
GCSE **HISTORY**

8145/2: Shaping the nation
Report on the Examination

8145
June 2019

Version: 1.0

Further copies of this Report are available from aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2019 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

8145/2A**Section A: Thematic studies****A/A: Britain: Health and the people: c1000 to the present day****Question 1**

The source appeared to be clear and accessible to the majority of students and students were able to interpret it in a straightforward way. Most students derived basic understanding from the sources for at least Level 1 and many went on to make simple inferences for Level 2 marks. Other students used their knowledge and reasoning to develop points for Levels 3 and offered some historical judgements for Level 4. It was pleasing to see that relatively few answers were composed solely of source description.

Most students recognised the utility of the source to illustrate the many treatments for illness available in the late eighteenth century and their variable efficacy. Answers concluded that there were not agreed treatments for illnesses in 1800 and many suggested there was a general lack of medical knowledge at the time. Such answers were rewarded at Level 2. More effective answers pointed out that it was scientific knowledge that was lacking and noted that the source predated Germ Theory. Developed answers including such points could be rewarded at Level 3 of the mark scheme. Students often referred to the captions in the source and discussed in a simple way the purpose behind treatments such as Quinine, noting a lack of knowledge about what constituted a safe dose for a medicine. Answers that simply stated that the source was exaggerated because it was a cartoon or poked fun at medical practitioners (referred to in the caption of the source), together with simple evaluation based on the content of the source, were rewarded at Level 2.

Level 3 answers frequently noted that the source showed Quack doctors of the eighteenth century and the peddling of fake remedies for money at that time. Those with knowledge of Quackery described confidently with examples that the source showed how, in a pre-germ theory world, unscrupulous Quacks preyed on a frightened and confused Britain (illustrated by the central character). More effective answers often went on to a thoughtful discussion about the provenance of the source and reasoned speculation regarding its intention to expose Quackery at that time. Successful Level 3 answers saw utility in the source because it showed that while many treatments on offer were useless or fake, by 1800 some remedies had some limited research to back them up and might be effective. The use of historical context related to the potential utility source in this way led to marks at the top of Level 3. At Level 4, answers were able to combine some detailed reference to the content of the source with judgements about its use to historians as a way of showing the publication's campaigning or warning intentions, or in a prescientific age, the exposure of contemporary opinions about some medical practitioners at the time.

Question 2

This question produced a wide spread of responses which ranged from the impressively knowledgeable to those which demonstrated a vague and patchy knowledge of Islamic medicine. This surprised examiners for a topic in the specification which is to be considered with regard to its 'nature and importance'. However, some very knowledgeable and well considered answers were seen in response to this question from students who have learned about Islamic medicine in contrast to the contribution of Christianity during the medieval period. There were many answers to this question which achieved high marks.

At Level 1, answers offered a basic response to the question, often referring to the Islamic world using new treatments such as herbs or unspecified drugs. Level 2 answers identified at least one key point of significance of Islamic medicine and surgery in the Medieval and early Renaissance periods. Students awarded marks at this level often pointed simply to the Islamic collection and preservation of ancient medical knowledge and theories during the Dark Ages. That was significant at the time because Western Europe did not value ancient learning. It was also significant because this was the way that eventually Hippocratic and Galenic knowledge was able to find its way back into Europe. Responses at Level 3 identified at least two areas of significance and explained such things as the different attitude to the treatment of the sick in the Islamic world. Developed answers also noted the research and recording of cures in the Muslim world that contrasted with the more superstitious acceptance of disease and the palliative care that was more prevalent in Europe at this time. Such answers were rewarded highly in Level 3 when supported by good factual knowledge of the work of named individuals and Islamic texts. Answers which were rewarded highly at Level 3 and 4 explained with specific knowledge and understanding, the significance of the way Islamic scholars challenged the theories of Galen or of the more scientific approach of key Islamic scholars such as Avicenna and Rhazes. They noted that this was in contrast to the approach to medicine prevalent at the time in Western Europe.

Question 3

This question was answered well by many students and it seemed evident that they had had opportunities during teaching to reflect on the similarities between different people and events. The vast majority of answers did not mention any differences in the work of Pasteur and Fleming. The more effective answers to this question showed a sound knowledge of the work of both individuals. At Level 1 students knew something of the narrative of the work of both scientists, but at this level they failed to clearly identify the points of similarity. Level 2 marks were given for a simple explanation of at least one similarity; this was frequently an understanding of the inability of each individual to capitalise immediately on their discoveries. Both men's discoveries had to await the work of others before effective applications could be made of them. Another common similarity identified simply was that both men's work involved germs.

Level 3 answers referred to more than one similarity including such things as the impact that war and national rivalry had on the work of the both scientists or the role which chance played in their discoveries. With regard to the factor of chance in the work of Pasteur, some students were unable to adequately support the operation of this factor in relation to Pasteur's discovery of Germ Theory, whereas others were able to support this factor by reference to his development of vaccines. However, many students were rewarded well in Level 3 by supporting their points of similarity with details of exactly how the individuals displayed the personal qualities of patience and dedication or the use of observation and painstaking scientific methodology. Many answers showed a good understanding of the scientists and doctors who made the further development of Pasteur's and Fleming's discoveries. Level 4 responses were seen where detailed answers were extended to include such things as the wider impact of their work on, for example, surgery and public health or on combatting infection on a very wide scale into the modern era.

Following a review of the question papers, teacher feedback and consultation, it is intended to alter the format of this question in 2020 to help students more clearly focus their knowledge and understanding. In 2019 the following question was set:

'Compare the work of Louis Pasteur with that of Alexander Fleming. In what ways were they similar? Explain your answer with reference to **both** individuals.'

Using the topic set in 2019, the format of the question in 2020 will read:

‘Explain **two** ways in which Louis Pasteur and Alexander Fleming were similar.’

