



GCSE **History**

8145/2A A/B/C

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.

2AA Britain: Health and the people: c1000 to the present day**Question 1**

The source for use with this question was a newspaper cartoon commenting on the Beveridge Report published in 1942. Students were asked about its utility to an historian studying the Welfare State. Most asserted its value and interpreted it correctly, realising that the report was being portrayed as a means of destroying poverty and ill health that had impacted the lives of many people at the time. The cartoon was probably unfamiliar to many students, but most recognised the issues portrayed especially in relation to the potential role of the state in addressing disease and the health of the nation in the modern age. The Report's links to the establishment of the NHS in 1948 were also recognised by many students who noted that a change of government led to its ultimate establishment.

A Basic response at Level 1 to the question featured source description, assertions, and inferences about the causes of poverty that could be drawn from the image.

At Level 2 students made simple evaluative statements related to the worthy aims of the Beveridge Report and the government's apparent unwillingness to act on it in 1942. Answers rewarded here noted that the public seemed happy about the Report's recommendations, and commented that it was a good way to destroy poverty.

At Level 3 answers deployed good knowledge and understanding of the history of twentieth century welfare reform. They often perceptively looked back to the mid and late nineteenth and early twentieth century developments which preceded it. Such answers mentioned the work of Edwin Chadwick in the 1840s, the Booth, and Rowntree Reports at the turn of the twentieth century and the Liberal Welfare Reforms that followed. Attempts were made to give reasons for the government's reluctance to act on the Beveridge Report at the time; they went beyond the simple mention of laissez-faire attitudes that often featured in answers rewarded at Level 2.

The utility of source content dominated answers at levels 2 and 3 rather than issues related to provenance. Some simple assertions related to the possible purpose of the source which occurred at Level 2 were developed at Levels 3 and 4 as students noted the apparent enthusiasm of the public for the report's provisions. They pointed out the cartoonist's implied criticism of the government's unwillingness to act on it at the time. Stronger answers noted the possible attempt by the cartoon to influence the discussions about the Report which were due to start and to pressure the government to act on it. Such answers supported by good historical contextual knowledge were rewarded at Level 4.

Students generally did not focus on the date of the source. Only a few answers referred to Britain being engaged in an expensive World War in 1942 which might have affected government attitudes to the creation of a Welfare State. Students instead often asserted that the government maintained a laissez-faire attitude to welfare reform more akin to early nineteenth century attitudes than those of a twentieth century government.

It was pleasing to note that fewer students than in the past assumed that a cartoon was merely designed to be funny and as such could be dismissed. They explained that it had, as in this case, a more serious purpose.

Question 2

This question produced good responses overall with students deploying knowledge of the developments in medical research and treatments during the Renaissance that contrasted with a lack of progress during the Medieval period.

At Level 1 students mainly asserted that individuals such as Vesalius and Paré made medical discoveries that improved on the Medieval theories of individuals such as Galen.

Answers that went further and described the experimental work and achievements of at least one Renaissance individual such as Vesalius, Harvey or Hunter reached Level 2. Answers here needed one aspect of significance to be explained and most students had appropriate knowledge at their disposal and were able to do this successfully. At this level considerable narrative writing tended to dominate answers. Such responses often made simple comparisons between the discoveries of Renaissance researchers and those of the Medieval masters at a time when the church condemned research and stifled development. Explanations of, or links to, the overall spirit of enquiry of the Renaissance age tended to be brief or only implied at this level.

Developed answers rewarded at Level 3 explained the significance of the Renaissance in terms of the weakening of church control over medical practice and education. Students also noted the desire of individuals to do experimental and scientific research that discovered new knowledge and often corrected the mistaken medical theories of the past. Such answers showed how the work of more than one individual fitted into the spirit of the age and the impact which their discoveries had especially in the fields of anatomy and physiology. Students at this level identified what new knowledge emerged and how it was distributed using the technology of printing, through named publications. Answers included explanations about how they arrived in Britain, as well as the impact they had.

