



GCSE **History**

8145/2B A/B/C/D

Report on the Examination

8145
June 2024

Version: 1.0

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

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, c1066–c1100**Question 1**

Students found the Interpretation straightforward. Most students found something to say, based upon their own knowledge, about this interpretation. However, examiners found many students reworking the Interpretation adding little of their own knowledge which was unexpected in the light of recent questions about towns in Norman England. It was important for students to connect what they knew with the interpretation directly, rather than merely assert something about towns under the Normans. A few students made speculative comments about the author that were not rewarded.

At level 1 students who showed an understanding of what the Interpretation was saying or paraphrased it were rewarded. Some made basic assertions about the growth of towns or that they were associated with trade but offered no explanation or knowledge in support. Many students still write that they agree with the Interpretation, ‘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 Golding, the author, was writing such a long time after the event.

At level 2 many students started to explain in simple terms, about the importance of the castle. They were rewarded for identifying it as a structure in which Normans felt safe. In the castle they could live, garrison, control the surrounding countryside, and use it as a base for military operations in case of rebellion or invasion. At this level students showed an understanding that castles were a symbol of Norman control and permanence to the Anglo-Saxon population.

One way in which students at Levels 3 and 4 often showed their understanding of the Interpretation was by applying their knowledge and understanding of the economic advantages of the growth in towns under Norman rule. Answers mention specific towns such as Droitwich, Nottingham, Gloucester, and students were keen to explain that some towns had a reputation for certain products eg, salt, fish, woodworking et cetera. It was pleasing to see that many students referred to specific ports and towns that benefited from an increase in European trade and the commodities which that involved.

Some excellent answers at Levels 3 and 4 maintained that the positioning or relocation of cathedrals in urban centres made them a focus as places of pilgrimage which in turn had an economic benefit for those towns. Students referred to the adoption of Anglo-Saxon relics to attract pious visitors. A rarer response was to see reference to towns being used as administrative centres by the Normans. Many good answers were seen that explored the way in which the growth in towns led to the development of an urban elite, often through the guild system, who operated in the period as a different group to most of the population who lived in villages.

Question 2

Most students understood that the question was about the important consequences of the death of Edward the Confessor. At level 1 students tended to make some basic points about there being no son or clear successor to the throne of England. Students were also, at all levels, keen to mention or explain how this meant that there were several claimants to the throne. However, at the lower levels there was less precision regarding the number of claimants or their identities. The importance of Edward’s death was often implicit in answers at Level 1 and 2.

At Level 2 students frequently were able to identify between two and four claimants to the throne following Edward the Confessor's death. Students at this level focused on Duke William and Harold Godwinson, often giving simple explanations of why they believed they should be the next King. The other consequence, commonly seen by examiners, was that disagreement between the claimants led to battles.

It was a characteristic of answers at levels 3 and 4 that students were able to identify and explain the reasons why each claimant believed they should be the next King. Edgar Aetheling was usually quickly dismissed as a serious claimant on the grounds of youth and inexperience. However, Harald Hardrada's claim was clearly understood. Examiners were impressed with the knowledge of the way in which the dispute expressed itself in the battles of Fulford Gate, Stamford Bridge and eventually Hastings. Some students did spend rather too long in a narrative of the Battle of Hastings.

A less frequent consequence of Edward's death that students mentioned was the absence of any definitive mechanism for choosing the next king. Some students at Level 3 or 4 grasped the various ways in which, under the circumstances, a new English king might emerge and be acknowledged. Examiners were impressed that some students were able to explain what was important about the death of Edward the Confessor was that his successor might have been a male relative, usually a son, or indicated by the King's nomination, and that the Witan might have a crucial role to play.

Many students made perceptive points that went a little beyond the year 1066. Taking a slightly longer-term perspective students maintained that within 10 years of the death of Edward the Confessor, Anglo-Saxon resistance had been crushed and Norman England established.

