



GCSE HISTORY

8145/2B A/B/C/D

Report on the Examination

8145
June 2023

Version: 1.0

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

Copyright © 2023 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.

2BA Norman England, 1066–c.1100

Question 1

Students found the Interpretation straightforward. Most students found something to say, based upon their own knowledge, about this interpretation. Though it is important for students to connect what they knew with the interpretation directly, rather than merely assert something about the legal system under the Normans. A few students made speculative comments about the author that were not rewarded. Some students chose to write about the feudal system rather than the legal system.

At level 1 students who either quoted parts of the source or rearranged parts of it were rewarded. Some made basic assertions about Forest Law or Murdrum 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. There are answers at this level which assert that the interpretation is unconvincing because it does not mention something which the student knows about. These answers are very rarely related to what is in the interpretation. Some also argued that the source was unconvincing because it was adapted or because Thomas, the author, was writing such a long time after the event.

At level 2 many students started to explain in simple terms, the Norman Forest Law or Murdrum. Examiners saw many answers that explained how all the ordeals worked to determine guilt or innocence as well as 'trial by battle.' Students were able to explain in simple terms the court of the local Lord but were less secure in understanding the types of offence that it dealt with. The laws regarding inheritance, particularly primogeniture, were understood and simply explained. A few students were able to explain what happened to an estate when the owner died without an heir.

One way in which students at Level 3 and 4 often showed their understanding of the Interpretation was by applying their knowledge and understanding to why the Normans did not bring a revolution to the English legal system. Some students based their answer successfully on the fact that the English system worked well and the Normans wanted to emphasise the legitimacy of the conquest and therefore the continuity of the legal system.

Regarding changes to the legal system, students said that Murdrum fines obviously deterred attacks on important Normans but supported the need for this change by explaining that the Normans were at any one time, outnumbered by the Anglo-Saxons. There were a few answers which provided an explanation of Forest law not only in so far as it suited the Normans but also referred to the ways in which it impinged upon the traditional lives of the Anglo-Saxons. Some rarer but effective answers at a high level explained the extra control which the Honorial courts provided to the Normans.

Some excellent answers at Level 4 maintained that there were many aspects of the Anglo-Saxon legal system which the Normans admired, may have been superior to their own, and had no reason to change. The reasons behind the changes that the Normans did make to the English system such as those regarding primogeniture were explained by students as a way in which the Normans remained in control of what they had conquered. Estates that were subdivided were less easy to control.

Question 2

Most students understood that the question was about the importance of towns in Norman England. At level 1 students tended to make some basic points about towns such as the increase in the number of them or that they were associated with trade. Students were also, at this level, keen to

mention free men and the various people that plied their trade in towns. Most answers were about the towns and very few students made observations that more appropriately related to English villages.

At Level 2 students most frequently provided simple explanations of the advantages of towns in terms of trade and control. Students wrote that in the towns the Normans often built a castle which they needed to control, protect, and to intimidate. Explanations at this level were based around the need to have somewhere safe for the Normans to live, garrison and use as a base from which to control the surrounding countryside. Answers at level 2 were also often keen to give a simple explanation of the markets that were held in towns. Answers also stated in simple terms at Level 2 that some towns had a reputation for certain products eg, salt, fish, woodworking et cetera.

It was a characteristic of answers at levels 3 and 4 that students were able to explain why towns were important to the Normans. At Level 3 and 4 a great breadth of knowledge was not necessary to attain the level. Some of the stronger answers developed the idea of trade which benefited not only the Normans but also the Anglo-Saxons who might take advantage of opportunities to gain greater wealth. In turn many students suggested this might encourage the Anglo-Saxons to accept the Norman conquest. Several students pointed out in their answers that the development of the guild system had many advantages for its members and those who enjoyed the products of the tradesmen.

Many students made the perceptive point that the towns with their castles as well as helping to police and control the local population also made it more difficult for an invader to take from the Normans what they had conquered. Examiners saw some detailed and thoughtful answers about the development of towns as religious centres around an abbey or cathedral. Students mentioned how some cathedrals had been moved to places of greater population and they became places of pilgrimage which in turn had an economic benefit for those towns. In a small number of answers students referred to the social changes that occurred in England through the emergence of different classes of people in the towns compared with those in the villages.

