FHS 2022 – FINAL

History
Examiners' Report

REPORT OF THE EXAMINERS IN THE FINAL HONOUR SCHOOL
OF HISTORY 2022

A. EXAMINERS' REPORT
Overall Performance

A. EXAMINERS' REPORT

FHS 2022 saw a return to in-person examining though continuing difficulties for students and staff due to recurrent surges of corvid infection.

Overall Performance

84 candidates, or 40.8% of the cohort were awarded Firsts. This compares with 50.5% in 2021, 51.2% in 2021, 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. We have seen, therefore, a return to something like the pre-Covid marks profile.

There were 206 candidates classified, with two remaining to be classified, compared to 224 in 2021. A total of 22 candidates withdrew, compared to 24 in 2021.

122 candidates, 59.2%, were classified in the Upper Second Class, which compares with 46.9% in 2021, 50.9% in 2019, 53.2% in 2018, 61.3% in 2017, and 65.2% in 2016. No 2.2 was awarded, compared to one in 2021 and 2020. (None were awarded in 2017 or 2016). No third was awarded, compared to one in 2021. No candidate opted to graduate DDH (deemed to have deserved Honours).

MCEs from 74 candidates were considered by the boards. This resulted in remedial action being deemed appropriate in 11 cases.

Finals board was aware that while there had been a return to in-person 'normality' the candidates had dealt with considerable pandemic disruption throughout their degree and took this into account. The results indicate a resilience in the student body and robustness in colleagues' efforts to fairly mark and scrutinise.

B. REPORTS ON INDIVIDUAL PAPERS

a)   History of the British Isles

BIF 1: The Early Medieval British Isles, 300-1100
Eleven candidates sat the take-home exam and two candidates submitted portfolios. Marks ranged from 57 to 77. Two candidates received firsts, two received high 2:2s and nine received 2:1s (with marks between 62 and 68). The overall quality was thus good, but with few stellar answers.
The most popular question ('Did political expansion and centralization in the tenth and eleventh centuries require new modes of government and administration, or the extension of existing ones?') had five takers. Two questions on kingship (Q1, Q6) also attracted five answers in total and the portfolio submissions offered three further essays on English politics and kingship. The least popular questions (the changing role of women in the church and on the importance of monuments) got one answer each. Remaining questions had between two and four responses each: conversion (4), literacy (3), the legacy of Rome (3), princely burials (3), the fate of the Picts (3), Scandinavian disruption (3), ethnic identity and language (2) and archaeology and political history (2). A total of 17 questions had no takers and these topics included warfare, border zones, economy and slavery, the church and land-holding, lords and peasants, towns and the economy, East

Anglian kings, regional differences in kingship, Byzantine influence, the archaeology of the Norman conquest, the Domesday book, British history as national history and the suitability of the term 'Anglo-Saxon'. There was thus a clear preference for English kingship and politics, especially West Saxon, Kentish and Mercian; questions on East Anglian kingship and regional variation in kingship had no takers. There was very little interest in the economy, towns, land, social structures and gender. Answers were overall Anglo-centric, though the question on the Picts got three answers – which were mostly very good – and several candidates brought in Pictish, British and Irish elements, though this was rarely as sustained or detailed as the English elements.

The most impressive answers offered original and unexpected arguments, engaged with recent scholarship, paid attention to detail and dealt with the complexities and uncertainties of the evidence. Weaker essays were marked by a failure to engage fully with the question, either by not dealing with its terms, concepts or implications or by answering a slightly different question than the one set, possibly to fit an argument from a tutorial essay. This was the case with the most popular question, where several candidates were closer to answering a question on changes and continuities across the Norman conquest than one on centralization and expansion in the tenth and eleventh centuries. Essays that received the lowest marks were also characterized by a lack of chronological and geographical specificity (e.g. making general assertions about large spans of time or space or using evidence from different parts of the period indiscriminately). Some did not pay much attention to changes and variation, thus appearing to treat the period as static and uniform. Mid-ranging answers were sometimes too descriptive and didn't always engage properly with the question. For instance, the relatively popular question on kings as priests ('Should we think of kings as being more like priests than secular leaders?') got competent answers, but most needed more engagement with the concepts and implications of the question to avoid being mere descriptions of the religious aspects of kingship.

In the future, it would be good to see candidates being ambitious when choosing questions and framing their answers, using the extra time afforded by this kind of exam to pursue new lines of thought and not to play it safe.

BIF 2: The British Isles in the Central Middle Ages, 1000-1330
A total of 12 candidates submitted portfolios for this paper. There were 7 marks of 65-70; 4 marks of 60-64; and 1 mark in the 50s. In general terms, the portfolios attempted a good range of topics across the period: social, cultural, political, and economic history were all well represented, and there were also several essays focused on Scotland and Wales and one on Ireland. Questions on the conquest, Magna Carta, empire, identity and the Jewish community also proved popular choices.

The strongest candidates had clearly developed the topic beyond their tutorial essays by reading more deeply in the primary sources and secondary literature. Candidates generally performed very well if they wrote densely, making effective use of the 2,000 word limit for each essay to develop as many themes and to register as much relevant matter as possible; if they probed the terms of the questions carefully, where appropriate challenging their assumptions; if they produced thoughtful answers written with an independent voice; if they substantiated densely and precisely, displaying a clear understanding of the primary sources and using well-developed case studies to bring specific points and problems into sharp focus; and if they tried to conclude with impact, offering a clear and direct answer to the question.

Weaker candidates tended to write overly leisurely introductions lacking direction and focus, appeared to be reworking tutorial essays answering a different question, or depended too heavily on material drawn from a single lecture. The weaker essays also tended to be substantiated patchily, manifesting a weak understanding of the source base; they were prone to error; failed to see that some questions were inviting candidates to engage with important contributions in the secondary literature (e.g. Rees Davies on empire, and Alice Taylor's important book on Scotland); and tended to end their essays with summaries rather than conclusions. Essays on religious life and the church tended to focus on Anselm and Becket or the Cistercians, and 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

Twenty-five students took the take-home paper in June 2021, in less-than-ideal circumstances caused by interruptions to teaching, difficult access to libraries, and all the other challenges of Covid and lockdown. The resourcefulness of tutors, but especially of students, in this situation was remarkable. Many found digital resources and off-bibliography e-publications that enabled them to approach familiar topics from genuinely new and surprising angles. Several students submitted a Covid impact statement alongside their essays, explaining how the circumstances had – in their view – prevented them from submitting their best work. However, in no instance did this seem to have been the case. There was no apparent detrimental effect, and the students are to be congratulated for their determination and ingenuity. They are more resilient and adaptable than they perhaps believe.

Students answered on a very wide range of themes, but the most popular were women's agency (12 answers), religious dissent (7 answers), popular disorder (7 answers), architecture and collective identities (6 answers), visual arts and social status (5 answers); questions on Wales, France, kings and the law, masculinity, social control, and bastard feudalism all received 3 or 4 answers, while questions on parliament, social bonds, demographic change, models of kingship, the body, the vernacular, the classical past, monasteries, immigration, national identity, Ireland, the Wars of the Roses and the Reformation were answered only by one or two students. No-one answered on the economic life of towns, moral beliefs of the laity, trade, the nobility.

The best answers were marked by extensive and original discussions of primary sources and a keen awareness of current and older historiographical positions. The weaker essays tended to be based on very limited reading, confined to pre-2000 publications. This was disappointing. All students had access to the Faculty bibliography and online lecture materials, which together indicate an extensive and up to date reading list for canonical and marginal topics alike. Tutors may wish to update their reading lists more often, but equally there is no excuse for students accepting the sufficiency of a reading list that has not been kept up to date by a tutor. For example, rehashing the 'golden age of women' debate of the 1990s without any reference to the past 25 years of scholarship ought to ring alarm bells for any second year student. The examiners would like to see more comparison across the British Isles; any student attempting such work is likely to be rewarded.

BIF 4: Reformations and Revolutions, 1500-1700

56 candidates submitted take-home exam scripts for this paper and 3 candidates who had suspended their studies and returned submitted portfolios of tutorial essays of the sort submitted for FHS 2021. While the great majority of the questions were attempted, most answers concentrated on the period 1560-1640, on England and on politics and religion. However, some candidates tackled social history with great success, not just witchcraft, but also marriage and race. Others were thankfully not shy of wide-ranging comparisons across the islands (for example on the question about Welsh Protestantism), or of questions about inter-relationships (above all the question about Anglo-Scottish relations in the seventeenth century), or of introducing Scottish or Irish material into thematic question such as those on queenship, literacy or the public sphere. A few candidates ventured past 1660 and several past 1685, while the Henrician Reformation tempted a few others back before 1547.

The strongest answers made good use of primary material, though not to the exclusion of wider argument based on secondary literature, and prioritised cogent argument over packed information. Thoughtful comparisons that suggested a wider grasp on the themes of the paper – between Catholics and Puritans, for example, or queens and mistresses, or Elizabeth I and her siblings – also featured in such answers even when not demanded by the question. The weakest submissions rested on very limited reading, much of it in general textbooks, or largely followed the logic and evidence of a single journal article; some failed to use all the allotted 2,000 words per essay, were so unclearly written as to be hard to understand, or repeated

aspects of argument, detail and bibliography from essay to essay. Between these extremes, there were many scripts which engaged only in broad and sometimes vague ways with the question set, offering answers that were only loosely conceptualized or which failed to see clearly the point and the implications of the question. It may be that further thought and reflection on the question itself, and the issues which it raises, would have helped in these cases. Though most candidates included relevant information and showed some knowledge of the period, sustained, coherent arguments in response to the questions were rarer; this was particularly true with regard to the more conceptual questions.

Candidates showed admirable sensitivity and empathy in embracing the idea that witchcraft was a 'rational' belief – it would seem that the days of seeing this phenomenon as primitive superstition are long behind us. However, the danger of the rationality of the past being reduced to a dogma was also evident here, as very few candidates were brave enough to point out that there was actually some contemporary debate about this – not all early moderns did see witch belief as rational, ergo it is perfectly possible to argue in a more nuanced way here. This may also point to a more general discomfort with handling concepts with confidence. Terms like 'post-reformation', 'power', and 'symbolic' were often treated in a very linear way or left hazily undefined, and few candidates elected to identify hard cases which could be used to test the applicability or parameters of a concept.

Future candidates would do well to think more carefully about how different approaches to asterisked and non-asterisked questions might be taken. While solid nuts-and-bolts competence is always welcome, it is also something of a missed opportunity to showcase only this quality for questions which have considerable open-ended, creative potential. Very few candidates chose to answer asterisked questions by comparing two non-contiguous parts of the period for instance, and many contented themselves with writing fairly traditional answers about a single reign. It was also disappointing – especially given that most candidates will have done some Disciplines-Comparisons by this stage – that very little thought was given to justifying why a particular part of the period was chosen, or to what a narrower focus could tell us about wider themes and debates. As last year, some portfolios of tutorial essays (as opposed to answers to the takeaway exam questions) made a virtue of the special characteristics of the format to tackle questions that drew in impressively recent debate and detailed evidence without undue narrowness of focus, whereas others found themselves answering very broad questions that were hard to handle in 2,000 words without omission of large areas or resort to questionable generalizations.

The bibliographies deployed for some topics were strikingly dated: essays about the early reformation in particular often used little or no material published this century. Of course, some unusual features of bibliographies, where for example US doctoral theses available online appeared, but standard biographies of individuals under detailed discussion or standard works on a given topic did not, may well have been a product of the difficult circumstances in which these examinees studied in their second year and which in general they overcame to very good effect.

BIF 5: Liberty, Commerce, and Power, 1685-1830
Twenty-eight candidates took this paper, which returned to its pre-Covid portfolio format. The overall standards were very good, with eight candidates scoring 70/70+, and more than half the field registering a mark of 68 or above. Few students recorded marks below mid-2.1 level. Candidates had clearly taken on board the exhortations of previous examiners to engage questions with energy and ambition to make the most of the permitted 2,000-words. There was a pleasing range of questions attempted, and it was notable that students were ready to answer questions on both political and socio-cultural themes. They also engaged more directly with British and Irish perspectives, often producing greater clarity of argument through instructive comparative analysis. There were few essays which were not well-informed, and the bibliographies suggested that the candidates' interests had been fired by a wide range of scholarly approaches. The best essays engaged productively with the relevant historiographies, defined their terms precisely, and organised their thoughts to ensure that they covered material efficiently. Although focused, weaker scripts were less systematic in their coverage, provided less convincing evidence, and they were not able to sustain their argument over the full course of the essay. They could also be too dismissive of

possible counter-arguments, and they could sometimes overlook obvious matters of importance. Nonetheless, the examiners would commend the overall performance of the field, and they would hope that future cohorts will exhibit the same lively engagement with the rich historiography of the period.

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

28 portfolios were examined this year – 26 candidates completed the take-home exam and two candidates submitted portfolios of tutorial essays.

Of the 30 questions on the 2022 BIF6 paper, 5 elicited responses from no candidates. Aside from one question which attracted answers from over half the candidates (question 26 on the impact of empire), there was a good spread of answers among the remaining 25 questions. Questions 22 (on the impact of the Great War); 28 (on opposition to women's suffrage); and 29 (on religion) were also popular. The questions which garnered no responses were questions 4 (on childhood); 5 (on Parliament); 13 (on liberal Toryism); 18 (on Gladstone and the Liberal Party); and 27 (on the extent of Anglicisation in Scotland and/or Wales).