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 tended to write about the corruption of the Anglo-Saxon church and implied or briefly referred to changes. At level 2 it was common to see many answers that explained specifically the weaknesses of the church which might also be applied to the Monasteries. Students showed a good knowledge and understanding of simony, nepotism, pluralism, and clerical marriage. At level 2 students also explained in simple terms how the Normans affected the English church through building in a new style – most frequently referred to as Romanesque. Some 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. Examiners were broadly accommodating of answers which discussed more generally reform of the English church and the need for stricter observance of religious practice in the monasteries.

At levels 3 and 4 students addressed the question more directly in terms of the motivation for the changes to monastic life in England after the Norman Conquest. The motivation was sometimes explained by the introduction of Lanfranc but also William's promise to reform the English church was frequently mentioned as part of the arrangement which secured William's papal endorsement of his invasion. William the Conqueror, students maintained, was a pious man, who was anxious to fulfil his promise to Pope to reform the English church. The reasoning behind reform of the English church was explained and frequently linked to the need to catch up with similar progress that had been made in Europe.

There were many good answers at Level 3 that explained in detail how changes were made to monastic life often driven by the introduction of monks from Cluny in France. Although sometimes there was a little confusion about whether the monks from Cluny were Benedictine or not, nearly all students recognised that these monks behaved in a different way. Good answers explained how Lanfranc wanted his monks to

follow the Benedictine rule strictly. Several very good answers were seen which explained how education and the Monasteries developed under the Normans. At Level 4 some students were able to substantiate an evaluation of the Norman reforms by pointing out the resistance that they met in some specific monasteries and cathedrals. Students explained the advantages which the changes to the English church and monasteries made for the Normans.

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 actions of the Marcher Earls as a reason for the success of the Normans in Wales.

At level 1 it was common in answers to see a basic recognition or identification of the Marcher Earls and their responsibility for the Anglo Welsh border. At level 2 students tended to provide a simple explanation of who they were and the special privileges they were given. The other main reason for Norman success discussed by students was the building of castles in Wales and on the border with England. It was common to see reference to Chepstow Castle and Pulverbatch Castle.

At levels 3 and 4 students were able not only to identify the names of the Marcher Earls, but also some of the shared history with William which made him consider them trustworthy. Having named them, many students at this level went on to identify the different parts of the border territories to which they were assigned. Level 3 also saw students explaining in specific terms the powers and privileges with which William entrusted them. For many students' castles were a more permanent way of ensuring Norman control in Wales and to support his idea they often cited the example of Roger of Breteuil, who succeeded his father, William FitzOsbern, in 1071, as Earl of Hereford. Roger led a rebellion in 1075 against William which became the disastrous Revolt of the Earls. In the eyes of many students this proved that castles were more dependable as a form of control than people.

With that in mind many students also argued that the Norman development of towns such as Chepstow and Monmouth and their attendant economies also contributed a great deal to Norman success in Wales. The example of Hugh d'Avranches founding a town next to his castle at Rhuddlan was frequently cited as an example of the Normans developing a region economically. At Rhuddlan Hugh built a church and had a mint. Furthermore, the Normans encouraged French merchants who were given considerable privileges if they settled in Norman towns such as Hereford where William FitzOsbern extended the town and rebuilt the castle.

There were excellent arguments at Level 4 which understood the value of castles for the security of the Anglo-Welsh border and Norman control in Wales. One of the most convincing arguments used by students placed less emphasis on the Marcher Earls than on their followers. It was argued at the Level 4 that given the extensive estates of the Marcher Earls in England and abroad, a powerful reason for Norman success were the actions of the followers of the Earls. Students noted that Hugh d'Avranches' followers, Warin the Bald and Robert of Rhuddlan were the men claiming land for themselves and building castles in North Wales. Roger Montgomery trusted Bernard de Neufmarché and his supporters, who built their own castles. The Marcher Earls were happy to bring in settlers from England and abroad. Men like Wizo the Fleming were aggressive and enjoyed trading privileges. These supporters of the Marcher Earls had everything to gain and nothing to lose and were brutal to the local inhabitants as they colonised parts of Wales. Another less popular but nevertheless convincing argument was proposed by some students who maintained that the Normans owed some gratitude to Harold Godwinson, whom William defeated in battle at Hastings. Harold had defeated Gruffydd ap Llywelyn, a warrior who united the Welsh. After Harold destroyed Welsh

military forces and Llywelyn died in 1063, Welsh unity disintegrated. In the resultant power vacuum local Welsh rulers competed for supremacy. The Normans benefited from this disunity.

