FINAL HONOUR SCHOOL OF ANCIENT AND MODERN HISTORY EXAMINERS' REPORT 2021 DRAFT 3

Part I

A. Statistics

All candidates

Class	No						%					
	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017
I	8	10	13	11	13	8	32	58.8	59	52.4	68.4	42.1
II.1	16	7	9	10	6	10	64	41.2	41	47.6	31.6	52.6
II.2	1	-	-	-	-	1	4	-	-	-	-	5.3
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

All candidates, divided by male and female

Class	Number										Percentage (%) of gender									
	2022		2021		2020		2019		2018		2022		2021		2020		2019		2018	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
I	4	4	8	2	9	4	8	3	6	7	30.8	33.3	72.7	33.3	60	57	61.5	37.5	66.7	70
II.1	9	7	3	4	6	3	5	5	3	3	69.2	58.3	27.3	66.7	40	43	38.5	62.5	33.3	30
II.2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

NEW EXAMINING METHODS AND PROCEDURES

B. Candidates were contacted directly in October and May with the new agreed classification procedures for AMH, which returned to pre-pandemic norms, except that returning candidates who had withdrawn from FHS 2021 should be classified on the FHS 2021 rules (that all candidates would be classified on their six highest marks and that other papers not already submitted would be examined remotely by the Open Book exam format). The ancient history sub-faculty confirmed its decision not to join the History Faculty in having the thesis supervisor as second marker, and all AMH theses were marked in the traditional way.

Part II

A. GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE EXAMINATION

25 candidates (13 M, 12 F) took the examination. There were eight firsts (4 M, 4 F) sixteen upper seconds (9M, 7F), and one lower second.

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

Results were more equal this year than for several previous years: 4 (out of 13) men and 4 (out of 12) women achieved Firsts, or 30.8% of men and 33.3% of women.

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

All 25 candidates took the Disciplines of History paper. Their average mark was 65.1 (History main school average mark 66.4 – this is the only year since 2008 that AMH students have performed less well in this paper than main school students.
Twenty four candidates submitted a thesis, the average mark was 66.46, with marks ranging from 57 to 75. (Compared with History, where the average mark was 68.42)
Seven candidates submitted three British History essays in year 2: the average mark was 65.9, with marks ranging from 59 to 77.
All 25 candidates took a Greek or Roman History paper, average mark 65.8, with marks ranging from 56 to 75.
Eighteen candidates took a European and World History paper; the average mark was 67.3, with marks ranging from 59 to 75.
Special Subjects: 11 candidates took a History Special Subject, and 14 took an Ancient Special Subject. The first group had average marks of 68.8 for gobbets and 69.3 for the Extended Essay; the second group had average marks of 66.8 for Paper I and 67.6 for Paper II.
Further Subjects: 11 candidates took a History Further Subject and 14 took an Ancient Further Subject. The first group had an average mark of 65.7 and the second, 66.8.
Only one candidate took an Ancient Language paper this year.

D. COMMENTS ON PAPERS AND INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS

Roman History 146-46

This was a challenging paper, with a number of open questions that invited candidates to demonstrate their own perspectives and particular interests, but many would have been better advised to avoid these questions than simply to reproduce familiar material from lectures and tutorial essays. This has also of course been a challenging time to study: we were well aware that this was the very first exam paper students had sat under normal university conditions, and we wondered if disrupted access to resources over the lockdown period might explain a noticeable tendency this year to focus on political history at the expense of social, economic, and cultural topics and on a relatively narrow range of both ancient evidence and modern scholarship; students were not penalised for this, but it encouraged a greater than usual degree of overlap between essays.

Overall, AMH candidates showed an impressive grasp of the relevant scholarship, but were less ready to engage in critical analysis of the ancient sources, and too often ignored important archaeological evidence. At the same time, too many scripts engaged in narrative at the expense of argument. In terms of the individual questions, answers to 1 (crisis in the 130s) that de-centered Tiberius Gracchus and land-related issues tended to

do better, especially since those that did not often failed to demonstrate intimate familiarity with the relevant sources. Answers to question 2 (how useful was it to be a *novus homo*) often lacked clarity on the ancient meaning(s) of this phrase. The most popular question was 4 (the biggest threat to the state in the early first century) where too many candidates hesitated to focus on a single topic in depth, instead outlining several possible threats before engaging in all too brief discussion of which was the greatest, and none took the opportunity to explore the concept of the 'state'. Question 11 (slavery) revealed by contrast some impressive knowledge of relevant facts and contexts, and some ingenious arguments from ancient literary sources. Answers to q15 (the contribution of documents) took 'documents' as literary rather than – as in the standard terminology – epigraphic texts. They were not penalised for this, but by defining the question in this way they gave themselves too much to cover effectively in a single essay.
(J Quinn)