Students who answered on empire were able to focus on either the cultural or the economic impact of empire on Britain, and the majority chose to focus on cultural impact. The strongest answers here were able to develop sophisticated arguments about how empire impacted British life, understood that impacts and experiences differed according to class, gender, age etc, and were able to draw in considerations of subjectivity and identity formation. Less sophisticated answers tended to list a series of impacts or to organise around case-studies, which hindered the development of a coherent overall argument. Few candidates distinguished the realm of "culture" as something apart from the social, and almost all interpreted culture as synonymous with "popular culture" only. Even the strongest answers often failed to incorporate any chronology or acknowledge the changing nature of the British Empire over 1815-1924.

Failure to note change over time was common in responses to other questions, too. Another common issue was the failure to note the existence of any debate about the topics under consideration – in some instances, historical debate seemed to have concluded on a topic several decades ago. Failure to engage closely with the question at hand was also an issue, but this was largely about candidates not sufficiently unpacking the implications of the question rather than because they were producing rote or pre-prepared answers. There was a broad tendency among candidates to avoid conceptual discussion, or to refer to concepts somewhat haphazardly. For instance, while there were many excellent answers on questions of gender, suffrage, and sexuality, weaker answers on these topics tended to treat gender as the sole axis of consideration. Weaker answers in general also tended to adopt quite schematic and one-sided arguments, reflecting an uncertain command of the evidence and inattentiveness to its complexities. Strong answers were able to show good logic for selecting material for discussion and conveyed a sense of the British Isles in this period as a dynamic place.

Indeed, the overall standard of this batch of scripts was high – examiners awarded First-class marks to 14 out of a total 28 scripts, and some of the 14 who did not achieve a First-class mark overall produced individual answers that showed great distinction. This demonstrates that students are preparing well for these exams but is no doubt also a reflection of the opportunity that the 10-day exam window affords candidates to undertake additional targeted reading. Even candidates who did not engage as consistently with the terms of the question as they could have produced evidence – including primary evidence – that was relevant to the question and elevated the quality of their responses.

While the effective use of primary evidence is part of the rubric for this paper and candidates were rewarded for deploying such evidence judiciously, the examiners wondered whether all candidates were aware that this was something they ought to pay some attention to. This mode of assessment is not intended to create another research-based piece of assessed work, but rather to reflect the nature of weekly tutorial essays. The examiners recognise that there is no one-size-fits-all approach to writing a good portfolio essay. But given that the use of primary evidence is included within the marking criteria for the portfolio exercise, it may be helpful if BIF6 reading lists could offer more consistent encouragement to candidates to incorporate primary source material into their answers to ensure equity among all candidates. Tutors may also wish to offer guidance on how best to incorporate and to reference this material within the context of the portfolio assessment.

BIF 7: Changing Identities, 1900 to the present
Sixty candidates submitted portfolios for this paper. It was striking that while most of the questions tempted at least one response, a small number proved particularly popular. These included, 'Did motherhood disempower women?' and 'How much did migrants have in common?' – indicating an appetite for looking at social inequalities linked to sex and race. Questions on social issues such as religion, the impact of war on class inequality and sexual morality, also attracted a high number of answers, but so too did political questions on Labour's ideology and the Conservative Party's appeal to working class voters. This year, again, only a very small number of candidates answered the questions on Scotland and Northern Ireland, suggesting persistent reluctance to look in depth at different parts of the British Isles. The questions on Europe also received limited interest. However, portfolios did show a pleasing range of interests and the calibre was generally high. About a third of candidates secured a First-Class mark and a little over a sixth gained a very high 2.i. Just over a sixth gained a lower 2.i and nobody got less than 60. This means all the candidates got a 2.i or higher, with half getting a top 2.i or First-Class. The less successful answers were descriptive rather than analytical in their approach, or they made general assertions without referring to specific scholarship and evidence to substantiate their claims. Weaker essays frequently lacked an independent perspective, failing to evaluate the secondary scholarship that was used. They also tended to lack precision, through ambiguity in their handling of core concepts (for instance concerning class or race), or by failing to refer to institutions and processes of change with specificity and depth. Another feature of less effective answers was narrowness in their focus. Conversely, over ambitions essays tried to cover too much and lacked the depth and rigor of a top-level answer. Some candidates had a tendency to load their answers. Bernard Porter's scepticism of the idea that imperialism dominated the public sphere was often cited in order to be rather summarily dismissed, but there was rarely evidence that it had really been read and understood. Answers of 'race relations' were effective in showing the persistence and weight of racism but paid little attention to contrary factors of amelioration and tolerance. There was little comparison to the race relations of other European counties. The best essays showed independent and imaginative, as well as informed engagement with the precise terms of the set questions. They characteristically demonstrated critical assessment of the relevant historiography; indeed, some candidates showed really impressive critical reading of relevant recent scholarship and used this judiciously to structure their arguments. The most effective answers extended this level of independent understanding and judgement to justify focussing the essay on a well-chosen selection of themes, which enabled the candidate to balance breadth of coverage with detailed and complex analysis within the 2,000 word limit. Really successful answers included incisive introductions and conclusions that explained their approach, making explicit the conceptual sophistication and originality in their arguments. Another feature, which elevated essays, was that some candidates went beyond drawing their evidence from the primary sources they encountered in the secondary literature and showed initiative as well as skill in analysing primary sources they had researched for themselves, including visual material such as advertisements and popular culture such as music lyrics and film, as well as statistical data and political documents. This frequently produced lively and original responses to the questions. Finally, while a very few portfolios suffered from obvious lack of breadth in their knowledge, with some resorting to writing their three essays on overlapping topics, the most compelling portfolios used their choice of essays to convey wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of the paper, by including discussion of different periods and places as well as political, social and cultural themes. At the end of the day, it was very clear when candidates had approached the paper with intellectual curiosity and diligence and this paid off in their ability to present an exciting portfolio in the exam.
(Aurelia Annat and Marc Mulholland)

BIT (a) Bodies of Feelings: gender and sexual identity since c.1500
There were thirty-one candidates who studied the paper in 2021-2. Eleven gained first class marks, and there were no marks below 60. Twenty-two out of thirty questions were attempted. The most popular questions were on sex education (answered by 35 per cent of candidates), sexual desire between women

(answered by 32 per cent of candidates), and motherhood (answered by 29 per cent of candidates). There were also three candidates who submitted a portfolio of essays, having studied the paper in 2019-20 (when it was cancelled).

The candidates showed encouraging engagement with the paper's central challenge of thinking about continuity and change across more than 500 years. The examiners were impressed by candidates' ambition in connecting knowledge from different time periods. The strongest answers also thought about regional variation across the British Isles. This was particularly strong in the answers on homosexuality and on the impact of industrial labour on gender inequality. Many answers that relied primarily on cultural evidence needed to think more about how ideas were communicated and some focused on imperial experiences needed to consider diversity across the British empire.

Questions often encouraged candidates to draw together a wide variety of evidence. Answers were most successful when candidates thought about, and contextualised, the sources they were using. Answers on the impact of the Reformation on sexuality and on eighteenth-century understandings of the body explored the nature of the fragmentary source material more effectively than many of the answers on the modern period. Answers on industrial labour were strongest when candidates were able to analyse quantitative data as well as drawing on personal testimony.

The essays all showed serious, lively, and independent engagement with the paper. First-class answers engaged critically with the concepts and methodologies used by historians and suggested by the question. Some of the weaker answers used concepts like 'patriarchy' or 'the state' without interrogating what this meant analytically or in specific time periods. The most original answers brought together a large amount of reading with relevant primary sources to offer stimulating new perspectives on this scholarship.

BIT (b): The Making and Unmaking of the UK, 1603-present (*suspended in 2021-22*)

   b) EUROPEAN AND WORLD HISTORY

EWF 1: The World of Late Antiquity, 250-650
There were seven candidates. Of these one achieved a first-class mark; the others upper-second, with three in the high range (69, 68, 68). Despite the number of candidates the range of questions attempted was good. Questions 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 15, 18, 24, 25, 26, and 27 were all attempted. Perhaps understandably, because of a surge of interest in pandemics and environmental history, question 25 (on 'catastrophe'), was the most popular question (5 answers), although some candidates framed their answers to that question in unexpected ways. Question 18, on the impact of religious change on women, was also popular, attracting three answers.

The best essays thought through the semantics of each question; approached the question from a number of angles, often imaginatively; organised their arguments clearly; deployed an appropriate range of scholarship and sources; and were not afraid to range in space and time. Weaker essays made too many assumptions about the drive of questions; sometimes forced those questions in directions which did not provide a sufficiently direct answer; and made too limited use of source materials or examples.

The quality overall was very good, and no single answer was given a mark below upper second. In previous years there was some anxiety on the part of the assessors that candidates were not sufficiently conversant with extra-European societies, but that was far from the case this year. Most candidates included extra-European perspectives, and it was gratifying to see candidates engaging detailed comparanda from Sasanian Iran, the early Islamic Middle East, Central Asia, and China.

EWF 2: The Early Medieval World, 600-1000
Three students sat this paper, with a mark spread (Mean average) of 63, 64, and 70. The exam required students to select and answer three essay questions. Issues of planning and time management clearly

emerged for two candidates, whose marks declined with each essay: 68, 64, 60 and 68, 66, 64. This is something that might be addressed in guidance to future cohorts. The strongest paper also had the three highest single marks, with no drop in performance, with 72, 68, 74. Perhaps more interestingly, no two students answered the same question, which is evidence of a broad range of interest in and engagement with the material and themes introduced.

In terms of the strongest and weakest responses, the best essays managed to demonstrate a depth of thought and reading across a wide range of relevant examples, also evidencing an ability to find points of contact across period and space. In contrast, the less successful essays were limited in their engagement with both primary and secondary material and failed to really draw out the significance of their case studies. Again, for two of the candidates this possibly had something to do with poor planning, given that each managed to produce a 68 for their first response.

Overall this an impressive result, with no mark lower than a (marginal 2:1). Most impressive is the range of cases discussed, from Charlemagne and the Vikings to the Mongols and Bulgars. The spread of essay questions selected is also evidence that students are not being guided towards or gravitating towards a narrow range of more traditional examples but are applying their knowledge to diverse and novel subjects.

EWF 3: The Central Middle Ages, 500-1500
Nine candidates sat this paper in TT2022, two of whom received first class results. Approximately half of the questions on the paper were attempted by at least one candidate. The most popular question (six answers) concerned ruling elites and how they secured their subjects' loyalty. Four candidates answered on the preference of institutions for 'reform' rather than 'change', while three wrote on heresy. All other questions that were answered were answered either by one or by two candidates. This suggests a pleasing spread of interest across the paper's broad concerns. Candidates tackled a broad geographical range in their answers, navigating quite well the broadly framed questions. It is important to remember that because this is a double-badged paper, the questions are written in such a way as to enable candidates to draw on any relevant examples that they please. This does *not* mean that answers should be framed in a vague or general way, but that a good explanation should be offered at the outset for why the candidate thinks the question is usefully illuminated by the specific material that they intend to use in their answer. On the whole this was done well, but it bears repeating as a fundamental element of how this paper is taught and examined. The expansiveness of this paper is designed to allow students to focus on different topics and regions, but they should still do so with the usual clear and detailed sense of historiographical considerations and primary sources for their different example.
(Amanda Power)

EWF 4: The Global Middle Ages, 500-1500
This was the third year in which this course was examined. There were 14 takers, of whom 7 achieved a first-class result, and 7 a 2:1 grade. Popular questions included those on disease, landscape as archive, maritime connections, nomads, writing, zomias and trade. This year's markers were very encouraged by the cohort's performance. Not only did more students take the paper than in the first two years of its existence, but the standard of overall performance was, with rare exceptions, very high, particularly so for a paper with such broad chronological, geographical and thematic parameters. Candidates with the strongest marks deployed a variety of strategies astutely: subtle critique of specialist historiography; the integration of carefully selected and relevant case studies; and direct interpretation of primary sources (material as well as written). As ever, to do well it was important for candidates to answer the question set as opposed to that which they had tackled in a tutorial essay. The standard of performance suggests that this paper is offering very bright students the opportunity to engage with complex and demanding historical concepts while also allowing them to become familiar with geographical regions and evidence bases which are not at the heart of the other EWF papers. The Global Middle Ages is an idea and a period still in its infancy as a subject of historical enquiry; it was very cheering to see so many takers of the paper rising to its challenges and developing insightful and in some cases original arguments under examination conditions.

