



A Level History

7042/2E The English Revolution

Report on the examination

Published: August 2024

Contents

The below table is interactive. You can press the control button click on the title of the question to go directly to that page.

Contents	Page
General guidance about question types	3
Individual questions and exemplification	5
Further support	19

General guidance on question types

Question 1: The 'Source' Question

- An assessment of the value (and limitations, where appropriate) of each source in relation to the question set.
- Students should address the content and provenance of sources and use their own knowledge to support their evaluation. Where relevant, students could also consider the emphasis and tone of a source in their assessment of the value in relation to the question set.

Qualities seen in more successful responses

- A clear judgement is made about the value of the sources in relation to the question set.
- Answers move beyond a balanced description and provide an argument driven by the student's judgement overall about a source's value in relation to the question set.
- Comments on tone, when used, focus on the value of the source to an historian studying the given issue in the question.
- The content and provenance of the sources is understood, and relevant and accurate knowledge is used to assess value in relation to the question set.
- There is roughly equal treatment of all three sources.

Qualities seen in less successful responses

- Follows a very rigid structure and/or relies heavily on pre-learned phrases, which convey a sense that answers have not understood the sources set.
- Confusion over terminology and exactly what makes a source valuable. Words such as 'bias' are often used without being able to explain how this links to a judgement on value. Bias may well be the reason that a source is valuable.
- Answers that ignore the historical focus set in the question. Answers give a general evaluation of the source without explaining how it might be valuable to a historian studying a set topic.
- Over-reliance on lengthy quotations with little supporting knowledge and/or explicit assessment of value in relation to the question set.

Questions 2-4: Essay questions

- Demonstrate a clear and full understanding of the question and its demands.
- Provide a balanced, analytical response which reviews the issues raised by the question.
- Provide appropriate and full coverage of the question, with appropriate supporting evidence.
- Substantiate judgements on the issues, throughout the answer and/ or in an extended conclusion.

Qualities seen in more successful responses

- Evidence of careful planning seen in the structure and organisation of the answer.
- An analytical approach which avoids lengthy narrative passages.
- Appropriate range, both in relation to any date range identified in the question and of issues to be considered.

- Balance of treatment, used to advance an argument and with appropriate judgement of the issues.
- Use of well selected supporting information.
- Provide an effective introduction which sets out the argument to be advanced and an effective conclusion demonstrating overall judgement.

Qualities seen in less successful responses

- Limited evidence of effective planning and structuring.
- Tendency towards partial responses to the question asked, either in terms of the date range specified in the question or range of issues to be considered.
- Inclusion of descriptive passages not clearly linked to the question.
- Over-lengthy introductions which do little more than provide contextual information.
- Inclusion of conclusions which repeat points already made.
- Issues with, or an absence of, sustained analysis and judgement.
- Occasional use of inappropriate language, such as over-use of first person etc

Individual questions

Report on Question 1

The majority of students were able to link a range of context to their assessments of the three sources from their knowledge of Buckingham as the favourite of Charles I to 1628 but also their knowledge of the Madrid Trip of 1623 and the legacy of James I. Students particularly used Buckingham's position as favourite, his role in foreign policy as Lord High Admiral or at the York House Conference to develop their comment on the value of all three sources. Students focused on assessing value and most were able to make some valid comment from elements of the provenance and content of the sources. Some students made appropriate comment on the tone of the sources being able to link the point they wanted to make to some part of the language of the source or its form. The strongest responses were able to appreciate that links could be made between provenance, content and context to make developed points about the value of each source rather than follow a too mechanistic approach in structuring their answer. Students who appreciated the range of comments that could be made from the different elements of provenance, form, date, author, audience and place, tended to have more developed answers with regard to the value of each source when such focus was linked to an element of content and context.

Question 1 – Exemplification of Level 5 qualities

Source A is valuable to a historian studying the influence of the Duke of Buckingham in 1625/26 because it provides evidence that Buckingham dominated the inner sanctum and held great sway over the king's decisions. The source is a report which makes it more valuable as it is comprehensive and informative having been written to provide an account of events. This can be seen ~~through~~ ~~its neutral tone~~ further by the fact it generally maintains a ~~report~~ neutral tone throughout apart from one positive reference to the king as "generous".

The source is valuable as it suggests that Buckingham held sole influence over Charles, stating that "he has been 'confirmed by Charles in all his offices, which are numerous and of the highest importance' and that 'nothing is done by the new King without Buckingham'". This is useful in particular because it shines light on Buckingham's social and political influence.