Question 4

Students showed in their answer to this question that they understand how different factors have affected the development of, in this case, Public Health, especially in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. However, it was evident that some students confuse events and individuals relevant to the development of public health in Britain with those relevant to the fight against disease and infection and the development of surgery.

As a Thematic Study, ‘Health and the people’ covers over a thousand years of history. Thematic Studies are distinct from Period and Depth Studies and in this question, given the large time period they cover, it is expected that in order to reach Levels 3 and 4, responses will use examples to support the argument made from at least three of the four parts of the specification. There is no expectation that all examples will be developed to the same level of detail, but some knowledge and understanding of more than two of the specification’s four parts relevant to the question is required at the higher levels.

Nearly all students addressed the factor named in the question in their answer. At Level 1, students frequently referred generally to unspecified laws that were introduced. These students showed, in a basic way, some understanding of what they hoped to achieve. At Level 2, students began to offer simple explanations of the named factor and often at least one other factor which was usually ‘the role of individuals’. It was common to see reference to nineteenth and twentieth century events and laws; these were identified simply as well as the contemporary reports on poverty and health that highlighted Public Health problems. Many answers offered a narrative of the work of John Snow and a simple explanation of its importance. A large number of answers referred, in a straightforward way, to the contribution made by public welfare measures such as free school meals and the creation of the NHS to improving Public Health in the twentieth century.

Level 3 was awarded to students who deployed detailed knowledge and developed understanding of the identified factor and other factors which improved Public Health in Britain over time. Students rewarded at this level had knowledge of initiatives in public health related to tackling the Black Death in specific towns or the Great Plague in the seventeenth century, however variable in effect they may have been. It was pleasing to see that students correctly recognised the role of town and city authorities as well as the King or Parliament as part of government. Many students took time in their answer to try to argue that medieval monasteries in Britain had a wider impact on public health in Britain. However, some responses were credited at Level 3 because they recognised that the authority of the Abbot, Prior or Mother Superior in such establishments would constitute a government and that rules were followed which contributed to the health of its members. Responses placed in Level 3 demonstrated knowledge of the name and nature of specific laws and the impact they had and the significance of the work of specific individuals such as Edwin Chadwick, John Snow, Joseph Bazalgette and Rowntree. The impact of War, specifically the Boer War, was considered by many students and its influence on the Liberal Welfare Reforms of the early twentieth century. Other factors considered at Level 3 with a variety of details and examples were the impact of developing scientific knowledge, and technology. The deployment of accurate knowledge and understanding helped determine the mark given in Level 3.

Level 4 responses went beyond Level 3 and made judgements about the relative significance of factors and how factors influenced each other to bring about developments in public health at

different times. Such answers showed a sustained line of reasoning supported by detailed factual knowledge and understanding.

A/B: Britain: Power and the people: c1170 to the present day**Question 1**

The source, both in its detail and caption, appeared to be clear to the majority of students. It was possible for most students to show an understanding of the source that might be rewarded at Level 1, but most made simple inferences or spotted simple aspects of provenance for Level 2. It was pleasing that examiners did not see many students who only described the source in their answer. In their answer, some students did not show recognition of the reference in the question to 'royal authority'. Instead they wrote in great detail about the Pilgrimage of Grace, but this missed the focus of the question and therefore meant it was unlikely that such answers could be rewarded beyond Level 2.

Many were able to connect the removing of 'the unworthy' with the Pope and the break from Rome and linked this to 'royal authority'. Where this was done well, responses gained Level 3 marks. Provenance featured in many answers but little was developed beyond the simple claim of bias linked to the idea that Henry himself had commissioned the painting. Whilst the question permits students to discuss the limitations of the source, those limitations have to be relevant to the question. Far fewer students this year were willing to dismiss the source out of hand because it did not mention something they knew about. Some more effective answers were seen at Level 3 which mentioned the propaganda value of the image, which portrayed Henry as he wished to be seen and linked it to his success in suppressing the Pilgrimage of Grace and the fact that there was no other serious rebellion during his reign, thus emphasizing the success of the break from Rome.

Question 2

This question was not answered well by many students. Less effective answers were rather vague, demonstrating a vague understanding of the General Strike or even strikes in general. They were notable for failing to focus on Significance. Answers often included some narrative detail about the events of the General Strike but students were unable to link this to significance. There were many answers that confused the General Strike with the Miners' Strike of the 1980s or that hailed the General Strike as a great success, resulting in the strikers getting everything they asked for.

At Level 3, students clearly expressed their knowledge of the short term significance regarding the failure of the workers or the success of government. A few excellent answers were rewarded at Level 4 for indicating the long-term significance of the General Strike in relation to the increasing power of unions after World War Two, or by reference to the relationship between the unions and the Labour Party.

Question 3

The more effective answers to this question showed a good knowledge of the Peasants' Revolt and 19th Century Trades Unionism. Students frequently were rewarded at Level 1 and 2 when they wrote about the two groups of people based upon what motivated each group ie pay, working conditions and taxation. Many students also saw a similarity in the monarch's or government's reaction to both groups. It was pleasing that far fewer students wrote about the differences between the two groups. Knowledge of the Peasants' Revolt was impressive. A small number of students chose to write about the Peasants' Revolt only. At Level 3, a more developed understanding showed through in answers where students focused on the causes and consequences of the events. Important understanding that secured reward at Level 3 and 4 was

often displayed in answers which selected a specific example from the history of Trades Unionism to compare with an aspect of the Peasants' Revolt, for example, the harsh treatment of the leaders, compared to the harsh treatment of the Tolpuddle Martyrs. Level 4 answers often explained how both events inspired future protests or movements.

Following a review of the question papers, teacher feedback and consultation, it is intended to alter the format of this question in 2020 to help students more clearly focus their knowledge and understanding. In 2019 the following was set:

'Compare the Peasants' Revolt with Trade Unionism in the nineteenth century. In what ways were they similar? Explain your answer with reference to **both** the Peasants' Revolt and Trade Unionism in the nineteenth century.'