2BB: Medieval England: the reign of Edward I, 1272–1307**Question 1**

The interpretation was easily accessible to students. It referenced a variety of aspects which students could construct an answer around. There was plenty of scope for students to expand upon these aspects allowing them to display their knowledge and understanding of the topic. They could focus on events, weaponry, tactics and strategy. At level 1, students quoted or paraphrased the Interpretation. Recognisable phrases included Edward being ‘tested,’ ‘the right terrain’ and ‘trebuchets, catapults, and movable siege towers’. Level 2 answers began to use their own knowledge with reference to Stirling Bridge or Falkirk by expanding upon battle details or explaining how named weapons were used. Both battles were a clear point of focus as they were mentioned in the Interpretation. As were schiltrons and archers for the same reason. There was a little confusion over the events of each battle but not as much as last year. Sieges and Stirling Castle were focused on less.

There were still some students commenting on provenance and this was not rewarded. Also, unlike previous years, no student seemed to focus solely on provenance; no student seemed to veer away from the Interpretation.

Answers at Levels 3 and 4 offered up information not in the Interpretation. So, there may have been a more detailed focus on the battles; a consideration of the strategies/tactics used; reference to weaponry not mentioned in the Interpretation and/or a focus on castles; mention of other battles, particularly Wales because of the Historical Environment this year. These answers would also include a wider consideration of warfare and acknowledge other aspects of it such as the need for carpenters to build the trebuchets and for blacksmiths to make swords. This was an awareness that warfare was not just about soldiers. Complex level 4 answers would focus on motives/reasons for actions eg castles emphasised power.

Question 2

There was a good deal of knowledge that could have been brought to this question although responses mainly focused on land and education.

Answers tended to be straightforward in structure, eg ‘One reason the Church was important was..., another reason it was important was...’ This meant students’ answers were clearly focused on the question as they moved from one example to another, and the awarding of marks simply depended on the level of detail and explanation achieved. There was a little confusion over what Archbishop Peckham did and what Archbishop Winchelsea did, but most students were clear about the Statute of Mortmain.

Level 1 responses tended to focus on the Church’s importance in peoples’ lives, whether it was a peasant going to church on a Sunday or Edward going on a Crusade. Level 2 answers began to focus on specifics, eg the Church owning 30% of England’s land. This piece of information had clearly been revised. It also tended to be the starting point before moving on to Edward and the Statute of Mortmain. It seemed to be understood what this Statute was meant to do and its effect on the Church. If education was the focus in the answer, then there was an understanding that the Church and the clergy were the ones who were educated and were responsible for educating their communities, eg the doom paintings that helped to explain scripture. It was also well known that the Church was responsible for Oxford and Cambridge universities.

Whereas land seemed to be a prevalent response at level 2, developed responses at level 3 seemed to centre around education and the key idea that the Church controlled education and thereby controlled what people were taught. Mention was often made of Roger Bacon and Duns Scotus with reference to the Church censoring knowledge. Level 4 answers explored the role of the Church in politics and would pick up on educated people working for Edward in his Parliament and in turn, his relationship with the Archbishops. This included the Pope stopping Robert Burnell becoming the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Perhaps because of question 4, Peckham's involvement in the reforms of the church in Wales were also referenced to varying degrees.

In a few cases there was mention of the conflict between Catholics and Protestants in Medieval England.

Question 3

This year, there seemed to be more lower quality answers to Question 3, or it was not attempted. Unlike question 2, there seemed to be less of a structure to answers, with students flitting from one area to another, and lacking some chronological awareness in their explanations.

