

**FHS 2021**

**History  
Examiners' Report**

## REPORT OF THE EXAMINERS IN THE FINAL HONOUR SCHOOL OF HISTORY 2021

### A. EXAMINERS' REPORT

FHS 2021 was run in the conditions of the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic with many staff working from home and all examinations sat remotely.

#### Overall Performance

113 candidates, or 50.4% of the cohort of 224, were awarded firsts. This compares with 51.9% in 2020, 48.7% in 2019, 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.

Numbers of withdrawals were slightly larger than in recent years at 29 (24 in 2020, 18 in 2019), but this was not surprising given the disruptions to the second and third years of this cohort's studies.

109 candidates, 48.7%, were classified in the Upper Second Class, which compares with 46.9% in 2020, 50.9% in 2019, 53.2% in 2018, 61.3% in 2017, and 65.2% in 2016. Two 2.2s were awarded, no thirds, and no DDHs (deemed to have deserved Honours).

Overall performance after two years of disrupted study and in the face of rapid and unsettling changes to the circumstances of examinations demonstrated, as last year, the impressive resilience of candidates and the robustness of the examining process. That this was not true only in the eyes of the board seems borne out by the fact that very few queries from students or tutors about classification were received after the release of results and the only appeal directed to the board by the Proctors concerned an MCE submission unavailable to the board which was then deployed for classification and correction of results. Additional precision on the 2.1/1 boundary was sought by clarification to the qualitative definitions of work in mark band descriptors and attention in the final scrutiny process to candidates both just above and just below the boundary in provisional classification.

Gender outcomes were less reassuring, as the figures are considerably more skewed against female achievement than they were last year, with a gap of more than 12% between the proportions of male and female Firsts, almost as large as in 2019; a gap between the average mark awarded to female and male candidates of 0.8, larger than any year in the past ten except 2018; and only 30% of the top 20 firsts awarded to female candidates, as low as 2017. The gap was particularly marked in the case of Special Subject gobbets, which is not usually one of the most distinctive elements in this regard. This outcome will have to be subject to further investigation, and perhaps analysed in relation to the educational background of applicants, but it does rather count against the suggestion that last year's near-parity of awards was the result of online examination. Comments follow on two specific areas of the board's activities, the applications of penalties and the use of the Assessment Support Package.

### B. REPORTS ON INDIVIDUAL PAPERS

#### BIF 1: The Early Medieval British Isles, 300-1100

Ten portfolios of essays were submitted. Unsurprisingly, considering the freedom of choice students had, there was a broad range of questions tackled. Alongside a strong showing for traditional favourites the Vikings (5 essays) and the Picts (4 essays) there were individual essays on relics, illuminated manuscripts, agricultural development, towns and princely burials. Traditionally very popular essays focused on individual kings were comparatively uncommon, with a single essay on Alfred and Offa each. The spread of topics was heartening to see, but the strong Anglocentric nature of the essays submitted hard to ignore; other than those on the Picts, very few essays strayed outside England and Pictish essays were not always as up-to-date as they could have been.

Unsurprisingly, once again, the standard was generally high with half of the portfolios receiving first class marks and half upper seconds. Marks ranged between 63 and 72, with very little weak work – but, perhaps equally notably, few really stellar marks. Unusual, often quite specific, topics often garnered the most

impressive results, although some answers on the Vikings were very strong also. The weakest essays tended to struggle to be consistent in attention to the essay question or to be sloppy in presentation; there were occasional examples of poor or incorrect knowledge, but usually limited to a single essay in a portfolio. The weakest portfolios, consequently, could usually have benefitted greatly from rather more attention and care at the proof-reading/copy-editing stage just before submission.

### **BIF 2: The British Isles in the Central Middle Ages, 1000-1330**

In general, these portfolios contained many good essays across an impressive range of topics across the period. Social, cultural, political, and economic history were all well represented. Several essays focused on Scotland and Wales—though one would still hope for more use of Scottish and Welsh material in answering thematic questions. Regrettably, Ireland was noticeable only by its absence. Questions on identity and on the Jewish community proved to be popular choices.

Perhaps because of the nature of this (pandemic) exercise, and the conditions under which students were writing, introductions were sometimes rather convoluted, and often brought in historiographical material that was only tangentially relevant to the essay question. The best essays were sharp, persuasive, and to the point, informed by recent developments in medieval history and new methodologies.

One distinction between first class scripts and others was precision in use of evidence. The best scripts showed a clear understanding of the surviving source material and pointed directly to specific examples of royal legislation (etc). Similarly, in essays on religious life and the church, there was reference to Becket and the Cistercians, but answers would have benefitted from greater diversity and range, recognising that there were multiple new monastic orders in the British Isles in this period, and looking beyond Anselm and Becket as important ecclesiastical figures.

### **BIF 3: The late Medieval British Isles, 1330-1550**

25 students submitted portfolios of essays for this paper and marking was divided between two pairs of markers, lessening the burden on each marker produced by the marking of previous take-home exams. The range of topics addressed in the essays was fairly broad, with a preference for social, cultural and religious history and political culture – epidemics, identities, women, towns, revolts, the law, the vernacular, universities, Lollardy, piety, the Reformation – over more conventional treatments of politics, though occasional candidates wrote mainly on English kings and some produced sophisticated analyses of large-scale political themes such as relations between kings and magnates and the functions of parliaments. Candidates concentrated overwhelmingly on England, with occasional ventures into Scotland, leaving Ireland and Wales generally untouched. While some used primary texts with skill, the range of evidence they used might have been wider and there was little sign of archaeological material.

The strengths and weaknesses of the work submitted were those familiar from tutorial essays, involving more or less complex and independent-minded conceptualisation of problems, more or less clear and precise argument and more or less rich, accurate and convincing deployment of detailed evidence. Perhaps as a result, those who had marked both exercises felt that it was much easier to differentiate good and bad performance in these portfolios than on the take-home exam. The concomitant disadvantage was the feeling that sometimes one was marking the tutor as well as the student, in particular when students were trying to answer questions which did not lend themselves well to presentation as an assessed piece of work of limited length.

### **BIF 4: Reformations and Revolutions, 1500-1700**

54 students submitted portfolios of essays for this paper and marking was divided between four pairs of markers, lessening the burden on each marker produced by the marking of previous take-home exams. Candidates covered a good range of topics in social, cultural, religious and political history and a good chronological range, from Henry VIII to William and Mary; they mostly wrote about England, but Ireland and Scotland featured at times and a good number tackled problems of the interactions between the kingdoms or comparisons between them. Where they were weaker was in awareness of the significance of continental contexts, something which might perhaps be more strongly addressed in lecture provision.

Some candidates answering on Elizabethan topics were able to discuss the relevance of the French Wars of Religion and Dutch Revolt, while those answering on the Glorious Revolution understood that William's motives may have had more to do with Louis XIV than the English domestic scene; but none showed any knowledge of how opposition to Charles I might have had to do with anything beyond his policies in the British Isles.

The overall impression recorded by one pair of markers was that the essays were 'solid, but a little disappointing'. Most candidates answered the question competently enough, with good supporting evidence and a clear argument, so 2.2 marks were rare and went mainly to those who really did not answer the question they were addressing. Few candidates were willing to do anything very distinctive with the question, with the same sorts of set-ups recurring again and again, often premised on some very predictable and often dated historiographical reference points whether as straw men (Tawney) or as those cited as the cutting edge of scholarship (Russell, Elton). Many candidates also put forward arguments without showing any obvious awareness that other interpretations are possible. Only the best essays were structured in a way that allowed the argument to develop in response to counter-arguments or developed their problematisation beyond the introduction. These best answers – like the best tutorial essays – were conceptually lively, and made sustained use of ambiguities or tensions suggested within the wording of the question to develop an argument which was both nuanced and positive. Equally, very strong answers tended to be more creative and dynamic in their use of evidence, deploying it to open up analysis rather than simply to 'prove' a point. Finally, candidates seemed to show little confidence in taking broad questions and narrowing them down. Answers on gender questions in particular often took on an unmotivated survey quality, with many solid points but no central focus. This might serve as a lesson not only for future candidates, but also for setters (notwithstanding the unusual format this year) that it can be better to give the candidate something specific to discuss, especially when the question is thematic.

