Politics FHS 2018-2019

Internal Examiners' Report

General comments from Convenor of Politics FHS Examining 2018/19

This year's examining process has prompted the following suggestions for future years.

(1) DPIR should consider developing the capacity of Examiners to review marks across papers and/or markers earlier in the process (in the week before the main Exam Board meetings).

(2) DPIR should consider whether it needs to review the mark descriptors for step-marking. Step-marking has worked well in stretching marks in the 1st class. But there is a concern about grade inflation overall and there is a need to consider if this is the case, and if so, if the current step marking descriptors are contributing to this.

(3) Advice on the typical distribution of marks should be sent out to Politics markers early in the process and probably repeated as the marking begins.

██████████████████

Take up by school for each paper

Paper	201	202	203	203 old regs	204	205	206	207	208	209	210	211	212	213	214
PPE	44	81	98	7	13	16	5	8	14	7	9	35	10	20	120
HP	6	25	16	0	6	4	1	2	5	2	0	12	7	2	32

Paper	215	216	217	218	219	220	223	224	225	227	228	229	297 CPE	297 ISC	Pol Thesis
PPE	17	9	16	8	10	82	1	23	5	16	6	30	24	44	12
HP	2	2	2	1	0	13	0	3	0	6	2	1	1	3	11

Performance by school for each paper

Paper	201	202	203 new reg	203 old regs	204	205	206	207	208	209	210	211	212	213	214
PPE	65.3	66.2	66.4	63.7	68.1	66.8	67.8	66.3	67.3	64.4	68.3	67.2	68.0	67.8	66.9
HP	66.5	65.8	67.1		69.5	64.8	▮	▮	69.8	▮		66.5	68.1	▮	68.4

Paper	215	216	217	218	219	220	223	224	225	227	228	229	297 CPE	297 ISC	Pol Thesis
PPE	66.8	66.2	67.5	65.8	65.4	64.9	▮	66.3	69.8	64.9	70.5	67.6	68.0	65.6	67.1
HP	▮	▮	▮	▮	▮	64.2		65.0		65.0	▮	▮	▮	67.7	65.9

Paper titles

201 Comparative Government	215 Political Thought: Plato to Rousseau
202 British Politics and Government since 1900	216 Political Thought: Bentham to Weber
203 Theory of Politics	217 Marx and Marxism
204 Modern British Government and Politics	218 Sociological Theory
205 Government and Politics of the US	219 Sociology of Post-Industrial Societies
206 Politics in Europe	220 Political Sociology
207 Politics in Russia and the Former Soviet Union	223 The Government and Politics of Japan
208 Politics in Sub-Saharan Africa	224 Social Policy
209 Politics in Latin America	225 Comparative Demographic Systems
210 Politics in South Asia	227 Politics in China
211 Politics in the Middle East	228 The Politics of the European Union
212 International Relations in the Era of Two World Wars	229 Advanced Paper in Theories of Justice
213 International Relations in the Era of the Cold War	297 CPE Comparative Political Economy
214 International Relations	297 ISC International Security and Conflict

FHS TT19: Politics stats by paper and by school

Paper	Degree	candidates	mean	>= 70 (%)	>= 60 (%)	>= 50 (%)	>= 40 (%)	Upper Q	Median	Lower Q
201	PPE	44	65.3	20.45	65.91	13.64	0.00	68.0	65.0	63.0
201	HP	6	66.5	16.67	83.33	0.00	0.00	67.0	66.5	64.5
201	Combined	50	65.5	20.00	68.00	12.00	0.00	68.0	65.0	63.3
202	PPE	81	66.2	27.16	56.79	14.81	1.23	70.0	66.0	63.0
202	HP	25	65.8	24.00	68.00	8.00	0.00	69.0	66.0	63.0
202	Combined	106	66.1	26.42	59.43	13.21	0.94	70.0	66.0	63.0
203	PPE	98	66.4	30.61	57.14	12.24	0.00	70.0	65.5	63.3
203	HP	16	67.1	25.00	75.00	0.00	0.00	68.8	66.5	63.8
203	Combined	114	66.5	29.82	59.65	10.53	0.00	70.0	66.0	63.3
203 old regs	PPE	7	63.7	14.29	57.14	28.57	0.00	67.5	63.0	60.0
204	PPE	13	68.1	38.46	46.15	15.38	0.00	72.0	68.0	66.0
204	HP	6	69.5	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	72.5	69.0	66.3
204	Combined	19	68.5	42.11	47.37	10.53	0.00	72.5	68.0	66.0
205	PPE	16	66.8	37.50	43.75	18.75	0.00	70.5	68.0	63.0
205	HP	4	64.8	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	66.0	65.0	63.8
205	Combined	20	66.4	30.00	55.00	15.00	0.00	70.0	66.5	63.0
206	PPE	5	67.8	60.00	40.00	0.00	0.00	70.0	70.0	64.0
206	HP									
206	Combined									
207	PPE	8	66.3	25.00	62.50	12.50	0.00	68.5	66.5	64.8
207	HP									
207	Combined									
208	PPE	14	67.3	42.86	50.00	7.14	0.00	70.8	68.0	65.0
208	HP	5	69.8	40.00	60.00	0.00	0.00	70.0	69.0	68.0
208	Combined	19	67.9	42.11	52.63	5.26	0.00	70.5	68.0	65.5
209	PPE	7	64.4	28.57	42.86	28.57	0.00	69.0	65.0	60.0
209	HP									
209	Combined									
210	PPE	9	68.3	44.44	55.56	0.00	0.00	70.0	68.0	67.0
211	PPE	35	67.2	34.29	60.00	5.71	0.00	70.0	68.0	65.0
211	HP	12	66.5	25.00	58.33	16.67	0.00	68.5	66.5	65.0
211	Combined	47	67.0	31.91	59.57	8.51	0.00	70.0	68.0	65.0
212	PPE	10	68.0	30.00	70.00	0.00	0.00	71.8	66.5	65.0
212	HP	7	68.1	42.86	57.14	0.00	0.00	70.5	68.0	65.5
212	Combined	17	68.1	35.29	64.71	0.00	0.00	71.0	67.0	65.0
213	PPE	20	67.8	40.00	55.00	5.00	0.00	72.0	67.0	65.0
213	HP									
213	Combined									
214	PPE	120	66.9	29.17	65.83	5.00	0.00	70.0	66.0	64.0
214	HP	32	68.4	40.63	56.25	3.13	0.00	71.3	68.5	65.0
214	Combined	152	67.2	31.58	63.82	4.61	0.00	70.0	67.0	64.0
215	PPE	17	66.8	23.53	76.47	0.00	0.00	69.0	65.0	64.0
215	HP									
215	Combined									
216	PPE	9	66.2	11.11	88.89	0.00	0.00	68.0	66.0	63.0
216	HP									

Paper	Course	N	Mean							
216	Combined									
217	PPE	16	67.5	31.25	68.75	0.00	0.00	70.3	67.5	65.0
217	HP									
217	Combined									
218	PPE	8	65.8	25.00	50.00	25.00	0.00	69.5	66.5	62.0
218	HP									
218	Combined									
219	PPE	10	65.4	30.00	60.00	10.00	0.00	69.3	66.0	64.0
220	PPE	82	64.9	24.39	64.63	10.98	0.00	69.0	65.0	61.0
220	HP	13	64.2	7.69	76.92	15.38	0.00	68.0	64.0	61.0
220	Combined	95	64.8	22.11	66.32	11.58	0.00	68.5	65.0	61.0
223	PPE									
224	PPE	23	66.3	22.00	74.00	4.00	0.00	68.0	66.0	64.0
224	HP	3	65.0	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	66.0	65.0	64.0
224	Combined	26	66.2	19.23	76.92	3.85	0.00	67.8	66.0	64.0
225	PPE	5	69.8	60.00	40.00	0.00	0.00	73.0	71.0	65.0
227	PPE	16	64.9	31.25	50.00	12.50	6.25	70.0	65.5	61.5
227	HP	6	65.0	33.33	50.00	16.67	0.00	68.8	65.0	64.3
227	Combined	22	65.0	31.82	50.00	13.64	4.55	70.0	65.0	62.5
228	PPE	6	70.5	66.67	33.33	0.00	0.00	72.0	71.5	68.8
228	HP									
228	Combined									
229	PPE	30	67.6	23.33	76.67	0.00	0.00	69.0	66.0	65.0
229	HP									
229	Combined									
297CPE	PPE	24	68.0	37.50	58.33	4.17	0.00	71.3	67.0	65.0
297CPE	HP									
297CPE	Combined									
297ISC	PPE	44	65.6	13.64	77.27	6.82	2.27	68.0	67.0	63.8
297ISC	HP	3	67.7	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00	69.0	67.0	66.0
297ISC	Combined	47	65.7	14.89	76.60	6.38	2.13	68.0	67.0	64.0
Pol Thesis	PPE	12	67.1	33.33	50.00	8.33	8.33	72.0	66.0	64.5
Pol Thesis	HP	11	65.9	36.36	36.36	27.27	0.00	73.0	67.0	59.0
Pol Thesis	Combined	23	66.5	34.78	43.48	17.39	4.35	73.0	66.0	61.0

Paper titles

201 Comparative Government	215 Political Thought: Plato to Rousseau
202 British Politics and Government since 1900	216 Political Thought: Bentham to Weber
203 Theory of Politics	217 Marx and Marxism
204 Modern British Government and Politics	218 Sociological Theory
205 Government and Politics of the US	219 Sociology of Post-Industrial Societies
206 Politics in Europe	220 Political Sociology
207 Politics in Russia and the Former Soviet Union	223 The Government and Politics of Japan
208 Politics in Sub-Saharan Africa	224 Social Policy
209 Politics in Latin America	225 Comparative Demographic Systems
210 Politics in South Asia	227 Politics in China
211 Politics in the Middle East	228 The Politics of the European Union
212 International Relations in the Era of Two World Wars	229 Advanced Paper in Theories of Justice
213 International Relations in the Era of the Cold War	297 CPE Comparative Political Economy
214 International Relations	297 ISC International Security and Conflict

201 Comparative Government

There were 50 candidates (44 PPE, 6 HP).

