



GCSE

HISTORY

8145/2B A/B/C/D

Report on the Examination

8145

June 2022

Version: 1.0

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

Copyright © 2022 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.

8145/2B/A**Paper 2 Section B/A: Norman England, 1066-c.1100****Question 1**

Students found the Interpretation straightforward and vast majority of students found something to say, based upon their own knowledge, about it. It is important for students to connect what they knew with the interpretation directly, rather than merely assert something they knew about that happened after the death of Edward the Confessor. A few students made speculative comments about the author that were not rewarded.

At level 1 students who either quoted parts of the source or rearranged parts of it were rewarded. Some made basic assertions about different claimants derived from the extract but offered no explanation or knowledge in support. Many students still write that they agree with the source, 'from my own knowledge', but neglect to include any. Some also argued that the source was unconvincing because it was adapted or because Howarth, the author, was writing such a long time after the event. At level 2 many students started to explain in simple terms, the grounds for the four contenders' claims to Edward the Confessor's throne. Examiners saw many answers that quickly dismissed Edgar's claim on the basis of his youth and inexperience. Students frequently gained reward at level 2 for commenting on the reasons for William's 'shock', but this often remained as only one single point which was developed. Other students provided brief, valid explanations about Harold's '*on the spot*' advantages. Some answers mentioned Harold Hardrada but at Level 2 these answers lacked specific knowledge.

One way in which students at Levels 3 and 4 often showed their understanding of the Interpretation was by applying their knowledge to the claims of both William and Harold. Fewer students were able to explain the claims of Harald Hardrada. Some students based their answer successfully on the 'dangerous invasion' comment in the Interpretation. They explained the difficulties of assembling a fleet, making sure Normandy was secure whilst William was absent, establishing alliances, obtaining Papal support, and all the logistical problems of food, weather, and the health of the troops. To this desiderata was added a hefty dose of luck which might be needed if Harold were to be waiting for William to invade. Some excellent answers at Level 4 recognised that William had received promises about the English crown from Edward after helping him deal with a rebellion by the Godwins. There were a few answers which provided a neat initial summary of what happened after the death of Edward the Confessor by saying that there was a 'succession crisis'. Answers such as these then proceeded to discuss the contenders. Some rarer but effective answers at a high level stated there were several ways in which a new ruler might be chosen. They explained that a powerful military noble, like Harold could seize or assume the crown, there might be a deathbed nomination, or the eldest son of a ruler could succeed, and all recognised the influence of the Witan in the process.

Question 2

Most students understood that the question was about the importance of Castle building in Norman England. At level 1 students tended to identify features of the Norman castles, that is, the height, the moat, the motte, the Bailey et cetera. Students were also, at this level, keen to explain both the advantages of the motte and bailey castle - it's rapid construction, from easily available materials, and its disadvantages – it could be set alight and, in time, would rot.

At Level 2 students most frequently provided simple explanations of why the Normans needed castles. Students wrote that they were needed for control, protection, and to intimidate. Explanations at this level were generalised and tended to lack detailed knowledge to support the assertions about the purpose or function of Norman castles. Answers at level 2 were also often keen to indicate where the Normans built castles. The Normans located castles in border areas such as Wales or Scotland, or in areas of likely rebellion such as the South West or the North. Answers also stated that they were built in towns, near to the coast, or to defend routes or river crossings. Some students were able to give specific examples of castles that illustrated these locations.

It was a characteristic of answers at Levels 3 and 4 that students were able to explain why the Normans built castles where they did. It was important at Levels 3 and 4 to focus on the importance of the castle either immediately after Conquest or as a feature of the consolidation of that Conquest. Some of the better answers drew that distinction and made the point that by building castles, particularly in stone, the Normans were sending a message to the Anglo-Saxons about the permanence of their takeover.

Many students made the perceptive point that the castles which the Normans built marked a dramatic change from those castles or ‘burhs’ which the Anglo-Saxons had. Exploring the strategic and symbolic importance of the castle marked out the better Level 3 and Level 4 answers. Examiners saw some detailed answers about why William was not secure after 1066 and needed castles often referring to the threat of further invasion as well as internal rebellion.