The source is also valuable because it emphasises the extent of Buckingham's power ~~corroborate~~ citing that he "has received the golden key". Therefore Buckingham ~~held great influence~~ both held great influence and sole influence over Charles. The source is also useful as it tells us that Buckingham's influence was inherited from James and that it was therefore a fairly natural assumption of power.

The source is less useful, however, as it does not detail which specific matters Buckingham influenced or how his influence was received by the Political Nation. Furthermore, the source was written in 1625 and therefore only tells us about Buckingham's early influence, soon after Charles' ascension to the throne.

On the other hand, it is more useful because it was written by someone in London - the heart of the Political Nation. Overall Source A is useful

because it tells the ~~the~~ extent and nature of Buckingham's influence. However, its utility is limited to 1625 and does not tell us how this influence manifested itself in Charles' political decisions.

Source B is ~~is~~ valuable to a historian studying the influence of the Duke of Buckingham in 1625/26 because it tells us how those who opposed him viewed his influence and what problems they believed he was the source of. The source is valuable because it references many different realms that Buckingham influenced. For instance, the source specifies the "failure at Cadiz" and blames Buckingham for "the loss of the king's influence at sea". This is valuable as it tells us Buckingham had influence over foreign policy and was blamed for its failures. Indeed, the raid on Cadiz in 1625 was led by Buckingham and ended in embarrassment as he lost control of English soldiers who became drunk ~~of~~ on Spanish wine. The source also references Buckingham's influence over finance and names him as "the cause of ~~the~~ limiting the king's revenue". This is valuable as Charles' financial problems in 1625/26 were exacerbated by the excessive patronage he endowed on Buckingham. The source also accuses Buckingham's close relatives of being "papists" and is therefore valuable as it suggests Buckingham had religious influence and used this to push Arminianism. However, the source is written solely by Samuel Turner, who was an opponent of Buckingham, and it is therefore limited in value to examining how the opposition viewed Buckingham's influence. It is also less useful because it was written to incite debate, ~~and emphasises~~ ~~Buckingham as a~~ For instance, it emphasises

Buckingham as a scapegoat throughout and uses a strong accusatory tone. This reveals the authors bias and suggests that the source may be prone to exaggerate. Furthermore, the source is less useful as it does not contain the House of Commons' response. This would perhaps be a more valuable perspective as it would reveal what the consensus opinion in Parliament was concerning Buckingham's influence. Having being written in ~~1626~~ March 1626, it is moderately valuable as it takes into account a considerable portion of the period but excludes the latter half of 1626. Overall, Source B is useful to examine what problems opponents of Buckingham believed his influence caused but its provenance limits it to this very narrow viewpoint.

Source C is valuable to a historian studying the influence of the Duke of Buckingham in 1625/26 because it provides his perspective and response to accusations brought against him in reaction to his influence. The nature of the source as a speech made by Buckingham makes it useful to analyse his perspective ~~but less useful as~~ and how he presented himself in this case to the House of Lords. However, ~~its nature as a~~ considering his words would have been considered and chosen very carefully and he would naturally take a defensive stance, the source should be treated carefully. The source was likely intended to persuade its audience - the House of Lords - of Parliament's wrongdoing. It takes an assured tone and attacks Parliament throughout, blaming it for problems such as "a delay in undertaking our foreign policy this year". Buckingham furthers this by adding in what may be interpreted

as a ~~set~~ sarcastic tone: "I presume the commons proceeded against me out of a zealous affection to do their King and Country service". ~~But~~ This is useful as it mocks Parliament and emphasises that although Buckingham is accused of causing wrongdoing via his influence, he believed Parliament was actually the source of England's troubles. Buckingham contrasts this with ~~him~~ his humility, presumably to win support in the House of Lords against his impeachment. ~~And~~ ~~at~~ For example, he states that "what I lacked in experience, I have endeavoured to supply by care and industry". This is valuable as it suggests that Buckingham endeavoured to do good in his role. The source is ~~not~~ ~~in taking in~~ valuable as it was written in June 1626 and takes into account most of the notable events in the period concerned. However, it is limited in its content as it was in Buckingham's interests to downplay the extent of his influence and it emphasises problems caused by the House of Commons rather than what he has done. Therefore whilst Source C is ~~not~~ valuable in providing Buckingham's perspective, it ~~is less~~ is severely hindered by its provenance and the fact it purposefully seems to focus on the House of Commons rather than Buckingham himself.