No questions were reported during the exam and the overall quality of answers was good and most answers sufficiently engaged with the literature. The average grade across all scripts was 65.6, the standard deviation 4.6.

The most popular questions were Q numbers 9 (democratization/regime change), 12 (authoritarianism), and 3 (electoral systems). The least chosen topics were 10 (colonialism), 6 (judiciaries), and 11 (constitutions).

The unweighted average score across all questions was similar. All questions received at least one exam.

I now turn to general impressions from examiners on relevant questions.

Question 3: Strong answers considered many alternatives to explaining party systems, and in particular, some nuances of the law that would explain why rules would lead to parties contesting elections. Consideration of both historical and contemporary examples was important.

Question 9: Answers needed to define democratization and defend this definition. Answers should have cited Ansell/Samuels, and/or Boix, and/or Acemoglu/Robinson and showed either in-depth understanding of one model or some cursory reference to all of them. Strong answers discussed evidence from different time periods.

Question 12: Good answers defined electoral authoritarianism and considered alternative conceptions of the terms "unstable," linking to definitions of what constitutes regime change. Way/Levitsky and Svolik needed to be discussed. Strong answers considered country examples and walked through different arguments about why some forms of electoral authoritarian regimes would be less likely to transition to democracies than others.

202 British Politics and Government since 1900

There were 106 candidates; 81 in PPE and 25 in MHP. Each group produced a very similar pattern of answers, and the comments which follow apply equally.

1.   Why did the Labour party take the form of an alliance of socialists and trade unionists?
18 answers
A smaller number of answers than a more straightforward question might have elicited. A few were very good demonstrating detailed knowledge of the labour movement, but more struggled with the word 'socialists', trying to define the word so as to make the comparison with 'trade unionists' easier. Although the question contained no end date, answers which ended in c.1910 were unlikely to be as persuasive as those which contained later information on how the form of the alliance changed.

2.   What caused the Liberal party to collapse so rapidly?
40 answers
An interesting set of interpretations which drew on a variety of explanations; structural, sociological, behaviour of party or parties. A few answers contained a great deal of pre-1914 material only, suggesting that the candidate had revised for a question which had not been set. More, however contained a few pre-1914 sentences as part of a broader answer. Much was written on the Asquith/Lloyd George split, and its effect on the party in the country. A few papers showed knowledge of the Liberals up to the 1930s. The effects of the 1918 franchise extension were often mentioned with opinions roughly equally divided between their importance to the question or insignificance because of the composition of the new voters. Finally, a few essays suggested that the party declined because increasingly, Liberalism was better represented elsewhere than by the old Liberal party. Many answers were clearly argued and to a high standard.

3.   Why was the Irish question so divisive at Westminster before 1922?
13 answers
A few answers knew much about Westminster development, but less about what the Irish 'question' was – or might have been. Other answers, possibly ill-advisedly, began a chronological essay starting in about 1886 and ended exhaustedly ten or twelve pages later. Sharper essays tried to pick on themes which made Ireland different and show how they informed Westminster; such as the constitutional argument in Ireland and the role of the House of Lords, the growth of Ulster particularism and the seeming irreconcilability of religions as they fuelled nationalism and unionism. Candidates' knowledge tended to peter out after 1914. Only a few knew about the coming of partition- unsurprisingly they were amongst the best answers.

4.   What were the decisive obstacles to women's enfranchisement before 1918?
22 answers
An interesting selection of reasons were proposed as 'decisive'; much of the liberal party (especially Asquith); not the Liberals as such but the large range of problems they faced which downgraded enfranchisement; the problems of enfranchising women alongside all remaining voteless men. Several candidates made thoughtful comments about the nature of 'property' as a political issue and whether enfranchisement of women would benefit the Conservatives. Although the importance of the war was disputed, virtually all answers agreed that by 1918 the decisive obstacles had been removed.

5. Were there credible alternatives to appeasement?
9 answers
About half the answers argued that there were credible alternatives, although what they were differed widely. The other half, arguing that there were no credible alternatives, were nevertheless usually critical of government policies at various points between the mid-1920s and mid-1930s. Most answers noted the strong anti-war popular opinion, but they differed on whether governments should or should not have taken notice of it. Similarly, the Treasury was thought to be a malign influence although exactly why was often not explained. Most answers were well constructed and showed knowledge of different approaches. Curiously a few did not define what they meant by appeasement, in spite of their strong views about it.

6. Did the Attlee government pursue socialism or consensus?
52 answers
The second most answered question. Many answers were clear, some trying to take the evidence for socialism and for social democracy; others being dismissive of one and endorsing the other. A few candidates claimed that the governments had not seized the alleged chance for a socialist transformation, and said that knowledge of party's history would always have suggested that this was likely (McKibbin and Miliband were frequently cited together even though their cases are very different). A different line was that Labour's social democracy stood in the continuum of radical reforming governments and was therefore successful but not as exceptional as has been claimed. Some candidates lent too heavily on their tutorial essays and their answers jumped around uncomfortably. Others allowed their essays to drift so that Marshall Aid, nationalisation, the NHS, and international constraints all came and went as though they were unrelated to each other.

7. Why did the Conservative party win elections in the 1950s but not the 1960s?
17 answers
Some good answers, but candidates tended to know about the 1950s – based on prosperity and preserving what Labour had done – or the 1960s. These answers tended to be hazy on election strategy and in a few cases when elections had actually occurred. The question could of course be addressed in different ways. Some better answers considered amongst other things party strategy and government behaviour and why issues changed in salience. A few bolder answers took a more difficult line; that the electorate demanded more after 1945, the parties tried to follow demands and won or lost accordingly.

8. Why did decolonisation cause so little domestic controversy?
19 answers
Almost no-one contested the assumption in the question. Those few who did challenged the assumption about the word 'decolonisation', saying that it was a process which continued after the formal, political act of independence. All the broad arguments were well covered including Conservative 'imperialist' opposition and why it was defeated by its own party. Candidates were also familiar with the economic arguments. A well-answered question.

9. Did the governments of 1979-1997 have much to do with Conservatism?
69 answers
The most answered question, and answers ranged from the excellent and clever to the bad and depressing. A large number of candidates tried a definition of Conservatism first, as a basis for the answer. This could work well, but those who tried to adhere too rigidly to late 18th or early 19th century definitions frequently found they were driven to rather negative essays. Those who took Conservatism to be more malleable and fruitful of reforms as well as preservation went

on to discover easier similarities with 1979-97. Another group gave themselves a much easier task by roundly declaring that the governments had little or nothing to do with Conservatism, and using both legislation, and attitudes to pursue their case. Good essays picked out examples of what they meant from the whole period (including 'statecraft' which was much commented on), producing crisp arguments. Less good essays included those which tried a laborious chronological approach or which mentioned (obsessively) only Thatcher and no other politician. Some students' knowledge evidently ended in 1990 and so could only write lamely that 'Major continued Thatcherism'. But some essays were really impressive, and it was interesting to read a few enthusiastic defences of 1980s economic policies and a few outright condemnations ('a project to attack the working class'). Students' verdicts were almost as varied as those of contemporary politicians.

10.   'New Labour was cautious in economic policy, but radical in social policy.' Do you agree?
46 answers
Some essays suffered from too much generality, and some also showed no knowledge of events after 2005 thereby ignoring Gordon Brown's premiership altogether. Much better essays were able to trace the evolution of Labour's work, sometimes showing how economic policy allowed the flourishing of social policies. This then allowed the direction of the essay either to agree or disagree with the title (most agreed). A few questioned whether Labour's policies were coherent or piecemeal, sometimes using Shaw's arguments about Labour 'losing its soul'. The most difficult approach, attempted by a small number, was to take the terms 'economic' and 'social', and for each set up a model of what 'cautious' and 'radical' might look like and then apply them to Labour over the whole period.

11.   'In a peacetime coalition, the Conservative party always comes out on top.' Discuss.
5 answers
Too few answers to offer comments, except that candidates generally agreed with the title.

12.   Why was a referendum on continued UK membership of the EU not held before 2016?
8 answers
Answers varied between those which concentrated on British policies towards Europe, particularly political parties and those which studied the evolution of the EU first and political parties second. Virtually all agreed that changing pressures within the Conservative party tipped the balance towards a referendum and that the party felt challenged by the emergence of UKIP. Some also noted Labour's divisions after the end of Brown's leadership, although the impetus for laying the terms of a referendum clearly lay with the government. The question attracted a small number of answers, but most were well-informed and thoughtful.

203 Theory of Politics

A new syllabus for Theory of Politics was introduced at the start of the academic year 2017-18. 2019 marked the first year that this syllabus was examined. As some students (typically those on four year courses) had started studying the paper under the old rubric, this year there were two separate papers: one set under the old rubric, and one under the new. Seven students sat the former paper, whereas the majority (116) sat the latter. The new topics on the syllabus were prompted, in part, by a consultative process of curriculum reform, and it is heartening to see that the new topics are attracting significant numbers of student responses. The most popular questions on the new rubric paper were questions 1 (on political obligation and civil disobedience – 63 responses), 4 (on liberty – 53 responses), and 6 (on equality – 57 responses). These are topics also to be found on the old syllabus (though civil disobedience is now separated from political obligation) but there pleasing numbers of answers on new topics on injustice in relation to race and gender (question 7 - 32 responses), political realism (question 12 - 22 responses), and to a lesser extent, perfectionism (question 10 – 10 responses). All topics on the new rubric paper received at least 10 responses, with the exception of question 11 on socialism (where it is striking the three of the four responses were by History and Politics students).