EWF 5: The Late Medieval World, 1300-1525

Twelve students took the paper this year. The exam questions were almost all framed permissively in terms of geography and precise chronological focus. Students took advantage of this to discuss everything from the early-fourteenth to the mid-sixteenth century, deploying material relating to Western Europe, the Ottoman Empire, Ming China and the Islamic World. There was episodic use of case studies from Japan and Africa (though nothing south of the Mediterranean coast), but no mention of the Americas or – more surprisingly – Eastern Europe (bar the Hussites) and the Orthodox Christian world. The paper is open to geographical diversity, and students can feel confident that any regional focus will be accommodated by the paper. The most popular questions were those on the regional effects of epidemic disease (9 answers), popular rebellions (7 answers), empires (four answers) and religious belief (four answers). Questions on political ideas, learning and education, gender identity, architecture, slavery, religion and warfare, race, and women's lives all received at least one answer. In general, the answers to less popular questions were better, the students seeming to be more capable of flexible thinking and more up to date in their reading. Students tackling canonical topics ought to make sure they are prepared for questions other than the one they wrote on for a tutorial essay, and that they have used their own initiative to find good secondary literature. Students struggled in particular to come up with regional comparisons when discussing the effects of the Black Death, and a surprising number of answers on rebellions did not engage with the secondary literature on popular politics as dialogue. There were no answers on political persuasion, death, cities, trade, aristocracies, art, discovery, the military state, literature, elite women, nomads, confederations, or the princely court. Given that the evidence suggests better results for students following a more personal suite of interests, we hope that others will take up this opportunity in future.

EWF 6: Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700

Twenty-three candidates sat this paper in 2022, and four gained first-class results, the rest achieving 2i's – a mark profile not significantly different from the two previous years of 'open book' exams. Ten of the thirty topics were not answered by any candidate, though some of the topics neglected had been answered by numbers of candidates in previous years. For example, a question on Poland-Lithuania which had no takers this year offers an instructive case of the role of lectures in this EWF course, since in previous years when a relevant lecture has been scheduled, questions on P-L attracted 3-4 answers, some of high quality.

The most popular questions were on the Catholic Reformation (10 answers), women's status and the household (8), Spain's greatness/decline (8), violence in the French Wars of Religion (6), Protestantism (5), and visual arts/material culture (5). There were 4 answers each on witch persecution, princely courts, popular revolts, and European attitudes to indigenous peoples. All of these questions were framed by the examiners in specific terms, and the besetting weakness of many of the answers was a reluctance to engage with this specificity. This was especially egregious in answers to the Catholic Reformation question, where the majority of candidates had seemingly not considered that lay elites (beyond rulers) might have any engagement with the reformation process, apparently entirely driven by the religious orders and a better-educated clergy. Numbers of low 2i and 2ii marks were given out for essays on the 'Catholic Reformation' which simply ignored any detail – or even the implications – of lay involvement. Similar problems were evident in the essays which discussed women's status in broad political, social and economic terms, but hardly bothered to consider the household as a forum for influence and status. Given the number of scripts tackling these questions, those candidates who did engage fully with the question not only gained far higher marks, but ensured that the deficiencies of weaker essays were especially apparent. Even when candidates were deploying substantial factual and historiographical knowledge, they often failed to demonstrate rigorous focus on the precise terms of the question which would have

gained them first-class marks. Six candidates fell just short of a first with marks of 68/69, and in most of these cases stronger direct engagement with the question would have taken them over the line.

EWF 7: Eurasian Empires. 1450-1800
Twenty-seven students sat the paper this year. Only five candidates achieved overall marks of 70 or above. This is a significant drop when compared to the previous years and may partially depend on the fact that most of these finalists did not sit exams in Prelims. Candidates attempted all questions from Section A (States and regions), except for q. 4 on West and Central Africa, q. 11 on Early British India, and q. 13 on Mainland Southeast Asia. There was a general preference for the so-called Islamic empires in Asia, with 8 answers to the question about the Mughals, 5 to that about the Heirs of Tamerlane, 3 for the Ottomans and 3 for the Safavids. The Iberian world also proved attractive, with both q. 1 on the Portuguese empire and q. 2 on the Incas, the Aztecs and the Spanish in the Americas being attempted by four candidates each. The remaining topics (the Dutch empire; Japan; Muscovy and the Russian empire) got two answers each, while only one student addressed q. 9 about Ming and Qing China. It can be hoped that the decline of interest in this topic is just fortuitous. Meanwhile, it should be noticed that while the rubric requires students to answer at least one question from Section B (Themes), candidates showed a strong preference for the second part of the exam paper, with c. 75% of them who opted for two questions from Section B (one candidate answered three questions from this section). This may perhaps indicate a shift of interest from the study of empires in isolation to that of processes and dynamics which occurred across them. If confirmed in the future, this shift may perhaps encourage tutors to rethink the balance between the typology of topics they teach and even slightly to update the lecture circus so to include more themes. Be that as it may, most of the answers to questions from Section B related to a limited set of topics, namely Gender and sexuality (7); Global early modernity (6); the Expansion of Christianity and Islam (6); Astrology, astronomy and millenarianism (6); and Cultural encounters, commensurability and early ethnography (4). Popularity, however, was not synonym for better preparation, as was demonstrated by the rather low quality of most of the answers to the question on Gender and sexuality. Three of the remaining topics from Section B (State responses to religious pluralism and changes; Imperial mentality and legitimacy; and Economic growth) were attempted by 3 candidates, while q. 21 about Ethnicity, patriotism and anti-imperial rebellions got 2 answers. All other questions had 1 answer each, except for those about Trading networks and violence in the Indian Ocean and Early modern consciousness, which found no answers.

EWF 8: Enlightenments and Revolutions: Europe 1680-1848 (Old and new syllabus)
Thirteen candidates sat the two papers, set on the old and new regulations, the vast majority under the new regulations. Three firsts, all on 70; five 2i's, a confirmed 2ii, and the rest sent to the external. Most to the 2i's were in the upper range of marks, over 66, and of good standard. Three scripts went to the external.
The examiners were concerned about the narrow range of questions chosen, and the even narrow breadth of knowledge shown in the answers. Only sixteen questions were attempted. Most confined themselves to France, Prussia, Russia and the Habsburg Monarchy. However, the examiners found it particularly worrying that Prussia was interpreted as a 'small state' in many answers to Question 11, which was answered by seven candidates, a clear sign of how limited their knowledge of the period was. The examiners allowed this as legitimate, which did much to raise the marks. No candidate answered a non-European question. There is a clear preference among the candidates for a purely European paper.

EWF 9: From Independence to Empire: America 1763-1898
24 candidates took EWF9 this year, nine were awarded Firsts and the remainder 2.1s. As a whole, the scripts were lively and engaging, well-informed, and engaged the questions directly. Candidates were also historiographically aware, often positioning themselves in and amongst the field carefully and, at their best, showing the significance of historian's historical interventions. Responses that fell flat were often too descriptive, covering a good range of events and demonstrating sound knowledge without developing a detailed close analysis. Here, the careful deployment of case studies might be beneficial in helping candidates to square the circle of breadth of engagement and depth of analysis.

Although there was some clustering in candidate's responses around certain topics, a good range of questions were answered. In fact, only six of the 30 questions were not attempted. Interestingly, half of these were on topics from the late nineteenth century (17, 18, 19), which likely indicates student preferences in the paper generally and the tendency to develop a strong narrative around slavery and emancipation across the paper and another around US imperialism. Student interests and the importance of some topics to the paper naturally resulted in some clustering, e.g. Q7 and Q27 on slavery and indigenous power were answered by almost half the candidates (12 and 11 respectively). Four candidates also answered Q5, showing clear interests in slavery. Those answering Q7 often engaged carefully with the histories of gender and the body in American slavery, developing sophisticated analysis; there was less evidence of candidate's brining in gendered approaches on other topics though there were opportunities.

   This was the first year in which "Section C. Themes" was compulsory. Only one of the theme questions was not answered (Q30), while Q27 was a clear preference, but the spread was more even between the others. These answers tended to be strong and afforded candidate's the opportunity to engage imaginatively with the material they had prepared on core topics.

EWF 10: The European Century, 1820-1925
8 candidates took this paper. 1 achieved a first, 6 got a 2:1 mark, and 1 candidate received a 2:2.
Candidates chose widely from the 28 questions available.
Excellent scripts provided nuanced yet clear discussions of 3 questions, and candidates often showed awareness of recent scholarship. Weaker answers struggled to establish causality, were vague on agency, or failed to address the question, but instead discussed a (more or less) related topic.

EWF 11: Imperial & Global History 1750-1930
Demand for this paper has remained steady in recent years. In 2022 19 candidates sat the exam, plus two others who were listed as taking the paper but who did not sit the exam. Of the 21 students listed, 11 were in Joint Schools, a slightly higher proportion than last year. The proportion of candidates achieving a first class mark (9) was a little higher than last year. 10 candidates achieved an upper 2:1; no candidate achieved a mark below 65 (there were three scripts at 65 exactly). The essays were of a consistently high standard across the paper, and there were some superb individual essays on gender, orientalism, nineteenth-century China, Islamic revivalism, and the 1857 Indian uprising. As in previous years, there was quite a bit of clustering. The most popular question in Section A, by quite some distance, was that on gender (answered by 12 candidates); the question on racism was answered by 6 candidates. This means that of the 28 essays written on Section A questions, 18 were on only two of the 14 questions available. This is a striking instance of clustering, and is presumably at least partly a reflection of the way the paper is covered in college tutorials, as well as reflecting prevailing thematic interests. All other Section A questions attracted one or two answers, or none (5 questions). In Section B, the question on Japan attracted the most answers (6), which was also the case last year; otherwise, Section B answers were more evenly spread, with 4 essays on China's nineteenth century, and 3 each on Christianity, the Black Atlantic, the 1857 uprising, the Ottomans, and Islamic revivalism. There were 5 unanswered questions, including 3 which spilled over onto the fourth page of the paper: the latter were on topics (the Scramble for Africa, Indian nationalism, and anticolonial resistance) which we would normally expect to attract at least some interest, suggesting perhaps that candidates missed the fact that questions 27-29 were on the final page. Finally, it is worth noting that, in contrast with the past couple of years, there was much more of a balance between the thematic Section A (28 answers) and the place-specific Section B (29).

EWF 12: The Making of Modern America since 1863
42 candidates sat the European and World 12, America since 1863 paper in the 2021-2022 Academic Year. This included six joint schools students. 11 candidates received marks in the first-class range, 29 candidates received Upper Second Class classification, and two candidates received Lower Second Class classifications.

The spread of question responses was a little narrower than is the norm for this paper – 22 questions attracted responses, while eight questions had no takers. The questions on Jim Crow, Reconstruction, the Second Red Scare, the Civil Rights Movement, American imperialism, Reconstruction, and the New Deal were particularly popular. The questions that addressed post-1960s developments were also popular. The asterisked questions attracted fewer takers than usual. Here, students should be mindful that the thematic questions are synoptic in nature and invite them to think expansively across their topics of study. Because of this, there are clear opportunities with the asterisked questions to furnish the reader with a response that offers a novel and interesting interpretation (qualities inherent in the very strongest essays).

On the whole, the exams scripts were strong, and demonstrated a detailed knowledge and understanding of the historical specifics. Most responses were rich in evidence and told the reader a great deal about the broader topic. Many responses also included reference to historiography. The very best responses mentioned historiography, but also situated the response (and student's own focussed argument) within the interpretative landscape discussed. Similarly, the responses that consistently achieved high marks were those that offered a multi-faceted and nuanced response to the question set. The highest quality responses were all tailored to the specifics and offered a clear, thoughtful 'take' which demonstrated original analytical thinking and interpretative boldness.

EWF 13: Europe Divided, 1914-1989

Twenty-eight candidates took this paper, and were required to answer one question from each section. It was pleasing to see candidates answer a wider range of questions across all three sections of the paper than the FHS 2022-2021. While many answers in 'Section A: 1914-1945' focused on revolutions, ethno-nationalism, and genocidal violence, questions relating to the social consequences of the two world wars, the outcomes of the Paris Peace conference, and the Allies' access to resources produced some of the better answers. Among the best were those which drew across Europe for their examples, be it by drawing evidence from the Baltic states in the North, to territories of the former Ottoman empire in the south. Where relevant they also showed good awareness and understanding of Europe's place in a changing, global world. Weaker answers tended to focus overly on Germany and Russia, and to travel time-worn arguments, material and literature, including references to 'recent texts' which were published in the 1980s. They were also quite general or vague in their use of supporting evidence, and often gave the impression of attempting to reiterate a tutorial essay rather than seeking to engage fully with the intellectual opportunities which the question posed on the paper opened up. There was a tendency in questions relating to ethno-nationalism and social and ethnic divisions to treat religious, ethnic and statehood categories as mutually exclusive when they are not. It is perfectly possible, for example for a Jew to be citizen of Poland and an ethnic German all at the same time. Nor are historians' opinions the same thing as historical evidence. Answers in 'Section B: 1945-1989' were equally well distributed this year; only two topics solicited no answers: the role of International and non-governmental organizations in shaping the lives of people and states, and the retreat of the welfare state. In this section, the geographic range narrowed markedly, with examples drawn largely from the histories of the two Germanies, and France, with the exception of the question on communism where the best answers drew on detailed knowledge of Romanian, Bulgarian and Yugoslavian history. 'Section C: Themes' produced some wonderfully rich, insightful answers on the limits of consumption to assuage political discontent, the history of the arts, and the effects of exposure to violence on individuals and communities. The best answers here ranged broadly in terms of geography and time. It is important to remember that theme answers (unless specified otherwise) require candidates to range across the period as a whole. Weaker answers tended to focus on the period solely after 1945. The question on organized religion was also popular, particularly in relation to Judaism and Islam. The best answers recognized doctrinal, as well as geographic diversity. What secularism comprised was generally less well-developed in all the answers. There was less variety in this section, with five questions (history of youth/teenagers; globalization; humanitarianism and/or peace activism; entertainment; and the 'end' of revolutions) eliciting no answers. The two answers to the 'question of Europe as a continent on the move' did not recognize the reference (Gatrell) signalled the question was about refugees and the history of population displacement, but they produced effective answers nevertheless.