The student has particularly good focus on elements of the provenance of each source, making valid comments that are supported linked to assessing value. For example, the student shows an appreciation of the form and purpose of an ambassador's report for Source A, the purpose of Source B to 'incite debate' and how Source C could be used to consider how Buckingham tried to present himself. For Source A the student references the date and place and supports their comment on this. For Source B the student has a clear link between content and context as part of their judgement. Also the student makes valid comment on tone and links this to purpose and nature of the source. There is also reference to the date in Source B linked to value. For Source C there is also appropriate comment on tone to follow from comment on purpose and leading into use of selective content. When the student deals with provenance there are elements where comment could be developed more but the range of comment and support across all three sources with a focus on value means the student has shown Level 5 qualities.

Report on Question 2

The majority of students chose to answer this question on why civil war broke out in England in August 1642. Most students had a good grasp of key events as part of their 1640 to 1642 timeline in explaining the division in the Political Nation over that period that led to the formation of two sides to make civil war possible in England. Many students chose to structure their essay with a section on Pym and then a section on Charles I. In some cases, this led to disjointed explanations of the link between the actions of Charles, the development of parliamentary radicalism and from that the reactive formation of a royalist party through Constitutional Royalism. Stronger responses were clear on the importance of the Irish Rebellion in leading to the Militia Bill and the Grand Remonstrance and used these in the context of Pym being seen as a radical. Good knowledge of these events strengthened answers. For example, some students used the vote on publication of the Grand Remonstrance not just to show a split in Parliament, 159-148, but that Pym was appealing to the people, especially the 'London mob', beyond the Political Nation. In illustrating the radicalism of Pym students also made comment on his link to the Root and Branch Petition and thereby another link of Pym to the 'London mob' and the Puritan network in London or the idea of his 'Junto.' Some made excellent comment on moderates' fear of 'King Pym' or Pym as a potential demagogue, including the issue of trust around the Militia Bill when MPs had to make a decision about control of any army raised to crush the Irish Rebellion. There was also comment on Pym in relation to the Bill of Attainder or Bedford's Bridging Appointments. Most students balanced their responses with material on how Charles I was a cause of the civil war from his actions after 1640. In this reference was made to 'The Incident' or the Five Members' Coup, or generally Charles' unwillingness to negotiate. Stronger answers stressed that the royalist party in reaction to parliamentary radicalism was support for monarchy as an institution rather than for Charles. Some answers did not move beyond the Five Members' Coup of January 1642 or the Militia Ordinance of March 1642 but there were some who commented well on the actions of millenarian activists in actually triggering conflict in the period March to August 1642.

Question 2 – Exemplification of Level 5 qualities

In 1640 to 1642 Pym led arguably the Long Parliament. John Pym was ^{hailed as 'king Pym' and became} the mastermind of many of Parliament's radical pieces of legislation which made the gap between Charles and Parliament unbridgeable. As a result, it was necessary to resort to a military solution. Therefore, Pym ~~is~~ can be seen as highly important in the years 1640 to 1642 for contributing to the outbreak of Civil War in England. In order to assess this, this essay will examine three key factors in causing the outbreak of war namely ~~Parliamentary radicalism~~ ^{Parliamentary radicalism}, ~~the events in Ireland~~ ^{the events in Ireland} and the failure to reach a settlement and will assess how important the role of Pym was for each.

Firstly, the events in Ireland catalysed Parliamentary radicalism which was rallied by Pym. For instance, ~~the army plot in early 1641 arose from rumours that Charles would bring~~ Events in Ireland shone a light on the army and raised questions over who had the constitutional right to control it. It became increasingly clear to Parliament that perhaps the king could not be trusted to lead the army. ~~but also that perhaps~~ This distrust manifested itself in the Militia ~~Bill~~ Bill for which Haselrig, rather than Pym was responsible for. However, Pym too capitalised on this distrust and sent out the 'Additional Instruction' in November 1640 which ~~did~~ insisted that Parliament would only assist the king in raising an army if they would be given influence over the king's choice of ministers. This was arguably more powerful than the Militia Bill because it provided ~~an~~ an ultimatum and questioned the king's prerogative more ~~directly~~ directly. Therefore, whilst Pym was not solely responsible

important in taking advantage of events in Ireland to mobilise against the king and increase Parliamentary power, he was certainly one of the dominant figureheads. Whilst it could perhaps be argued that tensions in Ireland were Parliamentary radicalism was also spurred by other events ~~and the burst of legislation~~ such as the Army Plot of 1641 and the burst of legislation that followed can be originated largely from Pym. Pym's influence formed the basis of 'Pym's Junta' ~~and as he tried to exact unity in Parliament for their shared goals.~~ perhaps more important in and of themselves in causing the outbreak of war, Parliament's response - led in part by Pym - cannot be disregarded.

