

**FHS 2017**

**History  
Examiners' Report**

## REPORT OF THE EXAMINERS IN THE FINAL HONOUR SCHOOL OF HISTORY 2017

### A. EXAMINERS' REPORT

#### Overall Performance

38.7% of candidates were awarded Firsts. This is compared with 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. There were no Lower Seconds, Thirds, or Passes. 61.3% of candidates were classified in the Upper Second Class (65.2% last year).

The following general comments can be made:

The 2.ii classification appears to be no longer awarded; the 2.ii mark is still infrequently used though its use was higher this year than in previous years. The highest use of the 2.ii mark this year, unusually, was for the Compulsory Undergraduate Thesis, where 22 candidates (6 women, 16 men, 9.8% overall) were awarded a 2.ii mark, the lowest use was for the Special Subject Extended Essay where 3 (1.3%) of candidates were awarded a 2.ii mark.

41.3% of women got Firsts, the highest for over a decade. This is compared to 32.6% in 2016, 22.7% in 2015, 28.6% in 2014, and 18.7% in 2013. This is the first time ever that the number and percentage of women attaining Firsts has been greater than men (45 women, 42 men, 41.3% of women, 36.2% of men). However, the gender balance of the top 20 Firsts was 14 men and 6 women, a return to the status quo after last year's promising 10 and 10.

### B. REPORTS ON INDIVIDUAL PAPERS

#### History of the British Isles I: c.370-1087

Twelve candidates took this paper. Four candidates were awarded first class marks, six were awarded 2.1 marks and two were awarded 2.2 marks. Despite the small number taking this paper, eighteen of the twenty three questions attracted answers and there was none of the bunching that sometimes occurs. Again in contrast to some years the British Isles as a whole received attention with some well-informed answers on the Picts (including Martin Carver's work on Portmahomack) and the deployment of material on Irish kings and saints in more general comparative questions. The best scripts engaged closely with the primary sources and were often able to place questions within the context of current debates; conversely the weakest scripts sometimes missed the purport of the questions, displayed little or no analysis, and were perfunctory in their handling of evidence. But taking the paper as a whole the quality of the scripts was strong; they displayed a real sense of engagement. The paper ends on a high note in its current form.

#### History of the British History Isles II: 1042-1330

Twenty seven candidates sat this paper, of whom 11 were given first class marks, 15 in the 2:1 bracket, and 1 in the 2:2. A refreshingly wide range of questions was attempted, with the most popular topics being gender, Jews, and failure in kingship; there was, however, a disturbing - and disappointing - absence of any essays on literary, visual or religious 'culture'. As ever, the best scripts came from those candidates who showed close familiarity with, and attention to, the complexities of the surviving primary sources, and those who concentrated on engaging with the *exact* terms of reference spelled out in the phrasing selected by the examiners. Outline papers are designed to test a student's ability to think critically, creatively and flexibly, not to serve simply as an outlet for predictable and pre-digested material.

### **History of the British Isles III: 1330-1550**

Thirty-two candidates sat the paper, and the overall standard was very good. There were eight first-class scripts and twenty-four upper second-class scripts; there were no lower seconds. Most candidates answered questions across a range of social, political, and religious themes, and were able to adapt their knowledge to the questions set. The better answers relied upon a wider range of reading and demonstrated knowledge of how the individual topics fitted into broader developments of the period, as well as showing a good knowledge of historiographical developments of the past thirty years or so. The weaker answers adopted fixed positions, sometimes relying on older historiography (no bad thing in itself in many instances) without apparent awareness of more recent developments in the field. Political history, heresy, revolts, gender, the Reformation, and non-English topics all received their share of very good answers, though some of the more specialised topics in social and economic history were not so popular. This may reflect the time it is taking for the content of lectures to pass into what is regularly taught in tutorials.

### **History of the British Isles IV: 1500-1700**

69 candidates, 12 of them in joint schools, sat the paper. The standard of performance was generally high. 25 candidates emerged with agreed marks of 70 or above (36%), 43 with marks in the 60s, and only one with a mark below 60. There would have been still more first class marks had a number of candidates managed to write three consistently strong answers; a handful wrote one answer for which they were less well prepared. Only the question comparing Scotland and England in the later seventeenth century attracted no takers. The most commonly tackled questions were those on the role of principle in making of religious policy (30 responses), witchcraft (22), patriarchy (19), popular politics (19), the threat of Catholicism/Puritanism (16), the British dimension of the civil wars (16), sixteenth-century Ireland (15), and parliaments (12). For someone who has not marked the paper for ten years, it was good to see that social and cultural topics were handled regularly and with both sophistication and variety; there was also significant engagement with the British dimension, sometimes in unexpected places. The five specifically post 1660 questions only attracted 11 responses between them, though candidates were willing to deploy post Restoration material on some of the asterisked questions, especially on witchcraft. The overall impression is very positive: the way the paper is studied clearly does not match some of the cruder stereotypes of British History lurking in some quarters. There are areas for improvement. Candidates sometimes need to pay more attention to the specific terms of questions: the issue of continuity in popular religious practice was sometimes avoided by a pre-packaged 'impact of the reformation' response; some of those tackling the question about the appeal of Restoration Anglicanism seemed to be in denial that it might have any, preferring to write about the challenge of Dissent. Definitional and historiographical issues were sometimes less well tackled: popular politics, for example, was regularly reduced to rebellions. Ideas and principles sometimes get short shrift: several candidates responding to the popular Q. 14 had a rather worryingly flexible notion of what a principle might be.

### **History of the British Isles V: 1685-1830**

Thirty people sat the HBI V FHS paper this year, twenty nine single and one joint honours candidates. Eight achieved a first class mark overall, 2.1 an upper second, and one a third. The range of marks awarded was 47-72, and the median mark was 67.

Answers were attempted to 21 out of the 28 questions on the paper. Of these 21, however, eleven were answered three times or fewer. The most popular questions were in order of preference 11 (Glorious Revolution), answered by 15; 22 (British intellectual life and culture) and 4 (changing attitudes towards empire), both answered by nine; and 17 (support for political reform 1789-1820), answered by seven; and 20 (middling sort) and 21 (evangelical religion), both answered by six. There was a strong tendency, as in previous years, to choose questions on political topics, although, as noted above, intellectual history, social identities and gender attracted a fair number of takers. There was only one taker for each of questions 18 (on black communities), 6 (corruption), 7 (changes to punishment of crime), 8 (the audiences for art and culture), and 26 (economic change). Question 20 was subject to an attempted clarification announced to candidates during the examination. The marks awarded answers to Q. 20 reflect that intervention.

The best answers were distinguished by their analytical clarity, the degree of control that was exerted over the discussion, and the range of evidence provided in support of the main arguments. The capacity to range across the whole of the British Isles, where this was desirable or necessary, was quite uneven, although the better answers on q. 11 (Glorious Revolution) drew important contrasts between England and Scotland, and, in fewer cases, between these and Ireland. Similarly, the strongest answers to q.1 (on changes to British urban culture) displayed an appropriately broad geographical scope. The amount of attention to Ireland seems to have been a bit less than in previous years. Of the five candidates who tackled q. 12, on support for and opposition to union, all answered on the Anglo-Scottish Union. The answers to q.22 on British AND/OR Irish enlightenment elicited a number of analytically acute, well framed, and sometimes quite subtle answers, although no candidate took on Ireland in this context, despite the recent growth of literature on this topic. Weaker answers here (as, indeed, on other questions) relied too heavily on assertion rather than systematic development of argument, and there was a tendency in quite a few answers to rely unduly on rehearsing the conclusions of historians. How to integrate historiographical awareness in answers is an area where there is scope for considerable improvement, and name checking of historians is not a substitute for careful argument. While some candidates had clearly thought hard about how to ground their arguments in appropriate evidence, it would have been encouraging to see more candidates prepared to think at the same time about the nature and limits of the available evidence, for example, in relation to q.4 (on attitudes to empire). Answers to this question would have been appreciably stronger had they managed to bring into clear focus specific contributions to relevant debates, and to explore more purposefully whose attitudes were being discussed. This was also a question that seemed to invite simplistic conclusions, usually because of overly schematic answers or a tendency to over-emphasize one aspect of attitudes towards empire at the expense of others. A notable feature of answers on q. 24 (on women's political involvement) was the complete omission of any discussion of the lower orders, candidates too readily and uncritically perhaps following the lead here of some of the relevant secondary literature which has focused almost exclusively on the elites.