Question 3

Examiners rewarded students who referred to either the lives of English villagers or English villages in answering this question. Examiners were able to reward at Level 1 students who either wrote more generally about life in the village or identified the destruction and death that may have accompanied the initial Conquest. At level 2 it was common to see many answers that explicitly referred to the Harrying of the North. Some students gave a single simple or developed explanation based on what this involved. A common component of many answers at Level 2 was reference to the Forest Laws. These were usually simply described with answers saying what they did and why the Normans passed them. The main characteristic of most level 2 answers to this question was that they contained some understanding but lacked development about how it affected the villagers other than to say that they could no longer hunt in the forest. Examiners frequently saw answers which stated that the villagers would be likely to have a new Norman landlord. The impact of this was rarely explored further than the difficulties of understanding the Norman French that he spoke. A number of answers at Level 2 also mentioned the Murdrum law and how that might impinge upon an English village.

At levels 3 and 4 students addressed the question more directly in terms of changes to the villages and villagers’ lives under the Normans. A good number of answers at this level rejected the implied suggestion that there were changes and based their answer around the largely manual, agricultural and seasonal lives of the villagers. This, it was averred, did not change much. Another prominent theme in answers was the change to the status of slaves in Anglo-Saxon society and villages. There were some considered answers that explained how the number of villeins increased as the number of slaves decreased. Students were more likely to attribute this change to changes in religious beliefs rather than to economics.

There were many good answers at Level 3 that explained in detail how the seasonal agricultural work of the villagers had to proceed after the Conquest. There was reference to the housing and life expectancy of the villagers. Those students who chose to develop the changes which the Forest Laws brought in were able to relate them to the villagers and the way in which it affected

their diet through the way the laws prevented hunting and foraging in the forests. Some answers related it also to the increased demands that the new Norman lords made of the English villagers. This was evidenced in terms of higher rents, or taxation. A small number of answers referred to French settlers who came across with the Conquest which increased ethnic tension but did help to bridge the gap between the Normans and the conquered English. Some answers which had a subtle grasp of the changes in the hierarchy of the English village discussed how freedom was a relative term with the movement from slavery to villeinage favouring the Norman lords as they increased their share of the village land and their desmesne.

Question 4

Students answered this question well. It was clear that they had made good use of the Historic Environment Resource Pack. Students knew about the location, origin, and uses of Castle Acre Priory. It was noted, however, that some students wanted to write a general description of monasteries and their function. It is important that students direct their energy, thinking and knowledge towards answering relevantly, the question on the examination paper. This is a question with reference to a specific 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 see only brief recognition or identification of Castle Acre Priory and its location. Other answers at Level 1 wrote in a generic way about how monasteries or priories were a place where monks carried out their religious duties and served a local community or the travellers passing through it. At this level there was a sensible understanding of aspects of medieval religious life. Examiners noted that sometimes students were vague about distinguishing between William the Conqueror and William de Warenne.

At level 2 students tended to explain one aspect, usually the religious motivation mentioned in the question, for the building of Castle Acre Priory. It was common to see mention in relation to Castle Acre Priory of reference to William de Warenne's concern to atone for all of the killing involved in the Conquest. Some answers mentioned the trip that he and his wife tried to make to Rome but which led to them spending some time at Cluny. It was here that de Warenne was impressed with the piety, elaborate services, and buildings of the Cluniac order. At level 2 answers were simple, either endorsing the religious motivation suggested in the question for the founding of Castle Acre Priory or offering briefly other reasons for the founding of the Priory.