It has not proved possible this year to provide specific comments on individual questions, owing to the number of different assessors used in marking the two papers. One the new paper, there were 35 overall marks in the 70+ bracket, 69 marks between 60 and 69, and 12 marks between 59 and 50. Strikingly, there were no overall marks below 58. ███████ ██ As these marks suggest most scripts were of a satisfactory standard, but a significant number of candidates tended to rely on a narrow range of set texts and on formulaic answers. This was particularly evident, for example, in the political obligation question (question 1a) where there was a marked tendency to reproduce the format of the lecture that was given on that topic. Stronger candidates referred to a wider range of thinkers and made an effort to answer the question rather than relying on a pre-rehearsed structure. First class scripts tackled the questions in an independent voice, using the literature and the lectures either to support or to challenge the line of argument that the candidate developed.

New rubric paper questions distribution

Q1	63
Q2	14
Q3	11
Q4	53
Q5	17
Q6	57
Q7	32
Q8	38
Q9	27
Q10	10
Q11	4
Q12	22

Old rubric paper questions distribution

Q2	4
Q3	1
Q4	4
Q5	3
Q6	1
Q7	1
Q8	3
Q9	1
Q10	2
Q11	1

204 Modern British Government and Politics

1. Has judicial power in the UK expanded at the expense of executive and legislative power? If so, why? 4 answers
Some good answers which addressed the whole of the question and were thoughtful about how power was to be measured. Weaker answers only looked at judicial power, or provided only weak evidence to support their claims.

2. Is the UK executive over-dominated by the Prime Minister? 8 answers
Better answers unpacked what 'over-domination' meant and how it might be assessed. They made connections across the literature to context, legislative strength as well as executive strength. Weaker answers were too anecdotal and failed to consider the institutional and procedural bases of Prime Ministerial power. Many students failed to think about the contrasting powers of other parts of the political system.

3. What determines the power of backbenchers in the UK House of Commons? 5 answers
Some very strong answers which engaged deeply with the scholarly literature. There were good examples and some really detailed engagement with select committee reform and other institutional and historical changes. Weaker answers simply focused on whether backbench power had or had not increased.

4. What are the distinctive problems of bicameralism in the UK? 6 answers
Some very good answers to this question. Strong answers dealt with the comparative nature of the question and provided sufficient detail on other systems, as well as engaging with constitutional questions. The better ones considered what was distinctive, and the weaker ones merely described House of Lords reform and failed to offer a balanced argument and assessment.

5. Are UK civil servants sufficiently responsive to the wishes of ministers? 6 answers
A wide range of answers. The best were very familiar with the literature, and sensitive to the question of what 'sufficiently' might mean, and whether the premise was valid. Weaker answers tended to examine cases in which ministers and civil servants had been at odds, or tried to defend the civil service against charges of inefficiency.

6. Why did both the Conservative Party and the Labour Party improve their share of the vote in the 2017 general election? 5 answers
The best answers to this question addressed it using the (available) data and studies based on it. Given the very up-to-date nature of this question, some strong answers provided original assessment (in the absence of literature 'providing' a straight answer to this question). Weaker answers were short on reliable data, and were also too narrow in their answers – thinking only that Brexit provided the explanation without critically thinking through whether this was necessarily the case. Most answers thought only about why the Labour and Conservative parties did well, rather than reasons the minor parties' shares weren't more effectively harnessed in 2017.

7. **EITHER:** Has the UK party system realigned around Brexit? 4 answers
This was not an easy question to answer well, and the better answers were suitably cautious about what could and could not be shown. Weaker answers were either reckless or had unspecified tests of what constituted realignment. Few of the answers engaged with a reading of the critical elections/realignment citations, and so the meaning of a realignment was not easy to answer for the students.

OR: Has the Scottish party system realigned around Scottish independence? 4 answers
Some well-informed answers. Again, weaker answers did not specify what realignment meant, offering only a descriptive account of changing party fortunes or rash projections of what might happen next. Very good accounts of Scottish devolution on display, which helped to support some stronger responses.

8. Has there been a revival of party membership in UK political parties? If so, why? 6 answers
Most answers to this question were thoughtful, well-informed and judicious. The sophistication of explanations to the second part of the question marked out the better answers. Weaker answers focused just on the popularity of the party or its leader; the stronger ones made use of the models of party membership. It would have been good to see people deal with data critique, and the wider literature on party membership strength and democratisation/cartelisation of parties.

9. Has devolution to Scotland and Wales since 1997 achieved its objectives? 7 answers
Some very strong answers, though a great deal of variety about what the objectives in 1997 were. Weaker answers got lost in recounting the detail of devolution and/or failed to define the objectives clearly enough to be able to provide a clear answer. The question of whether devolution had enhanced or contained nationalism could have been more studious, considering why.

10. What accounts for the successes and failures of power-sharing arrangements in Northern Ireland since 1998? 0 answers

11. Is there any politics left in UK local government, or is it all administration? 0 answers

12. What measurable effects do the media have on UK politics and government? 1 answer

205 Government and Politics of the US

Question	Answers (PPE + HP)
1	7
2	9
3	1
4	7
5	6
6	11
7	0
8	3
9	7
10	3
11	6
12	0

There was a notable clustering of answers for this year's paper, and it was surprising not to see more answers to straightforward questions on congressional partisanship, congressional oversight of the executive, and race. In general, the quality of scripts was high; the majority were solidly well informed, knew the literature reasonably well, and made a serious attempt to answer the questions asked. There were a good number of excellent answers showing profound knowledge of the issues in question and of the relevant literature, and producing inventive and interesting answers.

For questions with a significant number of answers, some specific comments:

Q1 (exceptionalism) was mostly answered solidly if not brilliantly. Weaker answers tended to downplay or even ignore the specific question in favour of a general overview of exceptionalism.

Q2 (federalism) was a popular question with a wide range of answers. Weaker answers tended to be less clear on theories of federalism, did not reveal an answer to the question, or used examples which were not obviously relevant. The best answers used detailed analysis of particular examples in the literature (such as NCLB and PPACA) to show convincingly both the strengths and the limits of state power.

Q4 (polarisation/elections) was probably the question which received the best answers on average. Some very solid answers engaged with the literature thoughtfully without being very conclusive; the strongest answers used evidence well and both articulated and defended a clear argument which was critically engaged with the relevant literature.

Q5 (Congress) was also generally solidly answered. Even the stronger answers were not quite as convincing on the relationship, if any, between the two noun phrases in the question as they were on each part separately, which was a lost opportunity for higher marks.

Q6 (President) was the most popular question, with no very weak but few very strong answers. In general candidates knew the presidency literature well and had thoughts about it, often related to the question. The strongest answers engaged energetically and critically with the literature and identified key recent examples to illustrate their points.

Q9 (Courts) attracted a wide range of answers. Weaker answers attempted proof by assertion, or wanted to talk more generally about the wellsprings of judicial behaviour. Many answers struggled to identify why the question mattered; some struggled with conceptual consistency across their essay; few engaged with the most relevant literature. The best answers were the ones which defined key terms carefully and used them consistently, which engaged carefully with the literature, and which made a clear argument.

Q11 (Media) was another question which had responses of very varying quality. The weakest answers at least showed a reasonable knowledge of the literature, but had little to say beyond that. Stronger answers engaged critically with the literature and had nuanced and thoughtful responses to the question conveyed persuasively.

206 Politics in Europe

There were six scripts of which three were excellent, and the other three achieved a 2.1 standard.

The quality of individual answers was high, with a few answers demonstrating excellent understanding of the theoretical arguments and using a broad range of relevant empirical examples from states across Europe.

Out of the 12 questions, seven questions attracted at least one answer, and five questions received no attempts. The detailed question breakdown is as follows:

Question	Number of Answers
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	2
5	2
6	3
7	0
8	4
9	0
10	5
11	1
12	1

Specific notes on questions with a substantial number of answers:

6 Three candidates answered this question. The best answers explained both the success and consolidation of radical right parties, drawing on a wide range of theories and empirical examples.

8 This was the second most popular question and was answered by four students. The best answers demonstrated a firm grasp of the research on minority cabinet formation.

10 By far the most popular question, answered by five students. The best answers combined an excellent theoretical understanding of delegation problems faced by coalition cabinets with the ability to critically evaluate the results of quantitative and qualitative analyses.

207 Politics in Russia and the Former Soviet Union

The examination was taken by 8 PPE students and 2 HPol students. Marks ranged from 58 to 72, with an overall average of 67. Two candidates achieved a First Class mark.

Frequency of responses: low (up to 3), high (more than 3).

1) **'By 1989, communism had ceased to exist in any meaningful sense in the Soviet Union.' Discuss. (High)**

Answers were strong on this question. They provided a clear definition of communism (politically, socially and economically) and analyzed how the perestroika period transformed its key characteristics.

2) **Account for the varied forms of nationalism in the late Soviet period. (Low)**

3) **Why are post-Soviet economies vulnerable to state capture? (Low)**

4) **In what ways, if any, do constitutions shape the authority of post-Soviet leaders? (High)**

This was the most popular question. The stronger answers discussed the relative importance of formal and informal rules, and provided evidence from different post-Soviet cases.

5) **What factors determine the form and scale of electoral manipulation by post-Soviet regimes? (Low)**

6) **Under what conditions is the opposition able to challenge post-Soviet authoritarian rulers effectively? (Low)**

7) 'Post-Soviet countries with an abundance of natural resources tend to have less economic growth, less democracy, and worse development outcomes.' Discuss. (High)

This was a popular question. Answers were of variable quality. Most scripts focused on the impact of resource wealth on democracy, with less discussion of the consequences for economic growth and development.