Question 3

In general examiners found this question to be very successfully answered by most students. Examiners were able to reward at Level 1 students who either wrote more generally about William being a religious man or about the reforms to the English church which Lanfranc brought in. At level 2 it was common to see many answers that explained specifically the weaknesses which the reforms were meant to correct. Students showed a good knowledge of simony, nepotism, pluralism, and clerical marriage. The main characteristic of most level 2 answers to this question was that they contained some understanding but lacked development about why these were features of the English church needed to change. At level 2 students also explained in simple terms how the Normans affected the English church through a building programme. However, again at this level it was often portrayed as a comprehensive programme of destruction and rebuilding. Many students also referred in a simple statement to the change in personnel at the highest level of the English church as Normans bishops replaced Anglo-Saxons.

At levels 3 and 4 students addressed the question more directly in terms of the changes which affected both the clergy and laity. The reasoning behind reform of the English church was explained and frequently linked to the need to catch up with the progress that had been made in Europe. Another feature of European development which a few students referred to was the introduction of the office of Archdeacon. This was sometimes related to the development of church courts in England or Durham Cathedral.

Another prominent theme in answers was the change in attitude to the church of William the Conqueror, and William Rufus. William the Conqueror, students maintained, was a pious man, who had gained the Pope's approval of his invasion of England, and was anxious, in return, to fulfil his promise to Pope reform the English church. William Rufus on the other hand, was interested in the wealth of the church and did not enjoy a cordial relationship with the Archbishop of Canterbury.

There were many good answers at Level 3 that explained in detail how the changes made to the English church by the Normans helped to increase their control of the Anglo-Saxon population. At Level 4 students tended to explain the advantages which the changes to the English church made for the Normans. So, it was common for examiners to see explanations of how the endorsement of the church enhanced the Normans claim to be legitimate and seemed to make rebellion a spiritually perilous option. Similarly, the extensive building programme that the Normans engaged with, particularly the magnificence of their cathedrals, was stressed by many students to be a way to intimidate the native population and present an irrefutable assertion of Norman permanence.

Some answers did display an understanding of the relationship between the power of the state and that of the church. This represented the Investiture controversy which was a feature of the time throughout Europe. There were a few answers which understood the subtlety of William the Conqueror's relationship with the Pope, in accepting the Papal Banner, and paying Peter's pence. Many students realised that William Rufus, in contrast to that of his father, had a more fractured relationship with the Papacy.

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 importance of the location and history of Anglo-Saxon Yorkshire.

At level 1 it was common in answers to see a basic recognition or identification of some of the features of the Harrying of the North. This was seen as a major consequence of the Norman conquest for Yorkshire. Students understood about the short-term devastation mentioned in the statement and the longer-term impact of Norman action on the fertility and viability of the land.

At level 2 students tended to provide a simple explanation of the 'devastation'. Examiners noted how students were able to identify the wider impact of the Harrying on other parts of the country. Some students identified the point immediately after the conquest and before the Harrying as a period in which Yorkshire rebelled against Norman rule. The Harrying was seen as a response to the rebellions. It was good to see that many students explained how the construction of castles in York and Pickering were designed to fortify the region. Furthermore, students explained that this was done to prevent further rebellion and to make Yorkshire both easier to control and to defend against external threats.

An economic dimension was thought to be a consequence of the conquest which was the rebalancing of the economy towards the south and Normandy rather than the north and Scandinavia. However, this was often associated with the shorter-term effects of the Harrying.

At levels 3 and 4 students did develop 2 or 3 consequences which were often to do with the economic, religious, or strategic consequences of the Conquest in Yorkshire. Those answers reaching the top of level 3 generally had two developed consequences but also started to make a judgement with some explanation. Those reaching level 3 and 4 focused on the extent to which the land was 'devastated' and showed a knowledge of different historians' opinions. At level 3 it was a feature of many answers that evaluated the impact of the Harrying by referring to the exodus of

people from Yorkshire to Scotland, and the south of England, as they sought food and safety. The overwhelming conclusion of many students was that the Harrying of the North was extremely destructive in both the short and longer terms.

Students' answers showed an understanding of the impact of the change in land ownership as the Normans were given estates in Yorkshire, particularly in and around York.