At Level 4 answers went beyond developed explanations and considered more complex aspects of Renaissance developments such as the limitations that available science and technology at the time often placed upon them. Some answers, for example, evaluated how much more individuals such as Harvey could have achieved had they possessed more modern technical equipment and materials. Other answers assessed how much Vesalius' impact depended on the assistance of Renaissance Art and printing.

Question 3

Drawing on students' knowledge of plague and Cholera, this question asked about the similarities between epidemics in the medieval period and the early nineteenth century. Students answered this question well. Examiners were impressed with the knowledge and understanding of students who compared epidemics before the nineteenth century with those of the nineteenth Cholera outbreaks. Most answers tended to focus on how in earlier periods and in the early nineteenth century there was no definite understanding of the cause of disease and how to cure it. Students explained that in both times diseases were easily transmitted by poor living standards, a lack of public health systems and the inadequate reaction of local and national governments to epidemics. Valid responses which referred to plague after the Middle Ages were credited throughout the four levels of the mark scheme.

At Level 1 students offered basic understanding of at least one similarity. Such answers often noted that many deaths occurred in earlier epidemics than those in the nineteenth century and that people were frightened and confused.

At Level 2 examiners saw simple explanations in which at least one point of similarity was made such as the fact that in both periods many poor people lived in squalid, unhealthy environments with sewage in the streets. Further they often might consume contaminated food and water. Other answers offered a simple explanation of one similarity and attempted a second which contained only a basic explanation about the inadequacy of cures or preventative methods. Where this occurred, answers were limited to an award at Level 2. Answers at this level often focused on the more exotic attempts to avoid catching plagues and the more sensational aspects of the squalor in which the poor lived. Students rewarded here often inferred that this was bound to lead to the ill health of the poor which the rich did not really care about.

At Level 3 students deployed accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding of two or more points of similarity between epidemics before the nineteenth century and those of Cholera in the nineteenth century. Answers explained how the diseases were transmitted and how environmental factors facilitated transmission. Answers explained how many theories about the cause of epidemics existed in a pre-Germ theory world in both periods. These included rational and supernatural explanations, as well as the measures these beliefs led to in terms of cures, preventing transmission, and efficacy.

Complex explanations of similarity between the epidemics in two periods were seen where students went beyond a developed explanation and, for example, considered the longer term or wider social consequences of the epidemics for those in power. Students noted how in the medieval period, landowners had to concede better wages and working conditions for labourers due to the scale of deaths that occurred, and in the nineteenth century the upper and middle classes were forced to investigate and improve public health through legislation.

Question 4

This question asked about the factors in understanding the cause of disease in Britain. It was gratifying to see how well-prepared students are to identify and discuss factors relevant to developments in health and medicine in the history of Britain.

Students showed their knowledge and understanding of the cause of disease across the last thousand years and how it continued and then changed over time. The better answers avoided the temptation to stray into issues about the transmission of disease and cures and stuck to the point of what was believed to be the causes of disease at different times. A strength of many answers was the student's ability to refer clearly to relevant factors from their study including the roles of religion, science, technology, and the individual in explaining the causes of disease at different times.

However, it was evident that some students confused causes of disease with its transmission and spent time describing the work of, for example, John Snow writing in terms of his discovery of the cause of Cholera when in fact he discovered how it was transmitted in London in the 1850s. He was unable to explain its cause in a pre-germ theory world leading to people opposing his explanation. Pasteur's work after 1861 would support Snow's conclusions and later the work of Lister, but in both instances, germ theory was needed to explain the causation of disease and infection. Other students were distracted by issues relevant to surgery or treatments rather than the cause of disease which again limited the reward that could be given. It remains important to help students to retain a relevance to the focus of the question throughout their answer.

