

**FINAL HONOUR SCHOOL OF ANCIENT AND MODERN HISTORY EXAMINERS'
REPORT 2024 FINAL**

Part I

A. Statistics

All candidates

Class	No						%					
	2024	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2024	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019
I	5	7	8	10	13	11	20.8	38.9	32	58.8	59	52.4
II.1	19	10	16	7	9	10	79.2	55.6	64	41.2	41	47.6
II.2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-
III	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	5.6	-	-	-	-

All candidates, divided by male and female

Class	Number										Percentage (%) of gender									
	2024		2023		2022		2021		2020		2024		2023		2022		2021		2020	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
I	2	3	5	2	4	4	8	2	9	4	20	27.2	50	25	30.8	33.3	72.7	33.3	60	57
II.1	8	11	4	6	9	7	3	4	6	3			40	75	69.2	58.3	27.3	66.7	40	43
II.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.3	-	-	-	-	-
III	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

NEW EXAMINING METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Candidates were contacted directly in October and May with the agreed classification procedures for AMH. The ancient history sub-faculty confirmed its decision not to join the History Faculty in having the thesis supervisor as second marker, and all AMH theses were marked in the traditional way.

Part II

A. GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE EXAMINATION

This was quite a large year, with 24 taking Finals (10M, 14F). There were five Firsts (2M, 3F), and 19 upper-seconds (8M, 11F), and it was felt by all examiners that overall there were fewer outstanding performances this year than in some others.

The main problems in the conduct of the examinations came from Exam Schools, from putting the wrong exam paper in front of candidates, to slow collation and sending out of exam scripts to markers. This even occurred in other subject schools where exam papers were being put on-line, which suggests simply that more and better checking of exam papers was necessary; and that a better

system, probably with more staff, is necessary for sorting out scripts and getting them to markers. Some markers were receiving scripts a week after they were sat, which played havoc with the tight marking schedule (AMH was most directly affected by this slow distribution of scripts). Individual members of staff were very helpful, and we realise more candidates sit exams elsewhere: nevertheless the smooth operation of past years was not encountered. Many problems would have been avoided had there been a straight system of checking with examiners (or Chairs) directly before the exam was sat. One or two colleagues have even suggested the return of topping.

B. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES AND BREAKDOWN OF THE RESULTS BY GENDER

Results were more balanced this year than in many previous years. Slightly more women than men got Firsts (3F, 2M): 2 out of 10 men (20%), 3 out of 11 women (27.2%).

C. DETAILED NUMBERS ON CANDIDATES' PERFORMANCE IN EACH PART OF THE EXAMINATION

It was not such an outstanding year as last, and the results on individual papers within AMH were not greatly different from those in the main school. The numbers are small enough to mean that bare averages and percentages can vary markedly between years.

All 24 candidates took the Disciplines of History paper. Their average mark was 67.1 (History main school average mark 66.9).

All candidates submitted a thesis, the average mark was 66, with marks ranging from 59 to 75. (Compared with History, where the average mark was 69.1)

Eight candidates submitted three British History essays in year 2: the average mark was 64.8, with marks ranging from 59 to 70.

All 24 candidates took a Greek or Roman History paper, average mark 67.9, with marks ranging from 59 to 72.

Sixteen candidates took a European and World History paper; the average mark was 66.7, with marks ranging from 59 to 75.

Further Subjects: 11 candidates took a History Further Subject, and 13 took an Ancient Further Subject. The first group had an average mark of 67.3 and the second 66.2.

Special Subjects: 11 candidates took a History Special Subject, and 13 took an Ancient Special Subject. The first group had average marks of 65.5 for gobbets and 66.3 for the Extended Essay; the second group had average marks of 65.4 for Paper I and 67 for Paper II.

Only two candidates took an Ancient Language paper this year.

D. COMMENTS ON PAPERS AND INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS

Numbers are too small for meaningful or anonymous comment, except for Disciplines.

Disciplines: The average mark for AMH was higher than the average for the History main school. What this levels out is the observation of markers that AMH candidates could do extremely well in this paper if prepared to think hard.

Certain questions could be easier within the AMH degree with its built in comparative angle. Many also produced disappointing answers, showing a thin knowledge of the ancient world. Answers were disappointing, for example, to questions on ritual and conformity (q.8), or the 'control of information' and imperial rule (18), where the ancient world offers rich material. Those who did best were those prepared to think conceptually across periods and who took telling and productive examples/or periods on which to base their analysis.

E. COMMENTS ON THE PERFORMANCE OF IDENTIFIABLE INDIVIDUALS AND OTHER MATERIAL WHICH WOULD USUALLY BE TREATED AS RESERVED BUSINESS

On the administrative side, I repeat here for future years the method for recording marks and comments for any papers originating in the Classics Faculty:

'Markers are now asked to complete Excel marksheets in the same way as for CAAH, Lit. Hum. and Joint schools, and to upload these to the Classics Faculty's Sharepoint site for UG examinations. Markers are to use the standard comment sheet templates available in Sharepoint for scripts in all six FHS involving Classics. However, the marking conventions for History should be used when marking Ancient History scripts in AMH.'

F. Members of the Board of Examiners

Professor Rosalind Thomas (Chair)

Professor Andrew Meadows

Dr Lewis Webb

Professor James Belich

Professor Natalia Nowakowska

Professor John Watts

Dr Hugh Doherty (External Examiner in History)

Professor Federico Santangelo (External Examiner in Ancient History)

The Chair and Board would like to thank most warmly the History Faculty office, the Classics office (especially Andrew Dixon), and all markers and the Externals for their work for this year of Finals examinations.