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

F. Members of the Board of Examiners

Professor Andrew Meadows (Chair)
Professor Stephen Baxter
Dr Christina de Bellaigue
Dr Olivia Elder
Dr Monica Hellstrom
Dr Grant Tapsell
Dr Hugh Doherty (External Examiner in History)
Professor Federico Santangelo (External Examiner in Ancient History)

FINAL HONOUR SCHOOL OF HISTORY AND ECONOMICS
EXAMINERS' REPORT 2022

Part I

C. Statistics

All candidates

Class	No					%				
	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018
I	5	6	11	2	4	25	42.9	64.7	16.7	28.6
II.1	15	7	6	10	10	75	50	35.3	83.3	71.4
II.2	-	1	-	-	-	-	7.1	-	-	-
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

All candidates, divided by male and female

Clss	Number										Percentage (%) of gender									
	2022		2021		2020		2019		2018		2022		2021		2020		2019		2018	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
I	2	3	4	2	10	1	2	0	2	2	22.2	27.3	57.1	28.6	66.7	50	28.6	0	28.6	28.6
II.1	7	8	2	5	5	1	5	5	5	5	77.8	72.7	28.6	71.4	33.3	50	71.4	100	71.4	71.4
II.2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

EXAMINING METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This year the classification rules returned to the pre-pandemic norms. HECO finalists were once again assessed on all eight papers. The two returning candidates who had withdrawn from FHS 2021 could have their lowest History mark disregarded, provided that it was not below 50, and provided that it did not disadvantage the candidate. The finalists were informed of these new rules and other matters directly by email in October and May 2021/2.

Part II

A. GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE EXAMINATION

There were 25% Firsts this year, a decline on the proportion for the previous two years (42.9% in 2021 and 64.7% in 2020). This marked a return to pre-pandemic levels, however, and to pre-COVID classification rules and, in the case of history, to closed book examinations. Examiners were generally satisfied with the standard exhibited by candidates, and noted some especially impressive First-Class performances.

Examiners did not encounter many MCEs, but they were considered with the utmost care by a sub-panel of the Board and mitigations applied by the Board following their recommendations.

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

Unlike in previous years, the proportion of Firsts awarded to female candidates (27.3%) marginally exceeded that among males (22.2%), but the sample is of course very small. This year was also the first year in which there were more female candidates than male.

C. COMMENTS ON PAPERS AND INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS

Comments on papers in Economics can be found in the Economics Subject Board report. No specific comments on History papers have been recorded. Prof Cannon raised important questions about the pedagogic rationale of the Development of the World Economy paper, which can be found in his external examiner's report. These comments should be considered carefully by the course convenor.

Special thanks are due to Andrea Hopkins (History) who facilitated the meetings and the Board's work with extensive preparation, as well as to Katherine Cummings (Economics) who provided support on the Economics side.

D. FURTHER COMMENTS ON THE EXAMINATION PROCESS

Dr Stephen Tuffnell (Chair)
Prof Johannes Abeler
Prof Patricia Clavin
Prof Peter Eso
Prof Marc Mulholland
Prof Trevor Burnard (External Examiner for History)
Prof Edmund Cannon (External Examiner for Economics)

FINAL HONOUR SCHOOL OF HISTORY AND ENGLISH EXAMINERS' REPORT 2022

Part I

D. Statistics

All candidates

Class	No						%					
	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017
I	8	7	6	6	2	3	80	50	46.2	50	33.3	33.3
II.1	2	7	7	6	4	6	20	50	53.8	50	66.7	66.7
II.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

All candidates, divided by male and female

Class	Number										Percentage (%) of sex									
	2022		2021		2020		2019		2018		2022		2021		2020		2019		2018	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
I	2	6	2	5	2	4	1	5	0	2	100	75	50	50	66.7	40	100	45.5	0	66.7
II.1	0	2	2	5	1	6	0	6	3	1	0	25	50	50	33.3	60	0	54.5	100	33.3
II.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-

NEW EXAMINING METHODS AND PROCEDURES

A. This year the classification procedures returned to the pre-pandemic norms of candidates being assessed on all seven papers. Candidates who had withdrawn from FHS 2021 were entitled to be assessed on the FHS 2021 rules – that finalists (whose British History assessment had been cancelled in 2020) were assessed on seven papers but if they chose to submit a British History portfolio of essays in their final year, the mark for this could substitute their lowest mark in a History paper, provided that it was not below 50 and did not disadvantage the candidate.