Knowledge of the period was, as in previous years, uneven, and there were more errors (incorrect dates, names garbled) in answers than in previous years. Candidates were better informed about the period before 1760 than after, especially the 1790s onwards. In the case of several of the questions there were notable gaps in knowledge and understanding. Most answers to q. 21 (on evangelical religion) omitted any detailed discussion of forms of lay piety and the role of gender. Answers to q. 17 on factors constraining support for political reform between 1789-1820, focused almost exclusively on the 1790s, omitting any discussion of the years after 1800, and thus the contrasts between the 1790s and the post 1815 period in respect of the amount and breadth of popular support for radicalism. Too many of the answers here also failed to bring into sufficiently sharp focus the key interpretative issues, tending, for example, to list repressive measures instead of exploring their character and impact. Answers to q. 20, on the place of politeness and virtue in the lives of the middling sort were on the whole rather better formulated, and in some cases notably sophisticated in how they framed the relationships between these two unstable categories and alert to the importance of change over the period. Nevertheless, the common (entirely contestable) assumption was of uniformity of experience and outlook among this notably diverse group. On the other hand, it was encouraging to see several candidates aiming at impressive breadth in their answers to some of the asterisked questions, covering most of the period, and able to impose a clear and promising interpretative pattern on developments and trends within this. A key challenge on this paper, as ever, is to demonstrate depth *and* breadth of understanding across the three answers.

#### **History of the British Isles VI: 1815-1924**

Twenty five candidates took this paper. There was an overall level of competence, reflected in the preponderance of 2.1 marks awarded. Very few 2.2 marks were given. However, there was also a relative paucity of 1st class work. Candidates tackled a wide range of questions, and responded particularly well to the opportunities given to address social and cultural themes, and to consider Britain both as a multinational entity and as one with global diasporic connections. Essays in response to questions on party political or constitutional history tended to be less ambitious and more conceptually and historiographically limited.

Whiggish teleologies proved resilient. The question on the role of socialism in the rise of the Labour Party (Q 29) was particularly popular, but elicited some surprisingly undifferentiated arguments; there was little evidence that real thought had been given to questions of definition. A few candidates yielded to superficial journalistic analogies to current politics. Across the paper as a whole the most successful essays were those which drew effectively on independent reading and deployed distinctive case studies to support their arguments. This might seem too obvious a point to be worth making, but it was striking how many candidates essentially relied on reproducing chunks of material from lecture notes rather than crafting their own analytical approaches and tackling questions critically. Candidates tended to play safe rather than demonstrating their intellectual ambition.

### **History of the British Isles VII: since 1900**

It would not be difficult to write a reasonably positive report on HBI 7 this year. All but one question got at least one taker, there were no short weight scripts and no third class essay marks. Candidates showed at least some knowledge of historiography through most of their answers. The proportion of decent firsts was reasonable.

Yet there is an alternative view that requires stating. The median performance on essays was low 2.1 showing no more than diligence and basic competence. High 2.1 marks overall were usually driven by one good essay with two mediocre ones. It appears this is what most candidates are aiming for and as a result this is what they achieved. Tutors constantly state the importance of a focus on the actual question yet it still appears that most exam essays are lightly modified pre-prepared answers that do little more than pay lip service to the question. Sometimes the question twisting was particularly egregious, for example the answers on the exceptional nature of 'two party politics' were reframed as standard essays about 1950s consensus and *none* of them made any attempt to explore the appeal of *any* party at *any* time other than Conservative or Labour. Similarly the candidates who answered the question on the impact of the Troubles in *Great Britain* wrote essays mostly or entirely about the impact of the Troubles in *Northern Ireland*. To clarify the distinction they probably should have looked at a UK passport. Generally 'the British Isles' seems to have dropped away as a framing for this paper, students were very Anglocentric, remarkably little was written about Wales or Scotland, although the little there was proved quite good.

Essays also tend to follow a very rigid historiographical format and were overly focussed on name dropping historians at the expense of thinking about *history*. Three questions can usefully illustrate this. The question on the role of socialism in the growth of the Labour party saw very few candidates identify a single notable socialist or their ideas, the question on the impact of feminism saw the same issue regarding feminists and the question on whether Margaret Thatcher was constrained by her cabinets saw little sense of who was in those cabinets or what they did or what they thought beyond a few vague generalizations about 'wets' and 'dries'.

There is something wrong when the vast majority of the proper nouns in a history exam essay are the names of historians. This is true even for an outline paper. The justification for 30 questions on small geographical area and a relatively short period must rest on the near infinite riches of primary material available literally at the click of a button. If all we expect are *precis* of three or four books or articles then we should be asking fewer questions and possibly many fewer.

As a Faculty we clearly need to talk about the responses to Question 12, 'How useful is the term post-colonial in understanding Britain since 1947?' This was by far the most popular question and one where the scripts were almost universally devoid of First Class quality. (See supplement.)

This relates to the other highly revealing thing about the paper. Every question EXCEPT Question 30 was answered.

Q.30 'Whose life stories in the British Isles during this period are most neglected by historians?'

This was an explicit invitation to go off the beaten track and demonstrate an enthusiasm for topics that were not constrained or defined by the standard 'A writes x but B claims y' essay plan and instead to interrogate larger historiographical prejudices and blind spots. It was quite sad that no one wanted to do this. It may be that Theses and Special Subject essays had fulfilled this need and the candidates feared penalties for repetition. But the unwillingness of candidates to take on this open ended question may be more shaped by

*tutorialitis*, the desire to make essays as close to standard tutorial ones as possible. It is noteworthy that q. 19 on 'Was 1910-1922 a Constitutional Revolution' got only one taker perhaps because it required synthesis across several standard tutorial topics and lectures.

Because this is almost the end of the road for the current exam format we need to look to the future. The examining of this paper in the form of a take home paper provides a serious opportunity to raise standards. Freed from panicky reactions and time pressure we can hope that students will start to think very differently about what they are doing. The time and space to move away from the tutorial questions, to supplement secondary reading and look for interesting primary source illustrations and above all to properly address the examiners question may well be just the revolution this paper clearly needs. This is a good moment to address our pedagogy.

#### Supplementary comment on Q.12

Some candidates reasonably challenged the question on the grounds that 'postcolonial' is a technical term which cannot be applied to a former Imperial metropole. This had some validity even if it was a bit narrow. Others attacked the concept of postcolonial by claiming that Britain remained a *fully* colonial society possessing overseas dependencies and governed by a strong sense of imperial mission. Again there is some truth in this but these essays tended towards hyperbole and also an ahistorical lack of interest in *change*. The normal authority appears to be Wendy Webster's book, a study (largely of film representations) which should be noted *ends* in 1965. A lot of essays were a standard (pre-prepared) 'decolonization' narrative with a rote condemnation of British racism tacked on. The frequently repeated idea that the Commonwealth acted only as a mechanism for sustaining informal imperial control by Britain would certainly have come as a surprise to Margaret Thatcher.

What was almost entirely absent was what the question setters had (perhaps over optimistically) hoped for, a sense of the *agency* of ex-colonial subjects, including 'new Commonwealth' immigrants and their children in the shaping of modern Britain. This needn't and indeed certainly *shouldn't* be a bland celebration of multicultural diversity and tolerance. It can and *should* emphasize contestation, exclusion and struggle as well as adaptation and hybridity. But the invisibility of *actual* BAME people in these essays was downright alarming.

So, for example, there was no mention in any script of key BAME organizations that contested racism, not the BPP, not the Indian Workers Association, not the Southall Black Sisters. There was hardly any mention of anti-imperialist or anti-racist movements at all. Important Black and Asian public intellectuals and activists such as C.L.R James, Stuart Hall, Darcus Howe and Tariq Ali passed unnoticed. One script mentioned Malcolm X in Oxford, none mentioned Muhammed Ali's visits to the UK. Even on the students' favoured ground of Westminster politics no one noted that the number of BAME MPs rose tenfold from the 'famous four' (none named) in 1987 to 41 in 2015.

The only post 1970 film mentioned was *Passage to India* as a supposedly straightforward example of imperial nostalgia (if one ignores the actual plot). *Gandhi* (much bigger at the box office and more critically esteemed) was ignored. Whilst the latter can be criticized, it was hardly a valorization of Empire and the same point can be made about *The Jewel in The Crown* TV series again treated uncritically as pro-Raj. More significant was the complete absence of reference to counter-narratives in film and television by Black and Asian directors and writers, from *My Beautiful Laundrette* and *Bend it like Beckham* to *Belle* and a *United Kingdom*. Even *12 Years a Slave* had a Black British director. There were no BAME actors. No Meera Syal, no Lenny Henry (whose career has seen remarkable change), no Idris Elba.