EWF 14: The Global 20th Century, 1930-2003

Forty-six candidates took this paper, with joint schools of History and Politics comprising the largest joint schools' cohort. The rubric requires candidates to answer three questions from at least two sections, one of which must be from 'Section C: Global Themes'. Candidates are reminded the chronological divides of all the sections are permissive – not restrictive. In Sections B the best answers took this as an opportunity, for example, to take a nuanced approach to analysing major religions, such as Islam, to articulate social and political difference. Equally, thematic answers for Section C need to range broadly across the entire chronology of the paper. While the strongest answers in this compulsory section demonstrated breadth of coverage, and precision in analysis on a range of diverse topics, including consumer culture, modern humanitarianism, and mass violence, many focused, seemingly by accident more than design, on the period after 1944. This was particularly notable in relation to the most popular question: people's participation in mass violence. It was pleasing to note the wide range of questions answered in all three sections. In Section C, human rights, the global 1960s, and sexual liberation remained popular, only the questions relating to the technological revolution and neoliberalism went unanswered. As in 2021, less popular topics often elicited the best answers, and it is gratifying to note rising engagement with questions relating to natural resources, international development, and overpopulation. In Sections A and B, most questions also captured at least one answer, with the best ones working hard to engage fully with the terms of the question. Especially impressive were answers on the still popular topic of the Second World War which engaged as much with the implications of a 'final rivalry' as with imperialism. In Section A, other popular topics included the origins of the Cold War, international cooperation, the practices of postcolonial states, and the end of Bretton Woods. In Section B, the end of the Cold War, global challenges, and anti-globalization drew the majority of answers. The range of case studies was impressive, with all parts of the world drawn into the mix, in conceptually strong, empirically well-evidenced, and tightly argued answers. Candidates in the History and Politics joint schools are reminded history papers invite them to engage and evaluate historical evidence and not rival theories about concepts and causality (although political science shaped some excellent critical engagement with the terms of the question in some answers)

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

20 candidates took the examination; four gained first class marks, fifteen upper second marks (mostly upwards of 64), and one a high 2.2 mark. There were 25 questions on the paper, in contrast to previous years. This was at the request of the Board, in order to bring the number of questions on the paper into line with those on the Outline papers. In the event, ten questions went unanswered. Of the fifteen that did attract answers, the most popular were those on queerness, homosociality, race, empire, and warfare.

As in previous years, the level of engagement with the material, both conceptual and substantive, was exhilarating. Candidates rose to the challenge of this paper, developing cogent arguments in relation both to gender theory and to particular case studies. Answers ranged happily across medieval, early modern, and modern contexts, showing control of specific material in broad comparative frameworks.

Future students and their teachers might devote some of their energies in two areas. One, theoretical precision: answers in particular on queer masculinity tended towards equating 'queer' with 'gay' or 'male homosexual'. This narrowed what these answers could achieve. The second area for possible improvement is source criticism: candidates should welcome the chance to discuss the limits and the potential of the primary sources they are using. This would only enhance the power of the comparisons they are making.

This is a paper that looks to encourage a combination of risk and precision. The best answers were those that showed curiosity and creativity with attention to detail in responding to the questions. Less successful were those that 'played it safe' by sticking to a rehearsed script. The less ventured, the less gained; conversely, high risk, high return.

EWT (B) Global Networks of Innovation, 1000-1700: China, Islam and the Rise of the West

This year was the first time that the paper has been offered under its revised designation (replacing the previous title, 'Technology and Culture in a Global Context, 1000-1700'). Students attended tutorials in Michaelmas, Hilary and Trinity terms, while also attending eight lecture and discussion seminars in Trinity. A much larger cohort of candidates is expected for the Trinity 2023 exam, as increased interest in this relatively new paper develops.

Three candidates sat for the exam (a fourth candidate withdrew beforehand on grounds of ill-health). By comparison with marks last year, this group wrote impressive essays, two of which were deemed to be worthy of a first (the third student wrote answers at a high II.1 level).

Students had the option of answering three questions from a list of twenty-six. Two questions were answered by two of the candidates (numbers 9 and 20); these were: 'how did the making and us of glass differ in the Islamic and European worlds before 1500?' and 'what were clocks used for in Eurasia besides timekeeping?' The responses of the students who attempted these questions were both technically rich and historiographically sophisticated, and they were assessed at the low end of the First Class range.

The outstanding essay of this group, which was awarded 85, addressed the question, 'what were the differences in the use of gunpowder between Asia and Europe up to 1700?' This answer showed an impressive knowledge of the history of military innovation and it engaged with a number of other course topics, including transcultural exchanges, alchemy and engineering. Other answers addressed the transmission of Islamic technologies to Europe; the question of the 'rise of the West' within the Eurasian context; and the worldviews of Western individuals responsible for technological innovations. The markers of the exam scripts noted that students had avoided questions that had been popular in the past, such as alchemy, navigation and the nature and effect of paper and printing innovations.

EWT(C) Waging War-in Eurasia

Last year I insisted on the urgent necessity of returning to invigilated, in-person exams, not least because of a nasty case of plagiarism. Thankfully this year we did so, and the integrity of the assessment process has thus been restored.

Seven finalists registered for the paper and six actually sat it this year. The spread of marks was more limited than in 2021, with none below 65, and only one first-class mark of 72. Three scripts received marks of 67, reflecting solid but not quite first-class performances. The spread of questions answered differed from last year but was closer to 2020, as four out of six candidates answered question 1 on the Mongols. Question 15 (on operation Barbarossa) was less popular than usual, with only two candidates choosing to answer it, the same number who answered Question 8 on Napoleon's invasion of Russia. I was satisfied to see one excellent answer on Ottoman warfare, and one on the Qing conquest of Inner Asia. Of the thematic questions (no candidate attempted more than one of these) the most popular was question 18 on the military divergence, which three candidates answered, with two choosing question 23 on Mackinder and one question 16 on logistics.

Overall the standard was satisfactory, with the two most substantial differences of opinion among the examiners (in both cases between 65 and 70) perhaps contributing to the evenness of the marks awarded, which were almost all in the high 60s. As the numbers were small this year it is hard to draw any clear conclusions from this. As might be expected apart from eliminating plagiarism the effect of a return to handwritten, invigilated exams is greater clarity of argument, spontaneity and fluency, but a reduction in the volume and detail of evidence.

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

Six students sat the exam in 2022, two fewer than in 2021. The overall quality of the answers was also lower, with only two students securing an overall mark of 70, one 68, and the other three in the middle of Upper Seconds. The most popular question was that on twentieth-century peace movements, which got 3 answers, with mission, family and the Church's attitude to the Third Reich being addressed by two

candidates each. The other questions that were attempted at least by one candidate covered a disparate range of topics (Ways of dying; Art; Sexuality; Nation building; Women's empowerment; Conversion in early modern Asia; Late nineteenth century social teachings; and Papal politics) and it's difficult to provide an overall assessment of the students' choices. It can be said, nonetheless, that the long chronological reach of the paper was clearly a challenge for some of them, who attempted period-focused questions whenever possible.

C) FURTHER SUBJECTS

FS 1: Anglo-Saxon Archaeology c. 600-750; Society and Economy in the early Christian period
Not requested (too few candidates)

FS 2: The Near East in the Age of Justinian and Muhammad, 527-c.700
Twelve candidates took the paper this year, spread across History, Ancient and Modern History, History and Economics, and History and Modern Languages. Three candidates were awarded agreed marks of 70 or above, eight candidates obtained marks from 60-69, and one candidate a mark of 59. The candidates answered a good spread of questions – no 11 on Miaphysites was the most popular, and only questions 3, 10 and 12 attracted no answers. As usual, the candidates who did less well had written essays that did not address the question posed in the paper, while the candidates who achieved high marks engaged fully with the questions, provided nuanced interpretations of them, and wrote thoughtful and sophisticated reflections supported by detailed source analysis.

FS 3: The Carolingian Renaissance
Not requested (too few candidates)

FS 4: The Crusades, c. 1095-1291
14 candidates sat the paper. The cohort was offered a revision session in the first half of Trinity Term by the current convenor (CH), the previous convenor (CT) having retired in the period since most students attended classes (HT2021). Most performances in the examination clustered in the mid- to high-2.1 range. Three candidates secured an agreed First class mark. There were no 2.2.s. 12 of the 14 questions on the paper received at least one response. Particularly popular questions were those on the Capetian narratives and Villehardouin. Perhaps because this is a paper to which students return in revision after a period focusing on Special Subject and thesis sources, many candidates tend to focus primarily on the Section A text-focused questions. Answers for these Section A questions ranged from the competent to the very good, with the better scores coming from those candidates who able to support their case with precise reference to the set texts rather than from a derivative presentation of relevant debates in the secondary literature - although those debates are still important, and candidates can intervene effectively in them if they know their texts well. Our principal observation is that candidates should not fear Section B. The questions here are certainly more open-ended, but their greater scope is an opportunity to score well. Answering broad and demanding questions through thoughtful engagement with primary sources and significant modern scholarship is a high-level skill which markers of the paper recognise and reward.

FS 5: Culture and Society in Early Renaissance Italy, 1290-1348
This was an exceptionally strong year, with 6 out of 12 candidates being given first-class marks. What was particularly impressive about these scripts was their combination of a detailed reading of the set-texts (and images) with judicious generalization about the broader themes and controversies they contain. Only one candidate chose not to write an essay on Dante; only one candidate received a mark lower than 60. Otherwise, the range and quality of the answers attempted suggest a real, and gratifying, engagement with the intellectual challenges of this paper.

FS 6: Flanders and Italy in the Quattrocento, 1420-1480

A relatively large cohort, by comparison with previous years, of nine candidates sat for the exam. In general their marks were very good, which compare with results in previous exams. Five of the students wrote impressive essays deemed worthy of a first, whereas two students earned marks at the high II.1 level. Three students wrote answers that ranged in quality from a high II.1 to a II.2, resulting in overall marks at a low-medium II.1 level.

Students answered three questions in a list of fourteen, arranged in two sections that addressed, respectively, (A) fundamental topics and (B) analytical problems. For the first section, all of the students discussed Rogier van der Weyden's pictorial strategies, developing in most cases their best answers on the exam, whereby sophisticated pictorial methods were assessed within their social contexts. The other popular question, though with mixed results among six students, requested an analysis of the devotional quality of Netherlandish painting, by contrast with pietistic approaches in Italian painting. Four students were also relatively prepared to discuss the influence of Italian patronage on Netherlandish painting. The outstanding essay in this group, awarded an 80, addressed technical innovations in painting as well as mercantile activity in sophisticated historiographical assessments that, overall, located those very specific developments within their broader contexts. Among questions avoided by students that were popular in the past, topics included the patronage of Netherlandish musicians, the different regions influenced by Netherlandish painting, some of the important reasons for this influence, immigration, and forms of material evidence of these transcultural exchanges.

FS 7: The Wars of the Roses, c 1450-c.1500

Nine candidates took the paper, earning one first class mark, one lower second, and seven upper seconds, most of them in the upper half of the class. Overall, then, this was a slightly weaker performance than usual, though candidates typically showed a good knowledge of the set texts, both in answering questions in Section A and more generally, and of the major secondary literature. The main weakness in answers – and this might help to explain the small number of firsts – was a failure to pay attention to the precise demands of the question (for instance, the first question – on chronicles – asked about how helpful they were in establishing 'narratives of events', and relatively few candidates focused their comments on this particular theme, instead writing generally on the strengths and weaknesses of chronicles as sources). Eleven of the fourteen questions attracted at least one answer, including all of those from Section A, but no-one answered on the international context, the role of the magnates or (surprisingly) whether Bosworth marked the end of the Wars.

FS 8: Women, Gender and Print Culture in Early Modern England
(Suspended 2020-21)

FS 9: Literature and Politics in Early Modern England

There were fifteen candidates for this further subject exam. All performed to a very creditable standard, with six first-class marks, and another nine in the range 62-69. Answers ranged across a wide away of topics, with all but two of the questions on the paper eliciting at least one answer, despite the comparatively small number of candidates. In particular, there were some very thoughtful answers in the section B part of the paper. As ever, a detailed knowledge of the set texts and the deployment of close reading skills produced the most impressive results. Candidates also showed a commendable knowledge of a wide range of secondary material and engaged constructively and often imaginatively with several contemporary debates. The quality of the responses demonstrated that the creative synergy between the two poles in this interdisciplinary paper continues to stimulate intellectual achievement of a very high order.

FS 10: The Iberian Global Century

Only 5 candidates sat the paper. They all performed quite well, with two students securing a strong First class mark and the remaining three achieving an upper II.1. Candidates who sat the paper this year were especially attracted by questions about the comparative history of the Iberian empires, colonial society, and race. Only two questions from Section A got answers, namely Q.1 on the consistency of accounts of the Spanish and Portuguese empires (4 attempts) and Q.4 on representations of colonial society and racial concerns (2 attempts). The tendency was largely consistent with answers to questions from Section B, with Q.8 on models of colonial society and Q.12 on colour and discrimination, which were attempted by four students each, while Q.6 on Iberian settlers and the attachment to their places of origin got one answer.