#### **BIF 5: Liberty, Commerce, and Power, 1685-1830**

'It was obviously hard to compare performance with other years, in that examination comprised the submission of a portfolio of essays. On the positive side, there was plenty of ambition, especially in respect of breadth and range of coverage, and there were several very impressive answers: analytically incisive, well supported with evidence, and fully integrating relevant historiography. Such answers managed to strike a very productive balance between breadth and the kind of detail required to lend strength and depth to arguments. Answers did tend, predictably (and despite immemorial exhortations in these Reports), to focus on England, even where one might have anticipated otherwise – for example, on the advance (or otherwise) of religious toleration. Curiously, there were more inaccuracies of fact than we tend to see with the normal examination format. The main weakness was, in less persuasive answers, a tendency to description and narrative, and a failure to confront squarely the key analytical issues posed by questions. This was in some cases due to rather flat questions which lent themselves to such responses. Weaker answers singularly failed to show any proper awareness of historiography and relevant historical debates. In terms of lessons for future cohorts, it is probably one long-standing one and one which relates to the newer format which are most pressing: firstly, this is a paper about the history of the British Isles, and not solely England, and this offers opportunities as well as considerable challenges; and, secondly, keeping to the tight word-limits should not come at the expense of conveying a clear sense of weighting relevant evidence in the answers.'

#### **BIF 6: Power, Politics, & People, 1815-1924**

'Marking the BIF 6 portfolio essays in 2021 was plainly novel, since candidates did not have to undergo the punishment of the 9 day timetable and submitted answers to questions of their own or their tutors' devising. While the online status of the exam was therefore essentially unchanged, the novelties will not be repeated, unless we are very unlucky. On these grounds it would perhaps be pointless to fashion any extended report: the technology and the timetable format remain under Faculty review, while the aspects unique to this year, because they were unique, need not take up too much of our time. It would be very difficult for any single examiner to pronounce on the standard of the scripts submitted — in this respect the overall marks profiles

for the paper may be more informative than anything else. Rough and ready impressions suggest that the overall standard and profile of the essays submitted conformed to what, on the experience of previous years, markers might have expected. That is to say, a minority of outstanding scripts and a majority of solidly respectable ones. The best work was rigorously framed, propositionally driven, and richly evidenced; weaker answers tended to the descriptive and omitted dimensions of questions (and their historiographies) without any vindication. Examiners' exhortation to write British and not English history so far as possible rolls on; while the tight word-limits to submitted essays necessitate thought over the weighting of evidence in the answers.'

### **BIF 7: Changing Identities, 1900 to the present**

I marked eleven portfolios. With no exam paper to focus upon, these submissions were pleasingly eclectic. No one topic dominated. The most popular was Imperialism/decolonization, which was offered by four candidates of the eleven candidates, while immigration and political extremism each had three takers. Mainstream political topics were quite thin on the ground: there were two takers for Attlee and for Thatcher, but no other high political topic was offered by any of my sample of eleven. Scottish and Welsh nationalism, gender, British national character, the interwar economy, affluence, class, religion, popular culture and Ireland were offered by one or two candidates. These were tutorial essays which had been mulled over for several months and where necessary reworked, so it was to be expected that there would be few duds in the sample, but standard was genuinely high. I gave no mark lower than 65, and nine of my eleven marks were between 68 and 74.'

### **BIT (a) Bodies of Feelings: gender and sexual identity since c.1500**

Twenty-six candidates submitted portfolios for this paper, addressing an encouragingly wide range of themes and questions. The examiners noted that there was no marked difference in the range and quality of the portfolio as compared to the essays marked for the take-home paper in previous years, suggesting that there is no significant advantage to the take-home format. A number of wide-ranging essays exploring the gendered body in relation to race and empire were notable for their theoretical sophistication and engagement with very recent historiography (with references to Philippa Levine's Special Faculty Lecture appearing more than once). The stronger candidates examined examples from across the whole period, and balanced discussion of the conceptual and theoretical questions with empirical case studies that were effectively contextualised. Weaker essays might skate over the period pre-1750 or tended to over-simplify processes of change with reference to rather monolithic ideas of 'the Enlightenment' or 'liberation' without thinking critically about what these might mean in different contexts or to different actors. Many candidates could have strengthened their essays by developing a stronger sense of the legislative, social and political contexts, drivers and repercussions of cultural and social change.

### **BIT (b): The Making and Unmaking of the UK, 1603-present**

'There were only six candidate for this paper this year; that, and the singularity of the exercise - i.e. with candidates submitting a portfolio of essays rather than addressing a take-home paper - perhaps limits the utility of much comment on the performance. But the theme paper does of course present specific challenges. The better work was framed argumentatively and selectively rather than by a necessarily rather superficial narrative of given themes; used the circulated primary materials imaginatively; and showed chronological and geographical range within the paper. The weaker work, well, didn't. In general candidates' bibliographical citation seemed oddly slight, some instancing only three or four books or articles, which suggested that the opportunities presented by the exercise had been squandered.'

### **EWF 1: The World of Late Antiquity, 250-650**

There were seven candidates. Of these, two achieved first class marks; all others were in the upper-second range. There was a good spread of questions. The following were attempted: 1-4, 6-7, 12-16, 18, 23-25, and 27. Only 12, 15, and 18 attracted answers from more than one candidate.

Some candidates focused their answers on particular periods and places, while others took a more expansive, thematic approach. But the best answers uniformly made an effort to frame the question with reference to their particular approach. Weaker answers either did not ruminate on the question, or presented an essay which argued past its actual drive. All candidates understood the need to enrich their answers with reference to sources and to relevant scholarship, although some did this more consistently than others, and some were overly led by secondary quotations.

Both assessors remarked on the fact that some scripts stuck entirely to the Mediterranean world, and to the period before 476, and while this did not necessarily detract from their mark, it did inhibit the breadth of some thematic answers. It was gratifying to see a small number of candidates forging creative and spontaneous answers by introducing comparative material from across the medieval world (esp. from the Middle East and China), but it was notable that in such cases non-European material was sometimes less well researched or understood. In no case did a candidate offer an answer which focused only on non-European examples.

### **EWF 2: The Early Medieval World, 600-1000**

Four candidates tackled the exam in the four-hour open book format necessitated by COVID-19 conditions. The questions were really broad, allowing students to adduce a range of evidence and sources. Generally students responded well to the briefs, producing interesting and informed replies. Two of the four candidates achieved a 2:1, while two scripts were sent to the external examiner. 12 questions were attempted with a marked preference for the Islamic world (the Arab-Muslim conquests and the 'Abbasid revolution) as well as imperial women. Answers were generally well-informed, supported by a wide variety of evidence ranging from Western Christendom to Tang China.

(F Bessard)

### **EWF 3: The Central Middle Ages, 500-1500**

(No report submitted)

### **EWF 4: The Global Middle Ages, 500-1500**

This was the second year in which this course was examined. There were five takers, of whom one achieved a first-class result, and four a 2:1 grade. Given that many students take EW papers in Trinity Term, many of the candidates must have studied for this paper under the remote learning conditions of TT2020. Eleven of the thirty questions on the paper received responses, which given the relatively small number of candidates represented a reasonable breadth of topics covered. The most popular question was that on the salience of climate to wider patterns of historical change. Questions about networks, maritime worlds, conversion, cultural encounter, slaves, empire/religious diversity, writing, medieval global thinkers and methodology were also answered. The range of chronologies and geographies covered by candidates was encouraging, although the more convincing answers were those which interrogated a controlled number of well explained case studies within any given answer, rather than those which offered a chain of only loosely connected examples. To succeed in a paper of this breadth it is important for candidates to realise that close engagement with modern historiography of the Middle Ages and global history of other periods can help provide important interpretative frameworks. As in all medieval papers, thinking critically about sources is also crucial, particularly so in a paper when the surviving evidence for different medieval societies differs so significantly. The global approach to the medieval world is still very new – this provides enormous opportunities for critical and imaginative historical analysis; the strongest responses demonstrated this potential very clearly.

### **EWF 5: The Late Medieval World, 1300-1525**

Eight candidates: three firsts and five 2:1. Thirteen of the twenty-four questions on the paper received responses, which given the relatively small number of candidates taking the paper represented a reasonably wide range of topics covered. The most popular questions were heresy (4 answers), gender and the sacred (3), teaching and learning (4). Questions about disease, empire, women and power, cultures of

display, martial culture, rebellions, religious institutions, law/violence, slaves/peasants and visual culture each received at least one response. Many candidates demonstrated an encouraging willingness to consider social variables including race, gender and class in their answers even in questions which were not framed explicitly in those terms. On the evidence of this year's answers, candidates appear to be approaching the paper principally in socio-cultural rather than political or economic terms, although it may be that these were the questions which candidates chose to answer rather than what is was they had covered in in term-time tutorials. While some candidates focused entirely on Europe, several integrated European and extra-European evidence and secondary literatures (in some cases to very powerful effect) or focused on extra-European contexts. The best answers came from those candidates who engaged critically with appropriate secondary literature (where relevant) to frame and advance their arguments, and those who were able to present and explain the salience of contemporary case studies or explore contemporary sources in a critical manner. Perhaps the most important advice that the examiners can pass on is that the best answers came from those candidates who worked closely with the terms of the question. The questions on the EWF medieval papers are set in very broad terms, but this breadth is not about intimidating candidates, tripping them up or encouraging superficial coverage. Instead, the breadth of question is designed to enable candidates to reflect critically and imaginatively on the specific evidence and case studies they have studied in tutorials. Those who were able to take advantage of this opportunity produced the best scripts.