A similar point can be made about art and literature. No mention of Benjamin Zephaniah or Chris Ofili (or again Steve McQueen), no mention of Zadie Smith, Hanif Kureishi, Andrea Levy (all best sellers, all adapted for prime time television) or Monica Ali. Almost no mention of global literary figures based in Britain (there was a brief mention of Salman Rushdie in one essay). The latter include not only Asians, West Indians and black Africans but also a lot of 'White Dominion' figures also wrestling with colonial and racial legacies.

There was also no sense of the post-colonial economic power reversals which might be identified in TATA Land Rover-Jaguar or Mittal UK Steel (fun fact – the residual East India Company is now Indian owned). Or even the existence of Etihad and Emirates stadia in the Premier League. Even the Al-Fayed Harrods soap opera might have been worth a line.

Popular music in these essays was invisible but it was implied it had stopped somewhere around Tommy Steele. No Reggae, no Two-Tone, no Northern Soul, no Bhangra influences, no Grime.

The trials and tribulations of race in sport got no notice. No *Fire in Babylon* with the West Indies crushing Tony Greig to the delight of black audiences. But it is also perhaps worth mentioning that a dozen years after Norman Tebbit's infamous 'cricket test' a British Muslim became England Cricket captain and that not much more than a decade after top division black footballers were showered with bananas on pitch, several of them would pull on the armband as England captain. Although the 'rainbow' team of the 2012 Olympics can be over sentimentalized – the wave of sound of boxing fans (not archetypal metro liberals) screaming on Nicky Adams tells us something.

Finally there is the simple demographic issue. Urban life in Britain has been profoundly changed. But even suburban and rural areas became much less white and mono-cultural. And the presence of between 1.2 million and 2 million British citizens who identified as 'mixed race' by 2011 is a social fact of real significance. In summary there was an absence of the sense of post-colonial *complexity* that is encapsulated for example by 'Baroness Doreen Lawrence OBE'.

Students might object 'but this wasn't in the reading' or 'this wasn't in the lectures'. Which is not unfair – we must be frank and admit this is at least in large part the fault of the Faculty and we must address it. But we are supposedly in the midst of a consciousness raising era as exemplified by *Rhodes Must Fall* and yet consciousness of BAME history in the UK still seems to be minimal in Oxford. It may be that the most conscious students are for various reasons not taking this paper. But the problem may be more fundamental, an unwillingness to think and read beyond the tutorial minimum. None of the information above is esoteric or hard to find.

### **General History I (285-476)**

Eight candidates sat the paper: there were two first-class marks, and six 2.1s. Candidates attempted eleven of the questions: the most popular topics were Q1 on the Tetrarchy and Q8 on the fall of Rome (five answers each); followed by Q19 on group solidarity (three); Q2 on Constantine, Q10 on persecution/toleration, and Q20 on literary allusion in texts (two); and then one each for Q4 on power-sharing, Q9 on Theodosian women, Q12 on regionalism in the church, Q13 on monastic communities and social norms, and Q18 on cities. As ever, the outstanding answers identified the crux of the precise question asked, showed awareness of and intelligent engagement with the relevant historiography, and supported their analysis with reference to specific texts and material evidence. In fact, all of the scripts showed a pleasing willingness to engage with a range of primary sources, whether they were coins, poems or sermons; particular rewards went to those who had thought carefully about what that evidence could and could not tell us. Answers on classic tutorial topics tended to lose focus on the actual issue raised: a number of essays in response to Q1 simply used it as a springboard for wider judgements on Tetrarchic policies, without thinking about how to rank greater military stability within that wider range of factors (or considering the prod in the question as to whether some of those other policies could be viewed as window-dressing). Some answers to Q8 were likewise too keen to slide away from identifying a fifth-century 'tipping point' in the West to a rehearsal of the causes of the end of the Western Empire. Those who challenged themselves to answer the less straightforwardly germane questions, like that on group solidarity (Q19), produced engagingly creative answers. The focus on the big political events which bookend the period was notable; it will be interesting to see whether this shifts as a result of the expanded GHI paper in two years' time.

### **General History II (476-750)**

██████████ sat this paper (██████████ Single Hons, ██████████ Joint Schools). ██████████ obtained first class marks, ██████████ II.I marks. A pleasing range of questions on the paper was attempted: eleven out of the twenty set, with only one question, on Islam, attempted by more than one candidate. This speaks well for the individuality of the candidates, and well also for health of 'the global turn' in medieval history. In general the answers showed a commendable willingness to think in expansive and, if need be, comparative terms, while showing awareness of the state of the historiography and issues of source criticism. In other words, this paper, like

GH I, III, and IV commands a niche but 'high-end' market: this promises well for the future of the new European and World History paper, spanning the period 250-650.

### **General History III (700-900)**

██████ candidates took this paper, a drop on the usual number. However the quality was good with ██████ securing first class marks and ██████ securing marks in the 65-68 range. ██████

██████ Nine of the 21 questions were attempted with the questions on images in East and West and the ways in which rule was legitimised and deligitimised each attracting three answers. Candidates had a lot to say about images in Byzantium but were on less sure ground when it came to the West. Similarly they had interesting things to say about legitimisation but had not thought about delegitimation; reading the work of Phillippe Buc would have helped them here. But overall the level of engagement was very good and it was clear that candidates had enjoyed the paper and got a lot out of it. All the scripts showed a readiness to engage with primary sources at a serious level and a willingness to make comparisons between different regions and regimes. Looking to the future it was also clear that the work on this paper was already meeting the spirit of being both European and wider world – answers variously looked at Europe, Umayyad Spain, the Abbasids, Byzantium, the Khazars, and the world of the Eurasian steppes.

### **General History IV (900-1122)**

The candidates who sat GH4 this year proved to be a competent cohort, who had clearly both enjoyed their studies and prepared carefully for the examinations. The standard of the essays was consistently high. While one or two individual essays were disappointing, all the candidates were placed in the 2:1 range or higher. As always, the very best scripts were the ones that engaged with the primary sources and handled complex and contradictory evidence sensibly. Only a few candidates mentioned non-written materials such as archaeology, numismatics and visual arts – those that did tended to produce the most impressive pieces of work.

Unlike many previous years where only a handful of questions were attempted, in 2016-17, only half a dozen essay topics went untouched. Candidates wrote answers to eighteen different questions. While the vast majority were most comfortable understanding the period in terms of Western Europe, it was both positive and striking that this year there were candidates willing to look at Byzantium, the Seljuks and the Tang and Song dynasties in China.

Several scripts were marked in the first class range. All showed promise and suggest that medieval studies at Oxford remain in rude health.

### **General History V (1122-1273)**

Eight candidates sat this paper, including one from Joint Schools. One candidate achieved a first-class mark, six were spread across the upper second class bracket, and one candidate achieved a lower second. The most popular questions were those that related to heresy and Capetian France. The level of intellectual engagement was mixed. Stronger answers were distinguished by close engagement with the exact terms of the question and the critical deployment of a range of primary evidence (e.g. non-Catholic sources for heresy as well as inquisitorial records). Weaker answers were characterised by one or a combination of the following features: narrowness of focus (perhaps addressing only two substantive points); a wholly thematic approach to the exclusion of any consideration of change over time; an inattentiveness to the need to tether primary evidence to broader analytical discussion; and, finally, an inattentiveness to the exact wording of questions (e.g. q. 13 asked '*How united was France under the Capetians?*', and not '*How was France united under the Capetians?*') With only eight takers it is difficult to draw firm conclusions from the range of questions attempted, but the fact that between them the candidates tackled thirteen questions suggests that candidates were willing to take advantage of the breadth of the paper, and the better scripts displayed a real appreciation for the paper's social, intellectual, economic, and cultural dimensions.



### **General History VI (1273-1409)**

Twelve candidates sat the paper. There were eight upper second-class scripts, including several at the higher end of this range, and four first-class; there were no lower seconds. Most candidates answered a good range of questions across several themes, and there was good use made of extra-European examples in several notable answers. The better answers were characterized by a combination of precision in dealing with evidence and argument, and a broad historiographical awareness. The weaker answers showed less engagement with sources and historiography, and in a few cases there did not seem to have been much wider reading and thought between the tutorial stage and the examination. With this number of candidates several major areas of question inevitably went unanswered.

### **General History VII (1409-1525)**

\_\_\_\_\_ sat the paper, \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ The best answers were characterized by a very high level of detail, and a historiographical knowledge and understanding that was both broad and deep. The weaker answers were more reliant on fixed positions, showing little apparent development between the tutorial stage and the examination.

### **General History VIII (1517-1618)**

This year 17 candidates took this paper, 15 from the main school and 2 from joint schools. Six of these obtained a first class mark overall, 10 got 2i marks and one got an overall 2ii.