8) How effective are post-Soviet political systems in managing ethnically divided societies? (none)

9) In what ways does corruption impede political and economic transformation in the countries of the former Soviet Union? (Low)

██

10) Do international diffusion processes make post-Soviet authoritarian regimes more resilient? (none)

11) Why has it been so difficult to develop a useful typology of post-Soviet regimes? (none)

12) How have political developments in the post-Soviet region influenced the study of comparative politics? (none)

208 Politics in sub-Saharan Africa

As in previous years, the students answered the examinations well and demonstrated significant knowledge and the ability to coherently structure arguments. ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮ the general level remained very high, with only a small number of disappointing scripts.

Some students struggled to maintain consistency across all three essays: candidates toward the lower 2:1 end sometimes had a mark at or below the 2:2/2:1 borderline, while candidates who performed well across the exam nonetheless often had one mark below the 2:1/1st borderline. As noted in previous years, this occasionally uneven performance of some candidates across the three essays is perhaps related to the complex and varied nature of the syllabus, and the broad range of empirical material that students must grasp. This said, and in line with 2018, this was less the case than in earlier years, and many scripts were consistent throughout.

In contrast with previous years, in which all questions were tackled by candidates, questions 8 and 12 had no takers. However, there was perhaps less budging around certain essay topics than in previous years with a good spread across the remaining questions. Ethnicity, the political economy of structural adjustment and elections proved popular but not unduly so, and generally attracted essays of a good standard (the improvement is particularly clear in the structural adjustment/economic reform essays, which often avoided the more formulaic approaches). The exception was the very popular question on conflict, which did attract 13 students. While in previous years the trend was towards an increase in the use of a broader set of case studies and comparative and theoretical literatures, this year too many essays stayed close to "greed and grievance" approaches. While a number of essays on the topic were very strong, candidates should be aware of the need to prod deeper into this body of literature and to relate interesting evidence with a broader set of arguments than the ones often brought forth. The essays on gender were again consistently good, as were those on the politics of religion. The best essays were those that somehow contested the literature in a judicious and evidence-based way, rather than those that embraced well-worn positions in the literature.

Some candidates, though fewer than in the past, still lost marks for failing to define key terms or to answer all parts of a question. Those candidates that did engage with key concepts and major comparative debates in the literature developed more thorough contributions and were rewarded accordingly. One of the most positive aspects of this year's paper, in line with the previous year, is that students answered questions with reference to no less than twenty-nine different Sub-Saharan African states and showed a strong commitment to sustained comparison. The over-concentration on one case study, and its deployment across several essays, continues to be a rare occurrence. However, Kenya and Zambia were still more frequently

engaged with than other cases, though this happen in a relevant manner. The Francophone states of West Africa saw an increase in references in regard to last year, especially to Senegal but with occasional references to Cote d'Ivoire, Benin and Mali. The Horn of Africa featured more prominently across a number of questions, a welcome increase already evident in 2018.

The candidates could still do a better job in three areas, some of which have been flagged out in the exam reports of previous years. First, the candidates should provide a more nuanced scoping of their answer: how representative are the cases they draw on? How were the examples chosen, and how are they situated in time and space? How generalizable are the suggested conclusions? Second, candidates should make a an effort to tackle essays, especially those that lend themselves to potentially predictable treatments, in a more deliberately original manner, both theoretically and in terms of engaging with a broader range of case-studies (this was clearly the case regarding economic reform, which shows that students are taking this advice to heed, but less so regarding conflict). Third, a number of candidates (though again, less than in previous years) picked up one scholarly reference and provided extensive paraphrases of its contents, used the same case studies, came to similar conclusions, etc., in a manner that was beholden to such contributions. This sort of over-dependence on one text does not do justice to the varied and contrasting arguments to be found across the field. Candidates are expected to have read widely and to have grasped the plurality of contributions to these debates.

While these points need to be kept in mind, the overall level of empirical and theoretical sophistication of this excellent set of scripts was again commendable.

209 Contemporary Politics of Latin America

This paper was taken by seven PPE candidates and two HPol candidates. In general, the quality of the scripts was high this year, with some variation across the marking bounds. ██ All the scripts had a reasonably good grasp of the comparative literature, although as tends to be the case, the weaker scripts struggled to adequately summarize some of the extant literature, let alone engage with the central theoretical ideas. As has been the case in previous years, the weaker scripts struggled to demonstrate empirical knowledge; they simply did not know enough about the actual politics of Latin America. Even for some of the stronger upper seconds, while theoretically very strong, their weakness remained a lack of in-depth empirical knowledge. Below is the distribution of answers, by question:

Question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
N	5	4	2	2	0	4	4	3	1	1	1	0

There was a greater spread in the choice of questions than there has been in recent years. Question 1, on state capacity, proved to be the most popular, but this was followed closely by Questions 2 (on democratic transitions), 6 (on executive-legislative relations) and 7 (the left in Latin America). Question 2 attracted some of the strongest answers. It was good to see such a spread in answers this year. In previous years, answers have tended to cluster on a handful of questions. This year, only two questions remained unanswered.

210 Politics in South Asia

Twelve questions were set in this year's paper, with ten out of the twelve attempted by the nine candidates who sat the exam. Question 1, focusing on the relationship between the weakness of political institutions and political instability in South Asia, was not attempted, possibly because a comparative focus of two or more countries was required. Question 6, which asked how social movements strengthen democracy in South Asia, again required a comparative answer of two or more examples, and was not attempted. The most popular question (answered by six candidates) was Question 11, which asked about the political importance of Islam in Pakistan and/or Bangladesh (here both a single country and a comparative answer were possible). The best answers to Question 11 demonstrated an awareness of complex empirical dynamics and looked at both internal and external factors. Question 3, focusing on affirmative action for lower castes and the impact on politics in India, was answered by five candidates. Weaker answers tended to focus on the social rather than the political impact; stronger answers looked at the impact of reservations on both Dalit and BJP politics; one interesting answer took a historical approach. Questions 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 12 drew responses from between one and three candidates. Notably, the two questions with an explicit IR focus, Question 7 (nuclear weapons) and Question 12 (regional cooperation) – new topics this year – were each attempted by two candidates. The spread of marks awarded (for the examination as a whole) ranged from 60% (high 2.2) to 78% (mid first). Overall, the answers demonstrated sound empirical knowledge. Weaker answers were descriptive, failed to explicitly address the question, or advanced either a simplistic argument, or a singular argument with no alternatives considered. Strong answers were empirically rich, critically engaged and demonstrated broad coverage of the literature.

211 Politics in Middle East

1.	The question on French decolonisation was quite popular. Students were often tempted to answer the question from the reading list about whether the legacy of colonialism was negative, rather than to examine the specific legacy of decolonization itself.

2.	The wording of the question perhaps put off some candidates, but this generated a few good answers on the Free Officers as a force for change.

3.	Some candidates misunderstood this question, focusing on state institutions etc rather than considering how states in MENA were often seen as artificial constructs and answers suffered as a result.

4.	A little attempted question, perhaps given the restricted number of cases.

5.	Very popular, but some sloppy answers – was KSA always a dominant state? Since when?

6.	A slightly fiddly wording re 'patriarchal expectations'. But this generated some quite good answers on the limits to women's rights. It is important to recognise, however, which rights have been achieved and where.

7.	A surprising question which does not reflect any reading list topic or question. No answers.

8.	Some took on board the potential of monarchies to be liberal in a general sense, others focused on MENA cases – good answers discussed both in the MENA context.

9.	Another question with fiddly wording and few attempted answers.

10.	No attempts – the reference to 'three cases' probably put candidates off this question.

11.	A number of students attempted this question but got bogged down in the meaning of the word 'mosaic'. This presumably was intended to convey the idea of states being comprised of multiple nationalities/ethnicities and religions rather than an attempt to describe an art form. However, there were some reasonably good answers.

12.	Islamism and politics. Some good answers; some missed the key point that in the absence of meaningful opposition in many states Islamic parties provide the most feasible alternative.

212 International Relations in the Era of Two World Wars

No. of students taking paper	17 (10 PPE, 7 MHP)

Summary reflections on the paper as a whole

The standard of the scripts was very strong indeed. Six candidates were awarded First Class marks for this paper, and the overall average was 68. There were no scripts below the level of an Upper Second Class standard. The Examiners felt that this reflected the high quality of the scripts overall.

The distribution of questions answered was:

Question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Answers	6	12	5	5	6	5	3	2	2	2	3	0

Brief remarks on individual questions

Question 1	
No. of students who answered this question	6
Range of marks	58 to 78

Comments

The weaker answers here suffered from a narrow approach to the question – for example, linking the capitalism element to the Fischer thesis, but ignoring Leninist theories altogether – and a couple contained some glaring factual inaccuracies or confusions. However, there were some excellent answers that considered the full theoretical range engaged by the terms of the question in very sharp analysis.

Question 2	
No. of students who answered this question	12
Range of marks	62 to 73

Comments

By far the most popular question on the paper, this proved a relatively safe option for many candidates, who were able to cover several aspects of the process of peace-making and weigh their consequences for the eventual outcome. Answers tended to cover a lot of ground, rather than making any very strong moves showing highly original or independent thinking, and this perhaps counted slightly against marks at the very top of the first class range.

Question 3	
No. of students who answered this question	5
Range of marks	65 to 78
Comments	

Few candidates explored some of the deeper socio-economic sources of potential instability, but most showed an excellent command of detail in the history of the region, and were able to speak to the entire Middle East, rather than just some isolated cases. Generally, it was a very well answered question.

Question 4	
No. of students who answered this question	5
Range of marks	62 to 73
Comments	

Weaker answers tended to focus very narrowly on Franco-German relations, which was an important aspect of the question, but not sufficient to answer it completely.