At levels 3 and 4 students did develop 2 or 3 (sometimes more) reasons with specific reference to Castle Acre Priory and composed these into an argument that addressed the 'main' in the question. Those answers reaching the top of level 3 generally had two developed reasons, but also started to make a judgement with some explanation. Those reaching level 3 and 4 focused on the personal religious motivation of William de Warenne, the broader religious motivation which the Normans possessed to reform the Anglo-Saxon church, to which the Cluniac foundation at Castle Acre was a contribution. Students answers showed an understanding of the Cluniac decoration of the buildings and the elaborate form of service. Castle Acre Priory demonstrated these features and contributed to the spiritual reform of the English Church. There were many answers which showed an understanding of the ways in which the design of the Priory at Castle Acre impressed all who saw it and reinforced a sense of Norman power. Some good answers placed this initiative in the context of national reforms instituted by Lanfranc. They were also able to make the point that the Cluniacs would guarantee prayers for William de Warenne's soul and it was for this reason that he and his wife were buried at Lewes Priory. Examiners were pleased to see answers from students who realised the power of the Priory and monasteries in general to control Anglo-Saxon England. The point was frequently made that the Normans were able to demonstrate through their building of priories, monasteries and cathedrals that God was on their side. Religious building alongside Norman castles emphasised spiritual and military control of a conquered land. In this

way the Normans seemed to present the proposition that to rebel against their rule would be to challenge God's will. Examiners saw answers that noted that the Normans announced their control in the area by the dispossession of the Anglo-Saxon landowner, Toki, which led to de Warenne acquiring it, and recognised de Warenne's role in maintaining control in East Anglia. There were some generalised reasons that were often rewarded at Level 2 regarding the value of monasteries for their educational or medical value to the local population, or the hospitality they offered travellers as well as the opportunity for wealthy families to place usefully, the spare sons and daughters of their families. If this point was related to Castle Acre Priory it was rewarded at Level 3. A small number of perceptive points were made about the economic value of the Priory within the context of the Castle and Castle Acre generally. The best answers were those which retained a focus on Castle Acre Priory at almost every part of their argument. A convincing argument was made by a few answers at Level 4 that William the Conqueror did not favour the Cluniac Order because it did not allow him any control over the leadership of the priories as that remained with the Abbot in Cluny. However, it was their piety that so impressed William de Warenne that he not only favoured the Cluniacs for the priories that he founded but also influenced other Normans to favour the Cluniacs when they founded priories in their own areas.

8145/2B/B**Question 1**

Students found the interpretation straightforward. The source 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 Statutes. There were still some students dedicating some of their response to speculative comments about the interpretation's provenance; this was not rewarded but the number of students doing this seems to be following a downward trend compared to 2019.

Answers at levels 3 and 4 focused on the issue of government and the motivations for Edward's actions, dividing it between 'concerns of his people' and 'benefitting himself'. Students explained how specific Statutes catered for one of the above premises. Some good answers would show how the sequence of Statutes would endeavour to improve on Edward's previous actions, thereby picking up on another point within the interpretation. For example, the Statute of Acton Burnell followed by the Statute of Merchants. Complex L4 answers would pick up on the relationship between Edward's barons and himself and the effect of this on government and/or refer to the influence and role of Robert Burnell on Edward's government inferring Edward's government was not just down to him.

Question 2

A good answer to this question centred on the students' knowledge of the 'Great Cause' in Scotland and subsequent deterioration in relations leading to frequent battles. There were many answers which could recount the relationship with Scotland from the Treaty of Birgham to the choice of John Balliol as King of Scotland. Level 1 answers were basic in that relations with Scotland were 'not good'. Answers at level 2 focused on the succession crisis and Edward choosing John Balliol because he was weak. The vast majority of students could recount this perception of John Balliol. There was a simple level of knowledge in these responses. There might also be an indication of Edward's motives in his dealings with Scotland e.g. the need for authority over Scotland.

At levels 3 and 4 students produced answers and showed a much more precise and perceptive understanding of the nature of the question. Students would expand upon Edward's exploitation of the succession crisis for his own benefit e.g. to further territorial gains, with the manipulation of Balliol but how the Scottish barons manipulated Balliol too with the consequent break down in relations when Scotland sided with France. They then linked this to the subsequent series of battles in Scotland as Edward retaliated, often mentioning the seizure of the Stone of Scone. They were also aware of a more 'personal' involvement of Edward with Scotland and explored the idea of 'obsession' and 'fixation'. Level 4 complex answers were clearly aware of the broader issues citing the impact of Scottish relations on England and Edward's reign, with Edward's determined focus on Scotland as a reason for neglect in other areas e.g. his relationship with the English barons and the re-signing of the Magna Carta.