The most popular questions were on the French Wars of Religion (10 answers), the Counter Reformation (8 answers), Justification by Faith (6), and with good take-up for women (5), Philip II (4), Calvinism (3), Reformation and literacy (3) and Witchcraft (3). A range of other questions attracted single answers, and – to be expected in a relatively small group of candidates – nine questions attracted no takers at all. Though the range of answers stretched across religious, political, economic, gender and social history, the answers were strongly concentrated on a Western European core – France, Spain, Italy – while most of Central-East Europe (Poland Lithuania, Muscovy, Scandinavia, HRE and Charles V) attracted no takers, nor did the Ottoman Empire or the wider non-European world, with the exception of 2 answers on commercial/ cultural exchange with Asia. As with last year, the existence of GH XVIII may be drawing off those whose interests might otherwise have gravitated towards extra-European topics. War, poverty, political ideologies and republicanism also attracted no takers.

The strongest scripts (35% achieved Firsts) demonstrated good knowledge of recent historiography, and could focus confidently on the questions asked rather than rehearsing more general tutorial essays, though quite a lot of the latter practice was in evidence. In weaker answers there was a tendency to confine the historiography to an initial, cursory paragraph, rather than to try to integrate it into the larger structure. Conversely the best essays managed to sustain a scholarly/historiographical debate or theoretical framework throughout, while also demonstrating excellent command of supporting evidence and argument. Both examiners would have welcomed more willingness to adopt and deploy comparison more widely, and to think more broadly about the larger concepts and issues behind questions; there was a lot of routine, narrowly-focused and ‘safe’ answering of questions, which is a pity given the evident breadth and thoroughness of reading indicated by many candidates. In cases of specific questions, too many candidates wasted time in the Counter-Reformation essay (Q 1) exercising the stale Counter v. Catholic Reformation historiography (for the most part a dialogue of the unread), when the question offered the opportunity to discuss the means and effectiveness with which reformed Catholicism sought to challenge Protestant ideas and practices. Again, the best essays seized the opportunity to discuss Justification by Faith (Q 6) in a wide range of theological contexts (including Catholicism), rather than as a peg for a rehearsed essay about the rise of Lutheranism. The number of takers for the question on the French Wars of Religion surprised the examiners, but again the question sifted those who could discuss with some knowledge the possibilities (and occasional achievements) of peacemaking, rather than telling the familiar story of dissatisfied Calvinists and nobles battering away at a weak crown. Quite a number of low marks were given out on this question to candidates who refused to engage with the question as set. Elsewhere, there were some excellent

and thoughtful essays about women and agency, about (often non-)revolutionary Calvinism and about literacy and orality in the spread of the Reformation.

### **General History IX (1618-1719)**

General History IX continues to attract low numbers, with just thirteen candidates sitting the exam this year (eleven from the main school and two from joint schools). As in previous years, quality compensated for quantity: there were four firsts and six scripts in the range 65-69. There was no mark under 60. Most candidates were able to produce three competent and well-illustrated essays. Fifteen out of the twenty-seven questions were attempted, with the most popular topics being the Dutch Golden Age (8 answers) followed by Sweden (5 answers) and the Catholic Church (4 answers). There were some distinctive weaknesses in the lower-scoring scripts, in particular a tendency to ignore the international dimension to answers about particular countries and a reluctance to explore the analytical possibilities presented by the questions.

### **General History X (1715-1799)**

Thirteen candidates sat General X this year, a marked decline in keeping with the drop in numbers for this paper in recent years. (50% lower than in 2011). Seven were MS candidates; 6 JH, which does show the sustained popularity of the paper among JH candidates.

Out of 27 questions, only sixteen were attempted. The most popular questions attracted only five to six candidates. The most popular questions, attracting four or more answers, were all European, mainly political or intellectual/cultural history questions. Overall, there was a reasonably wide spread of questions answered within the band of the sixteen attempted, but they concentration, as in most years, was on European history. This is normal, and probably reflect both the expertise of those who teach the paper, but also, possibly, the fact that students with extra-European interests now have dedicate GH papers, covering this period, to choose from.

The results were as follows: 2 Firsts; 9 Upper Seconds; 2 Lower Seconds, which is a slight decline in the number of Firsts, but not marked.

### **General History XI (1789-1870)**

This paper was taken by twenty one candidates. The overall quality of the scripts was good, and four achieved first class marks.

There was, as usual, a good deal of bunching around certain questions. Over half the answers were on Q 13 (Did national unification mark the victory or defeat of nationalism?), Q 11 (Were there clear consequences of the Revolutions of 1848?) and Q3 (Did Napoleon's reshaping of Europe leave any lasting traces?). There was very little interest in the French Revolution, whether Q1 on its violence or Q2 on its global reach. Geographically, the Tanzimat reforms, Meiji restoration and Latin America as a 'semi-colony' were the only non-European questions tackled; there were no takers for the American Civil War or China. Q 10 on Russia as an 'armed camp' attracted three takers, Q 12 on the Crimean War and Q 14 on the *Ausgleich* one each but there was no interest in the two questions on France post Napoleon I. The more thematic questions attracted uneven interest. Q 6 (Why was liberalism more influential in some countries than others?) attracted four answers, and there were two answers each on Q25 (secularism), Q26 (Jewish emancipation), and Q 27 (the audiences of Romanticism). There was one answer on Q15 (utopian/scientific socialism) but none on bureaucracy, education, globalization, industrialisation, or emigration. In this sense, the conceptual and comparative skills learned for the first-year GH papers seem to be largely dissipated by Finals.

The best scripts adopted some sort of framework of analysis. They attempted a comparative analysis where appropriate and combined a structured argument with intelligent use of evidence and example. They had some grasp of historiographical debate. Rare candidates ventured into the cultural history of nationalist images and symbols and even the history of emotions. The weaker scripts were hampered by failure to define concepts such as liberalism or secularism, failure to engage with the specific question (the *consequences* of 1848 or the *audiences* of Romanticism), an unstructured argument often betrayed by lack of paragraphing, and poor presentation.

### **General History XII (1856-1914)**

Seven students sat the exam this year. One received a first-class mark. The others were in the upper 2.1 range. In general the scripts showed broad competence. Both markers agreed that there were few outstanding answers. Four students answered the question (11) about the Italian South. Three students answered the question (7) of whether anti-Semitism was a social movement. Other questions with a couple of takers addressed the 'men on the ground' in colonial expansion (14) and the upsurge in popular religiosity (25). It is difficult to discern any patterns in the scripts based on the small sample. Predictably, candidates focused on Europe; only two scripts answered questions focused on the non-European world. Including more comparative questions that integrate disparate world regions might address this issue.

### **General History XIII (1914-1945)**

There is quite a lot of good news to report. The candidates tackled a very wide range of questions with only the question on Latin America, the question on discriminatory franchises in 'democratic' countries (eg sex in France, race in USA and Dominions) and 'violent secularization' (eg USSR, Spain, but potentially also Mexico, Mongolia and Turkey) finding no takers. Sadly one of the either/or options was also neglected, this being the question of whether Genocide was gendered (an idea that has generated excellent work in the last 10 years- see comments below) The paper showed candidates willing to take on global and international history and saw significant number of answers on Asia and the United States. Although more Eurocentric than GH 14 this paper has never been a purely European history paper and candidates answered with some fluency on Japan, India and China. At the top end there were some exceptionally good performances. One essay was independently judged by both examiners to be the best exam essay they had ever read. Similarly the number of truly poor performances was quite low. But the Faculty in its wisdom has ruled and next year will be the swansong of this paper.

The two major flaws were in historiography and in the answering of two specific questions. Many candidates seemed to be relying on works that were seriously dated or of questionable academic credibility or both. So a question about genocide and the participation of 'ordinary people' was answered almost exclusively in terms of the Goldhagen/Browning bust up. Whilst candidates were often well informed about this (and were credited for that) it needs to be noted that this argument first occurred before most of the current finalists *were born!* The historiography has moved on in this generation and has come to include some very vigorous debates about material interests, the participation of non-Germans in the *Shoah*, the pressures of living in the 'shatterzone' and the comparativist perspective on genocides (only one essay mentioned the genocide of Armenians at all). By notable contrast the best essays on 'personality cults' showed an impressively up to the minute sense of the historiography of Mussolini's Italy. The essays on the USSR sometimes showed a worrying propensity to draw on dubious works of popularization and the more nuanced historiography of the Great War since the 1990s and that of the subsequent peace was mostly (although not completely) missing. There was a lot of Chris Clark in answers to Question 1 which was of limited use.

