of the 'bourgeoisie'; 17 on George III and public favour; 22 on religious tolerance; 26 on views of industrial change; and 29 on the rise of either horse racing, reading societies and libraries, or literary and philosophical societies all attracted no takers. Perhaps the only real surprise among these is q. 17. Economic history questions continue to be generally avoided, which is regrettable. A good number of questions were tackled by only a single candidate: 5 on urban experiences; 7 on fiscal policy; 13 on Jacobitism; 14 on political continuities between George III's reign and the early Hanoverian period; 16 on rural protest in Ireland; 20 on the role of the nobility as cultural and artistic patrons; 21 on attitudes towards the relief of poverty; 23 on habits of consumption; 24 on notions of providence; 25 on attitudes towards the law and its agents; and 27 on the decline of politeness. Nevertheless, the broad spread of answers would appear to suggest that candidates were readily able to find questions with which to demonstrate thematic as well as geographical and chronological breadth. While several candidates tended to ignore developments in countries other than England, this was again less marked than in previous years, which suggests that the injunction to cover, where appropriate, the whole or at least as much of the British Isles as they can, is being more scrupulously observed. The strongest sets of answers were impressive, demonstrating excellent mastery of the topics, a sophisticated understanding of key issues raised by the questions, and a good grasp of important historiographical background. Weaker answers tended to be unduly narrow in focus, sometimes interpreting the questions rather loosely or in an unhelpful manner, and thin in respect of marshaling telling bits of evidence. There was too much in certain answers of a desire to challenge and debate the terms of the questions rather than setting out to answer them directly. Several candidates appear to have used the take home format as an opportunity to write in an unnecessarily pretentious and convoluted manner instead of aiming for precision and clarity in their writing. More bizarrely perhaps in some answers there were quite a few factual errors, mainly in respect of names and dates. Against this, there were plenty of lively, interesting answers, especially on questions which demanded a wide-ranging approach and where candidates needed to think for themselves, as, for example, in the case of q. 27 on the reasons for the decline of politeness. Where appropriate, a good number of candidates showed a commendable willingness to consider and discuss developments in the early nineteenth century, although few were prepared explicitly to challenge periodizations which commonly feature in writing on Britain and Ireland in the long eighteenth century. The new conventions for presentation of essays and referencing were

carefully and well followed, and appear to have created no significant problems.
(Bob Harris)

(BIF) History of the British Isles VI: 1815-1924 (Essay)

Thirty-seven candidates took this paper at the end of their second year, six of them in the joint schools, marking a slight revival in numbers (there were 40 candidates in 2015, 37 in 2016, 25 in 2017, and 32 in 2018). Disappointingly, the take-home exercise did not encourage greater diversity in the topics addressed, as might have been expected given the greater time to contemplate responses. As many as seven (of the thirty) questions returned no echo, an unusually high proportion, and many of these were on topics which have some historiographical or topical currency and on which many tutors have (rightly) exhorted questions. They included those on the nature of early nineteenth-century government, the later Reform Acts, British economic decline, Edwardian Conservatism, and elite/popular science. Most strikingly, given our efforts to expand conceptions of British History, not one candidate addressed a very permissively framed question on Welsh/Scottish/Irish culture – and in the current climate of British politics it was equally remarkable that no one felt moved to write on Britain's relationship with Europe. Also marginal were questions on leisure (2 takers), motherhood (2), art/literature and industrialization (2), childhood (1), the mass reading public (1), progress (1), the reforms of the 1830s (1), and immigration (1).

That said, there was no great bunching in the remaining fifteen topics. The big five were crisis of faith (12 takers), empire (identity rather than process) (11), Victorian Conservatism (11), Liberal decline (11), and definitions of masculinity (9), while questions on wealth/poverty and morality (7), landed elites (5), and education (4) proved moderately attractive. Questions on the whig reforms enticed one taker (as above), Chartism three, Gladstone four, and the rise of Labour three – all topics which predominated not long ago. Most surprising was the fact that the question on women's suffrage drew only four answers.

The decline of nineteenth-century British history in school syllabuses may paradoxically be *HBI VI*'s gain, for there was a sense that fewer A-level conventions were being regurgitated. But while the proportion of First-class work was about par with recent years, the feeling of the two examiners was that, in unanticipated ways, the take-home exercise bunched performances. At the weaker end, candidates whose focal imprecision and lack of detail would typically cost them in timed examination had the time to check (or have checked) whether they were really answering questions, or deploying enough supporting data. At the top, those who might have distinguished themselves in timed exams found it difficult to distance themselves from the more routinely competent, who had more time to work on the analytical clarity and illustrative detail hitherto confined to the very best candidates in timed exam conditions. Perhaps because this was the first year of the new system, there seemed to be a prevailing risk-aversion, which may have contributed to the bunching effect. Few candidates seemed really to have embraced and/or demonstrated the opportunity to read more widely and follow up their own angles on issues. Candidates should be encouraged to be more ambitious, and to deploy their reading more imaginatively, in developing more distinctive approaches to questions.

(S Skinner)

(BIF) History of the British Isles VII: 1900-present (Essay)

Fifty-eight candidates sat this paper, which for the first time was examined through three 2,000-word submitted essays. Almost all candidates wrote scripts that achieved either a low First or a higher Upper Second Class mark. The scripts were – without exception – competent and knowledgeable, but very seldom original or brilliant. While we appreciate that candidates were having to adjust to a new mode of assessment, we were disappointed that their essays were less adventurous and thought-provoking than the coursework essays previously submitted for some Further Subjects or many of the essays we routinely mark for tutorials. The essays showed that students had a good understanding of the paper and could use their notes to write organised answers. Regrettably, students did not use the opportunity offered by writing answers over ten days to take intellectual risks or to think more independently about modern British history.

One feature of these risk-averse scripts was the unusual degree of clustering around a small number of easy-looking questions. Almost half of candidates answered the question on political ideology, mostly through a

case study that presented a near-identical understanding of Thatcherism. Permissiveness and empire each received answers from more than one-quarter of candidates, while one-fifth of candidates answered the questions on black British identity and, again, on Thatcherism. By contrast, questions on attitudes to Europe and on regional identities received no responses. The questions on Irish politics and religion, nationalism, the media, suburbs, political alliances, trade unions, and class each received only one response. The change of format does not seem to have dissuaded candidates either from choosing the questions that look most superficially similar to their tutorial essays or from shoehorning their previous paragraphs into them.

Within these questions, candidates showed a relatively strong understanding of post-war England. Very few candidates showed a sophisticated understanding of the decades between 1900 and 1945, so that the early twentieth century seems to have become marginal to students' interests. Few students formed arguments that explored the whole of the British Isles. These were overwhelmingly Anglo-centric answers that showed little interest in interactions across the British Isles or with Europe.

One of the questions that was done well was an unexpected question on patriotism. Many of the seven candidates were able to work imaginatively with the George Orwell quotation, so as to draw together their knowledge of three distinct themes – class, interwar internationalism, and patriotism – to form answers that were focused, fresh and bold. Answers to the question on black British identity also showed an impressive and independent understanding of recent scholarship and revealed a sensitive understanding particularly of activism.