FS 11: Writing in the Early Modern Period

Not requested (too few candidates)

FS 12: Court culture and Art in Early Modern Europe, 1580-1700

(Suspended 2020-21)

FS 13: War and Society in Britain and Europe, c.1650-1815

Five students took this paper in 2022. Two achieved first-class marks overall, and two were on the 2i/first orderline. The paper demonstrated how effectively the candidates had assimilated and could make good use of the primary sources in their answers. Moreover, though lacking experience of writing essays under closed examination conditions, they acquitted themselves very creditably. Though the pool of candidates was small, a substantial proportion of the questions were attempted.

FS 14: The Metropolitan Crucible: London 1685-1815

Not requested (too few candidates)

FS 15: Histories of Madness and Mental Healing in a Global Context

(Suspended 2020-21)

FS 16: Medicine, Empire and Improvement/Imperial Pathologies

5 candidates sat the paper, which was examined in person at Exam Schools. The cohort was offered a two-hour revision session in 1st week of Trinity. No candidate garnered a 3rd or II.2. Two candidates secured an agreed first class mark. There were no instances of short-weight.

The assessors noted that candidates selected from a range of questions for both section A and B. In general candidates demonstrated an excellent grasp of the relationship between disease and imperialism, and were able to navigate cultural understandings of medicine while still taking account of key political and social factors. The analysis of the history of disease and its relationship to British imperialism also allowed for nuanced and careful analysis of race and its history among students, tied to broader questions of British identity and social structures.

FS 17 Constructing the First New Nation: A Political History of the United States

Not requested (too few candidates)

FS 18 – Nationalism in Western Europe, 1799-1890.

Five candidates sat the paper, which is a lower number than our usual eight to ten. The cohort was offered a revision class at the beginning of Trinity. One candidate attained a first-class mark, three a 2:1, and one a

2:2.

Although hard to extrapolate general trends from an exceptional year in terms of the low number of takers, the assessors were nonetheless struck by the popularity of certain questions over others. Two questions (**Section A: Q2 re: Mazzini and Gioberti** and **Section B: Q10 re: regional identities**) were extremely popular, with each being taken by four out of the five candidates, while there was only one response to any of the three Section A responses on Germany or France. Other topics which proved popular included the two questions regarding religion (**Q5** and **Q15**), gender (**Q16**), and art (**Q11**). In total, there were seven Section A responses and eight Section B responses, with therefore no general trend as to whether students choose to write their third essay from either section.

What distinguished stronger responses from others was a willingness to engage critically with the set texts and to place them in contextual dialogue with one another. Section B responses were strengthened through recourse to key historiography in a nuanced and sophisticated way, as opposed to touching only briefly on the scholars: this was seen particularly in the regionalism response. Weaker answers either strayed from the key primary sources or failed to use them appropriately, were limited in their chronological or geographic scope, or offered Section B responses which did not bring the cases together in a comparative way, instead presenting two or three sub-essays on any two or three of Germany, Italy, and France.

FS 19: Intellect and Culture in Victorian Britain

Five candidates took the paper this year, and were required to answer at least one question from sections A and B. Two takers gained overall marks above 70, and no candidate fell below a 60. Answers covered a wide range of topics across the paper, with the most popular question, addressing the relationship between gender and the ideal of a liberal education, drawing out four essays. Only four of the sixteen questions elicited no responses: these concerned Thomas Carlyle, the *Lux Mundi* essays, the instrumentalization of history, and the relationship between historicism and the arts. Answers were consistently at a creditable standard, and several excelled. The question on gender and a liberal education in Section B drew out a number of first-class responses; and the more wide-ranging questions in this part of the paper, on topics such as the cultural effects of academic specialization and the interface between science and the arts, also repaid the intellectual flexibility and imagination of candidates who decided to range beyond the apparently 'safer' topics. These higher-level answers were characterized by thorough knowledge of the set texts and precision in its deployment. They also showed an ability to relate the set texts to wider contexts, in ways that remained germane and focused on the demands of the question. The comparatively less vigorous essays, on the other hand, tended to drift away from the problem highlighted in the question into more broad-brush or vaguer discussion. They also sometimes displayed factual errors or misunderstandings of the prescribed authorities.

FS 20: The Authority of Nature: Race, Heredity and Crime, 1800-1940

Fifteen candidates sat the examination. Four students were awarded a first-class mark, and the remaining eleven all achieved marks in the 2.i bracket. The highest agreed mark was 72, and the lowest 62. There were no instances of short weight scripts.

Almost all questions were attempted by at least one candidate, with the exception of Q7 (on Marie Stopes) and Q11 (on eugenics in the post-WWII era), which attracted no answers. The most popular questions were those on mono/polygenism, Cesare Lombroso, and the relationship between eugenics and feminism, each of which were attempted by around half of all candidates. The volume of responses to Section A questions (23) and Section B questions (22) was remarkably even. Marks awarded for individual answers suggest the quality of responses was comparable across sections, as well as across different questions.

The strongest answers were those which combined sophisticated understanding of the historiography with close analysis of the set primary sources, and which set out and cogently defended a distinct central thesis. The weakest responses were either superficial in their treatment of the primary texts, did not engage

closely enough with terms of the question, or lacked an organising argumentative thread.

Some candidates showed a pleasing ability to contextualise the set texts with respect to audience, readership, usage, and genre. This sophisticated contextualist approach invariably made for more compelling answers, and students might well be encouraged to explore these issues more extensively in future years.

FS 21: The Middle East in the Age of Empire, 1830-1971

There were twenty candidates for this paper, six of whom were from FHS in Oriental Studies or European and Middle Eastern Languages and five from History Joint Schools. First class marks of 70 or above were achieved by four candidates, fewer than has been usual, and two candidates were given marks below 60. Of the marks in the 2.i range, nine candidates gained marks above 65 with the remaining five scoring between 60 and 64; there were several 'near misses', with 3 candidates marked at 69. Three candidates flagged as having SpLDs achieved marks of 63, 69, and 72. The most popular questions were Q3 (visual sources and European perceptions, 7 answers), Q4 (tanzimat, 8 answers) in section A, and Q10 (colonialism in the Maghrib cf. elsewhere, 7 answers) and Q15 (Palestinian refugees, 11 answers) in section B. Every question except Q8 (negotiated independence versus armed struggle) attracted at least one answer. The best scripts showed good, detailed and thoughtful engagement with the sources and a critical grasp of the historiography, with controlled, sustained arguments covering a good range of chronology and geography. Weaker answers lacked consistent lines of argument, tended to be superficial, repetitive, to state the obvious, or to fall back (despite the best efforts of the entire paper) into presumed essentialising differences between the region and 'the West'. This was especially a problem with Q3, which tended to attract some quite weak answers that failed to get beyond very general accounts of Orientalism and provided no, or very weak, contextualisation and reading of the art-historical material in particular (it may be necessary to rethink how these sources are presented or discussed, or even whether they should be replaced).

FS 22: Transformations and Transitions in African History since c. 1800

In 2022 12 candidates sat the exam, of which 4 were in Joint Schools. Five candidates achieved an agreed first-class mark, and 6 candidates achieved an upper second (including 3 candidates who achieved an agreed mark of 65). There were no instances of a lower second or third. As in previous years, the essays were of a consistently high standard across the paper. There was some clustering around particular questions, of which the most popular (with 8 answers) was the Section B question on the Scramble for Africa, which is evidently still viewed as the major landmark in the continent's modern history. In terms of Section A source-focused questions, there were 6 answers on the 'either Buxton or Lugard' question. Of these, there was a clear preference for Lugard (4) over Buxton (2), which may be an issue of accessibility and perceived contemporary relevance. As in previous years, smaller clusters appeared around questions on nineteenth-century commercial shifts (5 answers) and indirect rule (4 answers). Notably, 6 questions went unanswered by any candidate: on Fanon/violence, nineteenth-century European perceptions of Africa, anticolonial resistance, social impacts of colonialism, African women's experience of colonialism, and postcolonial economic challenges. This may reflect slightly briefer coverage of these topics in classes/tutorials, but at the same time, students taking this ever-popular paper come with almost no prior exposure to African history in the curriculum. They therefore sometimes avoid topics in the exam which require sensitive handling and more in-depth reading, and stick to the 'solid', more easily navigable topics noted above.

FS 23: Modern Japan

10 candidates sat the paper. The cohort was offered a two-hour revision session in Week 1 of Trinity. Three candidates received a mark of First Class, but only with a mark of 70 and 71, which is unusually low compared to many years in the past. The others did well on the whole. Seven candidates earned between

60 and 69, with no candidate receiving below 60.

The assessors noted that the candidates responded with good command of the historians' craft, by using the evidence and examples well, and they understood the significance of each question. Overall, their analytical skills and knowledge acquired were amply demonstrated in the way they contextualised their response in historical and historiographical contexts. Having said that, however, while everyone neatly earned above 60, the assessors note that we did not see the outstanding responses that we usually see frequently. We are not sure of reason for this, but we suspect that Covid may have had an impact. After all, the course had to be conducted online in the previous year, and the cohort only met face to face in a review session in Trinity term when the exam took place.

FS 25: Nationalism, Politics and Culture in Ireland, c.1870-1921
Thirteen students sat this paper. There were two Firsts and no marks of below 60. The median mark was in the high 60s. There was a good range of questions attempted and no problem with excessive clustering. Students showed a keen awareness of the set texts and were able to draw upon them for illustration and quotation. The better scripts summarised certain texts as a whole or in large part as well as quoting pertinent lines. A degree of historiographical discussion was always welcome, so long as it did not overwhelm the candidate's point of view. Knowledge of context and range across time, indicated by pertinent facts and figures, showed a confident knowledge in the better scripts.

FS 26: A Global War, 1914-1920
This year the final exam scripts for the Global War further subject were characterised by high competence – of the nine finalists, seven received overall marks over the midway point of the 2.1. and only a few individual essays received marks below 60. Candidates did genuinely address the questions being asked. All candidates demonstrated very good knowledge of core texts. A good range of questions were addressed – the nine candidates tackled eleven out of the fourteen questions. At the same time neither marker felt that there were many outstanding essay answers deserving marks over 75– either in terms of unusually deep source knowledge yielding surprising answers or very sophisticated historiographically based arguments. In some ways this was disappointing – the large amounts of supplementary material posted on Teams for the classes during the lockdown had less impact than might have been hoped and the scripts didn't seem to fully reflect the lively online classes and well prepared tutorial essays based on unusually extensive reading. It is possible that there was some intangible loss in the pedagogic experience which was genuinely not apparent at the time. (Perhaps out of class discussion?) It is also possible that the return to traditional exam format created an element of conservatism among the candidates which was less apparent in the classes and tutorials. The result was no disgrace to an excellent and rewarding year group who managed with grace and goodwill under difficult circumstances but perhaps not everything we might have hoped.

FS 27: China since 1900
In Trinity term 2022, 23 candidates sat the "FS - China since 1900 paper". It was examined in person, in a three-hour written exam. Of the overall cohort, three candidates obtained an agreed First class mark, two candidates obtained a II.2, and the remaining candidates obtained a 2.1.
Candidates answered questions from both Sections A and B, with an equal number of candidates choosing two Section A or two Section B questions. The assessors were pleased to see that Section A answers were more popular this year, and answers generally demonstrated a good grasp of primary sources. While candidates confidently responded to questions about the Cultural Revolution and early years of the People's Republic of China, answers about Republican literary production or women's history at times could have explored set texts in greater detail and engaged critically with the terms of the questions. Strong answers in Section B, meanwhile, embedded answers in relevant historiography. They drew out

different arguments and connected to debates in the field, especially for example in the case of the New Culture Movement and the economic consequences of Japanese imperialism.

FS 28: The Soviet Union, 1924-1941

7 students sat the paper, having attended a 90-minute revision class in the first week of Trinity term. 3 students received marks of 70 and above. There were no second or third-class marks, and no instances of short-weight. The examiners were pleased to note that only 3 out of the 15 exam questions did not attract any takers. The topic of Soviet policy on the family proved to be the most popular. The strongest responses showed an awareness of the plurality of party opinion on this issue and critically interrogated the notion of a 'retreat' in family and gender policies under Stalin. Questions on Socialist Realism and the creative intelligentsia under Stalin also attracted considerable attention, with the strongest answers illustrating their points with specific examples from the Set Texts and showing sensitivity to the multiple agencies involved in the creation of Stalinist culture. The topic of 'Soviet subjectivity' seemed to be a little more challenging for students. While a number of students illustrated a close familiarity with specific diaries and memoirs, they did not always show an advanced understanding of the secondary literature on this topic. Overall, however, the examiners were impressed by the quality of the exam scripts.

FS 29: Culture, Politics and Identity in Cold War Europe, 1945-1968

Twenty candidates sat the paper. No candidates received marks below 60, although nine – nearly half – fell in the 60-65 range, suggesting the examiners' general dissatisfaction with the overall quality of scripts. Five marks were in the 70+ range; the highest mark was 75.