Nearly all students addressed the named factor in the question in their answer. At Level 1 students frequently referred generally to supernatural explanations for disease in medieval times or how science

and communication helped discoveries later but offered weaker knowledge or no clear understanding of events over time.

At Level 2 students offered a simple explanation of developments in the understanding of the cause of disease either in terms of the stated factor alone or that together with others. Many students offered straightforward explanations of the theories of Hippocrates and Galen in Medieval times and the breakthrough of germ theory in the nineteenth century by Louis Pasteur and Robert Koch. Here students associated developments with individuals rather than to other factors that affected their work. Students at Level 2 often explained simply the role of communication and especially printing in transmitting ideas without offering any specific examples to support their point. Similarly, with Science and Technology students rewarded at level 2 tended to refer generally to such things as work in laboratories in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries without offering any specific examples.

Level 3 reward was made for students who deployed detailed knowledge and developed understanding of the identified factor and other factors explaining the cause of disease in Britain over time. Students rewarded at this level, for example, often had knowledge of the role of Religion in supporting supernatural explanations of the cause of disease in Medieval times and the Church's acceptance of Galenic explanations for it. They explained the key work of Pasteur and Koch in developing germ theory in the nineteenth century and the impact it had on understanding, and in inspiring other named individuals to further development. Students explained such things as Pasteur's laboratory experimentation and Koch's use of improved microscopes and photography. They assessed and explained the role of Science and Technology in discovering the cause of disease and went on to discuss such things as the role of scanners in the twentieth century. Regarding Communication, good answers were seen which explained its role in publications like the Lancet, in conferencing (supported by railway development in the nineteenth century) and the impact of the internet in the late twentieth century plus the benefits of peer reviewing in the industrial and post-industrial world. Again, the impact of developments supported answers which were rewarded at Level 3 especially those which linked changing understanding about the causes of disease to the ultimate development of cures.

Level 4 rewards were given for answers that went beyond Level 3 and often linked factors and developments showing how individuals benefitted from available understanding and technology at different times. Such answers made judgements about the relative significance of factors and how factors influenced each other to bring about developments. Students at this level built their judgements throughout their answer and showed a line of reasoning supported by detailed factual knowledge and understanding, leading to a summative conclusion explaining and justifying their final evaluation.

2AB: Britain: Power and the people: c1170 to the present day**Question 1**

The source, both in its detail and caption, appeared to be clear to most students. It was possible for most students to show an understanding of the source that might be rewarded at Level 1, by selecting details from it. Many made simple inferences such as commenting on the dangers of working in a factory in 1840 or indicating provenance for Level 2 such as the author having visited factories and having a first-hand experience of the scene. Many had detailed knowledge of factory conditions, though often did not link this factory reform. Many students were able to link the source to the work of the factory reformers, such as Robert Owen, Lord Shaftesbury, Titus Salt, Michael Sadler, or to the 1833 Factory Act. More able students appreciated that the 1833 Act didn't go far enough and that the source showed there was still work to be done. The number of students dismissing the source for not being useful continues to decline.

Question 2

This question was answered well by many students. Less effective answers described King John's actions or the key points of Magna Carta. Most were able to suggest the importance of Magna Carta at the time of its creation. Many students approached the answer by addressing 'short term' and 'long term' significance and this often worked well. The more able linked Magna Carta to future movements by inspiring groups such as the Chartists, and to documents such as the American Constitution and Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Question 3

Most students showed a good knowledge of the campaign for women's suffrage, although Chartism was a little less well known. The majority of students were at least able to identify a similarity. There were a range of approaches. Many addressed similarities in terms of methods used (violent or peaceful), key individuals, and outcomes. Important understanding that secured reward at Level 3 was often displayed in answers which had specific knowledge of both events; in terms of Chartists about the Newport rising, or suffragettes smashing windows and attacking politicians, while both movements used petitions and newspapers. At Level 4, students showed an appreciation of what the groups wanted the vote for, such as to improve lives.