The question asked students to focus on change in Government so should have given students plenty of scope eg representation, the legal system, Statutes. Reference was also made to Henry III by way of highlighting the changes Edward made.

Most students began their answers on Edward's Parliaments, particularly the first one with 800 people attending it. Level 1 answers would acknowledge this was the biggest Parliament England had ever seen and so was a clear change. Alternatively, students might know that Parliament passed Statutes and could name one or two. Level 2 answers would expand upon these points, focusing on representation in Parliament and identifying the reasons for the Statutes. There was a clear shift from 'what' were the changes to 'why' there were changes as students progressed up the levels.

By level 3, students were producing a more detailed analysis of the Statutes rather than just listing them, and there is evidence of chronological development eg difference between the First, Second, and Third Statutes of Westminster. With reference to Parliament, students focused on representation as a motive to dilute the barons' power and level 4 answers focused on the changing relationship between Edward and his barons.

Changes to the legal system were also included in answers as was the role of Robert Burnell but these were additional points rather than being the focus in the answers.

Question 4

Generally, the students answered this question well and it was very easy to reach a level 3. The Historic Environment Resource pack had clearly been used with lots of references to the variety of information available, from the castles to Peckham, from Rhuddlan to bastides. Some students did focus part of their answer on 'reasons for' the invasion as opposed to the 'consequences of' as stated in the question. But the vast majority of students were able to give at least three consequences of Edward's invasion of North Wales.

The stated reference to North Wales in the question immediately focused students' answers to what Edward did in Wales, and his castle-building programme was a common starting point and one accessible

to all. At level 1 students basically stated Edward built castles to assert his control. At level 2 students were explaining the purpose behind the castles, naming and locating them. From here there seemed to be a natural progression to mention the walled towns next to the castles and then students started referring to the Welsh specifically and the effect of English control on them, eg not being allowed to live in the walled towns. So, level 2 saw the introduction of new elements to answer the question. The bastides were a clear focus and led to developed answers centred around their economic benefits for the English, eg taxation, wool trade.

Levels 3 and 4 answers started to categorise, eg social, political, economic effects as consequences. Castles were revisited at these levels with reference to location and the psychological effect on the Welsh of building a castle on Llewellyn's homeland. Concepts of 'anglicisation', 'civilisation' and 'colonisation' also appeared in these higher levels. Complex level 4 responses referred to Edward's Imperial ambitions with reference to the Roman Empire, again linking answers around his castle-building programme.

Other aspects mentioned included the birth of the future King Edward II at Caernarvon as the Prince of Wales and its impact; the Statute of Rhuddlan, and Archbishop Peckham's involvement. The Statute did appear in level 2 but more often it was more successfully referred to in the higher levels as students' knowledge of what it entailed seemed to have been revised well, eg division of Gwynedd into 4 English-style shires.

Overall, there is still a tendency for some students, throughout the paper, to refer to the English and England as the British and Britain.

2BC: Elizabethan England, c1568–1603**Question 1**

This question appeared to provide the greatest challenge for students, with slightly lower performance here than anywhere else on the paper. The interpretation proved to be accessible with a good deal of material from which students might have developed a range of points in relation to Elizabeth and her parliaments. Most commonly, the answers at the top end tended to select the references to freedom of speech, especially in relation to marriage, or the impact of religious reform. The best answers were able to develop two points and relate these to Elizabeth's relationship with her parliaments, often focusing on change over time or the changing relationship due to the pressures Elizabeth was facing due to religion/war etc. It was however much more common for students to focus only on a single word or short phrase and to simply add some knowledge – for example on Mary Queen of Scots. The actual focus of the question on Elizabeth's relationship with Parliament was therefore often missed. Many students were limited by their lack of knowledge about Parliament itself with many simply using the interpretation as an opportunity to add brief contextual material about any aspect of Elizabeth's reign. It was quite common for students to confuse the role of Parliament with the Privy Council or the Court. The weaker responses tended to paraphrase the content which may well have been a consequence of not really knowing what Parliament was – very few if any marks are available for simply reformulating the interpretation. Structurally, responses were quite good with some good quotation and clear use of English. However, there remains a stubborn minority of those that continue to reference provenance in response to this question. Students should be very clear that there is no credit awarded at all for consideration of the attribution. In addition, some students tried to offer a balanced response perhaps considering things that the interpretation did not refer to. This sort of argument by omission accrues no marks. Overall, the best answers focused strongly on the material in the source and used specific information from contextual knowledge to support judgement. Many responses were limited by general or inaccurate information about the role of parliament.