Using the topic set in 2019, the format of the question in 2020 will read:

'Explain **two** ways in which the Peasants' Revolt and Trade Unionism in the nineteenth century were similar.'

Question 4

Many students showed in their answer to this question that they understood how different factors had influenced the development of Parliament in Britain over a thousand years of history. Nearly all students addressed the factor named in the question, war and violence, in their answer. At Level 1, students frequently identified war, such as the First and Second Baron's Wars or English Civil Wars, and showed, usually briefly, some knowledge and understanding of events. At Level 2, responses began to show some impact on the development of Parliament in relation to the war they had selected. Responses at Levels 1 and 2 showed some understanding that war and violence was only one factor that might have contributed to the development of Parliament. The role of the individual was the most popular second factor which answers considered at this level. Examiners did note that answers often lost a focus on the question which was about the development of Parliament when students chose as examples either the abolition of Slavery or the Pilgrimage of Grace to support their argument.

As a Thematic Study, 'Power and the people' covers over a thousand years of history. Thematic Studies are distinct from Period and Depth Studies and in this question, given the large time period they cover, it is expected that in order to reach Levels 3 and 4, responses will use examples to support the argument made from at least three of the four parts of the specification. There is no expectation that all examples will be developed to the same level of detail, but some knowledge and understanding of more than two of the specification's four parts relevant to the question is required at the higher levels.

At Level 3, responses clearly explained the identified factor. Answers showed how students had reflected on their knowledge and then related it to show how war and violence might be used to explain how the influence of that factor affected the development of Parliament. Answers that were given Level 3 marks chose examples from three or all parts of the specification in their support of an argument about the development of Parliament. They selected a range of examples appropriately for their argument. Answers at this level were based upon a consideration of at least two factors, one of which was the factor stated in the question. Many students appeared to find this straightforward to do. Some answers at Levels 3 and 4 were admirable for their ability to express the development of Parliament in terms of the change in the composition of Parliament, to include knights and burgesses (Medieval), more from the middle and lower classes (19th century) and

representation of both genders (20th century). It was good to see responses which argued that changes in economic circumstances and the introduction of new ideas were important factors in the development of Parliament. The question clearly invited students to consider the 'main factor' in the development of Parliament and answers that did that directly, with some substantiated judgement, were rewarded at Level 4. The more effective examples at Level 4 considered how the relationship between factors might have operated to bring about the development of Parliament.

A/C: Britain: Migration, empires and the people: c790 to the present day**Question 1**

The source appeared to be clear and accessible to all students. The source attribution added important information which was used well in the main. However, many students at Levels 1 and 2 could have exploited it further in developing their answers rather than just repeating the detail of it. Most students could write about the attraction of migration to Britain and many were able to explain the alternative viewpoint suggested on the right-hand side of the image. Many students do still appear to lack a clear understanding of the difference between assessing the utility of the source and the concept of the reliability of a historical source.

In Level 3 responses referred to, for example, the events of Windrush and the negative reaction of some British people. This was often linked to the period between the arrival of the first migrants in 1948 and the time of the source six years later. When discussing provenance some students were confused by the purpose of Punch, assuming it focused on humour only and not political comment. Responses which showed awareness of this, dependent on the judgement formed, were generally placed in Level 3 or 4.

Question 2

Students possessed a good knowledge of the triangular slave trade with some focusing solely on this. It was notable that less effective answers often offered long passages of narrative about the triangular trade which drifted away from a sharper focus on significance in the question. Some basic answers at Level 1 often just told a story. Answers at Level 2 referred to the economic significance of the slave trade but failed to discuss other significances as they wrote about the economic impact from a variety of angles. At Levels 3 and 4, students showed an awareness of a range of additional significant impacts including the development of the British Empire, the anti-slavery movement of the 19th century and the even longer-term impact on British society into the twentieth century.

Question 3

This question was answered well. Students showed a depth of knowledge about both the migration of the Huguenots in the seventeenth century and that of the Jews in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. There were some impressive answers showing an understanding of the short-term and long-term impact of the arrival on society and the economic state of the nation of both groups of people. The more effective answers to this question showed a good understanding of short, medium and long-term impacts and showed a good grasp of the concept of similarity. It was noticeable at Levels 1 and 2 that fewer students wrote about differences, some citing that Huguenots may have been accepted into society more quickly, but when they wrote this, they still suggested that acceptance of both groups was eventually achieved and this was therefore a similarity. Students appear to have been given more opportunities in their study of, 'Migration, empires and the people' to reflect upon the similarities between different periods, people and events in history. Examiners noted that the result of this was that students were far more effective in answering this type of question in the examination.

At Level 3, a more developed understanding showed through in answers where students focused on religious persecution, Britain as a tolerant society, a country of opportunity and one where, eventually, integration was possible. Impressively, many students could cite British institutions which flourished under the guidance, support and talent of Huguenots and Jews.

Following a review of the question papers, teacher feedback and consultation, it is intended to alter the format of this question in 2020 to help students more clearly focus their knowledge and understanding. In 2019 the following was set:

‘Compare Huguenot migration with Jewish migration to Britain. In what ways were they similar? Explain your answer with reference to **both** groups of people.’

Using the topic set in 2019, the format of the question in 2020 will read:

‘Explain **two** ways in which Huguenot migration and Jewish migration to Britain were similar.’

Question 4

Examiners noted that students had been well prepared to discuss factors contributing to the development of empires. Most students could offer examples of how empires developed from across the Thematic Unit. Many referred to the named factor of economic resources with a good range of examples. Less able students tended to focus solely on the stated factor and so were limited to Level 2 marks.