Parliamentary radicalism was also spurred by other events such as the Army Plot of 1641 and the burst of legislation that followed can be ~~originated~~ ~~largely~~ ~~found~~ to have originated largely from Pym. Pym's influence gave him a base of support which became known as 'Pym's Junta' and ~~came to allow~~ allowed him to pass through the Protestation Oath and the Bill of Attainder to execute Strafford. Pym was particularly influential in bringing about the Bill of Attainder which led to the outbreak of civil war in two ways. Firstly, it was resented ~~for~~ bitterly by the king who had been forced to sign his assent. This contributed to the further breakdown in relations between Crown and Parliament that would cause divisions to become unbridgeable. Secondly, the Bill of Attainder divided Parliament as some felt it echoed the Five Knights' Case and was unlawful. Therefore Pym's radicalism caused the emergence of a Royalist faction who felt Parliament was

going too far. This can also be seen by the Grand Remonstrance of December 1641 which Pym called a 'Pymic victory': it was only passed by ~~44~~ 148 votes to 159. Therefore, it is possible to see how a lot of the legislation passed during 1640 to 1642 was masterminded by Pym and how that deepened Crown - Parliament divisions and ~~fractured~~ fractured relationships in Parliament. This would come to facilitate the outbreak of war.

A final reason for the outbreak of war in August 1642 was the failure to reach a settlement. In part, this was not down to Pym. For example, the most agreeable proposition presented to the King, namely the Bedford Scheme, failed because Bedford died and the Scottish whom he was negotiating with demanded a Presbyterian settlement. However, the initiatives to reach a settlement from the House of Commons failed in part because they were too radical. ~~Pym~~ ~~Got this~~ For example, the Ten Propositions which were presented in June 1641 threatened to remove some of the King's prerogative rights, for instance, Parliament wanted control of the education of the Royal children. It could be argued the Charles' ~~stubborn~~ stubborn personality was also to blame for the inability to reach a settlement. However, the settlements were radical to an unprecedented ~~even~~ extent and perhaps more importantly Parliament refused to concede. This can be seen from the Nineteen Propositions in June 1642 which made similar demands to the previous Ten Propositions. unsurprisingly, this settlement was also rejected by the King.

Parliament ~~was not the~~ was not the sole reason for the outbreak of war. However, their actions often served to deteriorate their relationship with the king. This was ~~an~~ ~~at~~ a crucial factor in bringing about the outbreak of Civil War. ~~The other~~ Pym can be seen as ~~holding great sway over~~ a leader in Long Parliament and exerted his influence through his Junta and was therefore responsible to a large extent for ~~their~~ ~~action~~ Parliament's actions. The other crucial factor in bringing about the Civil War was the emergence of a Royalist faction in opposition to Parliamentary radicalism. Despite his attempts to encourage unity, Pym can certainly be regarded as highly significant in this development. Therefore, Pym can be said to be very important in the outbreak of war.

The introduction of the essay, although it could be clearer, indicates understanding of the role of Pym, the process of division but also the importance of the Irish Rebellion as part of this division. In the essay the student ably illustrates the importance of the role of Pym through using the Irish Rebellion, Militia Bill, Army Plot, Bill of Attainder, Protestation Oath and the Grand Remonstrance. The student makes a clear link between the actions of Pym and these events and the development of a 'royalist faction.' The student has balance in their essay by considering how the failure to reach a settlement was also a cause of war, referencing: Bedford's Bridging Appointments, the stubbornness of Charles and plans for settlements, 10 and 19 Propositions. While the student could develop the actions of Charles I, Constitutional Royalism, and the post March 1642 actions of millenarian activists, the focus in their essay on Pym with support and the balance of this with the actions of Charles I allows them to access Level 5.