In common with three-hour exams, candidates continued to fail to engage sufficiently with the precise questions asked and the concepts that underpin them. Writing was mostly competent, but there was a lot of poor syntax and inadequate proof-reading. This is presumably the result of the pressure of completing an exam over ten days.

We would like the Board to be aware that we found the marking of these 348,000 words particularly onerous. It is a much larger and more difficult task to assess these three essays than it is to examine standard scripts written under timed conditions. If this method of assessment is to continue, we would like the Faculty to consider whether it might be possible to divide the task between more post-holders or to reduce markers' examining loads elsewhere.

(S Pooley & M Grimley)

General History I (285-476)

10 candidates sat the paper (7 main school, 2 AMH and one HPol); five achieved marks of 70+, and none below 60, in one of the best overall performances in recent years.

The usual clustering of answers around the tetrarchs, Constantine and Julian was maintained, with the most popular questions being no. 1: "Did Tetrarchic government have a more significant impact on the eastern provinces than on the western?" (five takers), and nos. 3: "'A Passing Cloud' (ATHANASIUS, reported by SOZOMEN): do Christian writers understate the threat presented by Julian?" and 4: "Did consistent principles govern the legislation of EITHER Constantine OR Julian?", with six takers each. A clear difference was observed in all three cases between those who used their knowledge to answer the question (and first-class marks were achieved in each question both by people answering in the positive and in the negative), and those who merely reproduced what information they could remember about tetrarchic government, Julian's anti-Christian measures and Constantinian legislation.

Some of the most interesting, and most highly rewarded, answers, were those on topics beyond this comfort zone: especially memorable were a wide-ranging and imaginative response to no. 19, "What prevented Christian leaders from reaching agreement about the definition of their faith?", and the remarkably well-informed and thoughtful essay from the only candidate to brave no. 19. "Can evidence from Egyptian papyri be applied to social, cultural or economic conditions in other provinces?"

The two main lessons to be derived from the exercise are both familiar: the importance of engagement with the specific terms of the question, and the benefit of exploring beyond the scope of tutorial essays.

(N McLynn)

General History II (476-750)

One candidate sat this paper and obtained a high upper second-class mark (69). Although broad questions were attempted (e.g. 'Did the role of the family decrease in this period?'), the answers were limited to Gaul and Lombard Italy, with very rare mentions of Byzantium. The quality of the essays was good, but there was no mention of the Islamic world or steppe, let alone of east Asia, and this lack of geographical ambition was one of the reasons why the paper was not considered first-class. The relatively narrow scope of the essays raises the question whether the candidates should be more explicitly encouraged to address more than one broader geographical area in their answers.

(M Jankowiak)

General History III (700-900)

Three candidates sat the paper, achieving two 2.1s and one 1st/3 2. The most popular questions were 4, How Islamic was the Islamic caliphate, and unexpectedly q. 23, Does the period 700-900 have any meaningful coherence, which attracted two interesting answers. Occasionally candidates could have thought further about how best to tailor their material to the questions set. Attempts to reshape the question worked best when the terms were defined precisely and the line of argument developed fully. Evident weaknesses were a tendency to generalise and a reluctance to think outside a specific pre-prepared topic and to think comparatively. Especially going forward into the new format EWH papers, candidates will need to be prepared to connect topics and themes, and think across the paper comparatively. Generally, candidates demonstrated impressive geographical breadth and good awareness of primary source issues, while the best work was also historiographically informed and grounded in solid factual detail.

(E Screen & J Smith)

General History IV (900-1122)

Five candidates took this paper. One script was adjudged first class and the remainder 2.1. Notwithstanding the small numbers a good range of questions was attempted with no bunching. The overall quality of the scripts was not as good as in some years and could not be said to amount to a grand finale for this venerable paper which will be replaced next year by the larger chronological sweeps of EWF2 and 3. However the better answers did engage with source material and recent historical debates at a serious level; here it was clear that candidates had enjoyed reading some of the rich source material and had got a lot out of it. In contrast weaker answers did not think about what the questions were really about and/or were very thin when it came to supporting arguments with detailed evidence.

(J Nightingale)

General History V (1100-1273)

Five candidates took this paper, of whom 2 were awarded a first-class mark; the other three a 2:1 grade. No performance was poor. Candidates scored well when they engaged with the premise of the question asked, demonstrated good conceptual understanding of the wider issues at stake *and* integrated precise and relevant case studies, ideally showing awareness of the relevance and potential of contemporary source materials. There are many ways in which candidates can demonstrate relevance, breadth and depth in outline papers, but those who did not engage with the terms of the question, or who tried to 'download' in an unchanged form topics, they had prepared earlier, fared less well. Questions on power and heresy were popular; those on gender, trade, crusade, universities, chivalry and Byzantium also attracted answers. Many questions on the paper could have been answered with reference to parts of the world outside western Europe in the twelfth or thirteenth centuries, and some were.

(C Holmes)

General History VI (1273-1409)

There were only six candidates this year, but they answered a good range of questions covering themes in political, religious, economic and social history. The geographical range was quite good, with European, Ottoman, and Byzantine examples appearing. The best answers showed a broad knowledge of the period

and its historiography, as well as demonstrating an ability to respond to the precise question set, and to build a discussion on the basis of detailed case studies. Some answers added a wider theoretical reading to this, which was welcome when used to interrogate the source and historiography.

Reliance on older secondary literature hampered some candidates: while there is a lot to be gained from reading the older material, to do so without seeking out more recent discussions places an unnecessary limitation on what can be done with it. Some analyses may well stand the test of time, but they should be tested against newer arguments before that conclusion is reached. Questions requiring comparison really ought to be expected. Candidates who were only able to address a particular theme using one case study struggled to answer some questions.

(I Forrest)

General History VII (1409-1525)

Ten candidates sat the paper: six from the main school and four from different joint schools. They handled an impressively wide range of topics: all but seven of the twenty three questions were answered by at least one candidate, though the questions on humanism and minorities were the most popular. Three candidates were given first-class marks overall; the others received upper-seconds. The best answers were strikingly thoughtful and reflective, open to the complexity of the past, and supported by a good range of evidence and historiographical reference. Weaker answers tended to focus on only a limited aspect of the topic, or were marred by factual errors, repetition, or misunderstanding.