### **EWF 6: Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700**

Twenty-five candidates 'sat' this exam, of which 12 achieved a first-class result, and the rest were spread across the 2.1 range. Most questions were attempted, although as often some topics were more popular than others. Greater demand naturally creates a higher threshold, and the questions for these topics indeed enabled the examiners to differentiate between stronger and weaker attempts, which is always a good sign. The examiners were also encouraged by the demand for less mainstream topics (e.g. Poland-Lithuania). The overall distribution of marks in this paper came a bit closer to a normal distribution compared with the inflation of firsts in recent years.

There were several impressive essays, including by those who did not achieve a first-class result all round. The examiners occasionally noticed an over-narrowness in approach, for example in reducing the general question on family structures to the impact of the Reformation. The examiners also penalized essays with a less direct approach to the question. In some cases, candidates appeared to be recycling material from tutorial essays on different questions relating to the same theme. Never a sensible expedient, it seemed especially ill-chosen in an open-book setting.

### **EWF 7: Eurasian Empires. 1450-1800**

Forty-two students sat the paper this year. Nineteen candidates achieved overall marks of 70 or above. The marks this year were slightly higher than in previous years, which is in line with other exam papers sat during the pandemic. Overall, we found that students were able to manage the abundance of information and keep the focus on the argument. At the same time, scripts were penalized when their approaches and interpretations were merely derivative. Candidates attempted all questions from Section A (States and regions), with a strong preference for the Mughals (14 answers), the Portuguese empire (10), the Ming and Qing China (9), and the Ottomans (8). Conversely, almost half of the questions from this section were only attempted by one (q. 3 on the Dutch; q. 7 on the Safavids; q. 10 on Japan; q. 11 on early British India; q. 13 on mainland Southeast Asia) or two candidates (q. 4 on West and Central Africa). A similar imbalance emerged in relation to Section B (Themes), with a few questions attracting most of the answers, such as q. 14 (periodisation) with 14 attempts, q. 15 (conversion to Christianity and Islam) with 11, and q. 16 (religious pluralism) with 10, while four questions only had one (q. 24 on maritime violence in the Indian Ocean) or two answers (q. 18 on cultural encounters; q. 26 on global trade; q. 27 on war and warfare). Other four questions from Section B (q. 17 on astrology, astronomy and millenarianism; q. 20 on governing empires; q. 25 on economic growth; q. 29 on global consciousness) found no answers. By and large, this seems to be in line with scripts from previous years. However, the fact that a quarter of the questions (7

out of 29) receive more than 60% of answers whereas half of the questions (14 out of 29) barely exceeded 11% of attempts call for some attention. Of course, it is positive that an exam paper also covers less popular topics and a slight revision of the themes included in Section B may suffice to make some of the more attractive – a growing interest in topics related to gender and sexuality (q. 19 with 4 answers), race and ethnicity (q. 22 with 6 answers), and environment (q. 28 with 5 answers) is clearly visible. It is nonetheless worth considering that those questions which tend to attract more answers correspond to the topics on which lectures are offered for this paper.

#### **EFW 8: Enlightenments and Revolutions: Europe 1680-1848** (Old and new syllabus)

Twenty-two candidates sat the paper, almost evenly divided between MS and JS (12 and 10, respectively). Three candidates did not sit; there was one case of short-weight.

Students' choice of questions remained markedly narrow, and their core interests remain firmly those of the old General X. Of thirty questions set, only thirteen were chosen by candidates. Within this range, those on Europe, Enlightened Absolutism and the Enlightenment dominated their interests. No questions on the period 1795-1815 were answered; only one truly non-European question was answered (Q 5, on the Mughals), and that by only one candidate. Only one candidate answered on the Slave Trade (Q 16). The strongest extra-European interest was shown in Spanish America ((Q 3; five answers). Even within Europe, the vast bulk of answers came on Prussia and Bourbon France (11 each), the Enlightenment (10) and aristocracies (9). The examiners found that, on the whole, these questions were well handled, but noted with some consternation that those who answered Q. 10 (4) did not know the difference between the Holy Roman Empire and the Habsburg empire, and persisted on answering on the latter, despite there being a suitable question for their interests on the paper. (Q 24). Even within Europe, the territorial focus was narrow: the questions on Italy, Sweden, and the Netherlands finding no interest from candidates, and even Russia, normally well supported, got only four answers, as did the French Revolution.

The standard reached over all, was very high this year. The vast majority of scripts reached a very high 2i level, with several firsts. In the prevailing circumstances, this was very encouraging. Interest in this paper may be tightly focused, but engagement was often intense.

#### **EFW 9: From Independence to Empire: America 1763-1898**

24 candidates took this paper. 10 were awarded first-class marks and 14 were awarded a II.1. There was a significant degree of clustering in terms of questions answered this year, especially around questions 1 and 2. In total 17 candidates answered question 2, while 7 answered question 1 - of which 6 candidates answered both. 7 candidates answered neither. This is not a bad thing in and of itself and should not deter candidates from answering thematic questions on slave resistance and indigenous power, rather it reflects student interests, but there was a great deal of variation in terms of quality of answer. This was especially so in the case of Q2 where answers often had a "by numbers" quality and either ranged too widely and descriptively over slave resistance or fell back on rather generic characterisations of historiography and at times set off Elkins vs. Genovese rather schematically. The best answers married a breadth of awareness with detailed case studies that engaged directly with important historiographical interventions and conceptual approaches used by historians. Too few candidates engaged the terms of the question directly enough or picked up that it had asked about "black" resistance and not only slave resistance. Candidates tended to show their breadth of knowledge in their choice of questions, but still it is notable that less than half the questions were attempted with candidates gravitating toward "banker" topics (slavery, revolution, empire) rather than attempting to deploy their knowledge in new ways.

#### **EFW 10: The European Century, 1820-1925**

Although only six candidates took this paper, the examiners were pleased to see that between them they answered a wide range of questions, with 14 of the 30 questions on the exam paper receiving at least one student response. That said, questions relating to nationalism or national identity were clear favourites, with three students answering question 13 ('Was EITHER Italian OR German nationalism ever a mass movement?'), two students answering question 10 ('How successful were policies of state-sponsored



cultural and linguistic homogenization?') and there were also answers to questions on Zionism, regionalism as a rejection of nation-building, and 'national indifference'. (As always, students should be certain they understand terms-of-art, such as phrases in quotations, before they decide to tackle questions that contain them.) All scripts showed strengths: the students mostly tackled the questions posed; they did not rely on narrative in their answers; there was a very pleasing readiness to engage both with primary sources and with named historians. However, sometimes these names were simply dropped in to back up an existing point; only the strongest scripts used the historiography to develop their own original arguments. In the past we have chided students for writing about historical events and developments without ever naming a single historical actor who witnessed or participated in them, but that was decidedly not the case this year. Yet these examples were often mentioned in passing, to illustrate an existing argument rather than intrinsic to the development of that argument. We recognize that the word limit may have played a part in this rhetorical strategy.

### **EWF 11: Imperial & Global History 1750-1930**

Demand for this paper remains robust, with 20 candidates in 2021 (two further candidates were listed as taking the paper but did not sit the exam). Of the 20 candidates, 6 were in Joint Schools. 7 candidates achieved a first class mark on the paper, and 12 an upper 2:1 (of which 11 achieved a mark of more than 65). There was one outlier who was awarded a third, owing largely to an idiosyncratic (and at times curiously hostile) approach to the questions. The answers were overall of a high standard, and there were some outstanding individual essays on gender, capitalism, India post-1857 and Japanese modernization. There was some clustering. The most popular questions were, in Section A, question 7 (on gender and empire), answered by 7 candidates; 6 (capitalism and empire), answered by 6 candidates; and 1 (Great Divergence), 5 candidates. In Section B, question 20 (Japan) attracted the most answers (6) but otherwise answers were more evenly spread, although two of the three questions on India attracted 3 each. As last year, there was a clear preference for the broader thematic questions in Section A (37 answers, versus 23 answers to the more place-specific questions in Section B). Interestingly, no candidate attempted questions 10 (the European civilizing mission), 11 (the global First World War), 19 (Africa and the global economy) or 21 (decline of Muslim empires). An additional 7 questions had a solitary taker: 4 (modern imperialisms), 13 (orientalism and colonial literature), 14 (Christianity), 16 (Atlantic world), 23 (slave trade & Scramble for Africa), 24 (Indian nationalism) and 25 (China's cumulative crisis).