As I am writing this at a remove from the actual marking, I cannot offer much detail on the questions chosen or content of essays. I do remember that many students chose to write the comparative question on women's status in Eastern and Western Europe but failed to include the most glaringly obvious points of comparison; I think just one essay out of the whole bunch, for example, mentioned reproductive rights. The popularity of the question reinforces the sense that women's/gender history is of interest to many students, but the quality of the answers suggests this topic was not taught well/enough.

FS 30: The Jews in Poland in the Twentieth Century: History and Memory

Eleven candidates sat the paper, the first cohort to do so since this Further Subject was introduced. No candidate received a mark below 60. A hefty six candidates received a mark of 70 or above. The quality of the responses was very good overall. Both examiners were impressed with the demonstrated level of knowledge and generally detailed and thoughtful engagement with set texts.

FS 31: Britain at the Movies: Film and National Identity since 1914

Twelve candidates sat the paper. Only one question failed to elicit a response. All the other questions were attempted by at least one candidate, although questions on genre, including war films, inter-war documentary and romance, proved especially popular. Most popular of all, however, was question 8: 'Under what circumstances have films broken sexual taboos?', which three quarters of the cohort attempted. The calibre of the responses was high. Five candidates gained overall marks of 70 or above and no-one got less than a 60. This means everyone gained a 2.i or higher. Part of this success can be attributed to the fact that, taken as a whole, candidates showed extremely thorough knowledge of the films which comprise the set texts for this paper and were able to refer in detail to a well-chosen selection of these in their responses to the questions. However, weaker answers lacked sufficient contextual knowledge of the films to achieve real depth of analysis. Failure to unpack the questions carefully and to show understanding of the specific concepts that were referred to also undermined the competence of some answers. The most successful essays offered structured and precise engagement with the questions,

showing a good level of precise knowledge of the films as texts, as well as their production and reception and how this was framed by the wider historical context. Reference to specific relevant secondary scholarship and to other forms of primary evidence beyond the films themselves (for instance audience surveys or contemporary reviews) was also important in enhancing answers. Ultimately, then, wider knowledge that informed deeper engagement with the films was critical in achieving higher level marks.

FS 32: Scholastic and Humanist Political Thought
Five candidates sat the examination, of whom one secured a very strong First Class mark, and the others received 2.1 marks of various kinds, one high.
On the whole, candidates did not seem as well versed in the set texts as usual. It is likely that this was a result of having studied the paper during lock down, because they had appeared to be a committed and able group.
If a question asks about the relative influence of classical authors on a particular thinker, it is perverse (and counterproductive) to identify as the most influential an author for whom absolutely no evidence can be adduced that the thinker had ever read him.
The outstanding script ranged with confidence over the material, even Ockham, who generally separates the sheep from the goats.

FS 33: Political and Social Thought in the Age of Enlightenment
This paper was sat by six candidates. There was one first class paper, as agreed by the two examiners. All the rest for Upper Seconds, two in the higher range (68, 67), the others at mid Upper Second (65, 64, 64). No one received a III or IIii, or a lower IIi. In terms of exam performance, this was a successful paper. Neither marker took part in any of the teaching for this paper.
The spread of questions attempted was narrow. All but one candidate answered Question 1 (on Hobbes); three answered Question 16 (the Enlightenment); and three on questions relating to Mary Wollstonecraft, 7 and 8. Out of eighteen questions, ten were attempted by at least one candidate, but eight went unanswered. None of the questions pertaining directly to gender or the extra-European topics found takers.

FS 34: Political Theory and Social Science, c. 1780-1820
Six candidates sat this examination. One candidate obtained a first-class mark, whilst the remaining candidates obtained marks in the 2.1 range, with most hovering around 63/64 %. This examination was competently treated by the six candidates who sat it, though it was disappointing there were not more first-class answers. A broad range of questions were answered, with half the candidates choosing to answer question 1. Two candidates answered question 7 and another two answered question 13. Questions 10, 16, and 17 were not answered by any candidate. With the exception of a few scripts, candidates were unable to show a detailed and forensic knowledge of the set texts and had limited knowledge of the secondary literature. It is clear that candidates need to engage more rigorously with, and have a better understanding of, the prescribed works for this paper. In some instances, candidates showed no more than a superficial understanding of these works.

FS 35: Post-Colonial Historiography: Writing the (Indian) Nation
Eleven candidates sat the paper, which was examined in person. Five gained marks of 70 or above and no candidate scored below 65. Eleven of the fifteen questions set attracted answers. Those not answered focused on the politics of early Indian feminism, diasporic and cosmopolitan influences on Indian nationalism, and the relationship between contemporary environmentalism and colonial conservation. There was some bunching of responses: in particular, the question seeking a comparison of oral and

literary approaches to Partition was answered by six candidates, and the question on the relationship between gender, domesticity and nationalism by seven. Though no scripts were poor, the more middling answers were characterised by a tendency merely to outline postcolonial theory and/or historiographical debates without offering much critical analysis. They were also less effective than the strongest candidates in relating theory and debate to the set texts. The best scripts showed a strong command of relevant theoretical debates while also integrated this with outstanding knowledge of the set texts, very precise focus on the question and a willingness to challenge historiographical orthodoxy.

FS 36: Modern Mexico

Ten students sat the exam in Trinity Term 2022. The cohort had been offered a revision session at the beginning of the term. This was a strong batch of exams, with six candidates garnering a first class mark and the remaining four candidates all achieving a mark in the sixties. The examiners agreed that candidates were able to offer nuanced, empirically–anchored of the Porfirian dictatorship, the Mexican Revolution, and the rise and fall of the one-party state, as well as deeply contextualised readings of the primary sources.

SPECIAL SUBJECT GOBBETS PAPERS

SS 1: St Augustine and the last days of Rome, 370-430 (Gobbet exam)
Number of candidates = 7
Range of marks: 63, 65, 70 (X3), 72 (X2). Five takers had marks 70 or above, none below 60.

Spread of Qs chosen and performance on assessment:
All options were answered, but two questions (1F; 4F) by only one student each. For many questions the returns were too few to allow for a detailed report without compromising anonymity,

1. All options were answered, with C the most popular (all students) followed by D and A (4 takers each). B, E and F had 2 takers each.
> 1A: A popular question, if not always used to its full potential. All takers caught some of the ways in which the passage engages with Augustine's views on sin and baptism, and how it foreshadows events in Augustine's life, but few caught all of them.
> 1B: good responses, although missing some of the potential, such as discussing the fit of the passage into the work as a whole, or its theological implications.
> 1C: By far the most popular question. The best answers noted the importance of allegorical exegesis for Augustine's understanding of the Bible, and how he blamed his own conceit rather than classical culture. Weaker answers strayed too far from the content of the passage, and failed to recognise its function in the work overall.
> 1D: Although several responses were very good, the question was not always used to its full potential. The more successful answers paid attention to the role that Ambrose's preaching played for Augustine's spiritual development.
> 1E: competent if somewhat uneven responses, with too little attention to the multiple conversions in Augustine's *Confessions*, and how they structure the work.
> 1F: interesting and competent responses on the relation between Augustine's childhood faith and his struggles on the path to regain it.

2. All options were answered, with A the most popular (6 takers) followed by D (5) and C (3), with 2 takers each for B, E and F.
> 2A: very popular, and eliciting some very interesting responses. The best were sensitive both to political realities and Ammianus' literary strategies, noting the satirical tropes, his audience, and the habits of the Roman elite. Weaker responses showed a tendency to cite the text, and missed

some of the finer details.

2B: Too few responses to discuss, but the question allowed for discussing Ammianus' rhetorical strategies, social unrest, and the importance of provisioning Rome.

2C: The best responses gave details about Probus and recognised him both as typical of the highest Roman elite, and unique in his frequent holding of imperial office. There was a general lack of discussion of why he was controversial to many.

2D: Generally competent and interesting responses that noted how the episode contributes to Ammianus' negative characterisation of Valentinian I, and discussed his techniques, his readership, and the prevailing political culture.

2E: Too few responses to discuss.

2F: Too few responses to discuss. The question invited discussion on tax-evasion and the property of clerical officeholders.

3. All options were answered, with B and D the most popular (5 takers each) followed by A (3 takers), while E and F had 2 takers each.

3A: the best responses were attentive to Ambrose's rhetorical strategies, notably in smearing Auxentius and presenting himself as the representative of Catholic unity.

3B: The best responses were attentive to details, and to the chronology and audiences of the publications associated with the Altar of Victory. Several answers showed a good understanding of the religious milieu at the time, while some were uninformed and sloppy with details.

3C: Several competent responses, but a general lack of attention to the post-facto publication of Ambrose's letter, and what this means for interpreting his aims and audiences. Poorer answers were sloppy with details.

3D: Spirited if somewhat mixed responses, where the strongest recognised details such as the name and status of the addressee Asella, the purported place and time of writing, and the need for, and nature of, defense on the part of Jerome.

3E: Too few responses to discuss. The passage opened for several discussions, including the place of oratory, poetry and education in political culture, the role of Bordeaux, and Ausonius' methods of self-glorification.

3F: too few responses to discuss, but generally competent on unpicking inscription. The question opened for discussion of location, genre, aims, and content, as well as the individual honoured (Probus).

4. All options were answered, with E the most popular (6 takers) followed by B (5 takers), A and D (3 takers each). C had 2 takers, and F only 1.

4A: Generally good answers, with perhaps a tendency to stray beyond the passage. The best answers recognised the importance of will, and were careful with details.

4B: Good answers overall. The best ones noted the tensions between asceticism and traditional family values, and the role of the devil for displacing the guilt. There was a general lack of discussion on where the liquidated funds were meant to go.

4C: The best answers noted the details and historical circumstances, the need to safeguard the credibility of the clergy, and the tensions between family and monastery.

4D: competent and interesting responses, the best one situating it both within bids for friends among the Roman elite and theological tussles with Pelagius.

4E: Interesting and generally competent responses on Augustine's views on virginity and marriage. The best responses noted how the letter was exploited to address this more broadly, how Augustine's views differed from those of contemporaries, and how he fused ascetic and family values.

4F: Too few responses to discuss.

Overall Reflections: That all questions received at least one response, even in a relatively small cohort,

shows independence and knowledge on the part of the students. What produced problems for some was failure to situate text in their literary context, while some were sloppy with details, but overall the questions were very competently answered.

SS 2: Francia in the Age of Clovis and Gregory of Tours
(Did not run in 2021-22)

SS 3: On the Road to Baghdad
Seven candidates took the paper this year, six from the main school and one from Ancient and Modern History. Four of these achieved agreed first class marks ranging from 70 to 75; two obtained marks in the mid-sixties, and one a mark below sixty. This was an exceptionally strong cohort, the best of whom were able to provide detailed contextualization of their chosen passages, in-depth discussion of the implications, and exploration of the significance of topoi. Weaker answers were simply descriptive, often vague, and did not demonstrate historical knowledge.

SS 4: Byzantium in the Age of Constantine Porphyrogenitus
Not requested (too few candidates)

SS 5: The Norman Conquest of England
There were six takers for Norman Conquest, five from History and one from History and Modern Languages. Only one achieved an agreed first class mark, and the rest marks in the 60s. The standard of performance overall was encouraging, with mostly solid, competent answers and some very strong ones.

SS 6: The Peasants' Revolt of 1381
Not requested (too few candidates)

SS 7: Joan of Arc and her Age, 1419-35
There were eleven candidates for this paper, nine from History, one from History and Modern Languages, and one from History and Politics. One candidate achieved an agreed first class mark, and the rest had reasonable 2.1 marks, ranging from 64 to 69.

SS 8: Painting and Culture in Ming China
Number of candidates = 6
Range of gobbets marks: 63% (3), 68(1), 70 (1), 75 (1) Spread of Qs chosen are quite even.
Range of EE marks: 58 (1), 65(2), 67(1), 70(1), 73 (1)
On **the Gobbets paper**, two extracts attracted all 6 candidates (1a, 4a) – both are paintings and significant documents. Two went ignored (1f, 4c); 1f is a colophon on a court painting that requires quite substantial knowledge of court politics; 4c is another colophon that requires an in-depth understanding of Chinese painting theories. The in-depth contextualization required of these two questions might have discouraged students.
Students with lower scores mostly offer clear identification and definition of a problem but give relatively thin historiographical context. Questions 1b and 1e each attracted in-depth research by two candidates, showing complexity and sophistication of comprehension. One candidate presents innovative views on several artworks, such as the Eight Views. Argument is coherent, controlled, and relevant with conceptual and analytical precision.
Overall Reflections:
The group consisted of 6 students, 2 from History of Art, 4 from History. It's gratifying that one student from HoA and one from History have both achieved first class standard, both able to interpret images with in-depth formal analysis and contextualization. No student fell below 2i standard in any of the gobbets. The standard of performance on the Gobbets paper overall was very pleasing.