(N Davidson)

General History VIII (1517-1618)

This paper was taken by 23 candidates. A decent range of questions were attempted (21 out of 30), though some were significantly more popular than others: Q12 (Catholic Reformation) garnered 12 responses, Qs 21 and 26 (French Wars of Religion and witchcraft) 7, Q14 (masculinity and femininity) 5, and Qs 2, 10 and 11 (public punishment, the new world, and women's bodies) 4. The examiners were also pleased to see that 3 candidates took on the question about emotions – a topic making its first appearance in this paper. The overall quality was rather variable, with a little over 30% of scripts being awarded First Class marks, and just under 10% a 2:2 or lower. There were, perhaps, more low 2:1s than might have been expected, and few of the First Class marks got higher than the very low 70s. The best scripts were characterised by a willingness to organise the essay around clear themes and tensions, and to engage consistently in comparisons between well-developed case studies. Stronger answers also tended to problematise key concepts and definitions, rather than assume too much. Conversely, too many candidates either failed to define or give sensible parameters to tricky words, or made assumptions which they would have done better to interrogate – for instance, does an absence of 'regulation' necessarily make life easier?; is 'unity' always a good thing?; do 'elites' tend to agree with each other? Too often, candidates seemed determined to crow-bar in pre-packaged arguments, which at times led to the question itself being partially ignored. And while the examiners of course understand that memory is imperfect under exam conditions, it was striking how many candidates relied upon generalisations and assertions, unsupported by specific evidence. Technique as much as memory may be the problem here, as some candidates exhibited the opposite error of listing too many details at the expense of case studies which were carefully chosen and purposefully analysed. More broadly, exam technique let a surprising number of candidates down: all too often, essays began with a generic, meandering introduction, leading into analysis only partially relevant to the question (pre-packaged material?), and then only really coming to life on the last page or so, when the candidate was thinking on their feet but also running out of time. Perhaps the lesson here is that candidates should focus on the question, think hard, and step outside their comfort zone not as a last resort, but in the first instance.

(Leif Dixon)

General History IX (1618-1719)

Fifteen candidates took this paper in 2019 (14 from the main school and one from the joint schools), which was very typical of the last few years (16 in 2018; 13 in 2017). Although 10 of the set questions were not

answered (out of 28), some of those absences were self-explanatory: now that GH Eurasian Empires is well-established, it seems that tutors for GH IX no longer offer tutorials on the Asiatic empires or on issues such as global trade (and possibly overseas missions). Also absent were answers to questions on the Italian states, on missionary activity, literacy, legal institutions and Poland-Lithuania. A question on Spain, usually a popular topic, was avoided presumably because it required some knowledge of the Iberian Peninsula after 1643. There is a significant literature emerging on Spain in the mid/late century which evidently needs to be registered more in reading and preparation. The most popular questions were on witchcraft (6), patriarchy (5), the Dutch Republic (5) and the Thirty Years War (4), with war and the state, Catholic reformation, and nobles or peasants as defenders of their economic interests each receiving 3 answers. There was only one answer on popular revolt in France, once a staple of tutorials/essays, and only two answers on a question about Russia which required a wider perspective than the reign of Peter the Great. With the exception of one truly outstanding script, the performance overall was disappointing, with no other firsts achieved. Thirteen candidates obtained 2i's and one a borderline 2ii. Several candidates who gained first class marks on individual questions ended with high 2i's thanks to mediocre performance elsewhere on their papers. The majority of candidates emerged with middling 2i performances, which above all reflected reluctance to engage directly with what the questions required, rather than what their tutorial essays had provided. The best script gave an indication of what could be achieved not by the deployment of esoteric knowledge, but by a consistent focus on the questions, a willingness to question easy assumptions, and to use evidence and case-studies in a focused and accurate way.

(D Parrott)

General History X (1715-1799)

The paper was taken by a select group of 12 students (11 History candidates and one joint school finalist). Candidates were all well informed and did impressive preliminary reading across topics, geographical areas, and themes. While there was no high-flying script that deserved a mark in the higher reaches of the first-class category, none proved less than fully satisfactory. Some topics retained their traditional attraction (the French Revolution, the Enlightenment, and to a lesser degree Russia and Prussia); there were almost no attempts to tackle non-European questions. It would have been excellent to see more interest in social, economic, and gender issues, as well as more peripheral 18th-century states (Poland, the Netherlands, Italy, Spain). Yet it would be amiss to conclude this concise report on a critical note: the exam scripts were, on the whole, well planned and executed, reflecting thoughtful engagement with a period with which most undergraduates are less than familiar.

(A. Lifchitz)

General History XI (1789-1870)

The paper was taken this year by twelve candidates in the main school and nine candidates in joint schools. Just under a quarter gained First Class marks.

There was a significant bunching of questions on five questions - Q1 the impact of the Revolutionary Wars (6 answers), Q2.Napoleonic reforms (8 answers), Q4 the Vienna Settlement (4) Q 19 the Revolutions of 1848 (10) and Q 22 Italian or German national unification (12). The concentration was not wholly Eurocentric – there were three answers on the Meiji Restoration and two on the Ottoman reforms, but only one on China. Strikingly, there was only one essay on Russia and one on French revolutions between 1820 and 1871. Among the themed questions there were only two essays on industrialization, two on liberalism and two on cultural questions 12 and 30. There was one taker on the abolition of serfdom (Q9), on the 1867 Compromise (Q 23) and on women and politics (Q 27) but none on Spain's American colonies (Q 3), Greek Independence (Q 16), the Indian Mutiny (Q 21), the American Civil War (Q 24), political exiles (Q 11), the military and power (Q 13), science (Q 28) or educational reform (Q 29).

Generally, candidates sustained an argument and did not descend into narrative. There was relatively little analysis country-by-country when a comparative approach was called for. Some questions saved their best point until the end instead of using that point to frame the answer while some papers got off to a slow start and improved towards the end, which would indicate a need for tighter planning. While engagement with

the historiography was commended there was too much of a tendency to name-check historians on uncontroversial points – perhaps a hangover from A-level. In general the use of evidence was good but some papers were marred by too many factual slips.

(R Gildea)

General History XII (1856-1914)

4 candidates took this paper, of which 3 achieved a first, and one a 2:2.

Candidates answered a fairly wide range of questions, including country-specific as well as thematic and comparative ones. (Question 17 was answered by two candidates. One essay each was written for questions 1,2,3,5,4,12, 19, 22, 25 and 28. The remaining questions were not answered.)

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. Other shortcomings were simplistic answers or claims that were wrong.

The better essays, 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)

Thirty candidates sat this paper (21 in History, 3 in History Politics, and 2 each in AMH, History and Modern Languages and in History and Economics). This was the second year in which the paper was sat in its revised format and one or more candidates attempted most questions on the paper, with the exception of questions 3, 8, 12, 14, 17 and 20 (successor states in interwar Europe, authoritarian regimes, early Cold War, European integration, postwar consumerism, economic decline in the 1970s). By contrast, the most popular topics were: 9, 13, 19, 21 and 23 (genocide, resistance myths, 1968 radicalism, 1989 revolutions, and gender and the family). Overall performance on the paper was good.