### **EWF 12: The Making of Modern America since 1863**

36 candidates sat the European and World 12 (America since 1863) paper this year, including 4 joint schools students. 11 candidates received marks in the first-class range, and 25 candidates received Upper Second Class classification.

Although 7 of the questions attracted no takers, there was a good spread of answers across the remaining 23 questions. Many students also tackled one of the asterisked questions that allow the students to discuss any period covered by the course. Perennially popular topics -- Reconstruction, Jim Crow, the New Deal, the Reagan Revolution, the Civil Rights Movement -- attracted many takers. However, so too did questions on the American War in Vietnam, the women's movement of the 1970s and the impact of gender history on the writing of US history -- a reflection of the growing popularity of these more social history centred topics in tutorial teaching.

Overall, the scripts submitted were very strong and most candidates wrote essays that demonstrated good knowledge and understanding of the broader topic at hand, and provided targeted responses to the specifics of the questions. The strongest scripts critically and actively engaged with relevant historiography (foregrounding the student's own 'take') and offered a clear and original argument in relation to the question set. Scripts that received lower marks tended to only passively engage with the historiography, and to address the specifics of the question only sporadically.

### **EWF 13: Europe Divided, 1914-1989**

Twenty-three candidates took this paper. Candidates are required to answer one question from each section. In 'Section A: 1914-1945', the majority of answers clustered around questions relating to the postwar revolutions, fascism, and genocide. Weaker answers to these questions overly concentrated on the German case, and did not pay enough to the question of violence in relation to their treatment of genocide and society. They also tended to lead with historians' opinions or historiographical references rather than historical evidence. Stronger answers ranged across the Ottoman Empire, the USSR and central and eastern European states, offering a strongly sustained argument focused very directly in terms of the question. Five questions in section A elicited no answers: (Mobilization, Great Depression, gender and sex; art and culture, Second World War). Answers in 'Section B: 1945-1989' were again strongly clustered. Candidates opted to answer questions on the origins of the Cold War; the eastern bloc 'thaw'; the rebels of 1968; and the events of 1989. No other questions elicited any answers. Weaker answers used a narrow range of texts and examples that resulted in predictable answers. By contrast, stronger answers on the origins of the Cold War recognised the contingent elements of the relationship between the war and its aftermath, whilst those on 1989 and order recognised the wider global frame. They also offered a wonderful, and wide-range of different case studies and detailed empirical evidence to support their broader points. 'Section C: Themes' is arguably the most challenging part of the paper. Candidates are urged to remember this section requires them to move beyond a close focus on one or two relevant case studies, and/or time periods. Weaker answers answered with reference to a narrow timeframe, and cases. It is simply not enough to answer with reference to Germany in relation to genocide, nationalism, gender or sex here. It is important to remember that Europe comprised of Empire as well as nation states. The paper is called Europe and World History of a reason. In this section, it was pleasing to see candidates attempting a wider range of topics: crisis and catastrophe, gender and racial stereotypes, nationalism and consumption were all popular. The top performers on this section produced wonderfully rich and thoughtful answers ranging across the whole history of the short twentieth-century.

### **EWF 14: The Global 20<sup>th</sup> Century, 1930-2003**

Fifty-two candidates opted to take this paper, with the joint schools of History and Politics, and History and Economics strongly represented among them. The rubric required candidates to answer three questions from at least two sections, one of which needed to be from 'Section C: Global Themes'. In practice, around half the candidates examined opted to answer questions from all three sections by addressing questions in 'Section B: 1989-2003'. (The least popular section.) Here most answers were clustered on the question of whether the end of the Cold War marked a new world order, and the revival of popular religiosity after. Few candidates opted to answer on the 'power of the powerless' in the late Cold War despite the rich literature on this topic. Nor were there answers to questions on local and global activism, or the relics of empire, which was surprising given these themes contemporary relevance, and the outpouring of recent historical commentary they have elicited. It was disappointing there were no answers on global inequality, or South Africa, and only one on 'global challenges'. Candidates are reminded the chronological divisions of Section B, as Section A are not restrictive. This means it is perfectly possible - indeed sensible - to range beyond 2003 to take in the impact of the 2008-09 'Credit Crunch', and more recent 'global shocks' in relation to this section, as well as the global themes addressed in Section C. Answers in Section C were strongly concentrated on human rights, sexual preference and public health, environmental politics, and, in particular, violence as a feature of modernity. Weaker answers here focused narrowly on one or two case studies, without connecting to the broader themes, or took historiography as their point of departure in an approach more suited to the 'Disciplines of History' paper. Less popular topics - questions relating to international development, natural resource and poverty, and neo-liberalism - often produced the best answers, although HECON candidates, in particular, should think carefully about how to relate their specialist IPE knowledge to historical case studies. There were no answers to questions on over-population, new technology or consumption. In 'Section A: 1930-1989', the Second World War, wars of national liberation and the conflict in Vietnam and/or Algeria elicited the most answers. Violence was depressingly commonplace as a topic of interest among candidates, as well as being a feature of global modernity.

Weaker answers on the topic of national liberation sought to repackage the terms of the question to make it one about decolonization. This is obviously a related theme, but it meant answers gave undue attention, often in the first part of the essay, to the agency of the colonial powers, and not those seeking to liberate themselves. It may sound basic, but examiners reward candidates to answer in relation to the terms of the question asked. Questions relating to nuclear power, personality cults and youth disaffection also elicited a few answers. These were among the best, with imaginative essays offering fresh, sometimes-subtle arguments and interesting examples to complex questions. No one answered on the persistence of global colour lines, economic depression, the institutionalisation of international relations and the turbulent 1970s. Frantz Fanon was perhaps the most commonly misspelled proper noun.

### **EWT (A) Masculinity & its Discontents, 200-2000**

Twenty two candidates took the subject and twenty one sat the examination. Eight candidates gained first class marks and twelve gained upper second marks. (one result awaited). Overall, the scripts were most impressive, showing both a grasp of theory and a breadth of evidence. This is a demanding paper, requiring students to range widely and do more than just compare different periods, but to explore a theme across different historical periods. It also requires students to develop arguments and think deeply about masculinity in relation to complex bodies of theory, and do so critically. This is a time of flux in the history of masculinity, and students showed their awareness of this, and of the latest developments in theory. We were impressed by students' evident enthusiasm, wide reading, command of detail, and engagement with the paper.

All candidates covered the three chronological periods of medieval, early modern and modern in their scripts. All displayed a good knowledge of the periods from which they chose to draw evidence, and this was quite striking, because the paper requires students to move beyond periods and places with which they may be familiar: candidates managed this very well indeed. The medievalist marker was particularly struck by the informed engagement with the Middle Ages, and compared this very favourably with the depth of knowledge displayed by candidates in other medieval outline papers. Only question 4 was unanswered by any candidate. The most popular question was that on religion, but overall there was no marked 'bunching' on questions.

The best scripts showed an ability to develop a theme through a range of different examples across time adroitly, putting their own interpretations on evidence, and applying insights from one historiography to another. They showed a capacity to devise complex arguments. Above all they showed ability to deploy and analyse evidence effectively. Less good scripts occasionally resorted to quotation in place of evidence, or compared two case studies mechanically drawing only on a small range of authors.

### **EWT (B) Technology & Culture in a Global Context, 1000-1700**

Three students took the EWTb paper 'Global History of Technology, 1000-1700'. Tutorials were conducted in Michaelmas and Hilary terms and lectures/discussions conducted remotely in Trinity Term 2021. From 15 questions each of the students answered Q3 (on paper and print technologies in China and the Islamic world); two students answered the question on medieval/early modern horological innovation; and one each on explanations for innovation in glassmaking, on innovation in navigation/cartography, on technology and religion, and on the relative merits of histories of technological use and technological innovation.

Two female and one male student took the paper. Overall, one student was awarded a lower 2:1, one a borderline 2:1/1st (69), and the other a mark of 72. Two students gained first class marks in their answers on paper and print – their choice of question and quality of answer due in no small part to the excellent teaching of Prof. Yusen Yu. There were outstanding answers to the questions on glassmaking and horological innovation.

The paper will be renamed 'Global Networks of Innovation 1000-1700' from 2021-22)

### **EWT(C) Waging War-in Eurasia**

In 2020 I had confidently predicted that I would be able to compare a set of proper examination scripts from this year's cohort with those sat under emergency 'open book' conditions last year, when the first full cohort sat the paper. Sadly that proved impossible, although this year the rubric was enforced and students had to answer both case study and thematic questions. The most serious problem produced by this ersatz form of examining – namely plagiarism – unfortunately reared its ugly head once again, and this time in more serious form. While last year it was simply a case of a student re-using tutorial essays, this year one essay had substantial sections lifted from britannica.com. On further investigation it turned out that these too originally came from a tutorial essay which had contained the plagiarised text, which I had failed to spot at the time. This further underlines the absolute necessity of returning to invigilated exams under controlled conditions as soon as we possibly can.