E. Candidates were informed directly by email in October and May 2021/2 detailing this year's examination procedures.

Part II

A. GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE EXAMINATION

Ten students sat the examination (8 W, 2 M). Eight received Firsts (six women and two men). Mitigating circumstances were considered ahead of the main meeting by the Chair and Deputy Chair.

The automated classification algorithm miscategorised one candidate's classification, but this was spotted independently by both the Chair and by the chief administrator and corrected.

The external examiners read two sets of scripts: the lowest first class and the highest 2.i, on the basis that they would each have seen highest quality work from the parent schools, and that they had limited time available. I was particularly interested to hear their views on the bridge papers and interdisciplinary dissertations, as these are the distinctive feature of HENG. They indicated that they were happy to comment on the first class / upper second boundary, and that they would have been able to consider *two* candidates from either side.

On behalf of all the examiners, I would like to record my thanks to the administrative staff in the History Faculty for their efficient and patient work at all stages in the process, and to their counterparts in in the English Faculty for making scripts available to the external examiners. I would also like to thank the External Examiners for their work in reading and commenting on scripts.

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

It is noted that the two candidates whose results were classified as 2.i were both female, but, given the small size of the school, the gender ratio of candidates, and the ratio of classifications, it is not clear that this can be treated as significant.

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

An extraordinarily high-achieving year, with no marks below 60 and a total of 35 marks over 70 (out of 70, i.e. 50% first class marks throughout all papers).
All 10 candidates submitted a Bridge Essay: The average mark was 72.3, with a range from 64 to 80.
All 10 candidates submitted a Compulsory Interdisciplinary Dissertation: the average mark was 70.1, with a range from 65 to 75. (This compares favourably with the History Thesis, where the average mark was 68.42)
9 candidates submitted three History of the British Isles take-home essays: the average mark was 70.1 with a range from 64 to 75.
8 candidates took an English Further Subject: the average mark was 69.5, with a range from 64 to 80.
8 candidates took a Period paper in English Literature: the average mark was 69.75, with a range from 65 to 72.
9 candidates submitted the Shakespeare paper: the average mark was 67.11, with a range from 64 to 72.
5 candidates took a European and World History paper: the average mark was 69.8, with a range from 65 to 73.
7 candidates took a History Further Subject: the average mark was 70.1, with a range from 60 to 78.
1 candidates took a History Special Subject paper.

H. COMMENTS ON PAPERS AND INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS

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

J.   Members of the Board of Examiners

Professor Michael Whitworth (Chair)
Professor Matthew Bevis
Professor Christina de Bellaigue
Professor Ian Forrest
Professor Peter McCullough
Dr Jon Parkin
Professor Michael Braddick (external examiner in History)
Professor Anke Bernau (external examiner in English)

FINAL HONOUR SCHOOL OF HISTORY AND MODERN LANGUAGES EXAMINERS' REPORT 2022 DRAFT

Part I

F. Statistics

All candidates

Class	No						%					
	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017
I	11	10	17	11	11	9	57.9	40	77.2	64.7	47.8	60
II.1	8	14	5	6	12	6	42.1	56	22.8	35.3	52.2	40
II.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DDH	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-

All candidates, divided by male and female

Class	Number										Percentage (%) of gender									
	2022		2021		2020		2019		2018		2022		2021		2020		2019		2018	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
I	5	6	4	6	9	8	9	2	4	7	71.4	50	36.4	42.9	100	61.5	66.7	28.6	66.7	41.2
II.1	2	6	6	8	0	5	1	5	2	10	28.6	50	54.5	57.1	0	38.5	33.3	71.4	33.3	58.8
II.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DDH	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

G. NEW EXAMINING METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This year the classification rules that applied to the main school and other joint schools in FHS 2021 came into force for the HML finalists. This meant that to compensate for the British History assessment being cancelled in 2020 (when this cohort were in their second year) candidates were permitted the choice of submitting a portfolio of tutorial essays on British History in their final year, which could then be substituted for the lowest mark in a History paper, provided it scored above 50 and the overall outcome didn't disadvantage them. If candidates chose not to submit the portfolio, they were classified on the remaining 8 papers. As in 2021, the Oral examination was conducted on a Distinction/Pass/Fail basis and the candidates classified on 9 papers weighted at 1 each (instead of 9.5 as in previous years).