Question 3

On this question it was relatively straightforward for students to reach a level 3 or 4 as there were some clearly defined elements for them to focus on. That being the idea of a land battle fought in the open and the idea of siege warfare. The extent to which they developed their answer with explanation

and evidence then determined the mark awarded at level 3 or 4. However, a number of students began with Edward in the 1260s when he was a prince. This was a narrative account of his early battles and did not directly address the 'ways' Edward I's armies fought. Better answers used this contextual knowledge to reinforce why the armies were so good because Edward used his previous experience and knowledge as prince in his military campaigns as king.

Level 1 answers tended to have a generic statement that described Edward's army as being 'good' or 'strong'. Level 2 answers turned into a list of personnel and/or weaponry with only a simple explanation. There was a need for a stronger focus on the 'ways' in which Edward's armies fought and the changes to or consequences of the armies fighting. Some students mentioned castles but it depended on how castles were seen in relation to the army as to whether this part of the answer was credited. Some answers explicitly said castles were built after the armies had succeeded in battle which was not credited, whilst others said Edward built castles as a garrison for his army to prevent rebellious outbreaks, keeping his soldiers on standby.

The better answers which reached levels 3 and 4 usually identified and split their answer into the two different battle strategies – land and siege. These answers explained the different parts of the army; how it was used; gave evidence of the impact/effectiveness of the soldiers and tactics and explained Edward's enthusiastic use of the 'Warwolf'. There was also an awareness that Edward's armies consisted of more than just troops, with the mention of 'specialists' who helped to keep the army supplied with everything from food to weaponry. Better answers included how Edward would adapt and change strategy when needed. Most common example cited was the use of longbows to tackle the Scottish schiltrom before the cavalry was used. As well as the physical way the armies fought, it was also mentioned how mentally battles were fought – 'brutally', 'aggressively' and 'harshly' were common epithets. Good answers also inferred reference to psychological warfare with Edward's extraction of the Stone of Scone to London and its symbolism for the Scots.

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 students' responses such as, '36% of all England's trade'; 'population growth of 80,000'; 'spread beyond Roman walls' and 'a centralised Government'. There were many good and detailed answers which showed that students had used the Resource Pack well, memorising a lot of factual detail about London.

The stated aspect of the development of London being the King's need for money was accessible to all and some generic statements of London developing 'a lot' were described at level 1. At level 2 some students did tend to list features of London with only a simple explanation of their link to money e.g. the Royal Mint stored Edward's money. The lists of features were extensive but the support for the answer at level 2 was simple in explaining how these features aided Edward's desire for money. Students had obviously studied the Resource Pack but there was a sense that they were just writing down what they could remember, not necessarily grasping the significance of the aspect e.g. the Aldermen. This was heightened by the fact that quite a few students seemed to remember the historians' names cited in the pack – Ian Mortimer and Gwyn Williams. This information, however, was not used very well as students either just mentioned their names or said they agreed or disagreed with them.

At level 3 and 4 answers, students were able to explain and argue how the different aspects of London fulfilled Edward's need for money. There was a large focus on trade and Edward's taxation

of it, and this was often the starting point for a more detailed look at London's development. Trade was often linked to other features e.g. the Royal Mint and solving coin-clipping to instil trust in the English economy so trade continued and increased. Many L4 answers based their judgement on the importance of trade as a source of revenue for Edward and often compared it in importance to Edward's need to assert his authority in London. Some complex answers noted that in both cases, Edward was trying to make himself less reliant on the barons and increase the power of the Crown. Good responses would also evaluate other areas of London's development like law and order or its cleanliness and link them back to trade. The most frequent line of argument used by students at levels 3 and 4 was that the King's need for money did stimulate the development of London and that everything Edward did in London was to achieve this aim, which was mainly achieved through the taxation of trade.