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 role of Parliament.

At Level 3 there was more sophistication to the evaluation with good, specific subject knowledge used that was keenly focused on the role of Parliament across two or more factors.

By Level 4 knowledge and quotation were used with the clear purpose of arriving at a judgement about the ways in which the interpretation was convincing about the role of Parliament. 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.

Question 2

Responses to this question were generally good, aided undoubtedly by familiarity with the focus of Elizabethan theatre. Indeed, many were able to give some detail about the theatre which was most

commonly related to the design of the theatre and especially the groundlings and the rich. In addition, many named Shakespeare and also the Globe theatre, and an impressive number were able to identify specific plays relevant to the Elizabethan period. Very good responses were able to move beyond this descriptive approach to consider more than just one factor and were also able to indicate why or how these factors had an impact on the broader historical context. For example, some students commented on how Elizabethan theatre might have been utilised to send a nuanced message and linked this convincingly to the Essex Rebellion. As in previous years, the very best answers were those that could link the identified factor to the broader context of the period, and to thereby provide an explanation of importance rather than simply a description. There does however remain some factual misunderstanding of theatre; for example, that Elizabeth herself attended or that women were banned entirely from attending.

At Level 1, students gave very basic undeveloped answers. Here, the most typical response simply identified the name of a theatre or gave very general responses about ‘entertainment’.

At Level 2 there was more detail in response, although again very little attempt to move beyond the descriptive. In most examples, this was in relation to the tiered seating in the theatres without considering any other factor.

At Level 3 there was consideration of more than one factor, most commonly the social hierarchy of the theatre and also how the theatre was received by puritans.

At Level 4, there was a range of factors, as seen at Level 3, but this was combined with a clear judgement about importance. Often this meant placing the stated factor within a broader historical context.

Question 3

Many of the responses to this question were very detailed indeed and reflected the excellent subject knowledge that students had about individual plots. Many referenced the Babington Plot and gave impressive detail about the key events. It was pleasing that students were often able to move beyond just one plot and so potentially accessed Level 3 and above by considering a series of linked factors. However, whilst the descriptive detail was impressive, this was less commonly linked to a consideration of how these plots threatened Elizabeth. Unfortunately, quite a number discussed the causes of the plots rather than how the plot represented a threat and there was even quite a bit of description of the Essex Rebellion which could not be credited as a Catholic plot. Indeed, for a good number, any reference to threat did not move beyond the generic and often inaccurate statement that the plotters wished to kill Elizabeth. Another notable observation was the amount of confusion between Mary Queen of Scots and Mary I. The best answers took the form of coherent narratives which further placed the plots in their broader historical context – England’s vulnerability, illegitimacy and succession, religion and the Papal Bull (Jesuits), France/Scotland, Spain/Netherlands. Others did this with a focus on change over time, the increase then decrease of the threat tied into the arrival and execution of Mary Queen of Scots.

At Level 1, students simply identified a relevant event, most commonly the Babington Plot. There was little further detail and certainly no appreciation of how this threatened Elizabeth.

At Level 2, there was more development of a single plot, or generalised commentary about the nature of the plots that could apply to any and all of the plots in the period.

By Levels 3 and 4 there was not only greater detail but also a clear narrative of linked factors / plots possibly identifying how key events such as Elizabeth’s excommunication or the arrival of Mary changed the nature

of the threat. Some students did offer impressive detail about the how the changing level of support for the plots from abroad affected the level of threat for Elizabeth.