H. INFORMING CANDIDATES OF EXAMINATION CONVENTIONS

Candidates were informed of the changes to the Examination Conventions through direct email correspondence to individual candidates at various dates in Hilary Term; the final version of the HML Examining Conventions was circulated on 5 May 2022.

Part II

A. GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE EXAMINATION

The examination process for History & Modern Languages still continued to be complicated by the circumstances of the pandemic. It ran successfully thanks to the continued resilience of the candidates, the herculean efforts of the administrative staff of both faculties, and all those marking the papers and serving on the examination board.

Candidates were informed of the changes to the Examination Conventions through direct email correspondence to individual candidates at various dates in Hilary Term. 19 candidates took this joint school, a drop on last year's 25, the peak number across the past five years. Of the 19 candidates, 11 classified with a First-Class degree, and 8 candidates gained Upper Seconds. The percentage of Firsts was low compared with previous years, and the distribution of Firsts by gender continued to be more equal this year – as it was last – when compared with earlier years (see discussion below).

The Chair and the Modern Languages Coordinator held a preliminary meeting in advance of the Final Marks Meeting to consider MCE applications (the Mitigating Circumstances Panel, or MCP) and to identify borderline candidates' papers which needed to be scrutinized/re-read, in accordance with the established procedures.

All Mitigating Circumstances submissions (10 in total) were discussed individually and, in accordance with the University's Examination and Assessment Framework, banded according to seriousness on a scale of 1-3 with 1 indicating minor impact, 2 indicating moderate impact, and 3 indicating very serious impact. As a result of this assessment recommendations were made to the full Board meeting that in several cases marks should be disregarded, or automatic penalties waived, on the basis of the MCE notifications. At the Final Marks Meeting itself the MCE banding and the decision of the MCP was noted for each student.

A particular complication this year was that MCE applications arrived very late, in some instances just before the board met. (It is worth noting that HML sits very late in the cycle of Main School and Joint School Boards. The problem of late MCEs was even more pronounced for earlier boards.) This was an indication of the intense pressure felt across the entire welfare and examination system this year. In these circumstances, it is hard to see how a more specialist Mitigating Circumstances Panel, as in other universities, discussed at last year's board might operate. Although there appeared to be more convergence in relation to MCE applications and board practices than last year, further University guidance and support in this difficult area would be welcome.

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

The past two years have shown a much more equal distribution of results by gender than previous years. This year, 71.4% of men secured Firsts, 50% percent of women. (Last year the figure was more equal still, with 42.9% of women gaining a First compared to 36.2% of men.) The relatively small number of candidates makes it difficult to generalize, and can exaggerate trends. For example, while 71.4% compared to 50% seems a big gap, it reflects the fact the fact that 6 men gained a First compared to 5 women. That said, it would be worth comparing these effects to single-subject results to see if there are features of the 2021 and 2022 are having similar effects given the improvement to gender distribution overall.

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

It is difficult to make much meaningful analysis of the component parts of the HML examination because of the small cohort and the variety of papers taken. Last year's report noted the improvement in Bridge Paper performance, the unique component of the HML degree. This year's results showed a slight decline on the previous two years of results, though it remained above pre-pandemic levels.

HML Bridge Essays	2022	2022%	2021	2021%	2020	2020%	2019	2019%
70+	5	26.3%	8	32%	8	36.4%	4	23.5%
65-69	7	36.8%	8	32%	9	40.9%	9	52.9%
60-64	6	31.6%	7	28%	4	18.2%	4	23.5%
50-59	1	5.3%	1	4%	1	4.5%	0	
less than 50	0		1	4%	0		0	
Candidates	19		25		22		17	

Few candidates in HML write History theses (this year there was only one, which secured a First-class mark). It is striking, however, that Bridge essay marks overall are low when compared to the History Main School theses, on which most students score their highest marks. (This year in main school history, 89 candidates out of 206 or 43.2%, secured marks of 70 or above for their thesis.)