Question 5	
No. of students who answered this question	6
Range of marks	62 to 78
Comments	

Stronger answers here showed a very deep grasp of historical detail, and explored themes such as the impact of bureaucratization on Soviet foreign policy-making that significantly enriched the analysis. Weaker answers tended to be a bit overly focussed on the early years of Soviet foreign policy, and included less detail on Stalin.

Question 6	
No. of students who answered this question	5
Range of marks	62 to 73
Comments	

This was a very wide open question, and the best answers started by veryclearly setting out well-chosen parameters for the answer. Weaker essays tended to work at too vague and general a level in terms of empirical historical detail to achieve really high marks.

Other questions attracted too few answers for detailed comment.

213 International Relations in the Era of the Cold War

23 candidates (20 PPE; 2 HP; 1 withdrawn)

The numbers are consistent with the previous three years and remain strong. No particular issue arose. The general standard was high ███████████████████████████████████████ ██████████████████████████████████████. The best answers to all questions successfully combined analytical depth with knowledge of the relevant historiography.

The vast majority of candidates chose to answer at least one or two questions from the first section of the paper. This is unsurprising, given the structure of the paper, and in line with previous years. Among the questions on thematic and regional aspects, the most popular answers were to questions 5 (China) 12 (the Middle East). Not a single candidate attempted question 6, 7 or 8, which may suggest an excessive focus on Europe in the current list of topics and the declining popularity of the Japan topic.

Question-specific comments:

1.   When did the Cold War start?
The single most popular question. Answers were generally good, with a few outstanding ones. Most candidates were able combine insight into the origins of the Cold War with an insightful discussion of possible moments in which the wartime alliance collapsed. As last year, relatively few managed to provide a solid discussion of both ideas and goals in the US and the USSR, which greatly improved their answers. This is a topic especially rich in historiographical depth. As usual, the best answers took advantage of it.

2.   Was the US policy of 'containment' successful?
A fairly popular question, with generally good results. Most candidates showed good knowledge of course of US foreign policy. Fewer candidates were able to reflect on what 'success' means in this context. While not as rich in literature as the previous topic, there is still a number of key texts that candidates should be familiar with. The best answers discussed them.

3.   To what extent was détente shaped by domestic factors in the US and in the USSR?
Another relatively popular question. Most answers were 'inclusive', allowing a role for domestic politics while focusing more on international issues. Most candidates discussed both superpowers, fewer managed to discuss European détente, while fewer still included analyses of crises in the Third World. The literature on détente is large and daunting, but the majority of candidates managed to focus on the most relevant books and articles.

4.   Did structure matter more than agency in determining the end of the Cold War?
The second most-popular question, and once again the one in which candidates did best on average. The vast majority answered the question focusing on agency, particularly of the Soviet leadership, while at the same time conceding that structure, particularly economic, did matter. In line with previous years, this reflects the historiographical trend and shows that students can engage critically with it.

5.   Was the People's Republic of China a superpower during the Cold War?
A popular question in the second section of the paper. Candidates did generally quite well, combining discussion of some of the key events with analyses of doctrine and leadership. There was no general consensus in the answers, and candidates took very different approaches in explaining the PRC's foreign policy during the Cold War. As in other cases, the very best answers showed an advanced knowledge of the key historiography.

6.   Assess the impact of the Korean War for the course of Japanese foreign policy.
No answers.

7.   Did ideology matter in French and German foreign policy during the Cold War?
No answers.

8.   Was European integration an economic or a political project?
No answers.

9.   Did Third World states mange to pursue a policy of 'non-alignment' during the Cold War?
Similar to 2018, relatively few answers but of generally good quality. The best ones combined discussion of classic Cold War ideologies with political and economic ideologies that originated in the Third World.

10.   'Soviet power in Eastern Europe rested on economic more than military factors'. Discuss.
More answers compared to last year, and on average of better quality. As usual, the challenge for this question is to construct a coherent analytical narrative without focusing too much on the details and too little on the 'big picture'. In this as in other topics, knowledge of the historical context is essential.

11.   To what extent were Cold War-era conflicts in Southeast Asia a legacy of decolonization?
Too few answers for any meaningful comment. Surprising, given the popularity of the topic in tutorials.

12.   Was the Cold War in the Middle East influenced more by regional or by global powers?
The most popular question in part 2 of the paper. In general, answers were good. The best answers gave a nuanced view of the Cold War in the Middle East, showing knowledge of both local development and global trends. Given the richness and depth of the existing literature, discussion of the historiography was not especially prominent in the candidates' answers. This would generally improve the average quality.

214 International Relations

The IR core paper remains very popular with Honours students.

The overall standard of the scripts was very commendable, with some high quality answers at the top end, and only a relatively small number of answers below 2:1 standard.

The best answers focused forensically on the question, and combined empirical breadth with theoretical depth, and engagement with a range of theories and conceptual frameworks. The best answers also demonstrated an impressive ability to apply the theoretical material to contemporary international issues.

Comments on specific questions:

1. (anarchy): not many takers for this question, but the answers were generally solid; some candidates failed to recognise the constructivist undertone in the question.
2. (power): a fairly popular question, with some good discussion of the different frameworks; the weaker answers did not refer sufficiently to the literature or provide enough empirical illustration.
3. (globalisation): a popular question, and the answers were generally of a decent standard, although the different dimensions (and contradictions) of globalisation were sometimes glossed over.
4. (trade): very few takers, but the answers were generally competent.
5. (UN): a popular question, with some very strong, detailed answers at the top end, exploring the different international roles of the UN, as well as the role of agencies; however, many candidates did not discuss UN peacekeeping in sufficient depth.
6. (nationalism): some good answers, with a decent range of examples, although not always very sophisticated conceptually.
7. (NATO): a fairly popular question, generally well-handled; the best answers also discussed the impacts of the current US administration's unilateralism.
8. (democracy and liberalism): a very popular question, but many answers merely rehearsed the strengths and weaknesses of Democratic Peace Theory, and only superficially touched on what DPT might reveal about liberal theorising.
9. (sub-state actors): few takers for this question, but the answers were generally of an acceptable standard.
10. (Huntington): a popular question, and the answers were generally of high quality, combining a constructivist/post-colonial critique with a range of examples.
11. (global justice): a limited number of answers for this question, but they were generally of good quality, albeit rather thin on empirical illustrations.
12. (humanitarian intervention OR post-Cold war conflicts): the HI answers were more numerous, and were solid overall, although often did not discuss R2P in sufficient depth; some of the conflict answers were very impressive, taking on board relevant literatures (e.g. on "new wars") and coming up with nuanced generalisations about the state of the post-Cold war world.

215 Political Thought: Plato to Rousseau

20 Candidates (18 PPE; 2 HP)

Overall assessment

Overall, the quality of exams this year was quite high, with some stunning first-class papers. Excellent answers address all parts of the question in a coherent whole, drawing on specific textual and contextual evidence across on author's corpus (core and recommended texts) to argue a clear and consistent thesis. They avoided overly broad generalizations or descriptive paraphrase of the text, citing specific passages and considering the counter- or supporting arguments of other scholars. They clearly articulated the stakes of the question and their answer for historical and/or contemporary political theory, and there were some stunningly original arguments. Weaker answers relied on broad, glib, and sometimes incorrect generalizations about particular authors or texts, lacked specific textual evidence and/or contextual considerations, and/or offered summary or descriptive accounts of an author's thought without offering an independent argument in answer to the question asked. As in past years, answers clustered around certain questions and avoided others altogether (e.g., Hume and Montesquieu). Students should be encouraged to respond to a wider range of questions and to avoid obvious favorites (e.g. Plato) in order to stand out.

Individual Questions

1.   'A more accurate title for Plato's *Republic* would be *The Education of Glaucon*.' Discuss.

As ever, this was a very popular question answered by three-quarters of students examined. There were some really excellent answers drawing on a wide range of Plato's works beyond the Republic, the historical context in which Plato encountered Socrates and composed the text, and the significance of educational considerations to his political philosophy generally. Other answers suffered from limited understanding of the place of education in the *Republic*, of Glaucon's specific character and role, or a lack of consideration of the question's significance. Some essays relied too heavily on epistemic and ethical material from the Plato's Republic paper and failed to engage with the text as a work of *political* philosophy and were marked down.

2.   Aristotle acknowledges that his choice to call the best possible regime 'polity' or *politeia*—that is, the generic Greek term for 'constitution' or 'regime'—is confusing. Why might he have made this choice?

About half of students attempted this question. Again, there were some very strong answers drawing on specific details of the *Politics*, as well as the *Ethics* and other Aristotelian works. The strongest answers offered detailed discussions of Aristotle's method and the role of normative assessment in his political science. There were some good engagements with secondary literature, particular Arendt and *The Human Condition*. Weaker essays failed to address the question, starting with the meaning of *politeia*.

3. Aquinas gives two different answers to the question, 'What is the best regime?' in his works: monarchy and the mixed constitution. What are his arguments for each? What might explain the difference between his answers?

Only 2 students attempted the Aquinas question; still, an improvement over past years. They were generally rewarded. The strongest answer displayed an expressive contextual knowledge of Aquinas's political and theological project, as well as his debt to Aristotle.

4. Machiavelli presents the Roman republic's liberty and its empire as inextricably linked. What is his reasoning? What implications might this have for theorists of republican liberty today?

The Machiavelli question was less popular than previous years, perhaps due to its focus on the *Discorsi*. The best answers engaged directly with arguments offered in the secondary literature by contemporary republicans like Quentin Skinner and Maurizio Viroli and used these as a foil to offer their own original arguments. Weaker answers offered stock summaries of Machiavelli's 'republicanism.'

5. Given his views on human nature, should one view Hobbes as an optimist or a pessimist about the possibilities of politics?