SS 9: Politics, Art and Culture in the Italian Renaissance: Venice and Florence
Not requested (too few candidates)

SS 10: The Peasants' War of 1525
Not requested (too few candidates)

SS 11: The Trial of the Tudor State, 1540-1560
11 candidates sat this paper, 8 History and 3 AMH. Three gained first class marks, and eight marks in the 60s. There were no marks below 60. By and large the candidates demonstrated a mastery of the gobbet form; there were some very impressive performances, and it was good to see them making connections between the texts. All managed twelve responses. But while aware of the relevant secondary literature, some were elusive as to the specifics of the document, and relied too much on the wording of the extract itself, which can lead to some laboured and narrow exposition. Even some of the better candidates were uneven in their performance, with good answers marred by ones where they missed the point entirely. The lesson is to read all the texts, and to read them carefully. It is clear that students enjoy talking about iconography, but are rather less precise when it comes to the economy.

SS 12: The Crisis of the Reformation: Political Thought and Religious Ideas 1560–1610
There were 8 candidates. Three gained 1st class marks, the others 2nd class.   The spread was between 72 and 64. On the whole, the scripts were of a good standard, showing that the students had engaged with the texts and thought about them, and could situate them within the political and intellectual context of the period. The responses were spread across a range of gobbets, and candidates were able to choose gobbets about which they could write to at least a 2:1 standard. The brief essays produced some thoughtful responses, especially in the best scripts.

SS 13: The Thirty Years War
Number of Candidates**:** 9
Range of Marks: 72, 70, 68, 67 (x3), 66 (x2), 63
Spread of Questions (Gobbet Exam)
The spread of responses was pretty even across the range of gobbets offered, with all those on the paper being tackled by at least one candidate. The rubric compels students to tackle a range of different types of sources (official records, ego-documents, statistical information, literary accounts, visual images).
Performance
Performance was bunched at the high 2.1/low 1st boundary which was broadly in line with the performance on the Extended Essays. Though five students scored slightly lower on the Gobbet paper than on the essay, the drop only affected the overall outcome in terms of degree class in two cases. Two students did better on the exam than on the essay, including one with a first in contrast to a high 2.1. The other two matched their essay marks exactly, including the lowest scored candidate overall. It was good to see that each student's achievement was broadly even across the four sections of the paper, with usually only a few marks difference between their highest and lowest scores. This reflects a good consistency of engagement across the full range of material on the course.
The most common shortcoming was poor contextualisation of the gobbet and/or not commenting fully on the language (or visual image) in the source. By contrast, the stronger answers not only addressed these aspects, but were also articulate in identifying each gobbet's significance as well as identifying ambiguities and issues surrounding interpretation.

SS 14: The Scientific Movement in the Seventeenth Century
There were five candidates for this paper, four from History and one from Ancient and Modern History. One candidate gained an agreed mark of 70 or above, the rest gained agreed marks in the 60s (range from 61 to 68). Good answers locate the passage or image correctly and identify the issues raised clearly and

concisely; weaker answers are vague, largely descriptive, lack the support of sound historical context and fail to identify significant debates.

SS 15: Revolution and Republic, 1647-1658
Not requested (too few candidates)

SS 16 gobbets: English Architecture, 1660-1720
Eleven candidates took this paper. One candidate was awarded a mark of 70 or above, and no candidate received a mark of below 60. Half the marks were in the mid 2.1 range. Candidates produced some informed and engaged work, with a clear understanding of the nature of the gobbet exercise and of the prescribed texts. It might be noted that the markers received the request for a report on Special Subject Gobbets marking at the start of the 2022-23 academic year and are thus not in a position to provide a more detailed report (for example on the range of questions taken) on this occasion.

SS 17: Imperial Crisis and Reform, 1774-1784
Not requested (too few candidates)

SS 18 gobbets 2021-2: Becoming a Citizen, c. 1860-1902
Twelve candidates took the 'Becoming a Citizens, c. 1860-1902' gobbets papers in 2021-2. Three candidates were awarded an agreed mark of 70 or over. No candidates were awarded an agreed mark of below 60. Agreed marks were more widely spread for this cohort – between 64 and 77 – than they had been for the intensely pandemic-affected cohort of 2020-21 who took the exceptional open-book gobbets paper.

Candidates responded accurately and intelligently to gobbets from across the paper, suggesting that there were no themes about which all candidates had limited understanding. There were also no very weak responses, so it was encouraging to note that all students had revised seriously for the paper and knew sufficient texts quite well.

The strongest individual answers, awarded marks into the high 80s, responded accurately and independently to the precise gobbet set. They revealed outstanding knowledge of texts, authors' biographies, genres, and historical contexts, which they were able to use selectively and concisely. The candidates made links to other texts, drawn from across the paper, to develop original, thought-provoking and lively arguments. Secondary reading was used critically to reveal not only how a particular gobbet supported other historians' interpretations of the period, but also to point out the ways in which evidence from the paper challenged historical and scholarly orthodoxies.

The weakest answers, awarded marks in the low 60s, showed some accurate knowledge of the gobbet, were able to identify relevant themes the gobbet raised, and identified some other texts in which similar themes appeared. However, these weaker responses were not able to develop the analysis beyond this level and made some factual errors. Often these responses failed to focus in sufficient depth on the precise sentences and their historical context. They also needed to think more reflectively about the source material, to engage critically with secondary reading, and to make more ambitious and productive connections to other texts so as to form an argument.

Overall, this was a pleasing performance that revealed the value of the return to in-person teaching and a closed-book gobbets examination for this year-group.

SS 19 gobbets: Race-Sex & Medicine in Early Atlantic World
11 candidates took this paper, the marks ranging from 63 to 73.

The students all did well in the gobbet exercise. No student achieved a mark below 60 percent, even before papers were second marked. Three out of eleven students achieved a mark higher than 70 percent. Marks between first and second marker were fairly consistent, though there were a handful of marks with

a discrepency of up to 8 marks. In these cases, markers revisited the papers together and negotiated a suitable mark.

SS 20: Art and its Public in France, 1815-1867

Five candidates took the paper this year and did exceptionally well – there was no agreed mark below 68 and two well above 70. Answers were highly competent at successful identification and contextualization, with sensitive and imaginative interpretation of images. The assessors however did notice a tendency, where images were to be compared, to concentrate on one at the expense of the other. Altogether very satisfactory performance.

SS 21: Slavery, Emancipation and the Crisis of the Union, 1848-1865

Seven candidates sat the gobbets paper, two having withdrawn. The marks ranged from 62 to 74; 5 got first class marks, and one a 69. All but two of the extracts were the subject of gobbet answers.

This was, overall, a strong set of papers. All but one candidate consistently understood the core issue(s) being raised by the gobbets and were to a greater or lesser extent able to connect their analysis to the larger historiographical and historical issues we discussed on the course.

I did not see in the assessment of the gobbet paper any reasons to think that there are any problems with the teaching or assessment of this course. The extended essays, however, were rather less satisfactory. Too many of the students ended up writing long versions of tutorial essays rather than demonstrating the deep engagement with the Set Texts which I had hoped to see. This is something for me to be aware of when I teach the students for the Long Essay this term.

SS 22: Race, Religion and Resistance in the United States, from Jim Crow to Civil Rights

15 students took the exam – all did well, some scored very highly.

Three students gained marks of 70 or above, the remainder scored marks in the range 60-69.

There were no clear patterns in terms of which questions were taken or which scored highly. Students took a wide range of questions – every question was attempted by at least one candidate.

There were many excellent (and high-scoring) answers to individual questions, with perceptive discussions of the source, historical context, key themes, and historiography. However, a number of candidates either did not complete all twelve answers, or had a few weaker or shorter answers, which brought their overall mark down.

SS 23: Terror and Forced Labour in Stalin's Russia

Not requested (too few candidates)

SS 24: Empire and Nation in Russia and the USSR

Did not run in 2021-22.

SS 25: From Gandhi to the Green Revolution: India, Independence and Modernity

There were 18 students in all: 1 each in DAMH, DMHN, and DMHP, and 15 in DMHY.

Out of these, 9 (or exactly 50%) secured marks of 70 or above, a surprisingly high number.

The highest mark was 74 and the lowest 65, which shows the still very narrow range of assessment.

SS 26: Nazi Germany, a Racial Order, 1933-1945

Not requested (too few candidates)

SS 27: France from the Popular Front to the Liberation, 1936-1944

There were nine candidates, all of whom performed at a good or very good level. There was a good distribution of answers across almost all of the gobbets set, and it was pleasing to see how the candidates recognised the challenge to go beyond explanation into analysis.

The marks awarded ranged from 64 to 71. Four were awarded marks of 70 or above, with the highest mark of 71; and three others marks of 68. There were no marks below 60, though some individual gobbets fell below this level.

This performance confirms the continued success of the Special Subject as a challenging but rewarding paper, which encourages students with a good knowledge of French to develop higher skills of critical analysis. The bunching of marks at the top end of the Upper Seconds and the lower First Class is perhaps a problem, but not, we suspect, confined to this paper. When students perform well on a paper of this kind, it is unusual for the average of the marks awarded to reach into the high 70s. Conversely, marks in the high 60s are a sign of high achievement on a gobbets paper of this kind, which obliges students to analyse twelve different pieces of text in three hours.

SS 28: War and Reconstruction: Ideas, Politics and Social Change, 1939-1945

The numbers taking the exam were quite small this year- seven candidates. Overall there was one clear cut agreed first and two marks on the 2.1/1st class border line. The rest of the marks achieved 2.1 overall. 2.1 marks were typical of individual gobbet answers with a preponderance of first class marks, including some quite high marks, over 2.2 marks (and a couple of third class) marks. There was a slight slide in quality compared to the 'open book' version of the exam last year even though both examiners were very careful not to compare apples and oranges – it may be that return to the regular writing format caused a few adaptation problems for the year group that didn't sit Prelims– although it is noteworthy that none of the candidates short-weighted the exam. Despite only seven candidates a wide range of gobbets attracted answers and few got no answers at all (although this examiner was quite sad that the *Picture Post* photo gobbet, which had involved substantial effort to reproduce, was one of these!) Candidates are still a little reluctant to take on visual gobbets which is a shame.

SS 29: Britain from the Bomb to the Beatles: Gender, Class and Social Change, 1945-1967

There were fourteen candidates for the gobbets paper this year, ten from History, one from History and Modern Languages, and three from History and Politics. Eight of the fourteen candidates achieved agreed first class marks (range 70-76) and the rest gained marks in the 2.1 range (62-67). A very strong performance generally from this cohort, with good contextualization and perceptive and cogent engagement with relevant themes and historiography of the set texts.

SS 30: The Northern Ireland Troubles, 1965-1985

1. Number of candidates = 17
2. Range of overall marks: 4 students received marks of 70% or above. The highest mark was 72. The other 13 were 2.1 marks, mostly in the upper 60s and averaging out at 66.5.
3. Spread of Qs chosen and performance on assessment:

The best answers were those which contained plenty of accurate information and showed a good understanding of the sources. Some of the higher-scoring candidates were admirably resourceful when it came to producing echoes of / counterpoints to particular claims from other sources. Also to be commended were those candidates who challenged the perspectives presented in the extracts (e.g. the CSJ's comparison of NI with South Africa; Oliver's view that 'violence' meant the Civil Rights protests rather than loyalist activity and that violence was the source of political instability rather than the other way round).

The weaker answers were excessively descriptive and in the most depressing cases found ways of repeating the extract rather than analysing it.

<u>Q1.</u> Oliver attracted the most answers (12); Healy got 11 and the CSJ got 9. O'Neill attracted only 4

candidates, although the extract's reference to 'rational argument' could have been used to open up discussion of his moderate and patrician standpoint. Answers on McCann were disappointing, generally failing to link the gobbet with other references to Protestants in his book.   Not all candidates opting for Healy picked up on the theme of local government and convinced the examiners that they had a detailed knowledge of the discriminatory measures at local level.

Q2. Thirteen candidates went for Cameron, although not all of them picked up on the importance of there being IRA stewards at a Civil Rights march. Callaghan drew 9 candidates, none of whom really got the point that Unity Flats is in Belfast, and the contrast being drawn was between Belfast and Derry. That's quite a recherche point; where comments were interesting they were nevertheless rewarded fully.

Unusually, only 5 candidates went for Collins, obviously unsure about the particular incident and the people mentioned. Candidates might still have got points by relating the recklessness described in the extract to Collins's wider criticisms of the IRA.

Answers to 2d, on loyalist paramilitary violence, should have shown wider knowledge of Dillon and Lehane's book; only one bright spark drew on the relevant interview with Andy Tyrie by O'Malley. Candidates attempting 2e needed to open up the question of Maria McGuire's deteriorating relations with conservative IRA figures.

Q3. Bunching here. Surprisingly, 18 chose the Forum report, though they did not always explain what 'identity' means or explore the more general shift towards alienation, culture, flags, emblems, etc. A meagre 2 attempted Paisley, being discouraged by the arcana of the Williamite settlement etc, something they should know about from Jennifer Todd's classic article on Unionism.

The H Block photograph was popular (13). The candidate who thought the cell looked 'cramped and unpleasant' was rather missing Robinson's point! Disappointingly, some failed to contrast the photo with the dirty protest (despite the caption) and few brought into play the prisoners' own accounts from *Nor Meekly Serve My Time*.

Only two candidates knew Thatcher well enough to comment on her thoughts about expelling Catholics.