In discussing consequences some students were particularly eloquent about the desire of the Normans to be seen as the natural inheritors of the Romans, and to build up York as a centre for culture and government in the north of England. To this end examiners saw answers that were extremely knowledgeable about the religious buildings in York. Students understood that Norman religious building, alongside the construction of Norman castles, emphasised spiritual and military control of a conquered land. Furthermore, the Norman buildings in York emphasised it as a religious centre and this was reinforced by the installation of a Norman Archbishop of York. In this way the conquerors seemed to propose to the Anglo-Saxon population that to rebel against Norman rule would be to challenge the will of God.

There were excellent arguments at Level 4 which understood the strategic importance of Yorkshire in the context of the Norman conquest of England. It was noted that the devastation prevented other interested parties such as the Scots or the Danes from utilising the resources of Yorkshire to mount a threat to England. In this sense Yorkshire was to become a buffer zone between any Scandinavian or Scottish threat and the rest of England.

2BB Medieval England: the reign of Edward I, 1272–1307

Question 1

The interpretation was easily accessible to students. There were a variety of aspects within the source which students could construct an answer around. At level 1, students quoted or paraphrased the source. The source lent itself to quite a few key phrases such as ‘great man’ and ‘bully’. Some would also mention whether the interpretation was convincing or not but with no further expansion.

Level 2 answers started to use their own knowledge but in the form of simple facts about William Wallace with the battles often being the starting point. There was a particular focus on Stirling Bridge but not so much on Falkirk. There was a little confusion over battle outcomes, citing Falkirk as a victory and sometimes also incorporating Wales but these types of answers were limited in number. As were students who referred to the English as the British.

There were still some students dedicating some of their response to comments on the interpretation’s provenance; this was not rewarded. It was commented last year that this seemed to be following a downward trend compared to 2019 but it would seem this trend has not continued. There were a few answers seen that were wholly based on provenance. Some low level answers also focused too much on Edward and not enough on William Wallace.

Answers at levels 3 and 4 focused on Wallace’s actions, often in light of the battles, explaining his ‘great skill in strategy’. For a lot of students this was easily achieved as there was a clear understanding of the events at the Battle of Stirling Bridge and the significance of its outcome. Good answers would also consider Wallace’s strategy at the Battle of Falkirk and this would form an insightful comparison of Wallace in battle eg Wallace’s use of the schiltron caused Edward to rethink his battle strategy. Complex level 4 answers would pick up on the threat Wallace posed to Edward and the reasoning behind Edward’s need to be rid of Wallace linking it to aspects in the source eg Edward’s bribery and bullying and how close Wallace came to defeating Edward.

Question 2

There was a good deal of knowledge which could be brought to this question and this was reflected in the wide range of content in answers. For example, responses referred to Edward’s castle-building programme, or the different treaties and the Statute of Rhuddlan or Llywelyn.

There didn’t appear to be any real structure to the answers, as students flitted from one aspect to another. This meant an aspect might be mentioned but not expanded upon as the student thought of something else. The majority of students wrote about Llywelyn’s refusal to pay homage to Edward and Edward’s castle-building programme. Although there was a great deal of revised knowledge exhibited, there was some confusion over the precise history involving the treaties and statute and the Welsh leaders.

Level 1 answers were straightforward making basic comments such as ‘Edward built castles’ or ‘fought Llywelyn’ with no expansion. Level 2 answers used simple knowledge that tended to focus on why the Welsh wars started with the majority of students knowing about Llywelyn’s relationship with the English monarchy. Alternatively, they focused on why Edward built his castles. Castles were an easily accessible response to this question.

Level 3 and level 4 answers showed a wider understanding of the consequences of the Welsh wars. There was an awareness of Edward’s use of the Welsh land for financial gain through the wool trade

and what controlling Wales now meant for Edward and the Welsh, and more perceptively, for the English too. This quite often led to the more complex level 4 answers thinking in terms of short-term and long-term importance of the wars and the wider issue of Wales being colonised and losing its independence. There was also an awareness of Wales being part of Edward's aspirations of having an empire.

Question 3

Although the question mentioned 'government', students saw beyond this just being about a political structure and explored the different elements encapsulated within it. These were elements like the Statutes, Robert Burnell and representation.

The extent to which they developed their answer with explanation and evidence then determined the level and mark. The majority of students could write about the beginning of Edward's government with the Parliament for 800 representatives and towards the end of his reign with the 'Model Parliament'. This was easily remembered evidence that structured their answers. Level 1 answers tended to mention one of these factors and not much else.