About half of students attempted this question. Strong answers offered a clear answer and entertained counter-arguments, picking a specific element of Hobbes's political philosophy and engaging directly with secondary literature and arguments. Weaker answers used the question as an opportunity to offer stock summaries of *Leviathan*.

6. 'The only argument in Locke's political philosophy that is still interesting as a starting point for contemporary political theory is that in the *Letters on Toleration*.' Do you agree? Why or why not?

The Locke question was less popular in previous years, perhaps due to the reference to the *Letters*. The strongest answers recognized the quotation and its importance for John Dunn's arguments in *The Political Thought of John Locke* (1969) and then argued for or against Dunn's argument for the irrelevance of the *Two Treatises*, while also demonstrating knowledge of *A Letter Concerning Toleration*. Students who did not recognize the quotation or answered exclusively with reference to the *Two Treatises* were not marked down.

7. According to Montesquieu, 'voting by *lot* is in the nature of democracy; voting by *choice* is in the nature of aristocracy.' Why? Is Montesquieu right that election is an essentially aristocratic principle?

I'm delighted to report that one student attempted the Montesquieu question, a significant rise over previous years.

8. What makes a government 'free' according to Hume, and how does his answer differ from that of other author(s) you have read for this course?

No responses.

9.   Does Rousseau's normative argument in his *Discourse on the Origins of Inequality* depend on the accuracy of his history of humanity?

A few answers to this question. The best linked Rousseau's 'conjectural history' to its historical context, answered strongly in the affirmative or negative, linking their answer to specific textual evidence in the *Discourse* as well as *The Social Contract*.

10.   Is the Island of Utopia really the 'best state of the Commonwealth,' on Thomas More's view?

Too few to comment.

11.   'Those who say that to understand a theory we must understand the historical conditions in which it was produced speak as if, to understand what a man is saying, we must know why he is saying it. But this is not true. We need to understand only the sense in which he is using the words.' Is this right? Discuss with reference to at least ONE example from this course.

The most popular thematic question. No one successfully identified the quotation (from John Plamenatz), but almost all were able to identify its significance as a foil for Quentin Skinner's contextualist methodology. The strongest answers argued with reference to particular examples of controversial terms from their reading, such as 'virtu' in Machiavelli.

12.   Does Christianity have any potential as a civil religion? Answer with reference to at least TWO authors you have read for this course.

Too few to comment.

216 Political Thought: Bentham to Weber.

The number of candidates who sat this paper (11) was roughly in line with previous years. There was a good spread of answers, with a high proportion of firsts. ███

A number of candidates answered on Hegel. As in previous years, there were a good number of candidates who attempted to answer the question on Tocqueville, but fewer candidates tackled Mill and Marx. Surprisingly, three candidates answered the question on Saint-Simon, a deviation from the norm. Three candidates answered on Bentham and two on Durkheim. Three candidates answered on Weber.

The spread of marks was in line with previous years, with the exception of several outstanding first-class scripts.

The examiners agreed that candidates on the whole need to show a far deeper knowledge of the authors and set texts than they did here. Some candidates had only the most basic knowledge of key set texts, and most failed to venture beyond the prescribed readings, which was a pity. Candidates' knowledge of the secondary literature covering this period was also limited. Few took the initiative to engage with recent scholarship, and most were failed to position themselves in relation to arguments in the literature. This poverty of depth and breadth, rather than analytical skills and the construction of a persuasive argument, proved to be the most significant obstacle to most candidates. It should be stressed to students that they need to engage more rigorously with the set texts and read more widely from the secondary literature.

The exception, of course, were the first-class scripts, 4 in total, with 2 outstanding firsts. These candidates showed a wide-range of textual knowledge for the chosen author, as well as a firm grasp of the historical context and secondary literature. Outstanding papers also showed original thought and insight, and in some cases made a persuasive argument for the continued relevance of these thinkers to contemporary concerns.

217 Marx and Marxism

No. of students taking paper	18

Summary reflections on the paper as a whole

Most candidates taking this paper demonstrated a solid understanding of the broad topic addressed by each of the particular questions that they answered. However, not all candidates were equally good at utilizing that knowledge as part of a written answer tightly focused on the precise question asked.

The very best candidates offered tightly focused and cogently argued written answers to the precise question. In addition, their essays demonstrated analytical sophistication and good textual knowledge (of the primary authors).

One area for improvement worth identifying here concerns textual knowledge of the writings of later Marxists. Candidates typically demonstrated weaker knowledge of primary texts in the questions on Bernstein, Gramsci, etc. (by comparison with the textual knowledge shown in their answers to questions on Marx and Engels).

Brief remarks on individual questions

Question 1	
No. of students who answered this question	0
Range of marks	
Comments	
[Too few answers to comment.]	

Question 2	
No. of students who answered this question	1
Range of marks	
Comments	
[Too few answers to comment.]	

Question 3	
No. of students who answered this question	8
Range of marks	
Comments	
The question was treated in a variety of ways. The 'hopelessly' qualifier gave several candidates a way of challenging the view in the quotation. Not all candidates were aware of two resources that might have helped them with the substance of the question: first,	

G.A. Cohen's distinction between 'restricted' and 'inclusive' readings of historical materialism; and second, Marx's later writings on Russia which some commentators suggest involve changes to the explanatory ambitions of his theory.

Question 4	
No. of students who answered this question	0
Range of marks	
Comments [Too few answers to comment.]	

Question 5	
No. of students who answered this question	4
Range of marks	
Comments Some good answers. However, first hand familiarity with the writings of 'utopian socialists' was not much in evidence. Candidates should note that without, at least, a little independent knowledge of the utopian socialists, it is hard to judge the soundness of many of the criticisms offered by Marx and Engels.	

Question 6	
No. of students who answered this question	2
Range of marks	
Comments [Too few answers to comment.]	

Question 7	
No. of students who answered this question	14
Range of marks	
Comments The most popular question. Weaker answers tended to treat this as an opportunity to rehearse pre-prepared accounts of the relation between Marx and justice; paying insufficient attention to the specific question asked. Stronger answers offered more focused essays, and demonstrated a good understanding of competing accounts of what might make exploitation morally problematic or unjust.	

Question 8	
No. of students who answered this question	10
Range of marks	
Comments Some good answers, most of them challenging the judgment in the quotation. However, not all answers directed enough attention to the 'as such' qualification in that quotation. That qualification can be seen as raising the issue of whether alienation might also be a possible feature of non-capitalist class-divided societies (such as feudalism), or of non	

class-divided societies (such as communism).

Question 9	
No. of students who answered this question	2
Range of marks	
Comments	
[Too few answers to comment.]	

Question 10	
No. of students who answered this question	2
Range of marks	
Comments	
[Too few answers to comment.]	

Question 11	
No. of students who answered this question	4
Range of marks	
Comments	
Some good comparative treatment of the ideas of the two authors was demonstrated here. That said, some candidates appeared unaware of the Polish dimension of Luxemburg's political life. And not all candidates demonstrated good, detailed, knowledge of Lenin and Luxemburg texts in support of their interpretative claims.	

Question 12	
No. of students who answered this question	7
Range of marks	
Comments	
There were some good attempts to define the various comparative options mentioned in the question ('repeating', 'refining', 'replacing'). However, not all candidates demonstrated good, detailed, knowledge of Gramsci texts in support of their various interpretative claims.	

218 Sociological Theory

9 candidates (all from PPE)

Nine candidates took this paper. The quality of scripts ranged from good (second class, upper division) to excellent (first class); the best answers demonstrated extensive reading and original thinking. Q12 (emotions and rationality) was the most popular, with seven answers. Q1 (neighbourhood effects), Q3 (social action), and Q7 (gender) each attracted three answers. There were two answers to Q2 (norms and racism), Q6 (state and violence), Q8 (networks and inequality), Q9 (capitalism and values), and Q11 (conformity). Q10 (shame) received a solitary answer.

219 Sociology of Post-Industrial Societies

2018/19 is the last year in which this paper will be offered for FHS. There were 11 candidates:
▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮ All questions were attempted, but the number attempting any given question was so small that it would not be appropriate or sensible to comment on specific answers. In general the standard of answers was high and continued the trend towards improvement noted in previous years. The best performances displayed a sound knowledge of a wide range of literature and this was deployed with skill to target the questions actually asked. Even the comparatively weaker answers managed, in the main, to bring a considerable amount of knowledge to bear on the target, though the relevance of the erudition displayed was not always entirely obvious.

220 Political Sociology

Answers this year and last year, by comparison with a couple of years ago, were quite variable. This year particularly, the quality seemed to vary on two distinct dimensions: knowledge of the material on the reading list and quality of argument in response to the exam question. Naturally the two are highly correlated but there were numerous cases of answers being good on one of these aspects but poor on the other.

Particularly striking and disappointing was the number of answers citing many key findings from the research literature, but a weak argument holding them (often tenuously) together. It appears as though some candidates are determined to show as much knowledge as they can at a cost of analyzing what they do know and developing an argument in response to the question set. Students should develop new lines of argument in the exam and not just rely on pre-prepared material. The questions, while close to familiar and well-rehearsed ones, are not quite the same. Answers ought to be sensitive to the differences.

Very often candidates are also required to reflect on the relevance of different material to the question and to evaluate what can or cannot be reasonably inferred from the research literature, i.e. to use the academic literature to address broader questions.

Questions where there were specific issues to point out are as follows.

3. Are both ethnic minorities and radical-right voters particularly motivated by candidates and leaders when voting in elections?
Many answers to this question failed to discuss sensitivity to candidate ethnicity for majority as well as minority groups, and/or the notion that radical-right electoral support is dependent on charismatic leadership.

5. How are national identities developed and maintained?

Answers to this question especially suffered from too much outlining the literature and not enough attention to the question. For instance, some candidates pointed out the difference between ethnic and civic nationalism without saying anything about how either was developed or maintained. The best answers reflected on how development and maintenance processes were different at different levels (individuals, communities, nations) and in different contexts.