As a Thematic Study, ‘Migration, empires and the people’ covers over a thousand years of history. Thematic Studies are distinct from Period and Depth Studies and in this question, given the large time period they cover, it is expected that in order to reach Levels 3 and 4, responses use examples to support the argument made from at least three of the four parts of the specification. There is no expectation that all examples will be developed to the same level of detail, but some knowledge and understanding of more than two of the specification’s four parts relevant to the question is required at the higher levels.

Nearly all students addressed the factor named in the question, economic resources, in their answer. At Level 1, students showed a weaker knowledge of factors, occasionally employing factors that were of their own design. It is hoped that students will have had an opportunity during the course of this study to consider all of the named factors in the specification. At Level 2, students began to show a better grasp of the way economic resources had a slightly different impact depending on the time frame or area of the world discussed. However, examiners noted that the level of supporting detail at Level 2 was simple.

It was at Level 3 and beyond that students began to show a clear understanding of the identified factor, as well as displaying a detailed knowledge of other factors. Answers that were placed in Level 3 chose examples from three parts of the Specification. Many answers at Level 3 and 4 displayed an impressive knowledge about Part 4 of the specification and the decline of the British Empire in the 20th century. Some answers discussed the role of the European Union as a Europe-wide economic empire of sorts. Level 4 could only be achieved with a strong Level 3 which sustained a line of reasoning which was sharply focused and led to a substantiated judgement. Some students at Level 2, and more commonly at Level 3, displayed an argument and attempted to make a judgment but this was not substantiated by knowledge or based on an understanding of the relative importance of factors, either in isolation or working together.

8145/2B**Section B: British depth studies including the historic environment****B/A: Norman England, c1066–c1100****Question 1**

Students appeared to find the Interpretation straightforward. The vast majority of students found something to say, based upon their own knowledge, about this interpretation. However, it was important for students to connect what they knew with the interpretation directly rather than merely assert something they knew about the Domesday Book. A few students made speculative comments about the author that were not rewarded.

Responses which provided basic analysis by either quoting parts of the interpretation or rearranging parts of it were placed in Level 1. Some made basic assertions derived from the interpretation but offered no explanation or knowledge in support. Many students wrote that they agreed with the interpretation ‘from my own knowledge’ but neglected to include any. Some also argued that the interpretation was unconvincing because it was adapted or because Roffe, the author, alludes to a debate which suggests that he did not seem certain himself. At Level 2, students started to explain their ideas in simple terms. Examiners saw many more effective answers that said William needed money because of the threat of invasion, but this often remained as only one single point which was developed. Other students provided brief, valid explanations about William’s need to obtain as much tax as possible or to assert Norman power by intimidating the English, but at Level 2 these answers lacked specific knowledge to back up their points.

One way in which responses placed in Levels 3 and 4 often demonstrated understanding of the interpretation was by applying knowledge to the purpose of the Domesday Book. Students alighted on the question of why money might be needed which might have been due to the threat of invasion from Vikings or even in Normandy from the French. They also explained that taxes were needed for the castle building programme. The record of land ownership was cited as a way of judging land disputes, especially as so much land had changed hands since 1066 and due to the changes in inheritance due to primogeniture. Some excellent answers recognised that William made the key tenants swear loyalty to him in August 1086 at Salisbury, thus proving that one of the purposes was to confirm the new feudal society and land ownership. Whilst accepting some points made in the interpretation, a few students did challenge the notion that the primary motive was to raise cash and suggested that it was rather about the wish for control and this was linked to the point about swearing fealty at Salisbury.

Following a review of the question papers, teacher feedback and consultation, it is intended to alter the format of this question in 2020 to help students more clearly focus their knowledge and understanding. In 2019 the following was set:

‘Study **Interpretation A** in the Interpretations Booklet. How convincing is **Interpretation A** about the Domesday Book? Explain your answer using **Interpretation A** and your contextual knowledge.’

Using the topic set in 2019, the format of the question in 2020 will read:

‘Study **Interpretation A** in the Interpretations Booklet. How convincing is **Interpretation A** about the Domesday Book? Explain your answer based on your contextual knowledge and what it says in **Interpretation A**.’

Question 2

Most students understood that the question was about the importance of the relationship between Church and state. At Level 1, responses tended to identify points and commonly this was that people were very religious at this time so it was important for the king to maintain a good relationship with the Church. Explanations at this level were generalised and tended to lack detailed knowledge. Some identified the use of the Papal Banner by William or said that William Rufus had a bad relationship with the Church. Answers at Level 2 were clearer about these points and managed to explain simply about the use of the Papal Banner and why William was granted this or how it encouraged his troops to fight. Other answers included the reforms by Lanfranc or William II having a poor relationship with Anselm. Sometimes narrative answers fell into this category where students wrote about the relationship but did not focus their answer to say what was important about it.

At Levels 3 and 4, a number of responses were able to show a knowledge of two or three kings. However, this breadth of knowledge was not necessary to attain the higher levels. It was important at Levels 3 and 4 to focus relevantly on the importance of the relationship and the effect it could have on the reign. Some of the more effective answers made perceptive points about how William obtained the Papal Banner or gave an explanation of the reforms carried out by Lanfranc. Examiners saw some detailed answers about William II and why he had a poor relationship with the church and the consequences of this. In their answers, students used examples which referred to Anselm, simony (Flambard), the King's morality, his profiting from empty positions and occasionally the case of St Calais and the Council of Rockingham. Some students recognised that William II's reign demonstrated the battle between the church and the state which was to continue long after his reign. Although fewer answers referred to Henry I, the issue of excommunication and the Investiture Controversy and the importance of reaching a compromise in 1107 did arise.