Q4. Almost everyone liked the soldiers (15). Mostly they were capable of commenting on 'messing people about' but failed to illuminate the reference to 'local celebrities' – i.e. the point that the soldiers knew who the IRA players were. Answers on Rose should have been able to bring to bear statistics from other relevant questions in his survey. Knowledge of the demographic situation, raised by the Barritt and Carter extract, was limited. The visual images attracted only 4 apiece, and answers on Bernadette Devlin failed to make wider points about the gendering of political life. (Nor, indeed, did candidates seem to notice the presence of a female IRA volunteer in gobbet f.)

SS 31: Pop and the Art of the Sixties
Ten candidates sat this paper; seven from History of Art and three from History. Four achieved agreed first class marks ranging from 70 to 75, and the rest 2.1 marks ranging from 63 to 68. Generally a strong performance from this cohort with very good analysis and interpretation of both texts and images. Weaker candidates tended to force their argument round to topics they felt comfortable with rather than the text/image they were actually responding to, and had little to contribute in the way of context or engagement.

SS 32: Britain in the Seventies
There were eight candidates for this paper in 2022; all from the History main school. The range of agreed marks was as follows: 2 x 70; 3 x 69; 3 x 66. A large proportion of answers were knowledgeable and succinct, hitting the nail on the head and identifying the key points of the extracts. The occasional weaker answer lacked depth of analysis of both immediate and broader context, and missed historical significance.

SS 33: Neoliberalism and Postmodernism: Ideas, Politics and Culture in Europe and North America, 1970-2000
Eleven candidates took the gobbets paper, eight from the main school and three from History and Politics. Three other candidates withdrew from the paper before the exam. Four candidates gained agreed first class

marks, ranging from 71 to 74; seven gained marks in the 60s, ranging from 65 to 69. The best candidates gave sophisticated treatment of extracts, and demonstrated strong understanding of narrower and broader contexts. Candidates should be aware that time-management is crucial in the gobbets paper, and if they are unable to complete twelve answers, the short-weight rules will apply.

SS 34: Revolutions of 1989

Fourteen candidates sat the paper; the cohort was divided into two seminar groups. Only two candidates received a mark of 70 or above, which is unusually low for this course. (Three did receive 69s though).
Two students received marks below 60.
The overall quality of the responses was very good, though they weren't generally as strong as in previous years. In any case, both examiners were struck by the high level of knowledge and thorough engagement with set texts assigned for the course.

Disciplines of History

This is a large paper, as it is required of all students in Single Honours History and AMH. In total, 208 students sat the paper. Forty-eight students gained marks of 70 or over, twelve students scored below 65.

It is an interesting paper to mark because very many of the answers succeed in capturing a candidate's cumulative wisdom and matured historical sensibility developed over three years of study. Of all papers offered, it perhaps comes closest to being an 'all round' paper that allows candidates to speak to the discipline as a whole with their own authorial voice. The paper is divided into two sections.

The first, Making Historical Comparisons, is certainly challenging, as comparative history is difficult for the best practitioners to carry through with full success. It can pay very rich dividends, however. Candidates would do well to consider the different kinds of comparative approaches which might be employed: is this entangled history, where one situation directly influences another, or conceptual history, in which a single model is used to compare and discriminate between fairly discrete episodes? The best answers brought a consciously deployed analytical framework to bear rather than simple laying out case-studies side by side.

There is nothing in the paper that forbids candidates from using a multiplicity of case studies. However a proliferation will tends to undermine the genuinely comparative aspect and the essay turns into a discussion of a theme with illustrations drawn apparently at random from various regions and times. The best essays in the comparative section usually used two or at most three case studies, controlled by a model or historiographical theory of action and process. Such high quality answers maintained control throughout and identified both commonalities and divergences.

'Making Historical Arguments' is, to a significant degree, a task of two halves. It asks the candidate to survey existing historiography and it also invites them to identify those analytical tools they find most useful to construct their own, personalized discussion of a problem. Very often candidates will seize upon the most 'up to date' historiographical tendency as best fitted for their purpose. It is certainly valid for the candidate to prefer contemporary or near contemporary historiographers over older variants. The important thing, however, is to develop one's own orientation and historical sensibility. In history, old analysis are rarely rendered entirely irrelevant by news advances, though obviously unexamined prejudices do often require rooting out. It may well be that a candidate will prefer tools and approaches that are somewhat older and perhaps less 'fashionable' and there is absolutely nothing wrong with that. The best answers in this section, and there were many of this nature, were notably individual: not in the sense of breaking with all previously existing points of view, but by assembling the candidate's own suite of useful methodologies and arguments and applying this personalized tool-kit to problems and examples which come through as genuinely fascinating to them. The best answers in Disciplines will be attentive to the display of historical skill but will set them in service to their own perspective shaped and developed over the entirety of the degree.

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

GENDER STATS BY PAPER FHS 2022 79 M   127 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	67.31	67.86	0.55					20 (15.9)	13 (16.9)	1 (0.8)	0
BH	67.4	66.9	0.5	25	6	22	17	39 (30.1)	18 (23.4)	4 (3.2)	3 (3.9)
EWH	65.29	67.57	2.28	9	12	42	12	17 (13.5)	27 (35.1)	8 (6.4)	2 (2.6)
FS	67.38	67.86	0.48	23	17	19	11	41 (32.5)	28 (36.4)	6 (4.8)	2 (2.6)
SSg	67.21	68.32	1.11	14	17	14	5	29 (23)	37 (48.1)	1 (0.8)	1 (1.3)
SSEE	68.27	68.47	0.2	31	20	14	13	46 (35.7)	32 (41.6)	3 (2.4)	1 (1.3)
DH	66.23	66.69	0.46	11	13	34	23	29 (23)	19 (24.7)	8 (6.4)	4 (5.2)
TH *	68.83	67.9	0.93	42	19	11	11	60 (47.6)	29 (37.7)	4 (3.2)	4 (5.2)

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)
EWH	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)
EWH	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)

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			
	2022	**2021**	**2020**	**2019**
I	84	113	109	109
II.1	122	19	99	114
II.2	0	2	1	1
III	0	0	1	0
Pass	0	0	0	0
DDH	0	0	1	0
Incomplete	2	0	0	0
Fail	0	0	0	0
Total	**208**	**224**	**211**	**224**

Class	Percentage			
	2022	**2021**	**2020**	**2019**
I	40.8	50.5	51.7	48.7
II.1	59.2	48.7	46.4	50.9
II.2	0	0.9	0.47	0.45
III	0	0	0.47	0
Pass	0	0	0	0
DDH	0	0	0.47	0
Incomplete	1.0	1.33	0.47	0
Fail	0	0	0	0

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

(a) 2022

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	84	40.7	39	50.7	44	34.9	53%
II.1	121	59.3	39	50.7	82	65.1	67.8%
II.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
III	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pass	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DDH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Incomplete	4	1.9	3	3.9	1	0.8	25%
Fail	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	**208**	**100**	**81**		**127**		

(b) 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							
Total	**225**	**100**	**117**	**100**	**108**	**100**	

(c)   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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	**211**	**100**	**98**	**100**	**113**	**100**	-

(d)   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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	**224**	**100**	**104**	**100**	**120**	**100**	-

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

Prelims Nos 2020	FHS Results in 2022					Finals not taken in 2022
	I	**II.1**	**II.2**	**III**	**Pass**	
Distinction:						
Pass:						

==(Can't report on this since Prelims was cancelled in 2020.)==

Finals Nos 2022	Prelims results in 2020		Prelims not taken in 2020
	Distinction	**Pass**	
Class I:			
Class II.1:			
Class II.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	89	43.6	29	37.7	60	47.6	67.4%
II.1	107	52.5	45	57.1	62	49.2	57.9%
II.2	7	3.4	3	3.7	4	3.2	50%
III	1	0.5	1	1.2	0	0	0
Pass	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Incomplete	4	1.9	3		1		25%
Fail	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	208		81		127		-

*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	78	37.5	32	39.5	46	36.2	59%
II.1	126	60.6	48	59.3	78	61.4	61.9%
II.2	4	1.9	1	1.2	3	2.4	75%
III	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pass	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fail	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	208		81		127		

*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	48	23.1	19	23.5	29	22.8	60.4%
II.1	148	71.2	58	71.6	90	70.9	60.8%
II.2	12	5.8	4	1.9	8	3.9	66.7%
III	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pass	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fail	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	208		81		127		

*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	57	27.4	18	22.2	39	30.7	68.4%
II.1	144	69.2	60	74.1	84	66.1	58.3%
II.2	7	3.4	3	3.7	4	3.2	57.1%
III	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pass	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fail	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	208		81		127		

*Some candidates have their marks disregarded

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	44	21.2	27	33.3	17	13.4	38.6%
II.1	154	74	52	64.2	102	49	66.2%
II.2	10	4.8	2	2.5	8	6.3	80%
III	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pass	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fail	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	208		81		127		

*Some candidates have their marks disregarded

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	70	33.7	28	34.6	42	33.1	60%
II.1	130	62.5	51	63	79	62.2	60.8%
II.2	8	3.9	2	2.5	6	4.7	75%
III	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pass	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fail	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	208		81		127		

*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	66	31.7	37	45.7	29	22.8	43.9%
II.1	140	67.3	43	53.1	97	76.4	69.3%
II.2	2	1	1	1.2	1	0.8	50%
III	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pass	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fail	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	208		81		127		

Some candidates have their marks disregarded

v) FHS Results by Gender and School Type

School type	2022	M=77	W=127									
	1st	1st	1st %	1st %	2.1	2.1	2.1%	2.1%	2.2	2.2	2.2%	2.2 %
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
State	20	24	48.8%	54.5%	21	50	51.2%	60.2	0	0	0	0
Independent	14	13	58.3	35.1	10	24	26.3	28.9	0	0	0	0
Overseas/Unknown	5	7	41.7	43.8	7	9	58.3	56.3	0	0	0	0
Total	39	44	50.7	34.9	38	83	49.4	65.1	0	0	0	0
State breakdown:												
6th Form College	2	5			4	10			0	0		
Comprehensive	7	6			3	9			0	0		
Tertiary college	0	1			1	1			0	0		
Academy	10	12			10	28			0	0		
Grammar	1	0			3	2			0	0		

School type	2021	M= 117	W = 107									
	1st	1st	1st %	1st %	2.1	2.1	2.1%	2.1%	2.2	2.2	2.2%	2.2 %
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
State	27	29	40.9%	61.7%	27	33	54%	56.9%	0	1	0	33.3
Independent	34	14	51.5%	29.8%	18	19	36%	32.8%	1	1	33.3	33.3
Overseas/Unknown	5	4	7.6%	8.5%	5	6	10%	10.4%	0	0	0	0
Total	66	47	56.4%	43.9%	50	58	42.7%	54.2%	1	2	33.3	66.7
State breakdown:												
6th Form College	4	8			0	7			0	0		

School type	1st M	1st F	1st % M	1st % F	2.1 M	2.1 F	2.1% M	2.1% F	2.2 M	2.2 F	2.2% M	2.2 % F
Comprehensive	2	7			8	5			0	0		
Tertiary college	1	1			4	3			0	0		
Academy	19	12			13	16			0	1		
Grammar	1	1			2	2			0	0		

School type	2020	M= 95	W = 114									
	1st	1st	1st %	1st %	2.1	2.1	2.1%	2.1%	2.2	2.2	2.2%	2.2 %
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
State	20	32	40%	54.2%	15	29	33.3%	53.7%	1	0		
Independent	27	20	54%	33.9%	26	20	57.8%	37%	0	0		
Overseas/Unknown	3	7	6%	11.9%	4	5	8.9%	9.3%	1	1		
Total	**50**	**59**	**52.6%**	**51.8%**	**45**	**54**	**47.4%**	**47.4%**	**2**	**1**	**2.1%**	**0.9%**
State breakdown:												
6th Form College	1	6			4	7			1	0		
Comprehensive	4	6			3	7			0	0		
Tertiary college	2	0			0	0			0	0		
Academy	11	20			7	14			0	0		
Grammar	2	0			1	1			0	0		

School type	2019	M= 103	W = 121									
	1st	1st	1st %	1st %	2.1	2.1	2.1%	2.1%	2.2	2.2	2.2%	2.2 %
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
State	22	28	37.9%	54.9%	16	35	36.4%	50.0%				
Independent	31	19	53.5%	37.3%	25	26	56.8%	37.1%				
Overseas/Unknown	5	4	8.6%	7.8%	3	9	6.8%	12.9%	1	0		
Total	**58**	**51**	**56.3%**	**42.2%**	**44**	**70**	**42.7%**	**57.9%**	**1**			
State breakdown:												
6th Form College	2	2			5	5						
Comprehensive	5	5			0	6						
Tertiary college	1	2			0	0						
Academy	11	15			10	22						
Grammar	3	4			1	2						

Examiners:
Prof S. Baxter
Dr C. de Bellaigue
Prof. P. Clavin
Prof. I. Forrest
Prof. M. Mulholland (Chair)
Dr J. Parkin (Secretary)
Dr G. Tapsell
Prof. S. Tuffnell

External Examiners:
Prof. M. Braddick, University of Sheffield
Prof. T. Burnard, University of Leeds
Dr H. Doherty, University of East Anglia
Prof. J. Fox, Institute of Historical research, School of Advanced Study, London

N:\Faculty office\Faculty office\FHS\2022\Examiners' Report\FHS History Examiners' Report 2022-FINAL.docx
20 October 2022

43