7. Why are graduates more liberal and environmentalist than others?

Better answers to this question reflected on the conceptual links between liberalism and environmentalism and not purely on their correlates.

8. 'People participate in politics because they care about the outcomes. Any other factors affecting participation are mere details.' Discuss.

Some arguments in favour of other factors affecting participation did not consider the counter-argument that the factor in question worked by affecting preferences. They wrote as if social characteristics, campaign activity etc. made no difference to what people want, just how they behave.

11. Do people care more about the amount or the fairness of state welfare payments?

Answers to this question were generally weak in their analysis of what counts as and what is perceived as "fairness". A full normative political theory analysis was not required, but something that delineated different aspects of the idea to make sense of the various social attitudes on the topic.

12. What is the most compelling method to study the causes of civil wars and revolutions?

Many of the answers showed a poor understanding of the methods used in the studies on the reading list. Some of the most thoughtful answers considered how different methods are needed to study different causal factors, and how data availability often affects methodological choice.

223 The government and politics of Japan exam report

Only 1 candidate sat the exam, so it will not be appropriate to write the report.

224 Social Policy

26 candidates (23 PPE; 3 DMHP)

Note that totals and comments below do not include analysis of answers by the 5 human sciences students taking the exam, as a separate report is submitted for human sciences.

The scripts were generally of a commendably high standard this year, with a few really excellent answers. All questions were answered by at least one student. The more popular questions this year comprised one from the first section of the course (which introduces students to key social policy/welfare state concepts and issues), concerning 'worlds of welfare', or typologies (15 answers), and one from the second section (on more specific social policy areas in the UK) (14 answers, about education). These are areas that are consistently of interest to students. The question on poverty and related concepts was answered by slightly fewer (10 students). Fewer, but always more than four, students answered questions on social policy and the welfare state; the mixed economy of welfare; labour market policy; and health policy. Less popular questions included one on evaluating social policies, which is from a generic topic, but one that students sometimes find more challenging; and on other specific policy areas (homelessness, immigration, family policy and ageing). However, there was generally a satisfactory spread of answers this year.

The most popular questions were:

6. 'Do recent changes in the UK welfare state suggest that it is a typical example of the liberal welfare regime?'

11. 'Have recent changes in education policy affecting schools in the UK resulted from practical considerations or political convictions?'

5. 'Does the capabilities approach resolve the choice between focusing on absolute poverty or relative poverty?'

10. 'Is social citizenship only possible to achieve with the state as the sole or main provider in the welfare mix?'

9. 'Is individual choice a meaningful concept in health policy in the UK today?'

This year many answers were high quality, putting forward coherent arguments which used evidence in support and demonstrated a thoughtful approach to the question. There is varying attention paid to devolution, which is becoming a more salient issue in a range of policy areas, and relatively few students discuss the role of authorities below the national level, which can also be an important issue in some.

All students wrote legibly this year, despite the challenge of timing. As in previous years, however, some students had clearly spent too long on the first question they tackled, leaving insufficient time for a thorough answer to the remaining two. Some answers either argued from first principles solely, or drew too much on other disciplines, or did not back up their arguments with evidence and knowledge of the relevant literature. Attempts to put forward a strikingly original answer are seldom worthwhile unless this is backed up by solid evidence.

There was some lack of understanding of the meaning of certain questions. But most scripts provided clear evidence of social policy knowledge, analytical ability, the capacity to

organise arguments into a coherent answer and willingness to answer the question posed, rather than the question the student wished it had been.

The number of takers for each question was as follows:

Q	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
No.	2	6	2	5	10	15	4	2	8	9	14	1

225 Comparative Demographic Systems

Five students in the PPE degree sat the Comparative Demographic Systems (CDS) paper. Following the change introduced in 2018 in the CDS paper in relation to Part A of the paper, the 2019 edition also featured one compulsory question that consisted of a several sub-parts. Part A of the paper focuses on demographic measurement. The question in Part A assessed students' abilities to compute and analyse demographic measures using data that were provided to them, understand their key assumptions, and to interpret their calculations of mortality and life expectancy in light of their wider readings throughout the course in relation to the mortality transition, sex differences in life expectancy and other topics. Similar to 2018, performance in this part (question 1 of the paper) was generally very good, with 3 out of the 5 students getting very high marks on this part. The continued strong performance on the quantitative part of the exam this year is promising and highlights that this format of the paper has been favourable for PPE students who have been able to master skills of basic quantitative demography well.

In Part B of the exam, the essay question on the role of improving levels of gender equality in contributing to the reversal of lowest-low fertility in Europe turned out to be very popular and was answered by all candidates. Performance on this question was good, with most essays of a good 2.i standard. In contrast, the choice of second essay question to answer was more varied, with all candidates choosing different topics ranging from health inequalities, the relationship between economic growth and demographic variables, and son preference and sex selection. Three of the five candidates performed well in both Parts A and B in the exam, showing mastery of demographic concepts as well as the substantive literature and theoretical perspectives, and were able to achieve a first-class mark.

227 Politics in China

A near-record number of finalists sat the exam in 2019. There was a good spread of answers this year with at least two candidates having chosen to answer every question on the paper. The most popular were questions on the Cultural Revolution, and on the 19th Party Congress's finding that "the principal contradiction in society is the one between steadily advancing lifestyles and unequal and inadequate development." Almost as popular were the questions on the historical roots of neoliberalism, and the characterisation of Xi Jinping's rule as either authoritarian resilience or revival.

Both markers were pleased to see the numbers of candidate opting to answer such questions, because, with the exception of the question on the Cultural Revolution, were either entirely or relatively new questions on the paper. The responses that received the highest marks this year happened to be either historical questions on the Great Leap, the Cultural Revolution and the historical roots of neoliberalism, or comparing Xi Jinping to Deng Xiaoping, China as a revisionist power, and whether the CCP was more concerned today about religious or ethnic divides.

Our overall marks were lower than they were in 2018 and displayed higher variance between scripts overall than between particular questions. However, as noted in our report on the 2018 exam, last year was an extraordinary year of record high. This year's distribution of marks was largely in line with departmental norms for FHS Politics papers. In light of this, we were encouraged to see candidates choosing "newer" and more novel questions that were perhaps just a bit outside of their comfort zones this year and did not observe any particular trend toward either higher or lower marks overall on particular questions overall.

228 Politics of the EU

8 students took this paper in 2018, 2 HP and 6 PPE students. ████████

████████ The mean was 67,4 in 2019. PPE students did on average (74,4) ████ ████████ This result is comparable to the 2018 exam, when 3 of 9 exams reached a grade above 70, and six exams were above 60, with a mean of 67,1.

The distribution of answers was as follows:

question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
number of answers	1	3	1	1	0	2	1	3	5	2	0	5	24

Students had to answer 3 out of 12 essay questions, and the distribution of chosen questions ensured that students had to draw on diverse set of topics that had been covered throughout the course. In comparison to last year, students did engage with more political questions, while also showcasing still a sound factual institutional and procedural knowledge.

Question 9 (Is a 'multi-speed Europe' a threat to European integration?) and question 12 (In the European Union, has 'permissive consensus' turned into 'constraining dissensus'?) were the most popular with five students choosing each of these questions. This emphasis is surprising, considering that the answer to those questions requires students to not only present institutional knowledge but also normatively interpret the political set-up of the EU. On the other hand, those questions represent current political and academic debates. It shows that students relate to those discussions (e.g. future of EU; Euroscepticism) and consider those topics interesting and relevant. The rest of the 14 chosen essays was spread across a wider variation of topics: Question 8 (3x Did the Lisbon Treaty successfully address the democratic deficit of the European Union?), question 2 (3x Why did European leaders create the pillar structure with the Treaty of Maastricht?), question 10 (2x), question 6 (2x), question 1/3/4/7 each 1x.

Exams above 70 combined excellent factual knowledge about a wider variety of different aspects, a sound line of analytical argumentation, with a convincing critical reflection. Exams above 60 were able to present their argument in a coherent and correct fashion, but were more limited in scope and lacked the wider political considerations. Exams below 60 lacked comprehensive and critical considerations. Single essays marked 70 and above needed to go beyond what had been covered in the lectures, go beyond textbook chapters and had to display a wider engagement with the academic scholarship.

229 Advanced Paper in Theories of Justice

31 students sat this paper this year. The general standard of answers was very good, with all scripts receiving overall marks of at least 2-1 standard. 23 marks fell within the 60-69 range, and a further 8 scripts received marks of 70 or higher, with two truly outstanding scripts receiving marks of 79 or higher. All topics on the syllabus received a good range of responses, with the notable exception of international trade (part of the global justice topic) for which there was only a single taker: it may well be that this topic is taught rather less in tutorials than the other two global justice topics. Specific comments on particular questions, along with the distribution of answers, are below. This year it seemed very clear that students are more reliant than others on material explicitly discussed in the lectures for this paper (and covered on lecture handouts). Better answers characteristically were able to draw on a wider range of material, which was both impressive in its own right, and was very much correlated with being able to tackle the specific question set in the exam.

1.   In what sense, if any, can trade be fair if distributive justice is unrealised? (1 answer)
Too few answers for comment.

2.   Can states justifiably refuse entry to migrants seeking to escape poverty? (21 answers)
This year's most popular question. Essays were of variable quality: while there was some good knowledge of recent work on the ethics of migrations, some answers struggled to focus on poverty specifically, and so either spoke generally of the extent to which states are justified in controlling their borders, or spoke broadly about duties to refugees.

3.   Is it fair to hold present day parties responsible for the costs of climate change resulting from historic carbon emissions? (13 answers)
Although some essays displayed some confusion as to different interpretations of "responsibility", this was generally well answered, with some impressive knowledge both of scholarly literature and of the contemporary political context.