Ten finalists sat the paper this year. Leaving aside the plagiarised script, which received a mark of 53 before further penalties were applied, the spread of marks was slightly greater than last year, with two below 65, and three first-class marks, the highest of which was 73. Four scripts received marks of 68, reflecting solid but not quite first-class performances. The spread of questions was also a little different from last year, with question A1 (on the Mongols) answered by only one candidate (last year it was six). As last year question A15 (on operation Barbarossa) was popular, and answered by five students, while four tackled question A4 on Napoleon's invasion of Russia. Much to my satisfaction one candidate chose to answer question A7 on Nader Shah (a topic that has been rather neglected). Of the thematic questions (no candidate attempted more than one of these) the most popular were question B22 on counterinsurgency and B16 on Orientalism, each answered by three candidates. There was only one essay on Mackinder's 'Heartland' Thesis (B23), which was a little disappointing as the paper has a whole lecture devoted to the topic, but it did crop up in other essays.

Overall the standard was satisfactory, with only one significant divergence of opinion between the two examiners, which was easily resolved. Apart from the plagiarism case, I had the impression that students this year had written more spontaneous essays with fewer attempts to copy and paste from notes, and this produced greater fluency.

### **EWT (D) Catholicism in the Making of the Modern World, 1545-1970**

Eight students sat the exam in 2021, the second year in which the paper had been examined at Finals. The overall quality of the answers was impressively high, with five students securing First-class marks, and the rest high Upper Seconds. The questions on the papacy, missions, and violence and war were the most popular, but more than half the 24 questions were answered by at least one student. And the answers demonstrated that candidates had taken advantage of the possibilities of the subject to range widely in their reading. Drawing on a genuinely global body of evidence from across the long chronological reach of the paper, the majority of answers displayed an awareness both of the complexity of local variations across space and time, and of current historiographical debates. Well-argued and clearly set out, the best answers offered a strikingly original analysis of their subjects.

### **Disciplines of History**

This paper is set by the whole board and sat by all students in the main school and in AMH. The median mark this year was 67, the same as in 2017-19, and the mean was 66.2, compared with 67 last year. It may be that the encouragement to markers to use the whole range of marks in the 60s to distinguish between more and less successful work within that band had a more intense effect on Disciplines than on other papers. It is notable that Ancient and Modern History candidates scored a mean mark of 69 and a median of 70, so it may be that the exercises of comparison and source analysis are more naturally ingrained in their historical practice than in those of some main school candidates. Many of them certainly deploy effective comparisons between ancient and modern societies. (AMH candidates did not noticeably concentrate on different questions from those in the main school). Disciplines was once again the paper on which the lowest mean marks were scored, though the gap between Disciplines and EWF, the most similar exam, was not large. This year, unlike the past two years, female candidates scored less well on Disciplines

than male: the gap in mean marks was almost identical to that in the reverse direction last year (0.92:0.85). Candidates answered a good range of questions, though there was one overwhelmingly popular question in each section and a few others were heavily subscribed. The only question to go unanswered in section A (Making Historical Comparisons) was that on consumer markets. The most popular topic, with at least 39 takers, was the instability of empire. Also widely answered were questions on national and regional identities (25 takers), religion (20), popular disorder (17) and unfree labour (15). In section B (Making Historical Arguments) the favourite question was on oral history (at least 35 takers), though gender (21), political history (18) and sexuality (16) were also popular. Here two questions apparently found no takers, those on the history of science and public history, and several, on microhistory, globalization, Atlantic history, the classical tradition, postmodernism and digital archives, were answered by only one. Overall the range of questions answered was wider than last year, but empire and oral history retained their pre-eminence, one which can be tracked to varying degrees across at least the past five years' reports. Markers commented as ever that close attention to answering (and at times thoughtfully critiquing, rather than merely denouncing) the question asked was the key to success, together with careful definition of terms and argument from example rather than assertion. For section A, successful candidates chose two or three case studies suitable to compare with each other in substantial depth – rather than merely to describe at length – in order to answer the question and did not clog up the answer with numerous similar examples. For section B, they did not fall into uncritical assumptions, for example that oral history automatically overcomes the effects of class or race in shaping the historical record, or that 'traditional historiography' can all be lumped together and used as a foil to whatever new development is under discussion. They were able to back up general characterisations of forms of historical writing with specific examples and not only explain what those examples said but also how that was relevant to the question. The weakest answers mainly fell in section B and were brief, generic and probably inflexibly pre-prepared treatments of themes in historical writing, or, a little better, summaries of a series of works read, not well tied together to address the question. A few others in that section were really exercises in comparative history, barely adapted to discuss historiography. Occasional answers in section A discussed only one substantial case-study or argued a position about current politics without sustained historical analysis. It is striking that significant numbers of candidates both at the higher and lower ends of the mark range scored very divergent marks on their two essays, often 10 marks apart and sometimes up to 17. This suggests that, for a good result, attention is necessary to mastering both the different sets of skills demanded by this exercise. It is also encouraging that this challenging paper enables candidates to write with a passion and sophistication that impressed markers about an enormous range of problems in history and historiography that they have clearly enjoyed studying.

**Further Subject: Constructing the First Nation: A Political History of the United States, 1781-1803 (new)**

Twelve candidates sat the paper, which was examined on the Inspira platform. The cohort was offered a two-hour revision session in 0th week of Trinity. No candidate garnered a 3rd or II.2. Four candidates secured an agreed First class mark. There were no instances of short-weight.

The assessors noted with pleasure that all the questions set attracted at least one taker and also that very nearly half the cohort chose to answer two questions from Section A. In general candidates understood the distinction between the strict wording of the federal Constitution and subsequent presentations of that settlement in political thought – especially as this distinction bore on questions of legitimacy. Candidates wrote well on partisanship, sometimes less ably its causes. Some candidates presented a sketchy understanding of key constitutional provisions, notably the three-fifths clause, or of key interpretative concepts, such as the separation of powers. The assessors are pleased to note this year's cohort engaged with the distinctiveness of this instance of nation-building. The paper is off to a promising start.

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

### GENDER STATS BY PAPER FHS 2021

117 M 107W

Main School Only

Paper	F Avrg	M Avrg	DIFF	F High	M High	F Low	M Low	F 70 +	M 70 +	F < 60	M < 60
ALL	68	68.8	0.8					28 (26.1)	43 (36.8)	1 (0.9)	1 (0.9)
BH	67.1	67.73	0.63	12	17	21	29	25 (23.4)	37 (31.6)	1 (0.9)	3 (2.6)
EWB	66.64	67.17	0.53	16	16	22	22	27 (25.2)	39 (33.3)	7 (6.5)	5 (4.3)
FS	66.96	67.35	0.39	16	16	19	23	34 (31.8)	37 (31.6)	8 (7.5)	5 (4.3)
SSg	67.02	68.59	1.57	11	14	11	9	25 (23.4)	52 (44.4)	8 (7.5)	3 (2.6)
SSEE	68.35	69.23	0.88	35	35	12	8	45 (42.1)	57 (48.7)	2 (1.9)	5 (4.3)
DH	65.74	66.66	0.92	14	12	35	31	24 (22.4)	34 (29.1)	9 (8.4)	8 (6.8)
TH *	68.21	68.85	0.64	27	32	14	13	43 (40.2)	45 (38.5)	3 (2.8)	3 (2.6)

### GENDER STATS BY PAPER FHS 2020

97 M 113 W

Main School Only

Paper	F Avrg	M Avrg	DIFF	F High	M High	F Low	M Low	F 70 +	M 70 +	F < 60	M < 60
ALL	68.09	68.18	0.09					30 (26.5)	30 (30.9)	1 (0.8)	3 (3.0)
BH	67	68	1	9	11	30	21	26 (23.0)	38 (39.1)	6 (5.3)	2 (2.0)
EWB	66.52	68	1.48	13	18	35	18	31 (27.4)	35 (36.1)	6 (5.3)	5 (0.5)
FS	67.79	67.56	0.23	19	15	16	15	42 (37.2)	37 (38.1)	4 (3.5)	3 (3.0)
SSg											
SSEE	68.95	68.93	0.02	37	25	18	17	49 (43.3)	41 (42.2)	3 (2.6)	3 (3.0)
DH	67.58	66.73	0.85	23	14	24	30	35 (30.9)	33 (34)	3 (2.6)	4 (4.1)
TH *	69.4	68.14	1.26	33	28	13	16	53 (46.9)	44 (45.3)	2 (1.8)	6 (6.2)