Level 2 answers consisted of a simple expansion of one of these statements eg why Edward wanted a Parliament of 800 people. With both examples, the focus was on the increased representation in Edward's Parliament and the government of England. Another way in for students was based around Parliament issuing Statutes and this quite often became a chronological exercise starting with the Hundred Rolls, Quo Warranto and Statute of Westminster before recounting the various other Statutes throughout Edward's reign. The mark and level depended on how these were dealt with.

Higher level answers considered Edward's motives for what he did and distinguished between a public perception of wanting to seem fairer and a personal perception of restoring Royal authority. The dilution of the barons' power and their relationship with Edward was a common observation. Surprisingly, only a minority of students mentioned Robert Burnell considering the central role he played in Government. There was some historical confusion between what happened in 1275 and 1295.

Question 4

Generally, students answered this question well and it was very easy to reach level 3. The Historic Environment Resource Pack had been clearly used with recurring references to the Merchant's House and Southampton's location in the majority of scripts. A lot of factual detail had clearly been memorised.

The stated reference to the Merchant's House was accessible to all and level 1 responses stated the basic facts of the House being for a Merchant who lived in Southampton. With a little more detail, it was very easy for a student to achieve a level 2 and these responses very much focused on the House. Most could write about the House being a sign of wealth due to the use of building materials; design features and its function as a residence, shop and business. The features of the House did become a list but most were able to explain their significance in terms of the merchant eg the large underground cellar was beneficial to his involvement in the wine trade. Level 2 answers would also see the introduction of new elements, trade being the obvious one with a link to Southampton being a port. The extent of detail determined the mark within the level.

Level 3 and 4 answers explored aspects of a merchant's life within a town. Whereas the House itself was used by the majority of students, there seemed to be more of a split between some students knowing about merchants who contributed financially to the growth of towns with money spent on

walls, churches or water systems, and those merchants who became more politically involved in the town, becoming part of Edward's parliament. If Edward was not mentioned in this way, then he was brought in via trade and the increasing amount of tax he obtained through trade. Trade and taxation frequently formed the main body of a level 3 answer and was the foundation for a student's argument. The reciprocal relationship between merchants and Edward, which increased their status, informed level 4 answers. Surprisingly, the Statute of Merchants was rarely mentioned.

A minority of level 4 answers touched on the aspirations of merchants wanting to become landed gentry and Lawrence of Ludlow was offered as an example.

The most frequent line of argument cited for the development of towns was the merchant class trading in wine and wool. Coastal towns grew because of it; new towns were created because of it; towns grew in size because people moved there for the trading opportunities, and Edward benefited from it so encouraged towns to develop.

f

2BC Elizabethan England, c1568–1603

Question 1

The interpretation proved very accessible and most students were able to extract relevant material, supplemented with impressive knowledge about Essex's Rebellion. However, for many, the whole response consisted of unconnected quotations or of simply reworded phrases or sentences. It was only the higher-level responses that provided an evaluation of how convincing the interpretation actually was. Whilst a good number of students had some idea that a judgement was required, this was provided only as an after-thought or as a single sentence without an attempt to explain why this might be the case. In addition, a minority of students dedicated significant time to irrelevant commentary about provenance.

At Level 1, responses were characterised by generalised paraphrasing of the content of the interpretation. Consequently, there was little evidence that the historical points made in the interpretation were understood and the response advanced little beyond a straightforward extraction of unconnected themes or ideas about any aspect of the period.

At Level 2, there was much more secure evidence that the interpretation had been understood and some contextual knowledge was used to support a simple evaluation about the rebellion. Most often, students referred to Essex bursting into Elizabeth's bed chamber as evidence of the deteriorating relationship but did not develop the point much further than that.

At Level 3 there was more sophistication to the evaluation with good, specific subject knowledge used keenly focused on the historical focus given in the question. Here the deteriorating relationship not only between Elizabeth and Essex, but also with the Cecil family, was typically explored with some very precise material detailing how the theme of Essex slowly being pushed out of favour at court might be supported or challenged by historical events – often the sweet wine monopoly.

By Level 4 knowledge and quotation was used with the clear purpose of arriving at a judgement about how convincing the interpretation was about Essex's rebellion. This moved beyond an assertive sentence along the lines of '...and so the interpretation is convincing' but the response worked as a sustained judgement across two or more aspects of the interpretation. At this level, many students referred to Essex's role in Ireland and impressively explained how this affected the relationship with Elizabeth and the extent to which the extract was convincing.