Two questions tripped candidates up badly. Question 4 about 'protectionism' before and after the Wall Street Crash inadvertently and worryingly revealed that many history undergraduates don't seem to understand what the word 'protectionism' means. Perhaps even more extraordinary was the wilful misreading of q.22 about sexual liberation and backlash as 'tell me everything you know about women and/or gender relations during this period.' This usually involved some material genuinely pertinent to the question and a lot of irrelevance. Very few candidates seem to have thought that ideas of *sexual* liberation might also involve men (both gay and straight). Interestingly a lot of these essays might have been better as answers to Question 19 but were clearly triggered by the single word 'liberation'. So basically the usual examiners' lament that candidates should try to read and answer the *actual* question.

### **General History XIV (1941-1973)**

Forty one candidates took this paper

This was the last time that General History 14 was set in its current form – the two new twentieth-century papers will cover longer periods and be divided between a global and a European

paper. The most popular questions were on the origins of the Cold War; 1968; gender history; the international relations of the Middle East. As usual, the standard of these answers varied. Some of the stronger essays were on social and cultural topics – for instance ‘1968’, consumerism and gender. While there were some excellent answers on the political topics relating to specific countries or regions, these essays suffered more frequently from a lack of engagement with the historiography and the more conceptual issues - for instance the nature of communism in the Soviet bloc, or the meaning of democracy in South Asia. It is hoped that more thematic questions and global scope of the new papers will remedy this, and allow for more stimulating and ambitious approaches to the period than the current format permits.

### **General History XV (Britain’s North American Colonies from Settlement to Independence, 1600–1812)**

Nine candidates sat this year’s examination, five of whom were female. The ambient performance was competent. No script was ill-informed and all candidates received at least a II.1. However, too many answers paid too little attention to the terms of the question set and offered pre-prepared responses to imagined interrogatives (this was particularly notably in respect of Q. 15 on slave societies). Predictably perhaps just one candidate (female) received a First. Questions 4 (colonial hierarchy), 11 (Chesapeake and New England) 15 (slave societies) proved popular. On a happy note, question 24, which asked candidates to discuss a generalisation made by the Harmsworth Visiting Professor in his Inaugural Lecture and the book it celebrated, attracted one taker -- who offered a very good appraisal.

### **General History XVI (From Colonies to Nation: the History of the United States, 1776–1877)**

11 candidates, including three joint school’s candidates, sat General History XVI in 2017. Two candidates were awarded first class marks in this paper, with the remainder being of a high standard, there were no 2.2s. About one half of the questions were answered by at least one candidate, not an ideal spread, but we were pleased that most of the candidates attempted at least one asterisked [\*] question – some taking on two. The best responses to the asterisked questions showed some intellectual ambition and probed large themes through discrete, analytical case studies; the weakest, were narrative answers. As usual, there was some clustering around the topics of the Revolution, Manifest Destiny, slavery, and the Civil War reflecting their popularity as tutorial topics. Most responses showed a strong grasp of the latest trends in American historiography, but this often came at the expense of independent argument as candidates chose to rely on the conclusions of existing scholarship.

One of the Questions not taken on, number 19 (‘In what ways were the politics of the second party system defined by the American Whig Party?’), asked candidates to deploy familiar material from an unexpected angle and it was disappointing that candidates tacked toward ‘safer’ and more discrete (perhaps even predictable) topics. This leads to one piece of concrete advice: candidates should be warned to consider the specific angle of the questions more carefully and beware of unconsciously inserting tutorial essays into exam responses. Questions 15, 20, and 26 seemed especially prone to this approach. On question 15 (‘Was the election of Thomas Jefferson in 1800 a revolution?’), for instance, no candidate even discussed the election of 1800 itself, instead focussing on Jeffersonian statecraft.

### **General History XVII (History of the United States since 1863)**

30 students took this paper this year: 22 straight historians, eight from joint schools. The seven candidates who secured first-class marks, as in previous years, included a disproportionate number who had been adventurous in their choice of questions--answering less obvious questions, and covering a wide chronological range. Pleasingly, every question drew at least one answer, and a larger number of candidates than in some years attempted at least one 'starred' question, often with good results. Twenty candidate secured an upper second mark, while three were awarded a lower second grade. In the latter case, candidates were in general let down less by lack of knowledge than by a failure to answer the question.



on the specific matters arising from the text and the broader context, and also included some impressive cross-referencing to other sources and case-studies. Weaker papers tended to be too (redundantly) descriptive and insufficiently analytical, or could veer to the opposite extreme and focus overly on the wider contexts triggered by the document, failing to engage with the detail of the extract. In other cases the answers were overly brief and missed obvious matters arising, though all candidates had absorbed the injunction to ensure that they discussed 12 extracts and there were no short-weight scripts, even though a few showed a marked deterioration in length and quality as the script progressed. A few candidates performed more strongly in discussing visual material from the course, and it may be worth considering expanding the number of images to fill the whole of the fourth section of the paper.

### **Disciplines of History**

The paper was prepared and reviewed in the usual manner by the main school board in collaboration, at all stages, with the Joint School of Ancient and Modern and with History Externals. No complaint or other response inviting comment has been received from AMH.

The following remarks concern the main school. 225 candidates sat the paper. 116 of these were male, 109 female. For 17 male candidates the agreed mark on Disciplines was the highest in their portfolio and 25 male candidates (21%) garnered an agreed mark of 70 or above. The high end of attainment for male candidates sitting Disciplines was, in percentage terms, a little down on the two years previous but not out of line with a five year average. Turning to the 109 female candidates, for 12 of these candidates Disciplines was the highest agreed mark they received. 21 female candidates (19%) garnered an agreed mark of 70 or above. This is broadly in line with five year averages. The high end of attainment for female candidates sitting Disciplines was roughly unchanged. At the lower end of attainment, an agreed mark of 60 or below, 6 female candidates and 3 male candidates classified in this band. Over the preceding three years the numbers involved, though similarly small, have more nearly even as between male and female.

Responses from Assessors suggest that there was nothing particularly unexpected or troublesome about questions set in this year's paper. Two assessors noted a surfeit of answers on oral history which is perhaps more a comment on teaching cultures. In so far as this comment relates to the questions set, the substance of the comment concerned the potential for overlap between answers to question A2 and B29. Even the Assessor concerned noted that few candidates attempted both A2 and B29. As in previous years Assessors felt that the best answers were those that defined terms from the outset, particularly perhaps in respect of A17 and B38. Assessors noted that poor answers, as in previous years, fixated on a term within the question set with insufficient regard to the question as a whole. One Assessor noted this tendency in answers to A6, which some candidates took to be "about" power relations. However, generally, questions on which the Board had spent energy constructing were answered and answered well. One final gripe from the Assessors. This year, as in some previous years, "political history" is apparently understood by undergraduates to be defined by chronology (modern) and geography (British).

As for marking culture. 42 scripts (c. 19% of the total) received raw marks of 1 or less points apart. This compares to (c. 17%) in a large HBI paper. Equally 40 scripts (c. 18%) received raw marks 8 or more points apart. The equivalent figure for a large HBI paper is roughly 5%. An obvious explanation here involves the pairing of Assessors. There is anecdotal and perhaps statistical evidence to suggest that pairing a modernist with anything other than modernist is liable to produce a discrepancy in raw marks. There is no obvious or immediate solution to this, given that the comparative section of the paper requires discussion across time periods and therefore needs assessment by markers with different specialisms. The Board, including its External members, were satisfied that the process of reconciling discrepant marks, where necessary by a third reading, was conducted with integrity.