### GENDER STATS BY PAPER FHS 2019

103M 121W

Paper	F Avrg	M Avrg	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

101M 134 W

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)

## 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			
	2021	2020	2019	2018
I	113	109	109	108
II.1	109	99	114	125
II.2	2	1	1	1
III		1	-	-
Pass		-	-	1
DDH		1	-	-
Incomplete	0	0	-	-
Fail		-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>235</b>

Class	Percentage			
	2021	2020	2019	2018
I	50.5	51.7	48.7	46
II.1	48.7	46.4	50.9	53.2
II.2	0.9	0.47	0.45	0.40
III		0.47	-	-
Pass		-	-	0.40
DDH		0.47		
Incomplete	1.33	0.47		
Fail				

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

(a) 2021

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	113	50.5	66	56.4	47	43.9	41.6
II.1	109	48.7	50	42.7	59	55.1	54.1
II.2	2	0.9	1	0.9	1	0.9	50
III							
Pass							
DDH							
Incomplete	0						
Fail							
<b>Total</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>100</b>	

(b) 2020

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	109	51.7	50	51.5	59	52.2	54.1
II.1	98	46.5	45	46.4	53	46.9	54.1
II.2	1	0.47	1	1.02	-	-	-
III	1	0.47	1	1.02	-	-	-
Pass	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DDH	1	0.47	1	1.02	-	-	-
Incomplete	1	0.47	-	-	1	0.89	100.
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



<b>Total</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>-</b>
--------------	------------	------------	-----------	------------	------------	------------	----------

(c) 2019

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	109	48.7	58	55.8	51	42.5	46.8
II.1	114	50.1	45	43.3	69	57.5	60.5
II.2	1	0.45	1	0.96	-	-	-
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pass	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>-</b>

(d) 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>-</b>

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

Prelims Nos 2019	FHS Results in 2021					Finals not taken in 2021
	I	II.1	II.2	III	Pass	
Distinction: 64	49	15	-	-	-	2
Pass: 162	64	93	2	-	-	24

Finals Nos 2021	Prelims results in 2019		Prelims not taken in 2019
	Distinction	Pass	
Class I: 113	49	64	4
Class II.1: 109	64	93	26
Class II.1: 2		2	1
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	131	40.94	68	40.72	63	41.18	48.09
II.1	181	56.56	95	56.88	86	56.21	47.51
II.2	5	1.56	2	1.20	3	1.96	60.0
III							
Pass							
Incomplete	3	0.94	2	1.20	1	0.65	
Fail							
<b>Total</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>100</b>	-

\*Some candidates have their marks disregarded

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	121	45.83	67	50.38	54	41.22	44.63
II.1	134	50.75	61	45.86	73	55.73	54.47
II.2	8	3.03	5	3.76	3	2.30	37.50
III	1	0.39	-		1	0.75	100
Pass							
Fail							
<b>Total</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>100</b>	

\*Some candidates have their marks disregarded

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	69	28.63	43	33.60	26	23.00	38.24
II.1	155	64.31	77	60.2	78	69.03	50.98
II.2	15	6.22	8	6.40	7	6.19	46.66
III	1	0.42			1	0.89	100
Pass	1	0.42			1	0.89	100
Fail							
<b>Total</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>100</b>	

\*Some candidates have their marks disregarded

d) BIF History of the British Isles *Essays* and *Portfolio* (Sex/Paper showing marks for that paper)  
(includes BIF Theme Papers)

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	71	28.74	42	32.81	29	24.37	40.84
II.1	172	69.64	83	64.84	89	74.79	51.74
II.2	4	1.62	3	2.35	1	0.84	25.0
III							
Pass							
Fail							
<b>Total</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>100</b>	

\*Some candidates have their marks disregarded

\*\* Old Syllabus History of the British Isles papers were not included

e) **European and World History (Sex/Paper showing marks for that paper)**  
Includes EWT theme papers (a) (b) (c) & (d)

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	96	30.48	53	33.33	43	27.57	44.79
II.1	207	65.71	101	63.52	106	67.94	51.20
II.2	9	2.86	3	1.90	6	3.85	66.66
III	2	0.63	2	1.25	-		
Pass	1	0.31		-	1	0.64	100
Fail							
<b>Total</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>100</b>	

\*Some candidates have their marks disregarded

\*\* Old Syllabus General History papers were not included

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	96	32.32	52	33.99	44	30.56	45.83
II.1	186	62.62	94	61.44	92	63.88	49.46
II.2	14	4.72	6	3.92	8	5.56	57.14
III	1	0.34	1	0.65	-	-	
Pass							
Fail							
<b>Total</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>100</b>	

\*Some candidates have their marks disregarded

**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	86	33.20	58	44.96	28	21.54	32.55
II.1	161	62.16	67	51.94	94	72.31	58.38
II.2	10	3.86	3	2.32	7	5.38	70.0
III	2	0.78	1	0.78	1	0.77	50.0
Pass							
Fail							
<b>Total</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>100</b>	

*\*Some candidates have their marks disregarded*

**(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)

	2021	2020	2019	2018
<b>(BIF) History of the British Isles (Essay) from 2019 and Portfolio (for 2021)</b>				
BIF 1. The Early Medieval British Isles, 300-1100	9 -	13 (2)	13 (1)	25 (1)
BIF 2. The British Isles in the Central Middle Ages, 1000-1330	21 (1)	20 (2)	20 (3)	31 (1)
BIF 3. The late Medieval British Isles 1330-1550	30 (6)	20 -	29 (1)	34 (4)
BIF 4. Reformations & Revolutions 1500-1700	57 (7)	58 (2)	71 (8)	67 (9)
BIF 5. Liberty, Commerce & Power 1685-1830	31 (8)	15 (6)	20 (2)	34 (6)
BIF 6. Power, Politics & People 1815-1924	31 (5)	34 (2)	32 (6)	32 (6)
BIF 7. Changing Identities, 1900 to the present	39 (6)	42 (8)	55 (11)	49 (10)
BIT (a) Theme paper: Bodies of Feeling since c.1500	23 (5)	27 (8)		
BIT (b) Theme paper: The Making & Unmaking of the UK, 1603-present	7 (3)	3 -		
<b>European and World History (EWF) from 2020</b> (previously General History)				
EWF 1: The World of late Antiquity 250-650	7 (3)	11 (8)	10	6 (3)
EWF 2: The Early Medieval World 600-1000	4 (1)	5 (1)	1 -	6 (1)
EWF 3: The Central Middle Ages 900-1300	7 -	11 (1)	3 (1)	5 (1)
EWF 4: The Global Middle Ages 500-1500	3 (2)	6 -	5 -	4 (1)
EWF 5: The Late Medieval World, 1300-1525	7 (1)	6 (2)	5 -	8 (2)
EWF 6: Early Modern Europe 1500-1700	25 (8)	16 (4)	5 -	7 (10)
EWF 7: Eurasian Empires 1450-1800	43 (16)	28 (10)	10 (4)	4 (3)
EWF 8: Enlightenments & Revolutions: Europe 1680-1848 (old & new regs)	22 (10)	23 (7)	22 (1)	21 (1)
EWF 9: From Independence to Empire : America 1763-1989	24 (5)	26 (2)	16 (1)	16 (4)
EWF 10: A Liberal Epoch? Europe 1830-1914	6 (1)	8 (2)	12 (5)	21 (10)
EWF 11: Imperial & Global History 1750-1930	20 (7)	22 (8)	21 (9)	9 (4)
EWF 12: The Making of Modern America since 1863	36 (4)	37 (9)	4 -	6 -
EWF 13: Europe Divided 1914-1989	23 (5)	26 (8)	30 (9)	9 (3)
EWF 14: The Global 20 <sup>th</sup> Century 1930-2003	49 (19)	34 (12)	39 (18)	29 (7)
			10 (4)	13 (2)
			20 (5)	21 (9)