Question 4

There were some very detailed and lengthy responses to this question, although this was quite often a consequence of students learning large tracts of the resource pack verbatim rather than making an effective connection between knowledge and understanding. This led to good number of students detailing large chunks of material that the student did not explicitly link to circumnavigation. For example, there was a common theme of offering extensive descriptive material about the Armada in 1588 but this was little more than a description of events. It may be the case that some students are tempted to answer this question before any of the others on the paper but, given the amount of detail given, it is clear that this had an impact on the time left for the student to answer the remaining three. A further issue identified this year was a less focused response to assessing consequence. Unfortunately, a good number explained how navigational developments, or increased funding and new technology made exploration possible. The clear focus of the question was on the consequences, and not the causes, of the circumnavigation. Most commonly students that offered an effective response were keen to detail the impact on relations with the Spanish or the personal consequences for Drake. This was often done very well with impressive and specific supporting knowledge. In order to access Level Four there should be a relative judgement in which the factors are compared, and a clear answer established as to whether navigation or another factor was the most significant consequence. Some students were aware of the need to do this, but their relative judgement struggled to advance beyond assertion. Any relative judgement should be substantiated and therefore will need more than just a sentence or two.

L1 answers tended to ignore the focus of the statement and simply described in very general terms one or several features of Drake and any sea voyage, sometimes mentioning navigation.

L2 answers were in the main characterised by brief mention of a variety of relevant factors, sometimes navigation, wealth, status, relations with Spain but with only simple support. The best of these made simple reference to consequence but again provided only very limited explanatory support.

Two features hallmarked L3 responses: (a) detailed knowledge of the consequences/outcomes of the circumnavigation, and (b) an understanding of the importance that these outcomes represented in terms of society, economics, political and the country's international standing. The depth of treatment of these various factors was often uneven, the 'hierarchy' was not always clear, and though 'main' was mentioned throughout the judgement in respect of 'importance', this was not the actual focus of the answers. There were lots of 'learned' responses with enough assertion to get into L3 but not enough understanding of the question to be able to fully develop consequence/ be able to explain a hierarchy.

L4 answers replicated the degree of detail and understanding brought to the L3 responses but were shaped so as to present (either by cleverly linked paragraphs through the essay or in a concluding paragraph) a judgement focusing on a clear hierarchy of supported importances.

2BD: Restoration England, 1660–1685**General**

Overall, students displayed a varied level of knowledge of the Restoration. Examiners were impressed by those who had extensive knowledge and understanding of the history of the period. All students need to direct what knowledge they have to answering the question in a relevant way. The responses of the weaker students needed to display a better grasp of chronology. This was particularly noticeable with regard to the ordering of events that took place within the Restoration period, such as placing the Clarendon Code after the Popish Plot.

Question 1

This question provided an opportunity for students to use their own knowledge to expand upon elements of the interpretation. There were many phrases that the students seized upon such as, the damage, refugees, disruption to the economy, the undermining of the government, the diversion of resources and the difficulties caused by lack of money. It was common for weaker students to focus on the damage, with estimates of casualty numbers that varied greatly.

In this question, it is important for students to deploy their knowledge and not consider the provenance of the interpretation. Students needed to examine the extract in the light of ‘how convincing’ it was; they should use their knowledge to support the elements of the interpretation. Students will flounder if they attempt to say why the extract was unconvincing. Discussing ways in which the interpretation was not convincing were rarely plausible or creditworthy. In the same way, criticising the interpretation for what it omits does not enhance the response.