(N Stargardt)

General History XIV (The Global 20th Century 1930-2003)

39 candidates sat this paper, 18 of whom were in joint schools. There was a very good range of questions attempted and overall the quality of answers was good: the paper is attracting strong students who have generally risen very well to the challenges it presents. Some noticeable clustering occurred in each of section A (Q6, on decolonisation, 18 answers), section B (Q11, 1989 a watershed, 10 answers, and Q18, resurgence of religion, 9 answers) and section C (Q21, social movements, 11 answers). Of the 30 questions, 11 were not attempted. A number of students at revision classes, and some of their tutors in correspondence with the convenor, worried about the difficulty of adequately preparing for the exam because of the imbalance between sections A (1930-89) and B (1989-2003). This may be a structural weakness in the paper, and although candidates seem to have coped well with section B questions, there was certainly more marked clustering in only 2 questions in that section. It will be worth considering whether allowing candidates to answer 3 questions from any *two* sections in future might not in fact (albeit somewhat counter-intuitively) permit a greater breadth of coverage.

Distribution of marks after reconciliation and some re-reading by the Board has swung markedly in favour of first class awards: 27 candidates eventually achieved an average mark >70 (69%!), 12 an average between 60 and 69 (31%). It is worth contrasting this with the initially agreed marks (16 x first, 21 x 2.i, with 2 sent for adjudication). Although as noted above, the general standard of scripts was high, this might be taken to suggest an excessive level of upward revision of reconciled marks at scrutiny stage-of course, treatment of mitigating circumstances may have played a role here.

(J McDougall)

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

Ten candidates sat this year's paper. Four of them were from the joint schools. Five candidates achieved Firsts. There were no lower seconds. Given such a small field the range of questions attempted was impressive. Several questions elicited good answers, notably 3 (the Atlantic World), 15 (Urban Development), and 16 (Civil Society). As is the case across the board, some candidates applied material prepared for 'banker' topics without regard to the question set. Questions 5 (on the working lives of slaves) and 18 (the Ratification of the Federal Constitution) suffered from this approach. Overall, the meritorious ambient quality of this year's tranche of scripts reinforced a sense of regret that this paper is being phased out.

(P. Thompson)

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

20 Candidates took General History 16 (USA, 1776-1877) this year, including 5 joint school students. Seven secured a first-class mark, while the remainder all performed in the Upper Second range. There was unfortunately some bunching of answers, with 18 of the 30 questions attempted by at least one candidate. Although this spread is less than ideal, we were pleased that the asterisked questions (which allow candidates to answer with reference to any part of the period) were consistently taken up, attracting 16 answers altogether, and with only two of the 9 asterisked questions going unanswered. Questions 10, 20, and 23 (on the radicalism of the American revolution, capitalism and slavery, and manifest destiny) attracted unusually high numbers of answers (10, 8, and 10 respectively), reflecting their popularity in tutorial teaching. What distinguished first class papers from others was an ability to draw widely and analytically on relevant historiography in order to put forward synthetic answers that reflected on larger themes and controversies in American history.

(K Paugh)

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

35 candidates took the GH 17 paper this year (27 for History and 8 from joint schools), one more than last year. 9 gained first class marks.

More candidates than usual answered one of the asterisked questions, which allowed candidates to consider a given topic across different time periods. The answers to these questions often scored highly. More generally, as last year, the best answers often made connections across the paper as a whole. The lecture series provides a good opportunity for students to learn about topics which they have not studied for their tutorials, so it is recommended that students attend all the lectures in the series rather than just the lectures that fit with their chosen topics.

Candidates addressed a wide-range of periods and topics, and virtually all the questions had at least one taker. As stated last year, all topics in the bibliography are equally likely to be examined, so there is no need for those preparing for the exam to rely on supposed banker topics or to avoid taking new topics.

Some answers could have been strengthened by reference to important recent secondary texts. Again, attendance at the lecture series is recommended, since the lectures provide a good introduction to the key historiographical debates.

(S Tuck)

General History XVIII (Eurasian Empires, 1450-1800)

43 candidates sat the paper, of whom 12 (28%) received a first and 31 (72%) received a II.1. The most popular questions were numbers 15 on orthodoxy and conversion in Islam and Christianity (16 responses), number 7 on the Mughals (12), number 1 on the Portuguese empire (11), and number 18 on incommensurability (10). Other answers clustered mostly around a variety of Part A and Part B questions, for example number 17 on millenarianism (9), number 8 on the Safavids (6), number 9 on the Qing (6). Historically popular questions on the great divergence (no. 25) and global trade (no. 26) did not receive any responses, which reinforces a general sense that candidates shied away from those questions that sought to make them think in new ways about familiar topics. The weakest answers in Part A remained descriptive and/or were unable

to find their centre of gravity in the topic. In some instances, candidates placed so much emphasis on individual rulers that they struggled to produce anything more than a simplistic top-down understanding of an empire; more thought should be given in the future to the perspective afforded from other parts of the empire, history from below and more. In Part B, some responses were limited by not making connections across the case studies or by relying too much on theory without adequate evidence to back up their arguments. As always, the strongest answers in this paper combined analytical breadth with contextual specificity. Those candidates who managed to do this ended up writing nuanced, engaging, and sophisticated answers that were rooted in deep evidence from the case studies.

(J-P Ghobrial)

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

25 candidates sat this paper, 11 of them for joint schools. The 2-part (thematic + regional) division of the paper seems to work well, though there was noticeably more clustering, and perhaps rather less original answers, in part B. Interestingly, a number of candidates opted to answer 2 section A questions and 1 from section B. (Overall, 30 essays were written for section B, 42 for section A.) In section B, questions 27 (neo-Europes distinct from the metropole, 7 answers), 20 (pre-1914 nationalism, 7 answers) and 19 (1857, 7 answers) were markedly more popular than others, with only Q14 (defensive modernisation), with 2 answers, attracting more than 1 candidate. There was much greater variety in section A, where only Q13 (colonial warfare) found no takers. The general quality of scripts was remarkably high, with some very good answers to, for example, questions about sexual propriety/sexual liberation in colonial societies, Islamic revivalism, neo-Europes, and Christianity and empire. Eventually, 14 candidates achieved a first class mark on the paper, 11 a 2.i; it is worth contrasting this with the first marker's raw marks (10 x first, 14 x 2.i, 1 x 2.ii).

(J McDougall)

Disciplines of History

Disciplines of History Report 2019As in previous years, the paper was set by the Board, with input from the Joint School of Ancient and Modern History and the External Examiners.

245 candidates sat the paper (224 in the Main School and 21 in Ancient and Modern History), 116 men and 129 women. A higher proportion of women (29.45%) gained a first-class mark on this paper than men (25%), reversing the results in 2018 when men performed more strongly at the top end of the field. However, a higher proportion of women (7%) scored lower than 60 compared to men (2.58%), a pattern that was also seen in 2017 and 2018. In terms of overall performance in the main school, there was a rise in the average score for women (67.1), confirming an upward trajectory from 2017 and 2018. Male scores (66.8) represented a fall from 2018, but were in line with their performance in 2016 and 2017. These figures suggest that most candidates engaged well with this paper, and female averages on Disciplines were very much in alignment with their record on other timed examinations.