4.   Is there a duty to share our resources with future generations? (8 answers)
It was notable that better answers to this question were able to draw on knowledge of a range of work on intergenerational justice, rather than speaking exclusively about the non-identity problem.

5.   Do we owe anything to the dead? (1 answer)
Too few answers for comment.

6.   "The scale of historic wrongdoing renders reparative justice impractical." Discuss. (13 answers)
Some thoughtful answers here reflected usefully on different ways in which we could understand ideas of practicality in political theory.

7.   Is it wrong to benefit from the wrongdoing of others? (11 answers)
Very much a question where better essays were able to go beyond the content of the lecture handouts.

8.   "Both the medical model and the social model are necessary to understand the full range of forms of disability." Discuss. (10 answers)

The quality of answers to this question were a little variable, but some were outstanding, showing nuanced understanding and genuinely impressive knowledge of contemporary debates.

9.   Is it ever right to seek to compensate rather than accommodate people with disabilities?   (2   answers)

Too few answers for comment.

10.   Is it permissible for parents to try to pass their moral values on to their children? Is it obligatory? (7 answers)

Better answers here were structured around the question set, and took account of both the putative permissibility and obligatoriness of passing on moral values.

11.   Should adults without children be expected to help pay for the costs of educating   the   young?   (6   answers)

Answers here were generally competent, but failed to go beyond the well staked out positions in the literature.

12.   To what extent should considerations of justice trump other concerns when it   comes   to   making   public   policy?   (0   answers)

Too few answers for comment.

297 Special subject in Politics- Comparative Political Economy

25 students wrote the CPE 297 Special Subject: Comparative Political Economy exam, 1 MHP and 24 PPE. Overall, as was the case last year, the scripts were of a high quality, demonstrating a consistent ability to reason through the questions and engage with a range of empirical material. Again, like last year the most popular questions related to the equity and efficiency tradeoff, varieties of capitalism, globalization and inequality. The weaker answer provided little sustained analysis of the debate, reviewed a limited range of empirical material, and often spent little time setting up a clear structure for analysis. The strongest answers provided a clear framework, a detailed and clear analysis of the empirical material (often digging into the details of how the evidence was gathered), and reflected carefully on what the literature really implied for the question at hand. These answers set up clearly what the they were trying to explain, often expanding on the question to develop a clear set of related outcomes (e.g. a range of changes in contemporary corporate finance) and then asking how well varying approaches could explain these outcomes. Most answers sat between these poles, answering the questions with care and competence, but displaying less empirical or theoretical range than the top papers.

297 Special Subject Paper in Politics: International Security and Conflict

Answers were generally of a high standard, with numerous first-class scripts, and students generally showed impressive understanding of leading theoretical approaches to the topics on the paper and an ability to deploy empirical evidence from a range of cases. No special issues arose regarding the examination. A total of 47 scripts were submitted for the 2018 examination, an increase of 4 on last year, indicating the continuing high popularity of this option paper, which has grown every year since we started offering it in 2016-17. Each question was answered by at least one student, although there was only one answer for Questions 3 and 10. This reflects a consistent pattern of few answers on those topics, and we may want to reconsider expanding or replacing these topics in future. Comments on individual questions are given below.

1.   Who has gained from efforts to broaden the conception of security since the end of the Cold War? (6 Answers)

Compared to the overall high standard of answers in this paper, answers to this question were a little weaker, in general because students struggled to move beyond descriptive accounts of how conceptions of security have been broadened to offer detailed evaluative arguments as to who this is beneficial (or costly) for. Some answers were also a little narrow in only considering one or two major ways in which notions of security had been broadened (e.g. Human Security), rather than the broader panoply of shifts in contemporary understanding of security.

2.   Are most interstate wars defensive wars? (18 Answers)

A popular question – the average standard was, again, not as high as on some other questions, typically because students struggled to pin down what would make a war defensive, and how it might be possible for a war to be defensively-motivated on both sides even if one actor was a notional first-move 'aggressor'. Some candidates chose to draw in as many different kinds of explanations of war from the readings on the syllabus into their answer as possible, which often showed solid revision skills but produced somewhat unfocused, list-like answers. Stronger answers made more systematic reference to spiral/deterrence models of wars, security dilemma dynamics, and the role of misperceptions in war, and several high performing candidates made reference to an impressive range of cases as a means of testing the role of such factors vis a vis the question.

3.   Why, if at all, might a region feature distinctive security problems and solutions? (1 Answer)

Too few answers to draw general conclusions.

4.   Do rational choice theories adequately explain the outbreak and resolution of ethnic civil wars? (16 Answers)

A popular and frequently very well answered question, with many candidates making detailed reference to both rationalist theories of civil war from scholars like Kalyvas, Collier and Fearon

& Laitin, and to critics such as Kaufman, while drawing on a number of key cases. Weaker answers sometimes struggled to explicitly focus on civil war outbreak and resolution, or were empirically narrow – lacking detailed reference to cases. Some answers were also lacking in detail over the distinctive character of ethnic civil wars, and how this interacted with theoretical explanations of outbreak and resolution.

5.   Why have the five recognised nuclear states under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty been unable to resist the proliferation of nuclear weapons? (6 Answers)

A generally well-answered question, with candidates effectively employing key readings on the proliferation dynamics of nuclear weapons to reach conclusions about the limited leverage the recognised nuclear states have managed to generate in preventing proliferation. Many answers discussed several empirical examples of proliferation, particularly India, Pakistan, Israel and North Korea effectively – by contrast, weaker answers remained very abstract, making surprisingly limited references to actual cases of proliferation.

6.   To what extent has the growth of terrorism in the 21st Century been fed by the foreign and security policies of 'Western' states? (23 Answers)

The most popular question, generating a generally high standard of answers. Candidates typically displayed a strong understanding of the literature on terrorism, and answers were often especially effective in explaining how factors unrelated to 'Western' foreign and security policy contributed to the growth of terrorism. Candidates' discussions of how Western states' policies might indeed feed into terrorism were often weaker, however – perhaps in part because many candidates seemed to remain locked into thinking about the explanation of terrorist radicalization at the micro-level rather the broader geopolitical trends which might cause levels of terrorism to rise in particular periods or places. Indeed, weaker answers often failed to focus on the specific growth trend of terrorism in the latter 2000s and early 2010s, and surprisingly few answers discussed in detail the relationship between such trends and the Iraq War, broader destabilisation of the Middle Eastern security situation, and the relevance of conflicts in Syria, Pakistan, Iraq and Afghanistan.

7.   "No special murderous ideology is needed to generate civilian victimization." Is this true of genocide and mass killing? (17 Answers)

A popular and generally well-answered question – most candidates showed a clear understanding of the differences between relatively ideologically-inattentive explanations of civilian victimization (associated with, inter alia, Downes, Valentino, and Fujii) and more ideological explanations (now associated with e.g. Straus, Bulutgil and Weitz). Many answers were also empirically detailed, although certain prominent cases – especially Rwanda – rather over-dominated the answers. The strongest answers were able to explain why ideology may or may not prove crucial in *interaction* with other important causes of genocide and mass killing, and were able to identify specific puzzles or flaws with both ideologically-attentive and -inattentive explanations. Weaker answers sometimes tripped up over what constituted a 'special murderous ideology', or were vague on what specific role ideology might play in generating genocide and mass killing outside the most superficially ideological cases (such as the Holocaust).

8.   Why might governments believe it is (or is not) in their interests to securitize forced migration? (9 Answers)

A high average standard of answers to this question, with many candidates able to offer detailed accounts of the specific links between forced migration and insecurity whilst also discussing the problems of securitization as a response. Weaker answers tended to be empirically shallower, or to amount to rather list-like accounts of the insecurities associated with migration without much consideration of the benefits or problems of securitization per se.

9.   To what extent does gender inequality explain violence against women? (16 Answers)

A very popular question, generating answers of wide-ranging quality, but solid on average. Strong answers were able to focus on the notion of gender inequality as a broad structural cause of violence against women, identify specific links between general levels of gender inequality and violence, and explain other important causes which cannot be reduced to levels of gender inequality. Weaker answers often lacked a clear conception of what 'gender inequality' as a cause of violence is, and therefore became rather general discussions of all the different explanations which have been offered for violence against women without focusing directly enough on what this reveals about the question asked.

10.   Does the growth of transnational criminal actors challenge the state-centrism of international relations theories? (1 Answer)

Too few answers to draw general conclusions.

11.   How can cyberwar be prevented? (18 Answers)

A popular answer, with answers of quite a wide range of quality. Knowledge of the literature on cyber conflict was generally strong, but weaker answers struggled to convert this into clear arguments and prescriptions for preventive policy – indeed, some candidates adopted very pessimistic conclusions that prevention was essentially impossible, without really justifying this with detailed explanation! Stronger answers often critically questioned the real risk of cyberwar in the first place and/or outlined specific vulnerabilities which could be linked to some clear (if relatively constrained) preventive implications. Strong answers also showed a very good understanding of the distinctive dynamics and properties of cyberwar and cyber threats, especially the prospects for significant offensive advantages in this domain, attribution problems, and the ambiguity of existing norms of practice.

12.   How successful have United Nations peacekeeping operations been in delivering sustainable peace? (10 Answers)

Answers were of a solid standard, and generally showed good familiarity with the core empirical research – both qualitative and quantitative – on the impact of peacekeeping operations on peace. Weaker answers sometimes failed to focus on the notion of *sustainable*

peace specifically (as opposed to conflict cessation, ceasefire monitoring, or civilian protection), or lacked illuminating reference to cases and specific linkages between peacekeeping and the long-run prospects of peace. Stronger answers, by contrast, often displayed impressive empirical detail, and clearly delineated what peacekeeping operations could and could not do to generate sustainable peace and the conditions under which they generally were able to do so.