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

GENDER STATS BY PAPER FHS 2017						116 M	109W								
Paper	F Avg	M Avg	DIFF	F High	M High	F Low	M Low	F 70 +	F%	M70 +	M%	F< 60	F%	M< 60	M%
ALL	67.21	67.31	0.1					18	16.5	23	19.8	2	1.8	0	
BH	66.26	66.99	0.73	12	17	23	14	27	24.8	35	30.2	5	4.6	5	4.3
GH	66.19	67.6	1.41	7	19	21	21	22	20.2	32	27.6	8	7.3	4	3.5
FS	67.55	67.63	0.08	18	21	19	13	36	33.1	45	38.8	2	1.8	1	0.9
SSg	67.67	67.36	0.31	19	17	11	15	41	37.6	35	30.1	3	2.8	4	3.5
SSEE	68.86	68.42	0.44	40	28	10	14	46	42.2	46	39.7	2	1.8	4	3.5
DH	65.87	66.26	0.39	12	17	30	33	21	19.3	25	21.6	6	5.5	3	2.6
TH	67.97	66.6	1.37	32	26	23	34	43	39.5	37	31.9	6	5.5	16	13.8
GENDER STATS BY PAPER FHS 2016						115 M	129W								
Paper	F Avg	M Avg	DIFF	F High	M High	F Low	M Low	F 70 +	F%	M70 +	M%	F< 60	F%	M< 60	M%
ALL	67.29	67.39	0.1					19	14.7	19	16.5	0	0	1	
BH	65.65	67.18	1.53	17	22	32	19	24	18.6	35	30.4	7	5.4	7	6.1
GH	67.29	67.14	0.15	18	18	16	19	34	26.4	30	26	3	2.3	6	5.2
FS	66.94	67.68	0.74	17	25	17	15	31	24	42	36.5	4	3.1	4	3.5
SSg	67.89	67.91	0.02	23	21	12	11	44	34.1	40	34.8	4	3.1	2	1.7
SSEE	68.47	68.18	0.29	32	36	12	14	51	39.5	48	41.7	1	0.8	3	2.6
DH	66.25	66.7	0.45	21	17	33	30	23	17.8	34	29.6	5	3.9	6	5.2
TH	68.12	67	1.16	34	24	27	28	49	38	35	30.4	6	4.7	7	6.1
GENDER STATS BY PAPER FHS 2015						115 M	119W								
Paper	F Avg	M Avg	DIFF	F High	M High	F Low	M Low	F70 +	F%	M70+	M%	F< 60	F%	M< 60	M%
ALL	66.56	67.09	0.53					11	9.2	22	19.1	2	1.7	2	1.7
BH	64.25	66.51	2.26	13	18	32	27	20	16.8	36	31.3	12	10.1	10	8.7
GH	66.04	66.3	0.26	14	11	20	18	20	16	34	29.6	5	4.2	6	5.2
FS	66.82	67.82	1	25	19	11	8	31	26.1	45	39.1	0	0	3	2.6
SSg	66.25	67.58	1.33	14	17	14	13	29	24.4	38	33.1	5	4.2	5	4.3
SSEE	67.66	67.9	0.24	32	31	9	19	38	31.9	46	40	2	1.7	7	6.1
DH	65.75	66.15	0.4	15	14	29	27	26	21.8	28	24.3	9	7.6	7	6.1
TH	66.77	66.88	0.11	20	20	29	22	29	22	37	32.2	12	10.1	8	6.9
GENDER STATS BY PAPER FHS 2014						124 M	105W								
Paper	F Avg	M Avg	DIFF	F High	M High	F Low	M Low	F70 +	F%	M70 +	M%	F< 60	F%	M< 60	M%
ALL															
BH	64.83	66.72		4	19	25	11	12	11.4	33	26.6	11	10.5	6	4.8
GH	66.1	66.69		10	26	16	16	20	19.1	39	31.5	7	6.7	8	6.5
FS	67.07	67.24	0.17	20	24	14	20	36	34.3	48	38.7	6	5.7	3	2.4
SSg	65.85	66.45	0.6	14	15	12	14	22	20.9	34	27.4	5	4.8	9	7.3
SSEE	68.12	66.6	1.52	36	23	8	28	41	39.1	36	29	4	3.8	16	12.9
DH	65.66	65.76	0.1	15	11	26	29	20	19.1	28	22.6	12	11.4	14	11.3

<b>TH</b>	66.76	66.48	0.28	25	33	22	34	37	35.2	35	28.2	15	14.3	16	12.9



## 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			
	2017	2016	2015	2014
I	87	85	69	72
II.1	138	159	160	154
II.2	-	-	█	█
III	-	-	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>244</b>	█	█

Class	Percentage			
	2017	2016	2015	2014
I	38.67	34.8	29.61	31.44
II.1	61.33	65.2	68.67	67.25
II.2	-	-	-	█
III	-	-	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-

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

(a) 2017

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	87	38.67	42	35.90	45	41.67	51.72
II.1	138	61.33	75	64.10	63	58.33	45.66
II.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>100</b>	-

(b) 2016

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	85	34.8	43	37.4	42	32.6	49.4
II.1	159	65.2	72	62.6	87	67.4	54.7
II.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>100</b>	-

(b) 2015

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	69	29.61	41	35.96	28	23.53	40.57
II.1	160	68.67	71	62.28	89	74.79	55.62
II.2	█	█	█	█	█	█	█
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	█	█	█	█	█	█	█

(c) 2014

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	72	31.44	43	35.25	29	21.10	40.27
II.1	154	67.25	76	62.30	78	72.90	50.65
II.2	█	█	█	█	-	-	-
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	█	█	█	█	█	█	█

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

Prelims Nos 2015	FHS Results in 2017					Finals not taken in 2017
	I	II.1	II.2	III	Pass	
Distinction: 71	46	21	-	-	-	4
Pass:	-	-	-	-	-	-

Finals Nos 2017	Prelims results in 2014/2015		Prelims not taken in 2014/15
	Distinction	Pass	
Class I: 87	46	35	6
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	109	35.17	56	32.37	53	38.69	48.62
II.1	164	52.90	90	52.02	74	54.02	45.12
II.2	28	9.03	19	10.98	9	6.57	32.15
III	█	█	█	█	█	█	█
Pass	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	6	1.94	5	2.90	1	0.72	16.66
Total	█	█	█	█	█	█	█

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	107	41.48	55	40.44	52	42.63	48.60
II.1	144	55.81	77	56.61	67	54.91	46.53
II.2	7	2.71	4	2.95	3	2.46	42.85
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	258	100	136	100	122	100	-

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	57	23.37	34	26.15	23	20.17	40.36
II.1	175	71.72	90	69.24	85	74.56	48.57
II.2	9	3.69	3	2.31	6	5.27	66.66
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pass	1	0.40	1	0.76	-	-	-
Fail	2	0.82	2	1.54	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>100</b>	-

d) History of the British Isles (Sex/Paper showing marks for that paper)

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	69	27.05	39	29.32	30	24.60	43.47
II.1	175	68.62	88	66.16	87	71.31	49.71
II.2	10	3.93	6	4.52	4	3.28	40.0
III	█	█	-	-	█	█	█
Pass	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	█	█	█	█	█	█	

e) General History (Sex/Paper showing marks for that paper)

Class	Nos (both sexes)	%	Men		Women		Women as % of total in each class
			Nos	%	Nos	%	
I	86	27.31	52	30.06	34	23.95	39.53
II.1	211	66.99	114	65.90	97	68.30	45.97
II.2	17	5.39	6	3.46	11	7.75	64.70
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	1	0.31	1	0.58	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>100</b>	-

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	105	34.54	59	35.55	46	33.33	43.80
II.1	193	63.49	104	62.65	89	64.50	46.11
II.2	█	█	█	█	█	█	█
III	█	█	█	█	█	█	█
Fail	1	0.32	-	-	1	0.72	100
<b>Total</b>	█	█	█	█	█	█	█

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	90	34.88	45	33.08	45	36.89	50.0
II.1	158	61.24	86	63.24	72	59.02	45.57
II.2	10	3.88	5	3.68	5	4.09	50.0
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fail	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>100</b>	

**(v) History and Joint Schools' candidates taking each paper**

(Figures include both Main and Joint Schools' candidates – bracketed figures indicate the number of joint schools' candidates) (withdrawn candidates have not been taken into account here)

	2017	2016	2015	2014
<b>History of the British Isles</b>				
1. c.300-1087	12 (2)	18 (5)	19 (5)	14 (3)
2. 1042-1330	27 (3)	37 (2)	28 (1)	25 (1)
3. 1330-1550	32 (3)	27 -	32 (3)	30 (2)
4. 1500-1700	69 (12)	64 (7)	75 (9)	74 (9)
5. 1685-1830	30 (1)	24 (8)	34 (7)	24 (4)
6. 1815-1924	25 (4)	37 (2)	40 (8)	51 (10)
7. Since 1900	60 (6)	65 (6)	49 (11)	45 (9)
<b>General History</b>				
(i) 285-476	8 (1)	7 (1)	6 (1)	6 (3)
(ii) 476-750	█ █	5 (1)	█ █	█ █
(iii) 700-900	█ █	7 -	6 (1)	11 (3)
(iv) 900-1122	11 (3)	█ █	6 -	11 (2)
(v) 1122-1273	8 (2)	█ █	█ █	10 (2)
(vi) 1273-1409	12 (4)	█ █	6 -	6 (3)
(vii) 1409-1525	█ █	14 (5)	8 (1)	9 (1)
(viii) 1517-1618	17 (2)	23 (6)	21 -	25 (2)
(ix) 1618-1715	13 (2)	12 (4)	15 -	20 (4)
(x) 1715-1799	13 (6)	12 (5)	21 (8)	27 (6)
(xi) 1789-1870	21 (6)	13 (6)	13 (2)	11 (4)
(xii) 1856-1914	7 (3)	█ █	6 (1)	10 (4)
(xiii) 1914-1945	33 (9)	28 (5)	25 (6)	30 (10)
(xiv) 1941-1973	41 (12)	40 (7)	35 (12)	44 (13)
(xv) (3028) History of the U.S. 1600-1812	9 (3)	18 (4)	15 (2)	13 (3)
(xvi) History of the U.S. 1776-1877	11 (3)	22 (5)	28 (6)	23 (6)
(xvii) History of the U.S. since 1863	30 (8)	39 (10)	39 (9)	31 (8)
(xviii) Eurasian Empires, 1450-1800 ( <i>new</i> )	54 (20)	45 (14)		
(xix) Imperial and Global History 1750-1914	15 (5)	24 (6)	40 (14)	21 (7)