Question 2

Whilst there were some exceptionally detailed and impressive responses to this question from students that were able to explain why the discovery of new land and the development of naval prowess was important. There were in addition some very comprehensive accounts of the circumnavigation. However, there were a limited number of highly generalised responses or those that tried to include material unrelated to the set topic, for example Elizabeth's progressions. Given that the theme of voyages is a bullet point in the specification, it was hoped that these students would have been able to provide more detail.

At Level 1, students gave very basic undeveloped answers with no explicit attempt to consider importance. Here, the most typical response simply identified that Drake took Spanish gold or that he was feared by the Spanish.

At Level 2 there was more detail in response, although again very little attempt to move beyond the descriptive. Typically, the attempted establishment of colonies in the Americas was identified and developed, or a chronological account of circumnavigation. In addition, there were a good number of descriptive responses that explored the theme of Hawkins and the development of the slave trade, but this was often confused with later developments and there was little attempt to explain why this was important.

By Level 3 and 4 there was an analysis of consequence and a supported attempt to explain the ways in which a specific event linked to the voyages of discovery was important. This was done across two or more identified consequences. It was impressive that many students were comfortable to argue that importance did not necessarily mean good, or an improvement but simply that a particular event had identified consequences that had a particular impact.

Question 3

It was hoped that this question would prove to be a very accessible one for students and provide plenty of scope for a detailed account of change. However, for a good number of students, knowledge was limited to a very simple description of the Poor Law in 1601 perhaps with some accurate account of the classification of the poor, but without any attempt to explain how this represented a change. Those that did very well had a keen appreciation of change throughout the reign perhaps even with an appreciation of how provision for the poor varied by region.

At Level 1, students simply identified a relevant event, most commonly the 1601 Poor Law. There was little further detail and certainly no appreciation of how this changed provision for the poor.

At Level 2, there was much more development of a single change, often detailing the measures put in place for the poor, or explaining the problems that the poor faced in the period.

By Level 3 and 4 there was not only greater detail but also a clear narrative possibly identifying what life for the poor was like at the start of the period or showing much greater knowledge about the reasons for changes in the condition of the poor. Indeed, there was some impressive knowledge displayed about the impact of inflation and also enclosure and at the top level this was closely linked to the explanation of change over time. The more impressive answers tended to see the Poor Law as the culmination of a series of events and also of the continuing efforts of the Tudor monarchs to address poverty. The awareness of different consequences, perhaps placing these in the broader chronological or the more precise geographical context provided a route to the highest level.

Question 4

In many regards, this provided the more impressive responses on the paper. It was clear that the source pack had been studied in depth and that many students were able to marshal a good range of material often in considerable detail, in order to arrive at a judgement. The ability to move beyond a description of the site and to use knowledge in order to support a clear evaluation was key to accessing the higher levels. It was however also notable that some students had little knowledge to rely on and instead resorted to generic or inaccurate comments about Mary being in prison or broader contextual explanation about the original reasons for Mary's imprisonment. Awareness of the physical location of the site was however often impressive, although even those students able to identify how far Sheffield Manor Lodge was from the coast, were less confident in explaining why this was significant. Similarly, students able to precisely detail the environment in

which Mary was held captive and the lifestyle followed were not always able to explain how this had an impact on Mary's plans to escape.

At Level 1 there was often a very basic description of the site with little attempt to link this to the question. This often included basic statements such as 'there were high walls' or Mary did not escape as there were lots of guards.

At Level 2 there was more detail, and enough to indicate some understanding of the site. The typical response here tended to include an attempt to explain why Mary would not wish to escape if she was treated reasonably well. However, there was often some detail provided at this level which did not clearly link to the set question – for example a description of Talbot's relationship with his wife or the fact that he spent a great deal of money.

At Level 3 there was a greater range of factors covered and a clear attempt to link these to an explanation about how this affected Mary's ability to escape. There was often an impressive awareness of the daily routine for example and this was then used as an attempt to explain Mary's difficulties in trying to escape.

At Level 4 there was a clear attempt to provide an opinion in response to the question and to offer a substantiated judgement. Often this took the form of a conclusion, but it was perfectly reasonable for the judgement to run throughout the response. Those that offered some supported view as to whether the Lodge was the most significant factor in explaining Mary's continued captivity, combined with detailed knowledge, found it relatively easy to access this level where the determinant of the mark tended to be how detailed the reasoning behind the relative judgement was.