This was the last cohort to sit the paper before the Faculty introduces an expanded number/range of topics. Given the breadth of topics attempted by candidates, the examiners felt reasonably confident that the paper had offered candidates a fair range of opportunities on both sides of the paper, and the planned reform should broaden choice still further. Some perennially popular topics continued to elicit a number of answers, especially belief (qu. 2), empire (qu. 4), aristocracies (qu. 6), art and patronage (qu. 9), revolutions (qu. 13), gender and sexuality (qu. 14), ethnic identities (qu. 16) in Section A, and the historiographies of material culture (qu.21), gender (qu. 34), ideas (qu. 40), and globalisation (qu. 42) in Section B. In many cases, there was plenty of evidence of the ways in which the development of new specialist courses had stimulated student thinking, and the thesis remains a potentially rich resource for both sides of the paper.

On the positive side, almost without exception all the candidates remained focused on the question, and chose serviceable case-studies to answer questions on both sides of the paper. The best scripts were those

which matched detailed analysis with a convincing argument, demonstrating a broad knowledge of the historical or historiographical themes addressed. There was also a greater recognition amongst candidates of the need to define key terms, although this was not always effectively undertaken, usually to the detriment of the overall argument. Most answers were also well-organised, and the stronger scripts were careful to sign-post their arguments as they quickly traversed time and space in pursuit of the question.

The weaker scripts were less concerned to engage with the full implications of the question, and were often unable to sustain their arguments over the full course of the essay (resorting to repetition rather than developing their ideas). They might also show less awareness of counter-arguments to their own position, leading to less convincing conclusions, while some scripts struggled to link their more focused case-studies to wider themes, and adopted a much narrower approach in their analysis. On the comparative questions, this fault might have been rectified by a more transparent justification of the use of their examples for the question at hand. More positively, even the weaker surveys organised their comparisons tolerably well, although they could exaggerate similarities between their case-studies and ignored differences. In section B, although there was good engagement with recent writing, some candidates did not convey the ideas of historians accurately, and greater care could have been used when discussing key terms (e.g. sex/gender) or applying modern concepts to past societies (e.g. LGBTQ+). More discussion of historians' use of sources would also have helped to clarify the importance and impact of new approaches to history-writing.

Thus, overall it appears that candidates are better prepared for this paper, and the best scripts had clearly taken on board the Faculty's encouragement to reflect on the broader lessons drawn from their portfolio of papers. Some candidates, however, are still too tentative when faced by the challenges of comparative history and historiography; they should be more confident of their ability to adapt their prepared case-studies to address broader themes of historiographical and historical change.

Further Subject: Modern Mexico 1876-1994 (new)

Eleven students took this further subject, of whom seven were adjudged first class and four upper second, though all of the upper seconds were at the low end of that class. Among the first-class papers were three outstanding candidates hovering around the eighty mark, reflecting what was on balance an excellent cohort. Ten of the fourteen questions were attempted, which was pleasing from group of eleven, though there were certainly three questions (answered by six, five, and five respectively) that were more popular – none came as a surprise, given the somewhat varying levels of interest in class topics across the term. Four questions had no answers attempted; while it is only the first year of the paper and we should perhaps avoid drawing conclusions too hastily, we should be mindful that three of these questions obviously required a strong evidential *and* conceptual grasp in the base case. While any or all of these might have allowed students to demonstrate their understanding of the material in a provocative or unusual way, they may have fallen victim to a seemingly safer (i.e. more obviously bounded/defined) approach. Many students showed a truly impressive knowledge of the primary material, in terms of recall, analysis, comparison and contextualisation. Knowledge of the secondary material was more uneven, though again deeply impressive in the case of many first-class papers.

(C Perez-Ricart & W. Booth)

Special Subject: The Dutch Golden Age 1600-1700 (new)

This is a revamped version of an earlier, interdisciplinary course on the Dutch Golden Age, designed and taught by Dr Geert Janssen, a historian, and Professor Hanneke Grootenboer, an art historian. The course has been rewritten with a focus on cultural and artistic expressions in the Dutch Golden Age, and has been taught by Professor Grootenboer on her own.

The course was taken by nine students, two male and seven female. Three were historians and six were art historians. One of the art history students rusticated in January 2019 so that eight students sat the exam. The course started off with a 3-day excursion to Amsterdam, attended by seven students. The marks for the extended essay ranged from 65 to 78, and for the sit-down gobbets paper from 63 to 75. For the

extended essay, three marks were over 70, with one mark of 69; for the gobbets paper, there were four marks above 70.

(H Grootenboer)

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

GENDER STATS BY PAPER FHS 2019						103 M	121 W				
Paper	F Avg	M Avg	DIFF	F High	M High	F Low	M Low	F 70 +	M70 +	F< 60	M< 60
ALL	67.71	68.14	0.43					23 (19.0)	24 (23.3)	0 (0)	1 (1)
BH	66.74	68.09	1.35	6	18	31	21	32 (26.5)	40 (38.8)	9 (7.4)	4 (3.9)
GH	67.13	67.66	0.53	14	13	23	23	32 (26.5)	37 (35.9)	1 (0.8)	4 (3.9)
FS	67.97	68.25	0.28	18	17	14	18	45 (37.2)	37 (35.9)	3 (2.5)	3 (2.9)
SSg	67.01	67.79	0.78	9	13	21	15	28 (23.1)	33 (32)	5 (4.1)	1 (1)
SSEE	68.51	68.48	0.03	33	16	16	11	49 (40.5)	41 (39.8)	2 (1.7)	2 (1.9)
DH	67.08	68.8	0.28	19	11	27	24	36 (29.8)	23 (22.3)	6 (5)	3 (2.9)
TH*	69.6	70	0.4	41	29	17	10	60 (49.6)	55 (53.4)	4 (3.3)	4 (3.9)

GENDER STATS BY PAPER FHS 2018						101 M	134 W				
Paper	F Avg	M Avg	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)
GENDER STATS BY PAPER FHS 2017						116 M	109 W				
Paper	F Avg	M Avg	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

GENDER STATS BY PAPER FHS 2016						115 M	129 W				
Paper	F Avrg	M Avrg	DIFF	F Hig h	M Hig h	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

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			
	2019	2018	2017	2016
I	106	108	87	85
II.1	117	125	138	159
II.2	1	1	-	-
III	-	-	-	-
Pass	-	1	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-
Total	224	235	225	244

Class	Percentage			
	2019	2018	2017	2016
I	47.32	45.96	38.67	34.8
II.1	52.23	53.20	61.33	65.2
II.2	0.45	0.40	-	-
III	-	-	-	-
Pass	-	0.40	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-

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

(a) 2019

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	106	47.32	56	53.85	50	41.67	47.17
II.1	117	52.23	47	45.19	70	58.33	59.82
II.2	1	0.45	1	0.96	-	-	-
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pass	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	224	100	104	100	120	100	-

(b) 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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	235	100	102	100	133	100	-

(c) 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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	225	100	117	100	108	100	-

(d) 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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	244	100	115	100	129	100	-

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

Prelims Nos 2017	FHS Results in 2019					Finals not taken in 2019
	I	II.1	II.2	III	Pass	
Distinction: 74	45	20				9
Pass: 145	50	80	1	-	-	14