Question 3

It was possible at Level 1 to reward responses which were imprecise in expressing knowledge of town life under the Normans. Examiners were able to reward at Level 1 responses which were more general about life in towns and villages or identified that there were more towns or that they grew. Other examples of answers which were rewarded at Level 1 were those that touched upon town life only insofar as it could be referenced to the feudal system or referred to changes to the legal system under the Normans. These answers tended to be of slight relevance because they were about lives of people rather than changes to towns. At Level 2, some responses provided a simple narrative based on how the structure of towns changed in relation to castles, cathedrals, monasteries and the growth of towns or trade with some statistical evidence in support. The main characteristic of most Level 2 answers to this question was that they contained some understanding but lacked specific knowledge. There were a number of students who seemed to have anticipated a different focus for this question and wrote about life in medieval England, the feudal system and legal changes (especially Murdrum and forest law) rather than about towns.

At Levels 3 and 4, students addressed the question more directly in terms of changes to towns under the Normans. Some used case studies to support their answers very effectively. They considered the changes in the urban structure and society; some discussed the divide between the Norman elite and the Anglo-Saxons in towns such as Nottingham or trade such as in Droitwich. Some students wrote knowledgeably about guilds and Charters and explained in detail the increased job opportunities available. Some answers explained the systems of apprenticeships. A

few students explained that towns became more independent due to Charters and that there was a growth of an urban elite.

Question 4

Students answered this question well and impressed the examiners. It was clear that they had made good use of the Historic Environment Resource Pack. Students knew about the location and uses of Pevensey Castle. It was noted, however, that some students wanted to write a general description of the uses of castles. It is important that students direct their energy, thinking and knowledge towards answering the question on the examination paper. This is a question on a historical site; therefore, the emphasis should be on providing references based on the nominated site that support an argument in answer to the question.

At Level 1, it was common in answers to find the brief identification that Pevensey was the first castle built and was used as a base for troops. Other answers at Level 1 wrote in a generic way about how castles were strong and they could be easily defended and usually made only a passing reference to Pevensey. At this level, there was often a poor grasp of precisely what 'military' might mean in this context, as students wrote that castles were built for defence, control or intimidation, implying in some way that these were not military purposes.

At Level 2 responses explained one aspect, usually military, with some specific examples from Pevensey. It was common to see mention in relation to Pevensey of the Roman fort, its high walls, the nature of its construction (as a flat-packed castle) and its location on a peninsular. Some answers mentioned trade with Normandy but also were aware of the impact economically on the town itself with reference to the salt works; the increase in burgesses and taxes was sometimes cited as evidence for this economic boom. At Level 2 answers were simple, usually making two or three points that lacked the specific support regarding Pevensey that was expected in order to qualify for Level 3 marks. Narratives about the siege were placed in Level 2.

At Levels 3 and 4, students did develop two or three (and sometimes more) points with specific reference to Pevensey and composed these into an argument that addressed the 'main' in the question. Those answers reaching the top of Level 3 generally had two well developed points, perhaps with some generic information, but also started to make a judgement with some explanation. Those reaching Levels 3 and 4 showed an impressive knowledge of the physical aspects of the castle, the people (Robert of Mortain) and the increase in trade with statistical support. They made links with the Roman empire and the Roman fort as symbolic and addressed how the castle was besieged by William II and used again by Henry I when in fear of invasion. Examiners were pleased to see answers from students who realised that Pevensey was located in what had been Godwin's land; therefore, its occupation and construction was also symbolic. Perceptive points were made by some students about how Pevensey was more to do with securing the invasion whereas other castles were built in rebellious areas and designed to suppress a local population or area. The most effective answers were those who retained a focus on Pevensey at almost every part of their argument. Examiners recognised that other castles could be referenced in an answer but only if the focus on Pevensey was retained to substantiate its argument.

The most frequent line of argument was that Pevensey was made for military use but this changed over time to one of economy and trade and therefore students disagreed with the hypothesis in the statement. The failure to hold out against William II in 1088 was cited as evidence for Pevensey's failure in military matters with the increase in taxation under Robert, as an absentee landlord, as evidence of economic success. Alternatively, students argued that the fact that Pevensey held out for six weeks and prohibited attacks from France meant it was militarily successful.

B/B: Medieval England: the reign of Edward I, 1272–1307**Question 1**

Students appeared to find the interpretation straightforward. The interpretation was accessible with plenty of elements which a student could pick out and use their knowledge to expound upon. At Level 1, many students quoted from or paraphrased the interpretation. Such answers were often prefaced by the assertion that the interpretation was convincing or not. Level 2 answers started to use contextual knowledge but often these were simple facts which needed a little more explanation to make them completely relevant to the point of the interpretation. At Level 2, answers sometimes resolved themselves into a list of facts. There were still some students dedicating half or more of their response to speculative comment about the interpretation's provenance; this was not rewarded.

Answers at Levels 3 and 4 focused on the issue of land specifically and its link to the monarch through the feudal system. Students explained how barons had usurped this authority under Henry III and Edward I was determined to restore his power and authority. Some good answers also referred to the Statute of Gloucester as a follow up to the previous statutes and the Statute of Mortmain, acknowledging the Church's involvement.

Following a review of the question papers, teacher feedback and consultation, it is intended to alter the format of this question in 2020 to help students more clearly focus their knowledge and understanding. In 2019 the following was set:

'Study **Interpretation A** in the Interpretations Booklet. How convincing is **Interpretation A** about Edward I and the nobles? Explain your answer using **Interpretation A** and your contextual knowledge.'

Using the topic set in 2019, the format of the question in 2020 will read:

'Study **Interpretation A** in the Interpretations Booklet. How convincing is **Interpretation A** about Edward I and the nobles? Explain your answer based on your contextual knowledge and what it says in **Interpretation A**.'

Question 2

A successful answer to this question centred on students' understanding of the word 'education' in the context of the specification. There were many answers which interpreted the word in a generalised and modern sense of simply 'going to school' or Edward's personal education as a noble and knight who had learned to hunt. Students did not struggle with this question if they were able to contextualise 'education and learning' and appreciate the role of the church in education and at the same time appreciate the development of more secular ways of thinking. Level 1 answers were basic in that they operated on an understanding of education that often was reduced to the point that boys went to school whereas girls did not. It was usual to see Level 2 answers which displayed a recognition of the church's dominance over education. Nevertheless there were many answers at this level which were simple, for example, based on the idea that monks were teachers or lessons were in Latin and there were universities. There was a simple level of knowledge demonstrated in these responses.