Question 4

Many students showed in their answer to this question that they understood the wide variety of protests in Britain in over a thousand years of history. Nearly all students addressed the factor named in the question, government, in their answer.

At Level 1, students, usually briefly, had some knowledge and understanding of events. Responses at Levels 1 and 2 showed some understanding that the government was only one factor that might have led to protest. Examiners were pleased to note that answers which lost the focus on the tail of the question, which was about the cause of protest, were fewer than in previous years. There was also less of a tendency to include introductions, which was pleasing as this is not a necessary requirement and students should be discouraged from doing this due to the time constraint of the papers.

As a Thematic Study, 'Power and the people' covers over a thousand years of history. Thematic Studies are distinct from Period and Depth Studies and in this question, given the large time period they cover, it

is now expected that in order to reach Levels 3 and 4, responses will use examples to support the argument made from at least **two** of the four parts of the specification in relation to two of the factors. The majority of students met this requirement though the level of development varied. There was a tendency to produce lists rather than develop points at level 2.

At Level 3, responses clearly explained the identified factor. Answers showed how students had reflected on their knowledge and then related it to show how government action, such as passing laws or failing to pass laws or demanding taxes, led to protest. Examples frequently used were events leading to the American Revolution, Brixton Riots, women's suffrage. Answers at this level were based upon a consideration of at least two factors, a popular second factor used was the economy with examples including the Peasants' Revolt. Many students appeared to find this straightforward to do. Some students however, made up their own factors rather than keeping to the eight outlined in the specification. Some answers at Levels 3 and 4 used the PEE structure to ensure that they developed their examples in relation to the question. The question clearly invited students to consider the 'main factor' and answers that did that directly, with some substantiated judgement, were rewarded at Level 4. The more effective examples at Level 4 considered how the relationship between factors might have operated to cause protest and were able to interweave their examples, coming to a valid judgement. Many answers went on for several pages having discussed 3 or more factors. Future students should be made aware that this isn't necessary, as 2 factors over 2 of the themes is sufficient to access all levels of the mark scheme.

2AC: Britain: Migration, empires and the people: c790 to the present day**Question 1**

This question was attempted well by many students. The source attribution added important information, which supported students to interpret the source accurately. However, students at Level 1 might have exploited it further in developing their answers rather than just repeating the detail of the source. At this level, a small number of students described the various images on the commemorative plate. At Level 2, students correctly wrote about Britain's imperial strength and influence, with many noting the plate exemplified the British public's pride in their empire. Whilst some students began to assess the utility of the source, others needed to develop a better understanding of evaluating utility.

For Level 3, students connected good knowledge to the source, for example, about Britain's colonisation of various colonies. Knowledge relating to India and its status as the 'jewel in the crown' was common. Others discussed the empire in Africa, with reference to Cape Colony and the influence of Cecil Rhodes. When discussing provenance some students were unable to grasp the motive behind the commemorative plate and the British company's role in spreading imperial propaganda. Students should pay closer attention to the source attribution, including the date and origin of the source provided. Those that were able to discuss provenance effectively were generally placed in Level 3 or 4. There were some pleasing Level 4 responses that addressed the content and the provenance of the source with impressive understanding.

Question 2

This question was attempted well with many really good responses. Students possessed a sound knowledge of the Hundred Years' War, often explaining significance in the long and short term. It was notable that weaker answers were a narrative about the war, which drifted away from a sharper focus on significance. Some basic answers at Level 1 often just told a story with limited knowledge offered. Answers at Level 2 referred to a wide range of significances, most commonly the violent nature of the Hundred Years' War and its economic impacts on both France and England.

At Levels 3 and 4 students showed an awareness of a range of additional significances including the social and economic impacts of the Hundred Years' War, political impacts on both France and England, and the longer-term cultural impact on English and French identity. There were many pleasing responses that considered a range of significant battles and individuals, with particularly impressive analysis of the political impact of Henry V and the broader cultural significance of key battles like the Battle of Agincourt, 1415. A number of students noted how the war resulted in an end to England's interest in France, causing early exploration of the New World – these were often awarded Level 3 or Level 4 marks.