8145/2B/C**Question 1**

The interpretation provided many varied views relating to the theatre in Elizabethan England which a pleasing number of students were able to extract with confidence. The most popular view commented upon was that all sorts of people watched plays and this was often accompanied by good subject knowledge on the seating available to different social classes. Only slightly less common was commentary on the building of new theatres, and quite often this was supplemented with specific examples such as The Globe. A large number of responses also referred to Elizabeth's frequent visits to the theatre which indicated some confusion over the popularity of plays at Court and especially where they were performed for the Queen. As in previous years, some students made irrelevant comments on the provenance of the interpretation which is not needed in response to this question.

At Level 1, responses tended to simply paraphrase, thereby showing some basic understanding of the views. A simple verbatim extraction however struggled to indicate even this level of understanding. It was clear at this level that students had a basic understanding of the theatre and perhaps acted upon a key phrase or term about which they were able to make a generalised comment.

At Level 2, students showed a simple understanding of the views in the extract or a more developed understanding of one view alone. Generally, it was more common for students to offer a range of views, but in a brief generalised manner, rather than to limit themselves to one view in more depth. Hence Level 2 typically was achieved by a general overview of many views with occasional items of specific knowledge to add detail to the points raised. In achieving Level 3, students considered more than one aspect of the interpretation; commonly the social composition of the audiences and the building of new theatres, and provided specific and appropriate knowledge to develop the points made by the interpretation. At this level there was considerable focus on the role of the Puritans and their opposition to the theatres, plus a good indication of the construction of theatres beyond London's walls. At Level 4, good knowledge and understanding was deployed with purpose, namely to arrive at a judgement about the interpretation and its views – however this level was achieved by a minority of students.

Question 2

There was a clear difference in response between those that knew what Queen Elizabeth's court was and those that did not. Given how central this topic is to the period, and the fact that a question on the court was asked fairly recently, it was disappointing that students still confused the court with a court of law, or even more commonly with Parliament. Centres would be well advised to ensure that, in future, students are keenly aware of the difference between Parliament and the royal court. Those that had an awareness of the court tended to do really quite well on this question. Reference to the role of the Privy Council was common, with some pleasingly specific examples of how individual members such as Walsingham had an impact on the broader historical context. Slightly less common, although still popular, was commentary on royal progresses and, crucially, what impact those had on Elizabethan England. This focus on importance, as demanded by the question, was a crucial criteria in determining access to the higher levels.

At Level 1 students commonly identified a role of the court in very general terms, such as it offered advice. Here, any reference to importance was by inference only. At Level 2 there was more

developed information, although typically of only one factor. This was commonly a description of the members of the court, although it was surprising that only a small number of students commented upon any social or cultural role. There was some detailed information given at this level but such description failed to move beyond the same point repeated several times over. There was also a good deal of commentary at Level 2 about the problems faced by Elizabeth as a female ruler, however it was much less clear how this might be used to explain the importance of her court. Level 3 typically provided evidence that more than one identified factor had been understood. There was a good deal of impressive subject knowledge about patronage, the sense of a deliberately divided Privy Council, and also about the extent of Elizabeth's progresses, but often less well related to why and how this made the court important. Responses that progressed to Level 4 had a keen sense of the broader historical context and were able to provide reasons why, for example, Elizabeth needed to control the members of the Privy Council, or how progresses helped to save money or to impress local magnates.

Question 3

It was perhaps surprising to see that a minority of students struggled with this question. This was a very accessible question for many students but, a notable minority had no clear grasp of what the Spanish Armada was. Most were able to locate the events as occurring at sea but some of those were prone to confuse the Armada as an attack on Spain rather than on England. In addition, there was quite a number of students that had not read the question carefully and consequently focussed their answer on the reasons for the launch of the Armada. In some cases, virtually the entire response explained why Phillip wanted to attack England, often with a detailed description of religious differences or events in the Netherlands but with very little on why the Armada was defeated. However, this was contrasted with a good number of exceptionally effective responses. The best answers were able to produce a developed narrative, often explaining how one event such as the use of fireships led to other events such as the breaking of the crescent formation and the journey around the north of Scotland.