At Levels 3 and 4, students produced answers and showed a much more precise and perceptive understanding of the nature of the question. Students make the connection between an educated

gentry and Edward's parliament, enabling him to make more informed decisions and be less reliant on the barons. The 'Great Cause' was cited as an example. The understanding that education was more secular with new subjects and challenges saw many students displaying a knowledge of the work of Bacon and Scotus. They were able to explain how their ideas and theories contributed to a wider expanse of knowledge and the impact their work had on the future development of education and learning.

Question 3

In responses to this question students appeared to find it relatively straightforward to reach a Level 3 or 4 as there were some clearly defined elements for them to focus on. The extent to which responses were developed with explanation and evidence determined the mark at Level 3 or 4 which could be awarded. However, a number of students felt the need to 'set the scene' and focused on Henry III's reign, which, although it could lead to the need for Edward to make changes, did not directly address the 'ways' royal finance and taxation changed. In many cases, this was given equal weight by the student to Edward's actions. Many of these answers turned into a list of points with only a simple explanation. There was a need for a stronger focus on the 'ways' in which Royal finance and taxation changed rather than on 'why' it changed.

The most effective answers which reached Level 4 usually identified and explained two or sometimes three specific changes. These changes included the introduction of a new currency, the use of Italian bankers and the introduction of a wool tax. Answers which were developed considered the impact of the change and some made perceptive connections between different changes. It was noticeable that better responses also made a distinction between short-term 'quick-fixes' like the loans and long-term, stabilising effects like the wool tax.

Question 4

Students answered this question well and it was clear that they had made good use of the Historic Environment Resource Pack. The evidence for this is the prevalence of some key ideas and recurring references in responses such as, 'the medieval equivalent of a machine gun', 'impregnability' and 'civilisation meant urbanisation'. There were many detailed answers which showed that students had studied Caernarfon Castle with enthusiasm and thoroughness.

The stated aspect of Edward I's Castle building was accessible to all and some basic features were identified and described at Level 1. At Level 2, some students tended to list features with only a simple explanation of their military significance. Examiners noted that some answers tended to drift off at a tangent and introduce battles that had been studied or castle features in general, or Edward's campaigns in Scotland. All of these points extended their answers but added little in terms of creditworthy material. The lists of features were impressive but the support for the answer at Level 2 was simple in explaining how those features such as an arrow slit or a murder hole would have had a military consequence. Students had obviously studied background context of Edward's campaigns in Wales. They knew a lot about, for example, Gwynedd or Llywelyn but were not able to use it effectively.

Answers at Levels 3 and 4 explored the nature of 'military' whilst making specific reference to Caernarfon, evaluating the Castle's use. Students were able to explain and argue that there were other consequences of Edward's Castle building which were connected with some key concepts such as power, authority, domination and imperialism. However, its administrative use and purpose was considered by only a few students compared with other possible effects. It was pleasing to see many Level 4 answers which based their judgement on the difference between short and long-term

aims of building a Castle at Caernarfon. Some perceptive answers noted the complementary nature of the different consequences of building Caernarfon Castle that as well as building an 'iron ring' to stem Welsh rebellion, Edward also wanted the Welsh to know that he was intending to stay and that Wales was to be assimilated into England. Good responses also evaluated Madog's invasion of Caernarfon and how that reflected on the castle, citing its incomplete nature as the reason for Madog's temporary success. The most frequent line of argument used by students at Levels 3 and 4 was that Caernarfon Castle was all about being a military stronghold but with additional uses such as asserting English dominance over Wales.

B/C: Elizabethan England, c1568–1603**Question 1**

Students appeared to find the interpretation straightforward. However, as was the case last year, many responses failed to address the key word, 'convincing'. A few students made speculative comments about the author and his trustworthiness or reliability, which were not rewarded. The interpretation offered students a large number and variety of points which they chose to develop and responses demonstrated good knowledge of the Elizabethan Court. At Level 1 responses were often based on a paraphrase of the content and generalised; answers also asserted rather than explained. Students often made basic comments about the composition of the Court or activities that they associated with it. There was evidence that some students did not have a clear understanding of the concept of 'the Court' and made references to Parliament or to courts of law.

At Level 2 responses showed a simple understanding of a number of aspects of the Court. The most frequently explained were patronage, fashions and entertainment. Answers at this level showed an imbalance between understanding and knowledge. At Level 3 and 4, students demonstrated their understanding and knowledge by applying specific knowledge to the points made in the interpretation. Examiners noticed frequent explanations of how Elizabeth's control declined towards the end of her reign, with the deaths of Cecil and Dudley as key turning points. It was pleasing to see some perceptive and knowledgeable answers that made reference to Anglo-Spanish rivalry, the French Wars of religion, England and the Netherlands, all of which placed a stress on Elizabethan Court politics. Students at Level 3 also referred to the Court when it went on Progress and Elizabeth's techniques for controlling people and life at Court.

Following a review of the question papers, teacher feedback and consultation, it is intended to alter the format of this question in 2020 to help students more clearly focus their knowledge and understanding. In 2019 the following was set:

'Study **Interpretation A** in the Interpretations Booklet. How convincing is **Interpretation A** about the Elizabethan Court? Explain your answer using **Interpretation A** and your contextual knowledge.'

Using the topic set in 2019, the format of the question in 2020 will read:

'Study **Interpretation A** in the Interpretations Booklet. How convincing is **Interpretation A** about the Elizabethan Court? Explain your answer based on your contextual knowledge and what it says in **Interpretation A**.'