Question 3

This question was answered well. Many students showed a depth of knowledge about both the British colonisation of North America and the expansion of British control of India. There were some impressive answers showing an understanding of the short-term and long-term impact within both colonies, especially on the native populations. Many astutely discussed the economic motives that fuelled colonisation of North America and British expansion in India. In addition, students noted Britain's violent actions in both territories. The better answers to this question showed a good grasp of the concept of similarity and effectively discussed various impacts in the long and short term, as well as a wide range of causes. It was noticeable at Level 1 and 2 that pupils were likely to grasp a better understanding of the

expansion of control in India, with less developed understanding of the British colonisation of North America. This meant some exploration of similarity was underdeveloped and simplistic. Effective teaching of how events, periods and people may be similar continues, with examiners noting that students were generally successful in answering this type of question in the examination.

At Level 3 a more developed understanding was evident in answers where students focused on economic motives for colonisation and expansion, relating to the pursuit of valuable natural resources and the driving role played by trading companies. In addition, many students explained in depth the violent impact of the British on native people, namely the Native American tribes and the Indian Sepoys. Some students, impressively, could discuss the similar role of religion and ideas relating to cultural superiority in both North America and India, with these responses often placed in Level 4.

Question 4

Examiners noted that many students had been well prepared to discuss the factors contributing to the movement of people to and from Britain. Most students could offer examples of why people moved to and from Britain from across the Thematic Unit. Many referred, with a good range of examples, to the named factor of religion. Weaker students tended to focus solely on the stated factor, often accompanying it with less developed alternative factors that achieved lower Level 2 marks. A small number of students focussed their answers on the expansion of empire and did not engage effectively with the concept of movement of people. These answers were usually limited to Level 1.

Migration and the People is a thematic course, covering over a thousand years of history. It requires students to show knowledge of the earlier Medieval and Early Modern periods, as well as the Modern period. To reach Level 3 and Level 4, students had to provide examples from at least two of the four parts of the Specification. There was no expectation that all examples would be developed to the same level of detail but some knowledge and understanding of two or more parts of the Specification's was required for the higher levels. Pleasingly, many pupils offered an impressive range of relevant examples from the course.

Nearly all students addressed the factor named in the question, religion, in their answer. At Level 1 students showed a weaker knowledge of factors, occasionally employing factors that were of their own design. It is hoped that students will have had an opportunity during this study to consider all the named factors in the Specification. At Level 2 students began to show a better grasp of how religion drove the movement of people to and from Britain. The most common examples cited by students were Huguenot migration and Jewish migration. Whilst some knowledge was accurate, examiners noted that the level of supporting detail at Level 2 was simple. Level 2 responses often lacked a range of examples.

It was at Level 3 and beyond that students began to show a clear understanding of the identified factor, as well as displaying a detailed knowledge of other factors. Answers that were given Level 3 marks chose examples from at least 2 parts of the Specification. At Level 3 and 4, it was common to see impressive knowledge of the Huguenots and Jewish migration, the Highland Clearances and Ulster Plantations, as well as the migration of Asians from Africa. Some answers discussed the role of individuals in causing migration, most notably Idi Amin.

Level 4 could only be achieved with a strong Level 3 which sustained a line of reasoning that was sharply focused and led to a substantiated judgement. There were impressive arguments by some students relating to how a given factor could both cause migration to Britain, as well as from Britain. Some Level 4 responses cleverly argued the importance of one factor throughout their response, with strong acknowledgement of the factor's relationships with others. Some students at Level 2, and more commonly

at Level 3, displayed an argument and attempted to make a judgment but it was not substantiated by knowledge or based on an understanding of the relative importance of factors in either isolation or working together.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

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