At Level 1 responses tended to recall a fact or title, quite often that the Spanish commander was inexperienced, but did not go much beyond that. This was developed further at Level 2, often identifying a range of factors but these were not explicitly linked to defeat and had only a little more development than at Level 1. At these lower levels, students had some factual recall but commonly were unable to link this generalised knowledge to an answer on why and how that led to defeat. It was pleasing that so many could name Drake but a notable few also explained his role as a privateer or an explorer which was not linked to reasons for the defeat of the Armada. Whilst detail in answers could be accurate, events were often disjointed or seemed to be structured in a manner that moved away from a narrative of change. However, by Level 3 students were confidently deploying knowledge to produce a convincing series of factors with much more precise and accurate knowledge. This was further developed at Level 4 with many students contrasting long term and short term factors – typically including some impressive detail about the singeing of the King of Spain's beard but explicitly explaining how this led to delay and poor victualling. Most typically at this level, students produced a reasoned explanation of the impact of events. Most students had a good grasp of the importance of the fireships but many, even at this level, struggled at times with exactly which side deployed the crescent formation and also precisely how and when bad weather may have played a decisive role.

Question 4

There were some impressive responses to this question, and it was clear that a good number of students had studied the resource pack in detail. The question itself proved to be an accessible one with students often confidently deploying a range of information about poverty in the Elizabethan period. Many responses were lengthy and integrated contextual knowledge with specific material about Burghley's almshouse very well. At Level 1 the answers were generalised, often illustrating some knowledge about poverty in general or asserting for example that Burghley wanted to build an almshouse as he was very religious. There was only sparse indication at this level of specific understanding of the historic environment. At Level 2 there was commonly more development of a factor mentioned, perhaps detailing how Burghley was Protestant and how this then led to a religious motive to help the poor. Such responses tended to focus on religion as the named factor and only a cursory identification of other potential reasons. At Level 3, there was a range of developed factors, most commonly based on religion, and legacy. For each of these factors there was development that went beyond the general; for example detailing how regularly almshouse residents were obliged to attend church service, or that they were expected to wear Burghley family colours. There was also an impressive awareness of the architectural style of the almshouse and also precise knowledge of its location and how this might further support legacy or renown as a factor. Given the impressive nature of this knowledge, it was however disappointing that fewer students managed to access Level 4. Whilst many students were aware of the need to provide a judgement relevant to the question, this often did not advance beyond an assertion. Simply mentioning that one factor is more important than another in a brief summative conclusion, is not enough to convince examiners that the student has produced a substantiated judgement. Whilst it is not expected that students produce a judgement throughout the response, it is important that this judgement, wherever it falls, is supported by reasoning and carefully selected knowledge.

8145/2B/D

Overall, the students accessed the full range of marks, with most accruing some credit on all questions.

Question 1

The first question required students to discuss why the interpretation was convincing. There was no necessity to comment on why it was not, or what the source neglected to mention. Equally, there is no credit given for comments on the provenance of the source in this question and this year saw fewer students wasting time attempting to do this. Responses needed to address 'how convincing' and acknowledge the interpretation. Some produced narrative accounts of the wars or of Catholic toleration without specific reference to the convincingness of interpretation. This was difficult to credit beyond the basic level, if at all.

There were few students who did not attempt some kind of response and most were able to accrue some marks on this question. Weaker students tended to focus on 'naval tactics' and 'major battles'. Those who were able to give specific examples of, for example, the use of the line ahead, could access higher levels, with those who went on to give details of when the tactic was not used, leading to defeat, potentially attaining level 4. In general, level 4 answers tended to be awarded to those who focussed on the latter part of the interpretation and a pleasing amount of own relevant own knowledge was put forward by the more successful students.