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

E. Members of the Board of Examiners

Prof Patricia Clavin (Chair)
Dr Edward Nye (Modern Languages Coordinator)
Dr John Parkin
Prof Stephen Baxter
Prof Rajendra Chitnis
Prof Geraldine Hazbun
Prof Simon Kemp
Prof Thomas Kuhn
Prof Francesca Southerden
Prof. Trevor Burnard (External Examiner for History)
Dr Emily Lygo (External Examiner for Modern Languages)

FINAL HONOUR SCHOOL OF HISTORY AND POLITICS EXAMINERS' REPORT 2022

Part I

I. STATISTICS

All candidates

Class	No						%					
	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017
I	20	23	22	20	14	13	47.6	53.5	46.9	43.5	38.9	34.2
II.1	22	19	24	26	22	22	52.4	42.2	51.1	56.5	61.1	57.9
II.2	-	1	-	-	-	3	-	2.3	-	-	7.9-	7.9
DDH	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2.1	-	-	-

All candidates, divided by male and female

Class	Number										Percentage (%) of gender									
	2022		2021		2020		2019		2018		2022		2021		2020		2019		2018	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
I	6	14	14	9	13	9	15	5	9	5	42.9	50	60.9	45	50	42.9	45.5	38.5	45	31.5
II.1	8	14	8	11	13	11	18	8	11	11	57.1	50	34.8	55	50	52.4	54.5	61.5	55	61.5
II.2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DDH	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.7	-	-	-	-

J. NEW EXAMINING METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This year the classification rules returned to the pre-pandemic norms. For returning candidates who had withdrawn from FHS 2021, the FHS 2021 classification rules applied, and they could have their lowest mark in a History paper disregarded, provided it was not below 50 and did not disadvantage the candidate.

K. CHANGES TO EXAMINATION CONVENTIONS

As indicated above, there was a return to pre-pandemic norms, except for returning candidates (who remained subject to the norms of the year in which they would have sat FHS if they had not withdrawn). A system of Congratulatory Firsts was also re-instituted, following a change in university policy, to recognise the achievement of candidates who achieved a clean sweep of 70+ marks on all their papers.

L. COMMUNICATION OF EXAMINATION CONVENTIONS TO CANDIDATES

Candidates were informed of the classification conventions through direct email correspondence to individual candidates at various dates from October to March; the final Examining Conventions document was circulated on 11 May 2022.

Part II – CONDUCT AND OUTCOME OF THE EXAMINATION

A. GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE EXAMINATION

The examiners once again noted the generally high standard of performance in the examination. The return to pre-pandemic norms, removing some of the 'safety net' procedures of recent years, resulted in a decline in the percentage of Firsts of almost 6%. Seen in year-on-year terms, that looks significant, but it still results in a higher percentage than in 2019, the last pre-pandemic 'normal' year. ES-C might note the percentage increases in Firsts: 2017-18 +4.7%; 2018-19 +4.6%; 2019-22 [i.e. stripping out the worst pandemic affected years of 2020 and 2021] +4.1%. The percentage of Firsts awarded in 2022 was thus 13.4% higher than the figure for 2017.

The examiners - including the externals - were thankful for all the hard work of administrative staff, especially Dr Andrea Hopkins, in circumstances that were less than ideal. An external examiner also praised the 'extraordinary' care taken to protect candidates' interests within the Oxford system, including the oversight of mitigating circumstances claims. Alongside this went the hope that in future years there could be greater and earlier efforts to clarify procedures for re-reading scripts and to clarify the meeting schedule for the benefit of external examiners. This may involve more frequent and detailed communications between History and Politics.

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

This year 50% of female candidates gained a First, compared to 42.9% of men. As the statistical tables in Part 1.A above show, this is the first time that women have outperformed men in HPOL during the 5 year span of time covered. It is striking that this set of exam outcomes occurs at the same time that the cohort features a higher proportion of women than ever before, and by a very large margin: 2022 66.7% F; 2021 46.5% F; 2020 44.7% F; 2019 28.3% F; 2018 44.4% F. All usual caveats about the relatively small size of the HPOL cohort apply.

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

Reports on candidates' performance in each part of the examination are supplied in the reports of the History Main School FHS and the report for the Philosophy, Politics and Economics FHS.

D. COMMENTS ON PAPERS AND INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS

Reports on papers and individual questions are supplied in the reports of the History Main School FHS and the report for the Philosophy, Politics and Economics FHS.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS

Dr Grant Tapsell (Chair)
Dr Michael Hart
Prof Desmond King
Prof Marc Mulholland
Mr Stephen Tuffnell
Professor Jo Fox (External Examiner in History)
Professor Jude Browne (External Examiner in Politics)