More able students included in their responses specific detail of why the fire spread so quickly and thus caused so much damage, with mention of jettying, building materials and/or weather conditions. It was pleasing to see that many students spent time considering why this was a critical moment for the government, with references to the plague, the Dutch Wars and religious conflict. Good answers were knowledgeable about how the economy was undermined, mentioning the importance of the cloth industry and/or the inability to collect the hearth tax, with the consequent problems funding the Dutch Wars. Some students pointed out the enhanced reputation of the royal family during the fire compared with its behaviour during the plague. Rebuilding London was a well understood theme amongst the better responses, with mention of the rebuilding plans, lack of funding, and new designs for homes which would be less vulnerable to fire. Some students showed knowledge of the introduction of fire insurance and the availability of better firefighting equipment. All these, when done well, allowed the students to access levels three or four.

Question 2

This question was, in general, well done, with many students providing levels of development that enabled them to access levels three or four of the mark scheme. The strongest students discussed the consequences of the plots. They included the impact on attitudes towards the royal family, the worsening relationship between Charles and parliament and the Rye House Plot allowing Charles to remove Whig opposition, consequently securing James’ succession. Comments about the plots’ contribution to the Exclusion Crisis were likely to be credited at the higher levels.

Weaker students focused on descriptive accounts of the plots but lacked a grasp of the impact that they had. Some students tried, usually with little conviction, to argue that the Exclusion Crisis was itself a plot. A minority of answers were written about the Gunpowder Plot. Several students were confused about the chronology, stating that the plots led to the Clarendon Code, the Treaty of Dover, or the Declaration of Indulgence. Responses that suggested that the plots resulted in the Test Act were given credit, as this was potentially a reference to the 1678 and 1688 acts, not that of 1673. The strongest students showed an awareness that there was more than one Test Act or referred to a more rigorous implementation of these existing anti-Catholic measures.

Question 3

This question required students to move beyond the purely descriptive and look at what was innovative about the Restoration theatre. Leaving aside those weaker students who believed that Shakespeare was still alive and writing new plays, most students had some broad knowledge of the innovations in theatre design, the role of women in the theatre and new styles of writing. This allowed students to access at least level two in the marking.

Some students attempted to distinguish between short- and long-term consequences. It was difficult to make this appropriate to this question, leading to some less than convincing responses. The stronger students focused on the role of satire and the ability to influence political opinion, making particular reference to the broader political context. Examiners were pleased to see at levels three or four, reference to the impact of satire on the Exclusion Crisis, knowledge of Coventry and *The Country Gentleman*, or *The City Heiress*. There were good answers that contrasted the role of women in the theatre with women's role in wider society and suggested that despite greater freedom, women in the theatre were still sexualised. The best discussions of Charles' support and patronage acknowledged that his theatre going waned during the Exclusion Crisis.

Question 4

Examiners expected to see more detailed knowledge of this aspect of Restoration history. Students were required to consider the political impacts of the colonisation of Jamaica, along with other factors, the most obvious of which were the economic consequences and the impact on enslaved people. It was noted by many examiners that students were also able to cite slave resistance, or the actions of buccaneers as factors.

Some students struggled with the concept of political consequences. It was obvious that many students had been clearly taught that 'impact on the wider world' or 'war' might be consequences. Unfortunately, many failed to realise that this might contribute to an argument about the political impact. It was disappointing to see a small number of students focus their answers on the abolition of slavery or Windrush, with no reference to the consequences for the Restoration period. Although the more successful answers tended to emphasise the political impact for Jamaica, rather than England, both were credited, as were comments regarding the relationship with the Spanish and Dutch. Students who concentrated on the political consequences in detail but failed to address any other factors, precluded an award of marks beyond level two. In general, discussions of the economic impact were well done, with students mentioning the impact on Jamaica and the British economy, as well as the financial benefits for cities, the king and enslavers.

Examiners were pleased to see some excellent judgements made in students conclusions to Question 4. There were however many answers that were concluded with reiterations of earlier points, rather than

comparative judgements linking the factors. Students do need more help to provide a substantiated or comparative judgement in relation to this question. It is not sufficient to simply begin a final paragraph with ‘in conclusion,’ or ‘this was the most important factor.’ Students need to make a judgement about the most important factor and highlight briefly the reasoning or evidence for that decision, in the light of the other factors they have discussed.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

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