Question 2

It was pleasing to see that students clearly had a lot to say about the plots against Queen Elizabeth. However, many answers considered the causes of the plots and their events rather than focusing on the outcome of the plot and its importance. It was common to see answers that considered the Spanish Armada to be a direct result of the Babington plot. Many students also wished to see the Essex Rebellion as a Catholic plot. At Level 1, many students wrote at length about Mary, Queen of Scots and identified her as a key threat. However, her role was asserted or presumed. At Level 1, it was common to see a listing of plots; this knowledge was often imprecise with some confused attribution and incorrect dates. At Level 2, students were more ready to explain in their answers that one important consequence of the plots was that they failed. Answers

at Level 2 demonstrated a simple understanding of some details of the plots and general statements about Elizabeth government's reaction to the threat.

At Levels 3 and 4, students addressed the 'important' aspect of the question. At this level there was a much firmer grasp of the chronology involved and a clearer focus on the outcome of the plots. Some perceptive answers referred to the changing attitudes towards Roman Catholics in England which was evidenced by more punitive legislation against them. Examiners were pleased to see that students could place the plots in a broader European context, particularly with regard to the power of Spain. There were some sophisticated answers that showed an understanding of how the danger from different plots differed over time and particularly after 1584 when William of Orange was assassinated, leaving Elizabeth as the leading Protestant ruler in Europe.

Question 3

Students were keen to show their knowledge of poverty but all too often their answers concentrated on its causes rather than how it was dealt with by the authorities. There was a clear understanding shown in many answers that the Elizabethans distinguished between the deserving and undeserving poor. At Levels 1 and 2, answers were shaky in their grasp about precisely when this distinction and classification occurred. Similarly, students were confident about identifying workhouses and alms houses but less confident in showing knowledge about their roles and the dates when they were introduced. Level 1 answers showed an awareness of the treatment of the poor in the past and identified some basic changes, such as help for particular groups which was achieved by a change in the law. At Level 2, students most commonly identified different groups of the poor, although these often were weighed down with lengthy descriptions of the varying types and behaviours of the undeserving poor. There was some good knowledge shown of how the poor were helped in simple terms.

At Levels 3 and 4, students displayed a clear grasp of the different types of help and punishment which the new laws brought in from the 1570s onwards. It was pleasing to see that students had a knowledge of specific towns such as London, Norwich and Ipswich who developed strategies and provision to help the poor. Developed answers explained that the national government learned how these pioneering towns operated and was able to apply the lessons learned about how to treat poverty on a national scale. Students also showed a good understanding of the changing attitudes, why this occurred and how provision was different from that of previous periods. More effective responses explained how the 1601 Act was the culmination of that which had gone before and had perduring consequences.

Question 4

Students answered this question well and impressed the examiners. It was clear that students had made good use of the Historic Environment Resource Pack. The question was accessible to all abilities. It was common to see a strong emphasis being placed in most answers upon a knowledge of the pricing and seating at The Globe. At Level 1, the majority of students were able to describe in general terms a number of features associated with The Globe. This was commonly to do with who sat or stood where and how much they paid for the privilege. At Level 2, students discussed in simple terms the attractions of the theatre in Elizabethan times. They made frequent reference to the engaging topics for the plays with particular reference to their tragic, comic and contemporary appeal. Answers made simple reference to patronage, opposition and the attraction of the layout and facilities of the theatre itself. Many examiners reported a preoccupation with bearbaiting and prostitution. There were fewer references to the Renaissance and the Golden Age.

Some examiners noticed a small number of answers that seemed to suggest that the Essex rebellion was caused by the play, Richard II.

At Level 3, responses needed to focus more specifically on the wording of the question. At Levels 3 and 4 there were more developed answers that focused most frequently on patronage, the gentry, opposition and censorship or propaganda. Students were able to clarify with more precision who the patrons of The Globe were and why they frequented it. At Level 3 examiners frequently saw well-supported and reasoned answers that dealt with the opposition to the theatre from the Puritans or the local authorities. Judgements began to emerge about whether ‘entertainment for all’ was the main consequence at Level 3 and 4. At Level 3 there were answers that were little more than summaries of earlier points. However, at Level 4 there were many very effective answers which presented a relevant argument that balanced the accessibility of the theatre to the lower orders in society with the reinforcement of social stratification shown in the form of the tiered seating. Students also tackled the idea that the Elizabethan Theatre demonstrated the inspiring ideas of the Renaissance and led contemporaries to consider that they lived in a Golden Age. A judgement commonly formed was that the opposition to the development of the theatre was overcome because of the support for it from Queen Elizabeth and other nobles who found it stimulating and rewarding both socially and intellectually.

B/D: Restoration England, 1660–1685**Question 1**

Students appeared to find the interpretation straightforward, identifying several aspects which could be discussed. A number of students used time unprofitably by discussing the provenance, which was not required for this question and could not be rewarded.

At Level 1, students picked out some basic points from the interpretation, usually focusing on 'pleasure-seeking royal court'. At Level 2, students frequently showed a simple understanding of the phrases 'extravagant lifestyle', 'strong commitment to the Anglican religion' and 'deeply concerned about the succession' rather than other aspects of the interpretation. At this level students were aware of 'the Merrie Monarch', briefly mentioned religious tensions and made reference to the succession problem. However, these answers would have been improved by more specific reference to the measures that demonstrated the commitment to Anglicanism or details of the Exclusion Crisis. Some responses tried to assess why the statement was not convincing. This was not necessary and these attempts were often contrived and did not possess the development necessary for reward at the higher levels.

One way in which responses placed in Level 3 and 4 demonstrated understanding of the interpretation was by applying knowledge and considering several aspects of the statement in detail, for example, by linking the Exclusion Crisis to the fear of Catholicism and relations with France. Higher levels were also attained when responses demonstrated an awareness that the passing of the Test Act was both an indication of commitment to Anglicanism and a challenge to Charles' authority. Alternatively, they provided details of the compromises required from Charles in return for money.

