

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION IN HISTORY AND ECONOMICS EXAMINERS' REPORT 2024

Part I

A. Statistics

All candidates

Class	No						%					
	2024	2023	2022	2021	2019	2018	2024	2023	2022	2021	2019	2018
D	6	3	7	7	9	3	33.3	23.1	38.9	50	52.9	17.6
P	12	10	11	7	8	14	66.7	76.9	61.1	50	47.1	82.4
PP	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

All candidates, divided by male and female

Class	Number										Percentage (%) of gender									
	2024		2023		2022		2021		2019		2024		2023		2022		2021		2019	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
D	5	1	3	0	3	4	4	3	5	4	41.7	16.7	37.5	0	42.9	36.4	66.7	37.5	55.6	50
P	7	5	5	5	4	7	2	5	4	4	58.3	83.3	62.5	100	57.1	63.6	33.3	62.5	44.4	50
PP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

B. NEW EXAMINING METHODS AND PROCEDURES

- A. This year all candidates took their three-hour timed exams live in-person at Examination Schools. The European and World History papers were typed directly into Inspera.
- B. The classification rules were those used in Prelims 2019 and before.
- C. Candidates were informed directly by email in April and May.

Part II

A. GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE EXAMINATION

There were 18 candidates (12M, 6F), of whom 6 (5M, 1F) achieved a Distinction. The overall quality of candidates' answers was therefore relatively strong, especially in the History and economic history papers. The common paper, Introductory Economics, had the lowest average mark across HECO. Whilst several candidates excelled in this paper, it also attracted some notably low marks for individual candidates, depressing the overall average significantly. One context for this is that some disruption to preparations for the examination in Introductory Economics took place on the day.

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

In 2024 41.7% of male candidates obtained a Distinction, compared to 16.7% of female candidates. This is a higher discrepancy than has been observed in recent years. Given that the relatively small size of the school means that small changes in the absolute number of Distinctions by sex produces significant annual fluctuations in the relative proportions from year to year, it is difficult to draw wider conclusions from this disparity.

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

The common paper, Introductory Economics, had an average mark of 63.2, with a range from 47 to 74.

The HECO optional subject, Industrialization in Britain and France, was taught in 2023-24, and was chosen by eleven candidates (but only nine were examined). The average mark was 67.8 (66.6 last year), with a range of marks from 64 to 74.

10 of the 18 candidates took Approaches to History, and the average mark for this was 66.6 (65.3 last year), with three marks of 70 or above and a range from 61 to 74.

The HECO candidates all took a European and World History Paper, having a choice of four periods. EWP 3, 1500-1700, and EWP 4, 1815-1914 were the most popular, with two candidates taking EWP 2, 1000-1300 and one taking EWP 1, 370-900. The average mark for these was 66.1 (62.2 last year) (compared to 65.8 in the main school). The marks ranged from 60 to 75.

D. COMMENTS ON PAPERS AND INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS

The Examiners in the Introductory Economics paper report that whilst a number of candidates did very well across a good range of questions, with a number securing Distinction-level marks, there were aspects of the examination where it was possible for errors of approach to produce low marks. In particular, the examiners highlighted a poor grasp of Ricardian equivalence in question four; mistaken discussions of the Solow model in question six; and unsatisfactory scaled Venn diagrams in question eight as fertile sources of error. Candidates in future years may be well advised particularly to consolidate their understanding and application of these concepts.

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

F. Members of the Board of Examiners

Dr Joshua Bennett (Chair)
Professor Abigail Adams-Prassl
Dr Elizabeth Baldwin
Professor George Garnett