Report on Question 3

This was the most popular essay after Question 2. Given the wording the question most students structured their response around royalist weaknesses and Parliament's strengths. The stronger responses naturally linked these together. In considering royalist strengths many, rightly, stressed the strengths in the royalist position at the start of the civil war. In outlining royalist weaknesses students worked through a range of factors. Most commented on Charles as a weak leader whose faults were exaggerated by the pressures of war. Many linked this to the divisions among the royalists about their approach to the war, referencing Henrietta-Maria, Prince Rupert and Edward Hyde. There was some good comment on the limits of foreign support that Charles tried to use but better responses commented on the counter-productive nature of Charles' links to Irish Catholics and the French, and how this was used by Parliament as propaganda. Most made a direct comparison with the real benefits for Parliament of their 1643 Solemn League and Covenant with the Presbyterian Scots. Students referenced the importance of Turnham Green, Marston Moor and Naseby as part of their essays, either in sections on royalist weaknesses or Parliament's strengths. On Parliament's strengths students worked through a range of factors in addition to the alliance with the Scots. Most answers recognised the importance of

control of London, but the best answers explained its importance in terms of: manpower, manufacture, taxation base, printing, financial centre, centre of administration, government, Puritan population and as a port. Many referenced control of the navy. In relation to London there were more general comments about Parliament's control of the South-East and resources. Some made more of this by referencing the Excise and Assessment. In relation to administration there were some who made good comment on the drive of Pym in London being matched across the localities by Puritan led County Committees supporting Parliament's war effort. Some of the strongest responses stressed the religious drive that allowed leading parliamentarians like Pym and those in the localities to make the most of the resources at their disposal. Some strong responses when referencing the importance of the New Model Army also included the religious drive of a godly core within it, many from Cromwell's Eastern Association. Within this some made comment on a cultural/religious divide in the approach to war seen in the approach of Prince Rupert compared to godly officers in the Parliament's armies.

Question 3 – Exemplification of Level 5 qualities

The outcome of the First Civil War was as a result of Royalist weaknesses rather than Parliamentary strengths. In particular, the Royalists had clear weaknesses in their overall command and strategy, which outweighed Parliamentary strength in affecting the outcome. Furthermore, the lack of Royalist allies proved costly in determining the outcome of the war. When it comes to wealth and resources, Parliament were in a stronger position, but there were still clear weaknesses on the Royalist side.
In terms of commanders and overall strategy, it was clearly Royalist weakness that impacted the outcome of the war more than Parliamentary strengths. More specifically, the Royalist ~~strategy~~ strategy cost them the war, from the very first battle. Following the stalemate at Edgehill in 1642, the Royalist side were in a better position than the Parliament side. So, it should have made sense for

Charles and his army to begin a march on London, catching the city off guard, with their army out of the picture. However, due to the weakness in Royalist strategy, they instead decided to stall, and take an indirect route to London, allowing Essex and his army to return to the capital and ready a defence. In hindsight, had the Royalists taken the initiative and headed straight for London, the ~~war~~ war may not have lasted four years. Instead, Charles and his army arrived at Turnham Green outnumbered by nearly two to one. Throughout the War, Royalist commanders showed their weaknesses. There were several occasions where the Royalist cavalry, led by Prince Rupert, charged off the battlefield in pursuit of fleeing Parliamentarians. The first example of this was at Edgehill but happened later on at Marston Moor too. On all these occasions, had the command not showed weakness and remained in position, the Royalists may have had a better chance at victory. These clear failings in both strategy and overall leadership from the commanders heavily outweigh Parliament's strengths. This is because the Royalists had a clear advantage at the start of the war, so favoured a short war. But due to poor strategy and weak commanders, this was not capitalised on and hence having a greater impact on the outcome of the First Civil War than the strength of Parliament.

Charles was desperately seeking an alliance throughout the war to help determine the outcome ~~of the war~~ but it never materialised. He attempted to gain support from France and also from Ireland. Had he succeeded in doing so, then the outcome of the First Civil War could have been very different. As it turned out, Parliament were the side to have their forces bolstered by an alliance, in the form of the Scots. This was a very powerful asset during the war because it allowed Parliament to be more versatile. The Scots were prepared to move around the country freely and fight. This was a positive because local militia were not prepared to leave their designated areas, which made Parliament's forces thin. Therefore, the Scottish alliance was ~~pointed~~ key in determining the outcome

of the First Civil War. While this could be considered a Parliament strength that directly affected the outcome of the ~~later~~ war, it is important to understand that Charles had the capability to secure alliances from abroad and failed to do so. He could have obtained multiple, but again failed to do so. With no reinforcements and a forever depleting ~~backups~~ backups, the Royalist side suffered from their lack of alliances, which in turn had a direct impact on the outcome of the First Civil War.