Finals Nos 2019	Prelims results in 2017		Prelims not taken in 2017
	Distinction	Pass	
Class I: 106	44	50	12
Class III/Pass: -	-	-	-

(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	155	48.90	81	51.26	74	46.54	47.74
II.1	148	46.69	69	43.67	79	49.69	53.37
II.2	12	3.78	7	4.44	5	3.14	41.66
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pass	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	2	0.63	1		1	0.63	50.0
Total	317	100	158	100	159	100	-

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	112	43.08	56	45.90	56	40.58	50.0
II.1	141	54.24	62	50.82	79	57.24	56.02
II.2	6	2.30	3	2.46	3	2.18	50.0
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pass	1	0.38	1	0.82	-	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	260	100	122	100	138	100	-

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	67	27.34	29	25.0	38	29.45	56.71
II.1	166	67.76	84	72.42	82	63.57	49.40
II.2	11	4.49	3	2.58	8	6.21	72.72
III	1	0.41	-	-	1	0.77	100
Pass	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	245	100	116	100	129	100	-

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

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	84	35.0	47	43.92	37	27.81	44.04
II.1	140	58.33	54	50.47	86	64.67	61.43
II.2	16	6.67	6	5.61	10	7.52	62.50
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pass	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	240	100	107	100	133	100	-

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	94	29.75	53	33.54	41	25.94	43.61
II.1	213	67.40	100	63.29	113	71.53	53.05
II.2	8	2.53	5	3.17	3	1.90	37.50
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	1	0.32	-	-	1	0.64	100.
Total	316	100	158	100	158	100	-

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	109	35.51	55	35.94	54	35.06	49.55
II.1	184	59.94	91	59.48	93	60.39	50.55
II.2	12	3.91	6	3.93	6	3.90	50.0
III	1	0.32	-	-	1	0.65	100.0
Fail	1	0.32	1	0.65	-	-	-
Total	307	100	153	100	154	100	-

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	77	29.62	44	35.77	33	24.09	42.85
II.1	173	66.54	76	61.79	97	70.80	56.07
II.2	10	3.84	3	2.44	7	5.11	70.0
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	260	100	123	100	137	100	-

(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)

	2019	2018	2017	2016
(BIF) History of the British Isles (Essay) from 2019				
1. c.300-1100	13 (1)	25 (1)	12 (2)	18 (5)
2. 1000-1330	20 (3)	31 (1)	27 (3)	37 (2)
3. 1330-1550	29 (1)	34 (4)	32 (3)	27 -
4. 1500-1700	71 (8)	67 (9)	69 (12)	64 (7)
5. 1685-1830	20 (2)	34 (6)	30 (1)	24 (8)
6. 1815-1924	32 (6)	32 (6)	25 (4)	37 (2)
7. 1900-present	55 (11)	49 (10)	60 (6)	65 (6)
General History				
(i) 285-476	10 (3)	6 (3)	8 (1)	7 (1)
(ii) 476-750	1 -	6 (1)	4 (1)	5 (1)
(iii) 700-900	3 (1)	5 (1)	5 (1)	7 -
(iv) 900-1122	5 -	4 (1)	11 (3)	5 (2)
(v) 1100-1273	5 -	8 (2)	8 (2)	- (1)
(vi) 1273-1409	5 -	7 (1)	12 (4)	5 (1)
(vii) 1409-1525	10 (4)	4 (3)	3 -	14 (5)
(viii) 1517-1618	22 (1)	21 (1)	17 (2)	23 (6)
(ix) 1618-1715	16 (1)	16 (4)	13 (2)	12 (4)
(x) 1715-1799	12 (5)	21 (10)	13 (6)	12 (5)
(xi) 1789-1870	21 (9)	9 (4)	21 (6)	13 (6)
(xii) 1856-1914	4 -	6 -	7 (3)	5 -
(xiii) Europe Divided, 1914-89: Crises, Conflicts, Identities	30 (9)	9 (3)	- -	- -
(xiv) The Global 20th century 1930-2003	39 (18)	29 (7)	- -	- -
(xv) History of the U.S. 1600-1812	10 (4)	13 (2)	9 (3)	18 (4)
(xvi) History of the U.S. 1776-1877	20 (5)	21 (9)	11 (3)	22 (5)
(xvii) History of the U.S. since 1863	35 (8)	34 (10)	30 (8)	39 (10)
(xviii) Eurasian Empires, 1450-1800	43 (13)	41 (12)	54 (20)	45 (14)
(xix) Imperial and Global History 1750-1914	25 (11)	32 (6)	15 (5)	24 (6)

	2019	2018	2017	2016
Further Subjects				
1. Anglo-Saxon Archaeology of the Early Christian period	3 -	2 -	4 -	2 (1)
2. The Near East in the Age of Justinian and Muhammad, c. 527–c.700	11 (1)	11 (11)	8 (5)	11 (3)
3. The Carolingian Renaissance	- -	6 -	4 (2)	4 (1)
4. The Crusades (new & old regs)	16 (2)	9 (1)	17 (2)	16 (5)
5. Culture and Society in Early Renaissance Italy, 1290-1348	3 -	8 (5)	3 -	2 (1)
6. Flanders and Italy in the Quattrocento, 1420–1480	2 -	3 -	1 -	3 (1)
7. The Wars of the Roses (new & old regs)	14 (3)	11 (3)	7 (1)	8 (4)
8. Women, Gender & Print Culture in Reformation England, c.1530-1640	7 (2)	5 (2)	10 (2)	6 (2)
9. Literature and Politics in Early Modern England (A10711W1)	15 (2)	16 (2)	10 -	18 (1)
Representing the City, 1558-1640 (A13762S1) (Bridge essay only, no longer an FS) (HENG)	-	-	9 (2)	7 (1)
11. Writing in the early Modern period, 1550-1750 (A15060S1)	- -	3 -	1 -	
12. Court, Culture & Art in Early Modern Europe, 1580-1700	6 (1)	9 (2)	5 (1)	7 -
13. War & Society in Britain and Europe., c. 1650-1815 (new title) (A15982W1)	5 (2)			
The Military & Society in Britain & France, c. 1650-1815 (<i>Old title</i>) (A10714W1)	- (2)	4 (1)	11 (2)	2 -
14. The Metropolitan Crucible, London 1685-1815	9 (1)	8 -	8 (4)	6 (1)
15. Medicine, Empire & Improvement, 1720 to 1820	7 (1)	- -	- -	4 (1)
16. The Age of Jefferson	10 (3)	11 (5)	8 -	10 (1)
17. Culture and Society in France from Voltaire to Balzac	- (1)	2 -	- -	- (2)
18. Nationalism in western Europe 1799-1890	9 (2)	10 (2)	11 (1)	11 (3)
19. Intellect and Culture in Victorian Britain	5 -	4 -	4 -	2 -
20. The Authority of Nature: Race, Heredity & Crime 1800-1940	13 (2)	16 (4)	12 (1)	16 (2)
21. The Middle East in the Age of Empire	24 (7)	14 (3)	24 (5)	23 (5)
22. Imperialism and Nationalism, 1830–1966	15 (6)	19 (3)	14 (3)	18 (4)
23. Modern Japan, 1868–1972	9 (5)	9 (2)	11 (3)	12 (4)
24. Development of the World Economy since 1900 (PPE) (<i>new</i>)	(12)	- -	- -	- -
British Economic History since 1870 (PPE) (abolished)	- -	15 (14)	16 (15)	12 (8)