Those who commented on trade and colonies, needed to give specific examples, perhaps linking this to mercantilism, for higher marks. Higher level responses on the 'Parliament refused to grant Charles II money' part of the interpretation needed to demonstrate a developed understanding of why money was short, looking beyond the expense of the ongoing wars.

In general, question one was well done, with many students reaching levels 3 and 4.

Question 2

Compared to the other questions, three times as many students did not attempt this question. Weaker students were confused between court and parliament, often tackling this in a way that was not creditworthy. Sadly, some students who clearly knew plenty about parliament, describing many Acts passed in Charles' reign, produced responses that could be given very few or no marks. Accomplished students were able to produce responses that linked political influence to life at court and then went on to write about aspects of government in such a manner that did make it relevant to the question. A few students received zero marks for writing about the justice system.

Most of those who were able to distinguish between court and parliament were able to produce creditworthy comments, focussing on the 'Merry Monarch', the social aspect and mistresses. Those who developed this, for example, writing about Albermarle's promotion of Louise Keroualle, in order to foster the French influence, could reach the top level.

Those writing about the court as a centre of fashion needed to provide specific details of fashions, perhaps commenting on how this changed towards the end of the reign, in order to move above level 2. Equally, comments about patronage required named examples. Those writing about the French style and linking this to fears of Catholicism could gain good marks. Higher levels could

also be attained by contrasting Charles' court with the austerity of the Cromwellian regime, or with the absolute monarchy of Louis XIV.

A number of students resorted to utilising what they had learned about the theatre in preparation for question four, which, without other points to support it, frequently led to an unfocussed response worthy of few marks.

Question 3

Almost all students were able to access some marks for question three. Weaker students produced narrative accounts of the course of the Fire, rather than its impact. There were a number who were under the impression that many lives were lost and there were also comments about 'not turning the oven off', which displayed a lack of understanding of the social context, as well as being irrelevant to the specific question, which did not require students to write about the causes of the fire. A few confused the Fire and the Plague.

Stronger answers went beyond the destruction and rebuilding to consider the economic impact and the resulting effect on the Dutch Wars, or looked at blame and the consequent rise in anti-Catholic feeling and its impact.

Question 4

Responses to question four showed that most students now realise that they need to look beyond the factor in the question, in this case the plays and go on to consider wider issues. Students also needed to demonstrate knowledge of the Royal Theatre Drury Lane and relate their answer directly to the site itself and not just the theatre in general. Clear evidence of use of information from the resource pack was required. Some weaker students appeared to have learnt a generic response that covered aspects of the theatre which might have been used regardless of the question. These could be awarded level 2 at best.

The plays needed to be explained, giving examples of the new genres and making it clear how this was different from what went before. Higher level answers gave examples of plays and playwrights, with supporting detail. When considering other factors that made theatre going popular, many students focused on the changing role of women. For higher marks, this needed to go beyond a list of names to provide specific detail, possibly putting this in the context of women's roles in other parts of society. Most students who commented on patronage and the influence of Charles II, were aware of the King's Company. Higher level answers identified the changes in the level of the king's involvement and were aware that this lessened after the theatre was rebuilt and in the light of the exclusion crisis.

Some considered the social aspect and the importance of being seen and making contacts. Others looked at the theatre as the focus for new architectural styles and as an example of French influence. Some were aware of the use of the plays as a vehicle for political messaging and propaganda. Higher level answers gave details of specific examples, such as the downfall of Coventry, or the increasing criticism of Charles II at the time of the Exclusion Crisis

To attain Level 4, responses required a 'sustained judgement' and needed to address the word 'main' in the question in some way. Starting the final paragraph 'In conclusion', or similar is not sufficient; a well-argued judgement is required that is not just a summary of the points already made, nor should the conclusion introduce new points that have not been discussed in the body of

the answer. Occasionally good conclusions could not be awarded Level 4 because they did not arise from sufficiently explained points in the preceding paragraphs.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

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