2BD Restoration England, 1660–1685

Question 1

Only 4% of students did not attempt this question and nearly 30% achieved levels three or four. There were plenty of phrases in the interpretation that students might pick up on. Many managed to write about the role of women and an additional aspect for the top of Level 2, often going on to provide sufficient explanation for Level 3. The detailed examples and complexity required for Level 4 were however often missing, with only about 4% of students reaching this level. Some otherwise good answers lacked any reference to named actors, playwrights or plays.

Students are still misusing time and effort commenting on provenance, which is not required for this question. A few students' marks were held at Level two because they only commented on one aspect of the interpretation. Others made convoluted and usually implausible attempts to say why the source was not convincing. Top marks only require complex statements about why the source is convincing. The most common routes to higher levels were comparing women's role in the theatre with that in society as a whole and/or pointing out that the 'freedom' was accompanied by sexualisation; comments contrasting the reintroduction of the theatre with Cromwell's Puritan rule, when it was banned for religious reasons; or details about satire and its impact on named individuals, such as Coventry.

Question 2

This question was generally done well, which was very pleasing to examiners as students have often struggled with questions about religion in past exam series. Although 10% of students did not attempt the question, 40% reached Level 3 or above and 10% were awarded Level 4. Most students took the opportunity to write about the impact on foreign policy, the implications for the succession, or anti-Catholic hysteria and discrimination. A few weaker responses demonstrated some confusion between Protestantism and Catholicism. The stronger responses contained complex explanations about such things as the impact of the Test Act on the Exclusion crisis, or the link with foreign policy and the Dutch wars.

Question 3

Many students struggled with this question, with only just over 20% reaching Level 3 or above and 35% achieving only Level 1. Again, nearly 10% did not attempt to answer the question. Some students clearly had not grasped the concept of slavery and were obviously confusing slaves with servants, writing about slaves campaigning for higher wages, or seeming to be under the impression that the slaves were living and working in England in large numbers.

Where there was some basic knowledge of the topic, weaker answers provided narrative accounts of the slave trade, with no allusion to consequences. Some looked at the impact on the enslaved and/or racism in twenty-first century Britain and did not link this in any way to Restoration England. Comments about the impact on racist attitudes needed to include some understanding of how this related to the seventeenth century and not just talk about modern-day racism. Given that this year's historic environment question focussed on coffee houses, there was an overreliance on using what had been learned in preparation for this question. Whilst this was not irrelevant, in some instances the responses did not use this knowledge in such a way that it contributed towards answering the question.

There was plenty that could have been said about the impact of new wealth and the consequent philanthropy of those who profited from the trade, who were then viewed as benefactors. Comments could have been made about specific new products arriving in England and for higher levels, the

impact that this had on lifestyle. Students might have mentioned the increased demand for English trade goods and the consequent boost to manufacturing. Those who did reach higher levels wrote about the profits made by the king, which then enabled him to be able to rule without Parliament. Others related the slave trade to the mercantilist policy, or the consequent navigational improvements. Stronger answers looked at the economic impacts in the light of why these were seen as particularly beneficial at the time, with the need to fund the Dutch wars and to rebuild London after the Fire.

Question 4

This question was generally well done and students made good use of the pack, retaining some detailed information. In this way, 40% of students reached Levels 3 or 4. Unfortunately, just under 6% of students did not attempt to answer the question. There were several factors that could be mentioned, alongside the economic consequences. Most students were able to write about the educational/scientific aspect, giving examples. The political aspect was picked up on by most students with comments about the freedom to criticise the government and discuss plots.

The economic factor was often the least well done. Some students focussed on the profits for coffee growers, rather than discussing the impact of coffee houses on trade in general. Stronger answers mentioned named coffee houses, their functions and links with specific trades, or commented on the convenience of the coffee houses' location and design for those conducting trade.

Many otherwise good answers failed to reach Level 4 because they lacked a judgement. A final paragraph beginning 'In conclusion,' followed by 'x is the most important factor', needed to be accompanied by the reason why that factor was the most important, in comparison to other factors. Often 'conclusions' were merely more information about the chosen 'most important' factor. Some good, Level 4, responses commented that when Charles chose not to close coffee houses he was prioritising the economic over the political; this is the kind of supported argument that gained very high marks. 10% of students were able to provide a judgement that raised their mark to Level 4.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

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