	2019		2018		2017		2016	
25. Nationalism, Politics and Culture in Ireland, c. 1870–1921	12	(5)	9	(1)	4	(1)	14	(5)
26. Comparative History of the First World War	12	(2)	8	-	-	-	15	(1)
27. China since 1900 (new & old Regs)	22	(7)	23	(5)	24	(7)	23	(5)
28. The Soviet Union 1924–1941	7	(1)	8	(1)	10	(5)	14	(3)
Culture, politics & identity in Cold War Europe, 1945-68 (old regs)			17	(3)	16	(3)	19	(5)
29. Culture, politics & identity in Cold War Europe, 1945-68 (<i>New Regs</i>) (A10735W1)	17	(2)	-	(2)	-	(1)		
30. Britain at the Movies: Film and National Identity since 1914 (FSEE)	12	(2)	12	(1)	10	(1)	16	(2)
31. Scholastic and Humanist Political thought	-	-	4	(4)	5	-	-	-
32. The Science of Society 1650-1800	6	(2)	10	(2)	8	(3)	4	(1)
33. Political Theory and Social Science	8	(3)	7	(3)	13	(7)	7	(2)
34. Postcolonial Historiography: Writing the (Indian) Nation) (A13763S1)	-	(2)	12	(4)	5	-	4	(4)
35. Modern Mexico, 1876-1994 (new)	11	(2)						
Special Subjects								
1. St Augustine & the last days of Rome, 370-430	-	-	8	(1)	8	(2)	7	-
2. Francia in the Age of Clovis and Gregory of Tours	-	-	8	(1)	3	-	3	-
3. Byzantium in the Age of Constantine Porphyrogenitus	9	(1)	6	(1)	6	(1)	6	(1)
4. The Norman Conquest of England	7	-	10	(2)	7	(1)	10	-
5. The Peasants' Revolt of 1381	5	-	2	(1)	5	(1)		
6. Joan of Arc & her Age, 1419-1435	12	(2)	6	(1)	10	-	6	-
7. Painting & Culture in Ming China	5	-	5	-	5	(1)	4	-
8. Politics, Art & Culture in the Italian Renaissance, Venice & Florence c.1475-1525	9	-	13	(2)	5	(1)	20	(3)
9. Luther & the German Reformation	-	-	12	-	12	-	8	-
10. The Trial of the Tudor State: Politics, Religion & Society, 1540-1560	10	-	7	(1)				
11. The Crisis of the Reformation: Britain, France & the Netherlands 1560-1610	6	-	-	-	4	(1)	10	(2)
12. The Dutch Golden Age, 1600-1700 (new)	3	-						
13. The Thirty Years Wars	13	(1)	6	-	12	(1)	-	-
14. Scientific Movement in the Seventeenth Century (A10752W1)	14	(2)	2	-	13	(2)	8	
15. Revolution & Republic, 1647-16558	5	-	15	(2)	10	-	3	-

	2019	2018	2017	2016
16. English Architecture, 1660–1720	12 -	10 (4)	6 -	12 -
17. Imperial Crisis & Reform, 1774-84	7 -	6 -		
Growing-up in the middle-class family: Britain, 1830-70			11 (1)	19 (4)
18. Becoming a Citizen , c. 1860-1902	9 (2)	16 (3)		
19. Slavery and the Crisis of the Union, 1854–1865	11 (2)	13 (2)	18 (1)	19 (1)
20. Art and its Public in France, 1815-67 (suspended in 2018-19)	- -	5 (1)	2 -	2 (1)
21. Race, Religion & Resistance in the United States, from Jim Crow to the Civil Rights	16 (1)	16 (2)	17 (2)	16 (2)
22. Terror & Forced Labour in Stalin’s Russia	8 (4)	5 (1)	6 (1)	3 -
23. From Gandhi to the Green Revolution: India, Independence & Modernity 1939-69 (A15059W1)	25 (2)	13 -	18 (2)	19 (1)
24. Nazi Germany, a racial order , 1933-45	6 (2)	4 (2)	3 (2)	6 (1)
25. France from the Popular Front to the Liberation, 1936–44	8 (3)	1 -	6 (1)	4 (1)
26. War and Reconstruction, 1939-45	11 (1)	12 (3)	3 (1)	2 -
27. Britain from the Bomb to the Beatles, 1945-67	6 (1)	10 -	12 (3)	14 (2)
28. The Northern Ireland Troubles 1965–1985	18 (4)	18 (4)	15 (4)	17 -
29. Britain in the Seventies	8 (3)	20 (3)	8 (2)	19 (4)
30. Neoliberalism & Postmodernism: Ideas, Politics & Culture in Europe & North America, 1970-2000	- (1)	15 (3)	16 -	15 (1)
31. Revolutions of 1989	16 (4)	11 (2)	13 (1)	12 (1)
Optional/Additional Theses	- (2)	-	5 (2)	3 -
Disciplines of History	245 (21)	254 (19)	244 (19)	258 (14)
Compulsory Thesis (A10771S1)	280 (56)	286 (51)	270 (45)	244 (49)
Thesis in PPE (A12746S1) (HPol)	- (11)	- (7)	- (11)	- (11)
Thesis (A11024S1) (Heco)	- (12)	- (14)	- (15)	- (8)
Interd. Dissertation (HENG) (A14401S1)	- (12)	- (6)	- (9)	- (9)
Representing the City (A11026S1)(HENG only)	- (12)	- (6)	- (2)	- (4)
Postcolonial Historiography (A11027S1)	- -	- -	- (6)	- (5)

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

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
(BIF) History of the British Isles (Essays)						
1. 300–1100 (A16157S1)	-	-	-	-	1	1
2. 1000–1330 (A16158S1)	1	-	2	-	-	3
3. 1330–1550 (A16159S1)	-	-	1	-	-	1
4. 1500–1700 (A16160S1)	1	1	2	-	5	8
5. 1685–1830 (A16161S1)	-	1	1	-	-	2
6. 1815-1924 (A16162S1)	-	-	1	-	5	6
7. 1900-present (A16163S1)	1	3	4	-	3	11
General History						
(i) 285-476	2	-	-	-	1	3
(ii) 476–750	-	-	-	-	-	-
(iii) 700–900	-	-	-	-	1	1
(iv) 900–1122	-	-	-	-	-	-
(v) 1122–1273	-	-	-	-	-	-
(vi) 1273–1409	-	-	-	-	-	-
(vii) 1409–1525	1	-	-	1	2	4
(viii) 1517–1618	-	-	-	1	-	1
(ix) 1618–1715	-	-	-	-	1	1
(x) 1715–1799	-	-	-	-	5	5
(xi) 1789–1870	4	-	-	1	4	9
(xii) 1856–1914	-	-	-	-	-	-
(xiii) Europe Divided, 1914-89: Crises, Conflicts, Identities	2	2	-	2	3	9
(xiv) The Global 20 th Century 1930-2003	2	2	2	3	9	18
(xv) History of the U.S. 1600–1812	1	-	-	1	2	4
(xvi) History of the U.S. 1776-1877	-	1	-	1	3	5
(xvii) History of the U.S. since 1863	-	-	-	2	6	8
(xviii) Eurasian Empires, 1450-1800	4	1	1	5	2	13
(xix) Imperial & Global History 1750-1914	2	1	5	-	3	11