			35 (8)	34 (10)
			43 (13)	41 (120)
			25 (11)	
EWF Theme (A): Masculinity & its Discontents, 200-2000	21 (8)	8 (2)		
EWF Theme (B): Technology & Culture in a Global Context, 1000-1700	- (3)	3 -		
EWF Theme (C): Waging War in Eurasia, 1200-1945	10 (3)	9 (2)		
EWF Theme (D): Catholicism in the Making of the Modern World, 1545-1970	8 (2)	3 (1)		
	<b>2021</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2018</b>
<b>Further Subjects</b>				
1. Anglo-Saxon Archaeology of the Early Christian period	3 (1)	1 -	3 -	2 -
2. The Near East in the Age of Justinian and Muhammad, c. 527–c.700	11 (1)	15 (5)	11 (1)	11 (11)
3. The Carolingian Renaissance	2 -	3 -	- -	6 -
4. The Crusades ( <i>new &amp; old regs</i> )	13 (1)	13 -	16 (2)	9 (1)
5. Culture and Society in Early Renaissance Italy, 1290-1348	5 (2)	4 -	3 -	8 (5)
6. Flanders and Italy in the Quattrocento, 1420–1480	2 -	2 -	2 -	3 -
7. The Wars of the Roses	10 (2)	8 (1)	14 (3)	11 (3)
8. Women, Gender & Print Culture in Reformation England, c.1530-1640	- (1)	- (1)	7 (2)	5 (2)
9. Literature and Politics in Early Modern England	10 -	14 (2)	15 (2)	16 (2)
10. The Iberian Global Century 1550-1650	7 (2)	8 -	- -	
11. Writing in the early Modern period, 1550-1750	- (1)	2 -	- -	3 -
12. Court, Culture & Art in Early Modern Europe, 1580-1700	7 (1)	9 (5)	6 (1)	9 (2)
13. War & Society in Britain and Europe., c. 1650-1815 ( <i>new title</i> )	7 (3)	5 (2)	5 (2)	
The Military & Society in Britain & France, c. 1650-1815 ( <i>Old title</i> )	- -	- -	- (2)	4 (1)
14. The Metropolitan Crucible, London 1685-1815	6 (1)	10 (4)	9 (1)	8 -
15. History of Madness & Mental Healing in Global Context	11 -	- (1)		



16. Medicine, Empire & Improvement, 1720 to 1820	2	-	4	-	7	(1)	-	-
17. Constructing the First New Nation: A Political History of the United States, 1781-1803 (new)	12	(4)						
The Age of Jefferson 1774-1826 (old regs)	2	(1)	8	(2)	10	(3)	11	(5)
18. Nationalism in western Europe 1799-1890	12	(3)	10	(4)	9	(2)	10	(2)
19. Intellect and Culture in Victorian Britain	9	(2)	4	(1)	5	-	4	-
20. The Authority of Nature: Race, Heredity & Crime 1800-1940	14	(4)	8	(2)	13	(2)	16	(4)
21. The Middle East in the Age of Empire	23	(9)	15	(7)	24	(7)	14	(3)
22. Transformations & transitions in African History since c.1800	9	(1)	-	(1)				
23. Imperialism and Nationalism, Sub-Saharan Africa c.1870-1980	-	(1)	11	(3)	15	(6)	19	(3)
24. Modern Japan, 1868–1972	-	(1)	11	(2)	9	(5)	9	(2)
25. Development of the World Economy since 1900 (PPE)	-	(14)	-	(16)		(12)	-	-
26. Nationalism, Politics and Culture in Ireland, c. 1870–1921 (old & new regs)	11	(3)	15	(8)	12	(5)	9	(1)
27. A Global War 1914-1920	8	(3)	8	(2)				
Comparative History of the First World War 1914-1920 (Old regs)			-	(1)	12	(2)	8	-
28. China since 1900	20	(13)	22	(9)	22	(7)	23	(5)
29. The Soviet Union 1924–1941	3	(2)	11	(5)	7	(1)	8	(1)
30. Culture, politics & identity in Cold War Europe, 1945-68 (A10735W1)	25	(4)	19	(1)	17	(2)	-	(2)
31. Britain at the Movies: Film and National Identity since 1914	11	(1)	8	(2)	12	(2)	12	(1)
32. Scholastic and Humanist Political thought	2	-	5	(2)	-	-	4	(4)
33. The Science of Society 1650-1800	7	-	4	-	6	(2)	10	(2)
34. Political Theory and Social Science c.1870-1920	9	(1)	7	(1)	8	(3)	7	(3)
35. Postcolonial Historiography: Writing the (Indian) Nation	10	(4)	9	-	-	(2)	12	(4)
36. Modern Mexico, 1876-1994 (old & new regs)	10	(2)	6	(2)	11	(2)		
<b>Special Subjects</b>								
<i>(** in 2020 - SSEE only)</i>								
1. St Augustine & the last days of Rome, 370-430	8	-	-	(2)	-	-	8	(10)
2. Francia in the Age of Clovis and Gregory of Tours	1	-	3	(1)	-	-	8	(1)
3. Byzantium in the Age of Constantine Porphyrogenitus	13	(1)	7	(2)	9	(1)	6	(10)
4. The Norman Conquest of England	12	(1)	9	-	7	-	10	(20)

5. The Peasants' Revolt of 1381	1	-	4	(1)	5	-	2	(1)
6. Joan of Arc & her Age, 1419-1435	11	(1)	13	(1)	12	(2)	6	(1)
7. Painting & Culture in Ming China (suspended in 2020-21)	-	-	6	(1)	5	-	5	-
8. Politics, Art & Culture in the Italian Renaissance, Venice & Florence c.1475-1525	9	(2)	10	(1)	9	-	13	(2)
9. The Peasants War of 1525	5	-	8	(1)				
10. The Trial of the Tudor State: Politics, Religion & Society, 1540-1560	7	(2)	5	(1)	10-		7	(1)
11. The Crisis of the Reformation: political thought and religious ideas, 1560-1610 (new title)	7	-						
The Crisis of the Reformation: Britain, France & the Netherlands 1560-1610 (old regs)		-	5	(1)	6	-	-	-
12. The Dutch Golden Age, 1600-1700 (not running in 2020-21)	-	-	-	-	3	-		
13. The Thirty Years Wars	8	-	15	(4)	13	(1)	6	-
14. Scientific Movement in the Seventeenth Century	8	-	9	-	14	(2)	2	-
15. Revolution & Republic, 1647-16558	6	(1)	5	-	5	-	15	(2)
16. English Architecture, 1660–1720	8	(1)	8	(2)	12	-	10	(4)
17. Imperial Crisis & Reform, 1774-84	9	-	7	(1)	7	-	6	-
18. Becoming a Citizen, c. 1860-1902	13	(2)	11	(4)	9	(2)	16	(3)
19. Race, Sex & Medicine in the Early Atlantic World	11	(2)	7	(2)				
20. Art and its Public in France, 1815-67	2	-	-	-	-	-	5	(1)
21. Race, Religion & Resistance in the United States, from Jim Crow to the Civil Rights	15	(2)	-	-	16	(1)	16	(2)
22. Empire & Nation in Russia & the USSR	4	-						
Terror & Forced Labour in Stalin's Russia (not running in 2020-21)	-	-	-	-	8	(4)	5	(1)
23. From Gandhi to the Green Revolution: India, Independence & Modernity 1939-69	18	(3)	21	(5)	25	(2)	13	-
24. Nazi Germany, a racial order , 1933-45	-	(2)	4	(2)	6	(2)	4	(2)
25. France from the Popular Front to the Liberation, 1936–44	3	(1)	6	(3)	8	(3)	1	-
26. War and Reconstruction, 1939-45	1	-	14	(3)	11	(1)	12	(3)
27. Britain from the Bomb to the Beatles, 1945-67	16	(4)	14	(1)	6	(1)	10	-
28. Pop and the Art of the sixties (new)	1	-	2	-				
29. The Northern Ireland Troubles 1965–1985	16	(2)	16	(4)	18	(4)	18	(4)
30. Britain in the Seventies	20	(2)	12	(2)	8	(3)	20	(3)

31. Neoliberalism & Postmodernism: Ideas, Politics & Culture in Europe & North America, 1970-2000	10 (3)	15 (1)	- (1)	15 (3)
32. Revolutions of 1989	15 (4)	16 (3)	16 (4)	11 (20)
Optional Additional Theses		3 -	- (2)	-
Disciplines of History	(17)	233 (22)	245 (21)	25 (19) 4
Compulsory Thesis (A10771S1)		272 (62)	280 (56)	2 (51)
Thesis in PPE (A12746S1) (HPol)	(6)	(8)	- (11)	- (7)
Thesis (A11024S1) (Heco)	(14)	(17)	- (12)	- (14)
Inter Disc. Dissertation (HENG) (A14401S1)	(14)	- (13)	- (12)	- (6)
Representing the City (A11026S1)(HENG only)	(3)	- (2)	- (12)	- (6)
Women's Life Writing (HENG only)	(9)	- (9)		
Flame of Fire (HENG only)	(2)	- (2)		