Examiners also saw many perceptive answers that showed an awareness of the changing relationship between Charles and Parliament, or explored how foreign policy affected that relationship. A few more effective responses, whilst acknowledging the influence of Charles' time at the court of Louis XIV, mentioned that France was both Catholic and an absolute monarchy and discussed how this influenced on Charles' relationship with Parliament. Further, some students developed their answer by discussing Parliament's dissatisfaction with Charles' support for Catholic France against the Protestant Dutch and went on to demonstrate complex thinking by linking this to the Treaty of Dover.

Following a review of the question papers, teacher feedback and consultation, it is intended to alter the format of this question in 2020 to help students more clearly focus their knowledge and understanding. In 2019 the following was set:

'Study **Interpretation A** in the Interpretations Booklet. How convincing is **Interpretation A** about Charles II and Parliament? Explain your answer using **Interpretation A** and your contextual knowledge.'

Using the topic set in 2019, the format of the question in 2020 will read:

'Study **Interpretation A** in the Interpretations Booklet. How convincing is **Interpretation A** about Charles II and Parliament? Explain your answer based on your contextual knowledge and what it says in **Interpretation A**.'

Question 2

Students clearly had a lot to say about the Great Plague, though the key point about this question lay in their understanding of the word 'important' in the question. However, many students used a considerable part of their answer to provide a narrative account of the plague with little reflection on its impact. It was possible to discern from their answers that there was some, perhaps understandable, confusion in students' minds between the Great Plague and the Black Death, complete with occasional references to the Peasants' Revolt. A number of answers included references to the nineteenth century cholera outbreaks. A few students, perhaps latching on to the word 'Great' in the question, wrote about the Great Fire of London.

At Level 1, responses demonstrated a basic understanding that the plague led to many deaths but rarely mentioned any other consequences of the epidemic. The answers that were rewarded at Level 2 usually remedied that deficiency. They explained how the plague had an economic impact, halting trade. Government interventions were mentioned. At Level 2, this was usually restricted to what was happening in London. Some students mentioned medical knowledge or the lack of it. Credit was given for the understanding that the plague was not confined to London and for distinguishing between short and long-term consequences. The latter approach was sometimes less successful because it was formulaic.

At Levels 3 and 4, students showed a greater appreciation of the economic impact of the plague, such as restrictions on the movement of people and goods and the inability to collect taxes and customs, leading to difficulties funding the Dutch wars. Others acknowledged that this was a relatively short-term impact. Alternatively, more effective responses provided specific details of preventatives or treatments and linked each to the medical theory that underpinned that action. They also described attempts by national and local government to control epidemic disease and provided examples of when these measures were used successfully.

Question 3

This question required students to display an understanding of causation, continuity, consequence and change or actions that brought about change, in this case in relation to the effects of trade and colonies. It was not essential to consider both trade and colonies to access the highest marks, although most of the more effective answers did refer to both. With regard to colonies, students were expected to display knowledge of where the colonies were, the goods they supplied and the resulting benefits. Lower level responses limited themselves to describing the colonies and the goods that were traded. An understanding of the impact that this had was required to achieve marks at the higher levels.

Many responses referred to the slave trade. More effective responses considered the ways in which profits might be beneficial to the country, to Charles II, to the shareholders and plantation owners, as well as to the peripheral beneficiaries, such as the factory owners. A consideration of how these profits were used was likely to raise the response to Level 3 or 4, for example, by making links to Charles' need for money to fund the Dutch wars. Those who wrote about the mutually sustaining relationship between trade and the navy, linking this to mercantilism, the Navigation Acts or the Blue Water Policy were also usually able access the higher levels. Other responses explained the effects of the colonial products on Britain with links to coffee houses, the impact of cotton on fashion or the health effects of tobacco; these too were possible routes to Level 3 or 4.

Question 4

Most students had some information about Ham House to share and examiners were impressed by the quality of some of the answers. It was clear that many students had made good use of the Historic Environment Resource Pack. Less effective responses were descriptive, learned accounts of Ham House that did not have a connection with the wording of the question. These answers neither made mention of 'comfort and pleasure', nor did they attempt to address any of the other consequences of country house building and therefore tended to remain at Level 1. It is important that students direct their energy, thinking and knowledge towards answering the specific question on the examination paper.

Level 2 responses demonstrated that students were aware of the need to address different motivations or factors. However, some students appeared not to have been taught to consider 'comfort and pleasure' as an aspect, so this was ignored by many, restricting responses to the lower levels of the mark scheme. In some cases, the words 'comfort and pleasure' were inserted into what appeared to be a rehearsed answer in an unconvincing and ineffective manner. There were also attempts to use material that had been taught as, for example, 'wealth and status' and make it fit 'comfort and pleasure'. This was rarely successful and tended to garner reward at Level 2. In other cases, responses focused solely on 'comfort and pleasure', again restricting the mark to Level 2. Some students mentioned many factors but failed to support these with sufficient evidence and explanation. Focusing on fewer consequences and arguing for or against them using specific evidence from Ham House usually resulted in greater success.

At Levels 3 and 4, students discussed 'comfort and pleasure' in a convincing manner and also provided detailed evidence for at least one other factor. The more obvious and most frequently used supporting factors were foreign influences and fashion, displaying wealth or status, and royal influence. More rarely, students mentioned how the house reflected a social hierarchy or that a consequence was to create a centre of social interaction and political debate or patronage. More effective responses displayed a clear use of the Historic Environment Resource Pack in their argument and appropriate examples were used to back up each statement. Arguments that were awarded Level 4 went well beyond a simple summary and frequently made a judgement that had been supported by sufficient evidence in the preceding paragraphs.

Use of statistics

Statistics used in this report may be taken from incomplete processing data. However, this data still gives a true account on how students have performed for each question.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results Statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.