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
Further Subjects						
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	-	-	-	-	-	-
4. The Crusades, 1095-1291 (with old regs)	-	-	-	1	1	2
6. Culture and Society in Early Renaissance Italy, 1290-1348	-	-	-	-	-	-
7. Flanders and Italy in the Quattrocento, 1420–1480	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. The Wars of the Roses (New & old regs)	1	1	1	-	-	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
13. War & Society in Britain and France, c.1650-1815 (new title)	1	-	-	-	1	2
The Military & Society in Britain & France, c.1650-1815 (old title)	-	-	-	1	1	2
14. The Metropolitan Crucible, London 1685-1815	-	1	-	-	-	1
15. The First industrial Revolution 1700-1870 (<i>suspended in 2018-19</i>)	-	-	-	-	-	-
16. Medicine, Empire & Improvement, 1720 to 1820	-	-	-	-	1	1
17. The Age of Jefferson	-	1	-	-	2	3
18. Culture and Society in France from Voltaire to Balzac	-	-	-	1	-	1
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	-	-	-	1	2
22. The Middle East in the Age of Empire	-	1	1	2	3	7
23. Imperialism and Nationalism, 1830–1966	-	1	1	1	3	6
24. Modern Japan, 1868–1972	1	1	-	-	3	5

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
25. Development of the World Economy since 1800 1870 (new) (PPE)	-	12	-	-	-	12
26. Nationalism, Politics and Culture in Ireland, c. 1870–1921	1	-	-	1	3	5
27. Comparative History of the First World War	-	-	-	-	2	2
28. China since 1900 (13392W1)	1	2	-	-	4	7
29. The Soviet Union 1924–1941	-	-	-	-	1	1
30. Culture, Politics & identity in Cold War Europe, 1945-68 (A10735X1)	1	-	-	-	1	2
31. Britain at the Movies: Film and National identity since 1914	-	-	1	1	-	2
32. Scholastic and Humanist Political thought	-	-	-	-	-	-
33. The Science of Society 1650-1800	-	1	1	-	-	2
34. Political Theory and Social Science	-	-	-	1	2	3
35. Postcolonial Historiography: Writing the (Indian) Nation (A13763S1 & A13763W1)	-	1	-	1	-	2
36. Modern Mexico, 1876-1994 (new)	-	1	-	-	1	2

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
Special Subjects						
1. St Augustine & the last days of Rome, 370-430	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. Francia in the Age of Clovis and Gregory of Tours	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. Byzantium in the Age of Constantine Prophyrogenitus	-	-	1	-	-	1
4. Norman Conquest of England	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. The Peasants' Revolt of 1381	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. Joan of Arc & her Age, 1419-1435	1	-	-	1	-	2
7. Painting & Culture in Ming China	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Politics, Art & Culture in the Italian Renaissance, Venice and Florence c.1475-1525	-	-	-	-	-	-
9. Luther & the German Reformation (suspended in 2018-19)	-	-	-	-	-	-

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
10. The Trial of the Tudor State: Politics, Religion & Society 1540-1560	-	-	-	-	-	-
11. The Crisis of the Reformation: Britain, France & the Netherlands 1560-1610	-	-	-	-	-	-
12. The Dutch Golden Age (new)	-	-	-	-	-	-
13. The Thirty Years' War	-	-	-	-	1	1
14. Scientific Movement in the Seventeenth Century (A10735W1)	-	-	-	2	-	2
15. Revolution & Republic, 1647-1658 (A13773W1)	-	-	-	-	-	-
16. English Architecture, 1660–1720	-	-	-	-	-	-
17. Imperial Crisis & Reform, 1774-84	-	-	-	-	-	-
18. Becoming a Citizen, c. 1860-1902	-	-	-	1	1	2
19. Slavery and the Crisis of the Union, 1854–1865	1	-	-	-	1	2
20. Art and its Public in France, 1815-67 (suspended in 2018-19)	-	-	-	-	-	-
21. Race, Religion & Resistance in the United States, from Jim Crow to Civil Rights	-	-	-	-	1	1
22. Terror & Forced Labour in Stalin's Russia	1	-	-	2	1	4
23. From Gandhi to the Green Revolution: India, Independence & Modernity 1939-69 (A14633W1)	-	-	-	2	-	2
24. Nazi Germany, a racial order, 1933-45	-	-	1	-	1	2
25. France from the Popular Front to the Liberation, 1936–44	-	-	-	2	1	3
26. War and Reconstruction, 1939-45	-	-	-	-	1	1
27. Britain from the Bomb to the Beatles, 1945-67	-	-	-	1	-	1
28. The Northern Ireland Troubles 1965–1985	-	-	-	1	3	4
29. Britain in the Seventies	-	-	-	1	2	3
30. Neoliberalism & Postmodernism: Ideas, Politics & Culture in Europe & North America, 1970-2000	-	-	-	1	-	1
31. Revolutions of 1989	-	-	-	1	3	4

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
Bridge essays/Interdisciplinary papers/Exams	-	-	-	17	-	17
Theses (A10771S1)	21	-	-	-	35	56
Opt /BH/GH/FS/SS/Ad. Thesis	1	-	-	2	-	3
Disciplines of History	21	-	-	-	-	21
Politics theses	-	-	-	-	11	11
HECO theses (A11024S1)	-	12	-	-	-	12
Interdisciplinary Dissertation (HENG) (A14401S1)		-	12	-	-	12
Representing the City, 1558-1640 (A13762S1)(Bridge essay- only HENG)		-	12	-	-	12
Postcolonial Historiography: Writing the (Indian) Nation (bridge essay-A13763S1)		-	1	-	-	1

Examiners:

Dr G. Davies

Dr L. Dixon

Dr P. Gauci (Secretary)

Dr H. Gittos

Dr J. McDougall

Dr D. Parrott

Prof S. Todd

Prof B Ward-Perkins (Chair)

External Examiners:

Prof M. Barcia Paz, University of Leeds

Prof N. Reinhardt, University of Durham

Dr C. Watkins, Cambridge University

Prof J. Wright, University of Northumberland

N:\Faculty office\Faculty office\FHS\2019\Examiners' Report\FHS History Examiners' Report 2019-MASTER.docx

Updated 6th November 2019