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

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
<b>(BIF) History of the British Isles (Essays/Portfolio)</b>						
BIF 1-The Early Medieval British Isles, 300-1100	-	-	-	-	-	-
BIF 2 – The British Isles in the Central Middle Ages, 1000-1330	-	-	1	-	-	1
BIF 3 – The late Medieval British Isles, 1330-1550	2	1	-	1	2	6
BIF 4 – Reformations & Revolutions, 1500-1700	1	-	2	3	1	7
BIF 5 – Liberty, Commerce, & Power, 1685-1830	-	3	3	-	2	8
BIF 6 – Power, Politics, & People, 1815-1924	-	1	1	2	1	5
BIF 7 – Changing Identities, 1900 to the present	-	-	3	1	2	6
EWT (a) Bodies of Feeling, since c.1500	1	-	2	-	2	5
EWT (b) Making & Unmaking of the UK, 1603-present	1	-	-	1	1	3

<b>European and World History (EWF)</b>						
EWF 1: The World of Antiquity	-	1	-	1	1	3
EWF 2: The Early Medieval World 600-1000	-	-	1	-	-	1
EWF 3: The Central Middle Ages 500-1500	-	-	-	-	-	-
EWF 4: The Global Middle Ages 500-1500	1	-	-	-	1	2
EWF 5: The Late Medieval World 1300-1525	-	-	-	-	1	1
EWF 6: Early Modern Europe 1500-1700	1	1	-	3	3	8
EWF 7: Eurasian Empires 1450-1800	2	2	2	4	6	16
EWF 8: Enlightenments & Revolutions: Europe 1680-1848 (old regs)	2	1	-	2	4	9
EWF 8: Enlightenments & Revolutions: Europe 1680-1815 (new regs)	-	-	-	-	1	1
EWF 9: From Independence to Empire : America 1763-1898	1	-	-	2	2	5
EWF 10: A Libera Epoch? Europe 1830-1914	-	1	-	-	-	1
EWF 11: Imperial & Global History 1750-1930	-	-	1	4	2	7
EWF 12: The Making of Modern America since 1863	-	2	-	1	1	4
EWF 13: Europe Divided 1914-1989	1	2	-	1	1	5
EWF 14: The Global 20thC, 1930-2003	1	6	2	3	7	19
EWF theme (A) Masculinity & its Discontents, 200-2000	-	1	-	-	6	7
EWF theme (B) Technology & Culture in a Global Context, 1000-1700	1	-	2	-	1	4
EWF theme (C) Waging War in Eurasia, 1200-1945	2	-	-	1	-	3
EWF theme (D) Catholicism in the Making of the Modern World, 1545-1970	-	-	1	1	-	2

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
<b>Further Subjects</b>						
1. Anglo-Saxon Archaeology of the Early Christian period	-	-	-	1	-	1

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
2. The Near East in the Age of Justinian and Muhammad	1	-	-	-	-	1
3. The Carolingian Renaissance	-	-	-	-	-	-
4. The Crusades, 1095-1291	-	-	-	-	1	1
5. Culture and Society in Early Renaissance Italy, 1290-1348	-	-	-	-	2	2
6. Flanders and Italy in the Quattrocento, 1420–1480	-	-	-	-	-	-
7. The Wars of the Roses	-	1	-	-	1	2
8. Women, Gender & Print Culture in Reformation England, c.1530-1640	-	-	1	-	-	1
9. Literature and Politics in Early Modern England (old & new regs)	-	-	-	-	-	-
10. The Iberian Global Century 1550-1650	-	-	-	1	1	2
11. Writing in the early Modern period, 1550-1750)	-	-	1	-	-	1
12. Court, Culture & Art in Early Modern Europe, 1580-1700	-	-	1	-	-	1
13. War & Society in Britain and France, c.1650-1815	2	1	--	-	-	3
14. The Metropolitan Crucible, London 1685-1815	-	1	-	-	-	1
15. The History of Madness & Mental Healing in Global Context	-	-	-	-	-	-
16. Medicine, Empire & Improvement, 1720 to 1820	-	-	-	-	-	-
17. Constructing the First New Nation: A Political History of the United States, 1781-1803 (New)	-	1	-	-	3	4
The Age of Jefferson 1774-1826 (old regs)	-	-	-	-	1	1
18. Nationalism in western Europe	-	1	-	-	2	3
19. Intellect and Culture in Victorian Britain	-	1	1	-	-	2
20. The Authority of Nature: Race, Heredity & Crime 1800-1940	-	-	1	1	2	4
21. The Middle East in the Age of Empire	1	2	-	1	5	9
22. Transformations & Transitions in African History since c.1800	-	-	1	-	-	1
23. Imperialism and Nationalism, Sub Saharan Africa 1870-1980	-	-	-	1	-	1
24. Modern Japan, 1868–1972	-	-	-	1	-	1

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
25. Development of the World Economy since 1800 1870 (PPE)	-	14	-	-	-	14
26. Nationalism, Politics and Culture in Ireland, c. 1870–1921 (old & new regs)	-	-	-	2	1	3
27. A Global War 1914-1920	-	1	-	1	1	3
28. China since 1900	1	3	-	2	7	13
29. The Soviet Union 1924–1941	-	-	-	2	-	2
30. Culture, Politics & identity in Cold War Europe, 1945-68	1	-	-	2	1	4
31. Britain at the Movies: Film and National identity since 1914	-	-	-	1	-	1
32. Scholastic and Humanist Political thought	-	-	-	-	-	-
33. The Science of Society 1650-1800	-	-	-	-	-	-
34. Political Theory and Social Science	-	-	-	-	1	1
35. Postcolonial Historiography: Writing the (Indian) Nation	-	-	2	1	1	4
36. Modern Mexico,1876-1994 (old & new regs)	-	-	-	1	1	2

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
<b>Special Subjects (SSEE only for 2020)</b>						
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. The Norman Conquest of England	1	-	-	-	-	1
5. The Peasants' Revolt of 1381 (suspended in 2020-21)	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. Joan of Arc & her Age, 1419-1435	1	-	-	-	-	1
7. Painting & Culture in Ming China (suspended in 2020-21)	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Politics, Art & Culture in the Italian Renaissance, Venice and Florence c.1475-1525	-	-	1	-	1	-2
9. The Peasants War of 1525	-	-	-	-	-	-

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
10. The Trial of the Tudor State: Politics, Religion & Society 1540-1560	1	-	-	1	-	2
11. The Crisis of the Reformation: political thought and religious ideas, 1560-1610 (New title)	-	-	-	-	-	-
The Crisis of the Reformation: Britain, France & the Netherlands 1560-1610 (old regs)	-	-	-	-	-	-
12. The Dutch Golden Age (not running in 2020-21)	-	-	-	-	-	-
13. The Thirty Years' War	-	-	-	-	-	-
14. Scientific Movement in the Seventeenth Century	-	-	-	-	-	-
15. Revolution & Republic, 1647-1658	-	-	-	-	1	1
16. English Architecture, 1660–1720	-	-	-	-	1	1
17. Imperial Crisis & Reform, 1774-84	-	-	-	-	-	-
18. Becoming a Citizen, c. 1860-1902	1	-	-	1	-	2
19. Race, Sex & Medicine in the Early Atlantic World	-	-	-	-	2	2
20. Art and its Public in France, 1815-67	-	-	-	-	-	-
21. Race, Religion & Resistance in the United States, from Jim Crow to Civil Rights	-	-	-	1	1	2
22. Empire & nation in Russia & the USSR	-	-	-	-	-	-
. Terror & Forced Labour in Stalin's Russia (not running in 2020-21)	-	-	-	-	-	-
23. From Gandhi to the Green Revolution: India, Independence & Modernity 1939-69	1	-	-1	-	1	3
24. Nazi Germany, a racial order, 1933-45	-	-	-	2	-	2
25. France from the Popular Front to the Liberation, 1936–44	-	-	-	1	-	1
26. War and Reconstruction, 1939-45	-	-	-	-	-	-
27. Britain from the Bomb to the Beatles, 1945-67	-	-	-	2	2	4
28. Pop & the Art of the Sixties	-	-	-	-	-	-
29. The Northern Ireland Troubles 1965–1985	1	-	-	-	1	2
30. Britain in the Seventies	-	-	1	-	1	2

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
31. Neoliberalism & Postmodernism: Ideas, Politics & Culture in Europe & North America, 1970-2000	1	-	-	1	1	3
32. Revolutions of 1989	-	-	1	3	-	4
HENG Bridge Essays			14			14
HML Bridge essays				25		25
Theses	17	14	14	7	37	89
Disciplines of History	17					17
Politics theses					6	6

Examiners:

Dr P. Byrne  
 Dr C. de Bellaigue  
 Prof. P. Clavin  
 Dr H. Gittos  
 Dr S. Gunn (Chair)  
 Dr J. Parkin  
 Dr S. Skinner  
 Prof. S. Tuffnell (Secretary)

External Examiners:

Prof. T.G. Burnard, School of History, University of Leeds  
 Prof. J. Fox, Institute of Historical research, School of Advanced Study, London  
 Prof S. Hamilton, Exeter University  
 Prof N. Reinhardt, University of Durham