Though Royalist weakness was the prominent underlying factor in most areas during the war, there was one area that Parliament the strength of Parliament had a greater influence on the outcome of the First Civil War, ~~on~~ that being wealth and available resources. Parliament occupied the south and the east during the war which were the two wealthiest regions of England. Not only did that include London, but also the second largest city at the time, Norwich. These areas also contained the country's key ports such as Portsmouth and Hull. Therefore, with greater population and wealth, the parliamentarian side excelled and this was the underlying factor for their success. There was still Royalist weakness though. In particular, Charles had to rely on gifts from wealthy Lords to fund his cause which was not sustainable and could only be used once. Therefore, as the war dragged on, the Royalist cause ~~to~~ slowly began deteriorating. However this time, it was because they could not compete with ~~the~~ Parliament's strength rather than their weakness being the more significant factor.

~~Royalist~~ The Royalist army was constantly trying to equip itself during the war, with continuous focus on capturing cities with good resources. For example, at the beginning of the war, in 1642, Charles was refused entrance into Hull by general Hotham, ~~as~~ The city's armoury was extensive but Charles and his army failed to benefit from it. This constant lack of resources compared to Parliament's abundance was a key factor in affecting the outcome of the First Civil War but Parliament's strength was the outweighing decider in this area.

Overall, it is clear to see that Royalist weakness was the most important aspect when it came to deciding the outcome of the First Civil War. They fell behind in almost all areas. Most of the time, the Royalists fell behind because of their weakness rather than simply not being able to compete with Parliament's strength. This is evident when it comes to ~~some~~ strategy because the Royalist side made continuous errors, proving that their weakness played the pivotal role in determining the outcome of the First Civil War.

The introduction indicates the student has a sound grasp of the specific question and an appreciation of balance and a range of factors. A clear argument is put forward in the first section about the impact of royalist strategic mistakes with examples given - the failure to take London and Rupert's lack of control on the battlefield. The next section has clear comment on the impact of foreign alliances on both sides, although with actual limited selected evidence to develop this. In the last section there is clear illustration of the importance of resources with some good evidence deployed to reinforce the point about the importance of London and a stress on the importance of resources as the war dragged on. While the student does not address the role of religion, or some other factors, their clear structure of sections that have a balanced argument with support for a sustained argument illustrates enough Level 5 qualities to be awarded a mark in that level.

Report on Question 4

This was the least popular essay question on the paper. In strong responses students used a range of radical groups, Levellers, Diggers, Fifth Monarchists, Muggletonians and Ranters to illustrate the threat and limits of radicals across the years 1649 to 1653. Others also considered radicalism in a broader sense within the New Model or the position of the leading grandees like Cromwell, Ireton and Harrison in contrast to the relative conservatism of many Rump MPs. Most students appreciated the greater support for the Levellers and Fifth Monarchists in terms of numbers but also their links to the New Model. There was some excellent comment on Cromwell and Harrison's shared millenarianism and the Nominated Assembly. Strong answers outlined the reasons for the conservatism of the Rump as part of the reaction and limits of radicalism. As well as the limits of their support many students commented on other reasons for the failure of the radicals in terms of their message or the actions taken by the Rump and New Model, for example, at Burford or St George's Hill. Some students considered the Ranters in relation to the response provoked by the Rump with the Blasphemy and Adultery Act, but also more generally the conservative reaction to the press on the radicals rather than the reality.

Further guidance

Our reports on the exams are part of a suite of support we offer to enhance your understanding of our assessments and your students' performance.

Mark ranges and award of grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [results statistics](#) page of our website.

Enhanced Results Analysis (ERA)

Use our exam results analysis tool to create and customise different reports to help understand your students' performance.

ERA is our free online service for you to gain a detailed insight into your students' results. You can:

- analyse your students' scores for each exam question
- identify topics, skills and types of question where students may need further support
- compare your students' performance with those of other classes and with students in other AQA schools nationally.

For more information on ERA, log in through Centre Services.

Professional development

Attend one of our [courses](#) where you can review example responses from students and commentaries from our examiners.

Contact us

Our friendly team will be happy to support you between 8am and 5pm, Monday to Friday.

Tel: 0161 958 3861

Email: history@aqa.org.uk

aqa.org.uk