	2017	2016	2015	2014
<b>Further Subjects</b>				
1. Anglo-Saxon Archaeology of the Early Christian period	█ █	█ █	█ █	█ █
2. The Near East in the Age of Justinian and Muhammad, c. 527–c.700	8 (5)	11 (3)	9 (2)	18 (6)
3. The Carolingian Renaissance	█ █	█ █	█ █	█ █
4. The Viking Age: War and Peace c.750-1100	7 (4)	█ █	█ █	8 (1)
5. The Crusades	17 (2)	16 (5)	12 (4)	19 (6)
6. Culture and Society in Early Renaissance Italy, 1290-1348	█ █	█ █	█ █	6 -
7. Flanders and Italy in the Quattrocento, 1420–1480	█ █	█ █	6 -	- -
8. The Wars of the Roses	7 (1)	8 (4)	14 (2)	8 (2)
9. Women, Gender & Print Culture in Reformation England, c.1530-1640	10 (2)	6 (2)	7 (1)	█ █
Literature and Politics in Early Modern England (FSEE) (A10711S9)		█ █	21 (5)	18 (1)
10. Literature and Politics in Early Modern England (A10711W1)	10 -	18 (1)		
11. Representing the City, 1558-1640 (A13762S1)	9 (2)	7 (1)	6 (4)	
12. Writing in the early Modern period, 1550-1750 (new) (A15060S1)	█ █			
13. Court, Culture & Art in Early Modern Europe, 1580-1700	█ █	7 -	10 (1)	█ █
14. The Military & Society in Britain & France, c. 1650-1815	11 (2)	█ █	█ █	8 -
15. The Metropolitan Crucible, London 1685-1815	8 (4)	6 (1)	9 (2)	8 (1)
16. First Industrial Revolution 1700-1870	█ █	█ █	█ █	█ █
17. Medicine, Empire & Improvement, 1720 to 1820	█ █	█ █	█ █	█ █
18. The Age of Jefferson	8 -	10 (1)	15 (2)	13 (4)
19. Culture and Society in France from Voltaire to Balzac	█ █	█ █	█ █	█ █
20. Nationalism in western Europe 1799-1890	11 (1)	11 (3)	10 (4)	6 (2)
21. Intellect and Culture in Victorian Britain	█ █	█ █	7 -	8 -
22. The Authority of Nature: Race, Heredity & Crime 1800-1940	12 (1)	16 (2)	15 (3)	11 -
23. The Middle East in the Age of Empire	24 (5)	23 (5)	13 (5)	█ █
24. Imperialism and Nationalism, 1830–1966	14 (3)	18 (4)	23 (7)	18 (5)
25. Modern Japan, 1868–1972	11 (3)	12 (4)	- -	11 (4)
26. British Economic History since 1870 (PPE)	16 (15)	12 (8)	19 (14)	- (12)

	2017		2016		2015		2014	
27. Nationalism, Politics and Culture in Ireland, c. 1870–1921	█ █		14	(5)	█ █		10	(1)
28. Comparative History of the First World War	-	-	15	(1)	16	(4)	14	(5)
29. China since 1900 (with old Regs)	24	(7)	23	(6)	13	(2)	11	(4)
China in War and Revolution 1890–1949 (old regs)	█ █		█ █		█ █		█ █	
30. The Soviet Union 1924–1941	10	(5)	14	(3)	█ █		█ █	
31. Culture, politics & identity in Cold War Europe, 1945–68 (A10735W1) (old regs)	16	(3)	19	(5)	22	(4)	21	(7)
Culture, politics & identity in Cold War Europe, 1945–68 (New Regs) (A10735X1)	█ █							
32. Britain at the Movies: Film and National Identity since 1914 (FSEE)	10	(1)	16	(2)	8	(1)	15	(1)
33. Scholastic and Humanist Political thought	█ █		█ █		█ █		█ █	
34. The Science of Society 1650–1800	8	(3)	█ █		█ █		█ █	
35. Political Theory and Social Science	13	(7)	7	(2)	6		9	(3)
36. Postcolonial Historiography: Writing the (Indian) Nation ) (A13763S1)	█ █		█ █		8	(4)		
<b>Special Subjects</b>								
1. St Augustine & the last days of Rome, 370–430	8	(2)	7	-	6	(1)	10	(1)
2. Francia in the Age of Clovis and Gregory of Tours	█ █		█ █		█ █		6	-
3. Byzantium in the Age of Constantine Porphyrogenitus	6	(1)	6	(1)	10	(1)	10	(1)
4. The Norman Conquest of England	7	(1)	10	-	10	(1)	9	-
5. The Peasants' Revolt of 1381 (new title)	█ █							
England in Crisis, 1374–88			█ █		█ █		10	-
6. Joan of Arc & her Age, 1419–1435	10	-	6	-	7	(1)	8	(1)
7. Painting & Culture in Ming China	█ █		█ █		█ █		█ █	
8. Politics, Art & Culture in the Italian Renaissance, Venice & Florence c.1475–1525	█ █		20	(3)	19	(3)	8	(1)
9. Luther & the German Reformation	12	-	8	-	7	-	10	-
10. Government, Politics and Society in England, 1547–1558	█ █		█ █		8	(1)	10	(2)
11. The Crisis of the Reformation: Britain, France & the Netherlands 1560–1610	█ █		10	(2)	7	-		
12. The Thirty Years Wars (new)	12	(1)						
13. Scientific Movement in the Seventeenth Century (A10752W1)	13	(2)	8	-	15	(2)	15	(1)
13. Scientific Movement in the Seventeenth Century (A10752X1)	█ █							

	2017		2016		2015		2014	
14. Revolution & Republic, 1647-16558	(10)	-	█	█	15	(2)	16	(1)
15. English Architecture, 1660–1720	6	-	12	-	18	(3)	13	-
16. Debating social change in Britain & Ireland 1770-1825	█	█	█	█	█	█	15	(3)
17. Church, State, and English Society, 1829–54 (suspended 2016-17)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
18. Growing-up in the middle-class family: Britain, 1830-70	11	(1)	19	(4)	-	-	9	(1)
19. Slavery and the Crisis of the Union, 1854–1865	18	(1)	19	(1)	13	(1)	16	(1)
20. Art and its Public in France, 1815-67	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█
21. Race, Religion & Resistance in the United States, from Jim Crow to the Civil Rights	17	(2)	16	(2)	10	(2)	7	(2)
22. Terror & Forced Labour in Stalin’s Russia	6	(1)	█	█				
Russian Revolution of 1917	-	-	█	█	5	(1)	7	(3)
23. From Gandhi to the Green Revolution: India, Independence & Modernity 1939-69 (A14633W1)	18	(2)	19	(1)	16	(1)	-	-
SS. India, 1919-1939: Contesting the Nation (Old Regs) (A10761W1)	-	-	-	-	█	█	14	(3)
24. Nazi Germany, a racial order , 1933-45	█	█	6	(1)	█	█	█	█
25. France from the Popular Front to the Liberation, 1936–44	6	(1)	█	█	█	█	6	-
26. War and Reconstruction, 1939-45	█	█	█	█	13	(3)	15	(1)
27. Britain from the Bomb to the Beatles, 1945-67	12	(2)	14	(2)	8	-	7	-
28. The Northern Ireland Troubles 1965–1985	15	(4)	17	-	15	(3)	10	(3)
29. Britain in the Seventies	8	(2)	19	(4)	17	-	14	(3)
30. Neoliberalism & Postmodernism: Ideas, Politics & Culture in Europe & North America, 1970-2000	16	-	15	(1)	13	(1)	13	(1)
31. Revolutions of 1989	13	(1)	12	(1)	7	(1)	7	(1)
Optional/Additional Theses	█	█	█	█	█	█	-	(40)
Princeton assessment (A10773V1) (8999)	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█
Disciplines of History	244	(19)	258	(14)	249	(15)	243	(14)
Compulsory Thesis (A10771S1)	270	(45)	244	(49)	281	(47)	282	(53)
Thesis in PPE (A12746S1) (HPol)	-	(11)	-	(11)	-	(8)	-	(9)
Thesis (A11024S1) (Heco)	-	(15)	-	(8)	-	(13)	-	(11)
Interd. Dissertation (HENG) (A14401S1)	-	(9)	-	(9)	-	(8)		
Representing the City (A11026S1) (9092) (HENG only)	█	█	█	█	█	█		

	2017	2016	2015	2014
Postcolonial historiography (A11027S1) (9791) (HENG only)	- (6)	█ █	█ █	

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

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
<b>British History</b>						
1. 300–1087	█	█	█	█	█	█
2. 1042–1330	█	█	█	█	█	█
3. 1330–1550	█	█	█	█	█	█
4. 1500–1700	-	-	6	3	3	12
7. 1685–1830	█	█	█	█	█	█
6. 1815-1924	█	█	█	█	█	█
7. Since 1900	1	-	2	-	3	6
<b>General History</b>						
(i) 285-476	█	█	█	█	█	█
(ii) 476–750	█	█	█	█	█	█
(iii) 700–900	█	█	█	█	█	█
(iv) 900–1122	█	█	█	█	█	█
(v) 1122–1273	█	█	█	█	█	█
(vi) 1273–1409	█	█	█	█	█	█
(vii) 1409–1525	-	-	-	-	-	-
(viii) 1517–1618	█	█	█	█	█	█
(ix) 1618–1715	█	█	█	█	█	█
(x) 1715–1799	2	-	-	1	3	6
(xi) 1789–1870	1	-	1	1	3	6
(xii) 1856–1914	█	█	█	█	█	█
(xiii) 1914–1945	1	2	-	2	4	9
(xiv) 1941–1973	-	2	-	4	6	12
(xv) History of the U.S. 1600–1812	█	█	█	█	█	█
(xvi) History of the U.S. 1776-1877	█	█	█	█	█	█
(xvii) History of the U.S. since 1863	1	3	-	1	3	8
(xviii) Eurasian Empires, 1450-1800	4	3	2	2	9	20

(xix) Imperial & Global History 1750-1914	█	█	█	█	█	█
--	---	---	---	---	---	---

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
<b>Further Subjects</b>						
1. Anglo-Saxon Archaeology of the Early Christian period	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. The Near East in the Age of Justinian and Muhammad	█	█	█	█	█	█
3. The Carolingian Renaissance	█	█	█	█	█	█
4. The Viking Age: War and Peace c.750-1100	█	█	█	█	█	█
5. The Crusades, 1095-1291	1	-	-	1	-	17
6. Culture and Society in Early Renaissance Italy, 1290-1348	-	-	-	-	-	-
7. Flanders and Italy in the Quattrocento, 1420–1480	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. The Wars of the Roses	█	█	█	█	█	
9. Women, Gender & Print Culture in Reformation England, c.1530-1640	█	█	█	█	█	█
10. Literature and Politics in Early Modern England	-	-	-	-	-	-
11. Representing the City, 1558-1640 (A13762S1)	█	█	█	█	█	█
12. Writing in the early Modern period, 1550-1750 (A15060S1) (new)	-	-	-	-	-	-
13. Court, Culture & Art in Early Modern Europe, 1580-1700	█	█	█	█	█	█
14. The Military & Society in Britain & France, c.1650-1815	█	█	█	█	█	█
15. The Metropolitan Crucible, London 1685-1815	█	█	█	█	█	█
16. The First industrial Revolution 1700-1870	-	-	-	-	-	-
17. Medicine, Empire & Improvement, 1720 to 1820	-	-	-	-	-	-
18 The Age of Jefferson	-	-	-	-	-	-
19. Culture and Society in France from Voltaire to Balzac	-	-	-	-	-	-
20. Nationalism in western Europe	█	█	█	█	█	█
21. Intellect and Culture in Victorian Britain	-	-	-	-	-	-
22. The Authority of Nature: Race, Heredity & Crime 1800-1940	█	█	█	█	█	█

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
23. The Middle East in the Age of Empire	█	█	█	█	█	█
24. Imperialism and Nationalism, 1830–1966	█	█	█	█	█	█
25. Modern Japan, 1868–1972	█	█	█	█	█	█
26. British Economic History since 1870 (PPE)	-	15	-	-	-	15
27. Nationalism, Politics and Culture in Ireland, c. 1870–1921	█	█	█	█	█	█
28. Comparative History of the First World War	-	-	-	-	-	-
29. China since 1900 (13392W1)	-	4	-	1	2	7
30. The Soviet Union 1924–1941	█	█	█	█	█	█
31. Culture, Politics & identity in Cold War Europe, 1945-68 ( <i>New Regs</i> ) (A10735X1)	█	█	█	█	█	█
Culture, Politics & identity in Cold War Europe, 1945-68 ( <i>Old Regs</i> ) (A10735W1)	█	█	█	█	█	█
32. Britain at the Movies: Film and National identity since 1914	█	█	█	█	█	█
33. Scholastic and Humanist Political thought	-	-	-	-	-	-
34. The Science of Society 1650-1800	█	█	█	█	█	█
35. Political Theory and Social Science	-	1	-	1	5	7
36. Postcolonial Historiography: Writing the (Indian) Nation (A13763S1)	-	-	-	-	-	-

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
<b>Special Subjects</b>						
1. St Augustine & the last days of Rome, 370-430	█	█	█	█	█	█
2. Francia in the Age of Clovis and Gregory of Tours	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. Byzantium in the Age of Constantine Prophyrogenitus	█	█	█	█	█	█
4. Norman Conquest of England	█	█	█	█	█	█
5. England in Crisis, 1374-88	█	█	█	█	█	█
6. Joan of Arc & her Age, 1419-1435	-	-	-	-	-	-
7. Painting & Culture in Ming China	█	█	█	█	█	█

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
8. Politics, Art & Culture in the Italian Renaissance, Venice and Florence c.1475-1525	█	█	█	█	█	█
9. Luther & the German Reformation	-	-	-	-	-	-
10. Government, Politics and Society in England, 1547–1558	█	█	█	█	█	█
11. The Crisis of the Reformation: Britain, France & the Netherlands 1560-1610	█	█	█	█	█	█
12. The Thirty Years' War ( <i>new</i> )	█	█	█	█	█	█
13. Scientific Movement in the Seventeenth Century (A10735W1)	█	█	█	█	█	█
Scientific Movement in the Seventeenth Century (A10735X1)	█	█	█	█	█	█
14. Revolution & Republic, 1647-1658 (A13773W1)	-	-	-	-	-	-
15. English Architecture, 1660–1720	-	-	-	-	-	-
16. Debating social change in Britain & Ireland 1770-1825	-	-	-	-	-	-
17. Church, State, and English Society, 1829–54 ( <i>suspended 2016-17</i> )	-	-	-	-	-	-
18. Becoming a Citizen, c. 1860-1902 ( <i>new title</i> )	█	█	█	█	█	█
19. Slavery and the Crisis of the Union, 1854–1865	█	█	█	█	█	█
20. Art and its Public in France, 1815-67	-	-	-	-	-	-
21. Race, Religion & Resistance in the United States, from Jim Crow to Civil Rights	█	█	█	█	█	█
22. Terror & Forced Labour in Stalin's Russia	█	█	█	█	█	█
23. From Gandhi to the Green Revolution: India, Independence & Modernity 1939-69 (A14633W1)	█	█	█	█	█	█
24. Nazi Germany, a racial order, 1933-45	█	█	█	█	█	█
25. France from the Popular Front to the Liberation, 1936–44	█	█	█	█	█	█
26. War and Reconstruction, 1939-45	█	█	█	█	█	█
27. Britain from the Bomb to the Beatles, 1945-67	█	█	█	█	█	█
28. The Northern Ireland Troubles 1965–1985	█	█	█	█	█	█
29. Britain in the Seventies	█	█	█	█	█	█

	AMH	HECO	HENG	HML	HPOL	Total
30. Neoliberalism & Postmodernism: Ideas, Politics & Culture in Europe & North America, 1970-2000	-	-	-	-	-	-
31. Revolutions of 1989	█	█	█	█	█	█
Bridge essays/Interdisciplinary papers/Exams	-	-	-	15	-	15
Princeton assessment	█	█	█	█	█	█
Theses (A10771S1)	19	-	-	-	26	45
Opt /BH/GH/FS/SS/Ad. Thesis	█	█	█	█	█	█
Disciplines of History	19	-	-	-	-	19
Politics theses	-	-	-	-	11	11
HECO theses (A11024S1)	-	15	-	-	-	15
Interdisciplinary Dissertation (HENG) (A14401S1)		-	9	-	-	9

Examiners:



External Examiners:

