



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

Mark scheme January 2003

GCE

History

Alternative U: Units 2 and 5

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334
Registered address: Addleshaw Booth & Co., Sovereign House, PO Box 8, Sovereign Street, Leeds LS1 1HQ
Kathleen Tattersall: *Director General*

General Guidance for Examiners: AS and A2 examination papers

A: Introduction

The AQA's revised AS/A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specifications. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS and A2 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS/A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The revised specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the new specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for AS and A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives and across all the specifications offered by the Board.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B for AS and Section C for A2) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section D).

B: Exemplification of AS Level descriptors**Level 1:**

The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/guidance

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and indiscriminating with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

Level 2:

Either

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant but outline only description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but limited grammatically.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

Level 5:

As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

C: Exemplification of A Level (A2) descriptors

The relationship between the Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1.1, 1.2 and 2 and the Levels of Response.

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in AO 1.1, by writing a narrative or descriptive response, will restrict themselves to a maximum of 6 out of 20 marks by performing at Level 1. Those candidates going on to provide more explanation (AO 1.2), supported by the relevant selection of material (AO1.1), will have access to approximately 6 more marks, performing at Level 2 and low Level 3, depending on how implicit or partial their judgements prove to be. Candidates providing explanation with evaluation and judgement, supported by the selection of appropriate information and exemplification, will clearly be operating in all 3 AOs (AO 2, AO1.2 and AO1.1) and will therefore have access to the highest levels and the full range of 20 marks by performing in Levels 3, 4 and 5.

Level 1:*Either*

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such answers will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristic: they

- will lack direction and any clear links to the analytical demands of the question
- will, therefore, offer a relevant but outline-only description in response to the question
- will be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

- lack any significant corroboration
- be generalised and poorly focused
- demonstrate limited appreciation of specific content
- be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

IT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THIS TYPE OF RESPONSE AND THOSE WHICH ARE SUCCINCT AND UNDEVELOPED BUT FOCUSED AND VALID (appropriate for Level 2 or above).

Level 2:*Either*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

- understanding of some but not all of the issues
- some direction and focus demonstrated largely through introductions or conclusions
- some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of the language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

- arguments which have some focus and relevance
- an awareness of the specific context
- some accurate but limited factual support
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

- the approach will be generally analytical but may include some narrative passages which will be limited and controlled
- analysis will be focused and substantiated, although a complete balance of treatment of issues is not to be expected at this level nor is full supporting material
- there will be a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed, not fully convincing or which may occasionally digress into narrative
- there will be relevant supporting material, although not necessarily comprehensive, which might include reference to interpretations
- effective use of language, appropriate historical terminology and coherence of style.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope.

Exemplification/guidance

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

- sustained analysis, explicitly supported by relevant and accurate evidence
- little or no narrative, usually in the form of exemplification
- coverage of all the major issues, although there may not be balance of treatment
- an attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or summary
- effective skills of communication through the use of accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

Level 5:

As Level 4 but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 5 will be differentiated from Level 4 in that there will be:

- a consistently analytical approach
- consistent corroboration by reference to selected evidence
- a clear and consistent attempt to reach judgements
- some evidence of independence of thought, but not necessarily of originality
- a good conceptual understanding
- strong and effective communication skills, grammatically accurate and demonstrating coherence and clarity of thought.

D: Deciding on marks within a level

These principles are applicable to both the Advanced Subsidiary examination and to the A level (A2) examination.

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: “What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?”. Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates’ responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid “bunching” of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills:**
 - generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
 - well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid “double jeopardy”. Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

Alternative U: Britain 1929-1998**AS Unit 2: Britain, 1929-1951****Question 1**

- (a) **Use Source C and your own knowledge**
What was meant by “Soviet Russia hostile” in the context of 1947?

Target: A01.1, A02

- L1: Basic explanation of the term using the source – basic explanation of the start of the Cold War. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the term and its significance in relation to the context, e.g. uses own knowledge to explain how the Cold War relationship was still emerging in 1947, after Churchill’s Fulton speech but before the Berlin Blockade; or commenting on the way unfair or exaggerated views of the Soviet threat blamed the USSR for Western mistakes; or makes precise use of the source to show how much Britain depended on “engaging the United States...” because of the fears about Russia. (When in doubt as to awarding 2 marks or 3 in L2, the decisive factor should be whether or not the “context of 1947” is properly addressed.) **2-3**

- (b) **Use Source A and your own knowledge.**
How useful is Source A as evidence about the impact of the energy crisis facing Britain early in 1947?

Target: A01.2, A02

Whilst candidates are expected to deploy own knowledge in assessing the degree to which the sources differ/the utility of the source, such deployment may well be implicit and it would be inappropriate to penalise full effective answers which do not explicitly contain ‘own knowledge’. The effectiveness of the comparison/assessment of utility will be greater where it is clear that the candidates are aware of the context; indeed, in assessing utility, this will be very significant. It would be inappropriate, however, to expect direct and specific reference to ‘pieces’ of factual content.

- L1: Basic evaluation of the utility/reliability of the source either from own knowledge or based on provenance – e.g. relies upon description of the contents of the Source about “snow and frost” etc; or makes very general comments about the value of a contemporary source. **1-2**
- L2: Developed evaluation of utility/reliability of the source in relation to the issue linking source, own knowledge and provenance – e.g. identifies Shinwell as a cabinet “insider”, likely to be well informed and with direct responsibility; and uses both own knowledge and the source evidence about transport, unemployment, power supplies, Cripps etc to explain and assess the full impact of the winter crisis. **3-5**
- L3: Developed evaluation, drawing conclusions about utility/reliability based on strengths and weaknesses and judged against the context. A fully developed assessment, using precise evidence from the source to illustrate the tone and emphasis of the source in blaming others in the Cabinet (“only Attlee...” etc); or the apparently honest and self-critical approach (“In retrospect I must admit...”); or precise own knowledge of the rivalry between Shinwell and Hugh Dalton (or an argument that Shinwell was proved to be a failure by the success of Cripps’ policy of ‘austerity’). **6-7**

- (c) Use Sources A,B and C and your own knowledge.
“In 1947, a short term crisis forced the Labour government to face the facts of Britain’s long term decline as a great power.”
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement.

Target: A01.1, A01.2, A02

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations, which could apply to almost any time/and or place, based on either own knowledge or the sources, e.g. about Britain’s post-war position. **1-4**
- L2: *Either*
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.
- Or*
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on description, but will have valid links.
- Or*
Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant will lack both range and depth and contain some assertion. **5-8**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from source *and* own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4 but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

The dual focus of the question is on the ‘crisis’ and the ‘decline’ in 1947. Source A obviously suggests the extreme seriousness of the winter crisis and the inadequacy of the Cabinet response. Source B equally clearly suggests that the consequences were a drastic reduction in foreign commitments and that the facts were being faced. Source C attempts a more balanced view – it basically agrees with Source B about reducing commitments as fast as possible but it shows how Britain wants to use the USA to fill the gap rather than just pull out. Given the correlation of views in the sources, many good answers will firmly agree with the quotation and support it from own knowledge of examples of the “retreat of British power”. But other answers, often good ones, will use extensive own knowledge to dispute either or both the extent of the decline (arguing that Bevin had considerable success in his foreign policy and that Britain made a good economic recovery anyway) or to challenge the degree of “facing the facts” (arguing that Britain carried on with expensive and damaging ambitions to be a nuclear power and to keep an imperial role).

Question 2**(a) Comment on “bitter defeat” in the context of the Labour Party in 1931.**

Target: A01.1

- L1: Basic or partial explanation of the issue based either on the source or own knowledge, e.g. reference to the election defeat following the MacDonald split; or basic undeveloped use of the source – on ‘disaster’. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation demonstrating understanding of the issue based on both the source and own knowledge, e.g. understanding of the sheer size of Labour’s collapse from 288 to just over 50 seats; perhaps with own knowledge of the bitter divisions and recriminations within Labour. The source can also be used, linking bad municipal results with the earlier disastrous general election. **2-3**

(b) Explain why the Labour Party had partially recovered by 1940 from the disasters of 1931.

Target A01.1, A02

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements e.g. generalised comments about why Labour won in 1945. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. one or two specific factors such as shows awareness of the slightly better results in 1935; or of the unpopularity, by 1940, of appeasement, or how the ‘core’ Labour vote held firm in Labour strongholds. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors, and prioritises, making links or draws conclusions in order to provide an explanation, e.g. analyses examples of how the ‘first past the post’ system exaggerated the extent of Labour losses in the 1930s; or projects the rising trend from 1931 to 1935 to suggest what might have happened if there had been an election in 1939-40. **6-7**

(c) **How important, in relation to other factors, was the contribution of Stanley Baldwin to the political dominance of the National Government during the 1930s?**

Target A01.1, A01.2, A02

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and undiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisation which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: *Either*
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or*
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4 but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

The focus of this question is on large-scale support for the National Government in the 1930s and on the apparent stability of British society. The focus on Baldwin allows candidates scope for extensive analysis of Baldwin's role – first “behind the scenes” while MacDonald was prime minister, then as prime minister himself until 1937. But there should be a balanced approach to the “other factors”. This balance need not be even or comprehensive. Some answers, often very good ones, may offer a relatively brief assessment of Baldwin, whose contribution is deemed to be outweighed by the various factors leading to an underlying social stability, and reasons why political extremism in Britain achieved little. Such factors might include the differential impact of the depression, with many areas not badly hit by the slump; or an evaluation of the failings of the other traditional parties, especially Labour but perhaps also the Liberals. Answers might also focus effectively on specific policies of the National Government which proved largely popular and successful. As noted in 2(b) above, there was also the issue of the voting system which gave the government big majorities in seats from a relatively small total vote. Other issues might be included such as the monarchy, the empire, and the popularity, at first, of appeasement.

Question 3**(a) Comment on “Welfare State” in the context of Britain at the end of the Second World War.**

Target: A01.1

- L1: Basic or partial explanation of the issue based either on the source or own knowledge, e.g. general assertions about Beveridge; or literal paraphrase of the source on the war “speeding social change”. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation demonstrating understanding of the issue based on both the source and own knowledge, e.g. understanding of the way the wartime coalition prepared the way for the Beveridge Plan in and after 1942; or the growing disagreements between the parties as the war came to an end; or sensible use of the source evidence about society becoming “more civilised and humane”. **2-3**

(b) Explain how the war “influenced social change”.

Target: A01.1, A01.2

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements about ‘social revolution’ – e.g. breaking down of class barriers. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. one or two specific factors such as the impact of government controls and rationing; women in war work; evacuation; the shared experience of the Blitz; propaganda about “all in it together”. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors, and prioritises, making links or draws conclusions in order to provide an explanation – e.g. how some aspects of the war really did speed up lasting changes while others were temporary; or linking “long period of distress” mentioned in the sources to the way memories of the 1930s were different in 1945 from the feelings at the time. **6-7**

(c) How important, in relation to other factors, was social change in causing the Conservative Party to lose the General Election of 1945?

Target: A01.1, A01.2, A02

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisation which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: *Either*
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or*
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4 but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

The double focus of the question is on the effects of the war and on the reasons for the defeat of the Conservatives in 1945. One obvious theme, already noted above, is the changed perceptions of the 1930s. The Conservatives were now held responsible for the shameful memories of unemployment and appeasement in the ‘Hungry Thirties’. Another is the whole issue of social change and the extent to which people wanted a “better future” after 1945, including the idea that attacking Labour as too radical and unpatriotic would not work anymore after the work of Attlee, Bevin and Morrison in the wartime coalition. Another is the high profile of Churchill, and the resulting tendency to “respect Churchill but vote out the Tories”. Other issues might include the impact of press and radio in idealising “fairness”, “equality” and equal access to the higher things in life, as shown in the cartoons of Low, for example; or the way the vaunted Conservative election “machine” was disrupted by the war effort. It is also possible to argue that the Conservatives were already being regarded as “weak” on implementing the welfare state, even before the war ended. Given this wide range of possibilities, answers cannot be expected to be comprehensive. The key requirement is a relevant and balanced argument backed by selective evidence.

A2 Unit 5: Britain 1951-1997**Question 1**

- (a) **Use Sources A and B and your own knowledge.**
To what extent do these two sources agree on the significance of the 1975 referendum?

Target: AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Extracts simple statements from the sources or refers to own knowledge to demonstrate agreement/disagreement on the issue/event which is the subject of debate. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates explicit understanding of aspects of agreement/disagreement on the issue/event which is the subject of debate with reference to either sources and/or own knowledge. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of similarity and difference of interpretation in relation to the debate and offers some explanation. **6-8**
- L4: Uses appropriately selected material, from both sources and own knowledge, to reach a sustained judgement on the extent of similarity and difference in interpretation in relation to the debate. **9-10**

Indicative content

Level 1 answers will extract simple statements from the sources or refer to own knowledge show agreement/disagreement on the subject of debate, e.g. extracts simple evidence to show Source B is openly hostile while Source A is positive. Level 2 answers will show more explicit understanding of aspects of agreement/disagreement on the event e.g. uses accurate grasp of the evidence, pairing a series of source extracts to show differences of attitude – e.g. “I am enthusiastic” v. “abundantly justified”; “conclusive endorsement” v. “not accept any defeat as final”). Answers at Level 3 will demonstrate explicit understanding of similarity and difference of interpretation in relation to the debate and offer some explanation, e.g. Source A has several implications of Whitelaw’s reservations, as well as his support. Answers at Level 4 will use appropriately selected material, from both sources and own knowledge, to reach a sustained judgement on the extent of similarity and difference in interpretation in relation to the debate, e.g. Source A shows expert knowledge of the differences within the Labour Party of which Source B is typical. On a careful analysis of Source A, perhaps Benn’s views in Source B are not so different after all.

- (b) **Use Sources A, B and C and your own knowledge.**
“The issue of Europe deeply divided the country and the main political parties throughout the 1960s and the 1970s. The 1975 referendum did not settle the divisions.”
How valid is this assessment?

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-6**

- L2: *Either*
Demonstrates by relevant selection of material *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance.
- Or*
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with a selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

This question involves a variety of issues but, above all, the question of “settle” – or not. Evidence from the years after 1975 is not an essential requirement here – but many answers, often very good ones, will use their knowledge of later developments down to the 1990s to explain how 1975 was not final at all; or that it was indeed final and a few diehards have been unable to accept it. (This is invited by the closing section of Source C, where Ken Morgan carefully faces both ways on the issue, using the words “finally settled” but also referring to the “half hearted” commitment in years to come. Some answers might include the observation that in the 1960s and the 1970s it was Labour, not the Conservatives, who were most divided and that the key quotation is therefore wrong. The question is framed round the period 1960s and 1970s, inviting coverage of Heath and Wilson over the time leading up to 1973 and 1975. Some answers may look in close detail at the rejection of Britain’s application in 1961 and the “contentious” issue from the early 1960s; others will concentrate analytically on the referendum campaign in 1975. Either approach is valid as long as there is some balance on the long and short term “divisions” and the extent to which they were “settled”.

L1 answers are likely to be based on either sweeping general assertions with little or no support evidence, or on uncritical acceptance of the proposition backed by literal or superficial evidence from the sources. L2 answers may make fuller use of evidence from the sources and/or own knowledge, but will be mostly literal or descriptive in approach. Answers at L3 and above will make direct attempts at assessment, supported by adequate evidence. One feature of the most effective answers may be the use of precise and balanced selective evidence; another may be skilful differentiation between the supporters and opponents in the “country” and in the two main parties; and awareness of how divisions changed over time.

Section B

These questions are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidates should be clearly linked to the range of factors or issues covered in the generic A2 Levels of response mark scheme and by the indicative content in each specific mark scheme for each question.

Standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (without reference to sources)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: *Either*

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative.

Or

Answers implies analysis, but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such responses will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply almost to any time and/or place. **1-6**

L2: *Either*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, implicit understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **7-11**

L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Question 2

**“Thirteen years of Conservative dominance came to an end, apparently as the result of short-term political developments from 1962; in reality, long-term factors were more important.”
How justified is this assessment of the outcome of the 1964 general election?**

Target: AO1, AO2

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (without reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

The key to this question is the demand for a balanced assessment of short-term and long-term causation. As usual, there is a wide range of issues from which candidates can select and prioritise – in the longer term, there is scope for an overview of the thirteen years under Churchill, Eden and Macmillan, perhaps above all the Fifties prosperity which underpinned Supermac’s successes; the “post-war consensus”, before and after Suez, and various long-term factors which eventually pushed many on the Liberal and Labour side into opposition to old imperial ideas and leading towards CND and the rebellious anti-war mood of the Sixties. The “political developments from 1962” might include the question of Macmillan’s leadership – the Night of the Long Knives, illness, the unsure response to the Profumo Scandal and the security issues, the damaging effects of the leadership struggle after Macmillan resigned – or, away from the Conservatives, the impact of Harold Wilson as a new and effective challenger from 1963, perhaps especially Labour success in attacking overall economic failures and ‘Stop-Go’ as the result of “outdated” Conservatism.

L1 and L2 answers will usually be either generalised/incomplete answers based on unsupported assertions, or descriptive and uncritical narrative. Answers at L3 might have either an effective general overview of a range of factors or good analytical evidence lacking in balance – answers at L4 and L5 should have both.

Question 3

“The social revolution in Britain in the 1960s was caused above all by the prosperity of the long post war boom.”

How justified is this view?

Target: AO1, AO2

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (without reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

‘Social Revolution’ may be defined in a variety of ways (including a flat denial that one actually took place at all). Arthur Marwick claims the Sixties started in 1958 and ended in 1973 – the “1960s” in the question can be flexible (and many answers, often good ones, will go back to the Second World War to rack the origins of various aspects of social and cultural change). Apart from deciding how “justified” it is to write in terms of a ‘social revolution’ at all, the key issue in the question is causation. Was social change, however revolutionary, mostly down to the post-war boom? Or were other factors more significant? It is to be hoped that candidates will balance their answers with a range of factors promoting change, in order to assess what led to the “turning-points” of the Sixties and how the 1970s were fundamentally different (or not) from the 1950s. (Note that answers ought to define adequately, if not in equal depth, both the ‘prosperity’ and the ‘social revolution’ – dealing with only one would normally be placed in L2 or below; but an answer of otherwise high quality could make L3).

Question 4

Assess the impact of the oil-price crisis of 1973-74 upon the political and economic situation in Britain to 1979.

Target: AO1, AO2

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (without reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

There are three clear requirements here – the oil-price crisis, the political impact of 1979, and the economic impact to 1979. Balanced answers will deal with all three, though not necessarily in the same depth and detail. Similarly, answers ought to cover the ground from 1973 to 1979 but “balanced” does not mean “equal”. Many good answers may analyse 1973-74 in great depth, Heath, the 3 day week, two general elections and all, with relatively brief coverage of Wilson and Callaghan. Others may go for in-depth analysis of the ‘winter of discontent’. Some answers may devote much time and space to Northern Ireland and the collapse of the Sunningdale agreement, but this is not essential. Economically, there should be coverage of the recession and the crisis in the public services. Material after 1979 can be relevant but should not be descriptive or excessive. L1 and L2 answers will tend to rely on unsupported assertion or on descriptive accounts with only implicit grasp of the issues. L3 answers might have either a sound overview of a range of factors or good evidence. L4 and L5 answers will offer a balanced explanation of key factors, with specific examples.

Question 5

“Thatcher’s victory was due to decisive long-term shift in British politics.”

“Callaghan’s defeat was due to the short-term economic crisis of the ‘winter of discontent.’”

Which of these contrasting statements provides the better explanation of the downfall of the Labour government in 1979?

Target: AO1, AO2

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (without reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

The question offers many deliberately contentious key words (“decisive shift”; “short-term economic”) but only one central issue – why did Labour lose? Some possible arguments are personalised – about Thatcher’s strengths and Callaghan’s failings. Some are circumstantial – about the Winter of Discontent and the long-term problems of recession, public services and the unions. Some are structural – about the long-term trends undermining ‘Old Labour’ and those flowing with the Thatcherite and monetarist agenda. Answers could not reasonably be expected to account for all, or even most, of these possibilities. Successful answers will choose one quotation or the other (or else reject both and substitute their own case). The key requirement is for one view to be either “proved” (or skilfully re-defined) supported by well-chosen evidence. L1 and L2 answers are likely to adopt one uncritical view of Thatcher and assert it without much evidence or discrimination; or to provide sound description of events which is not focused on an argument in response to the key quotations. Answers at L3 and above will resolve the debate by means of a well-argued case, backed by appropriate specific evidence.

Question 6

To what extent did the governments led by Margaret Thatcher from 1979 to 1990 “rescue Britain from economic disaster, but lead Britain to social upheaval”?

Target: AO1, AO2

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (without reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

This question comprises three distinct elements – the policies of the Thatcher governments to deal with the legacy which was inherited in 1979; recovery from “economic disaster” (or not); and “social upheaval” (or not). Good answers will be able to assess the extent of the “disaster” of 1979, and then analyse the policies of the 1980s to evaluate the extent of any “rescue”. There is scope here for radically different conclusions to be drawn. One way for better answers to reveal themselves will be differentiation between successes and failures; or between different elements within the Thatcher governments, not just a focus on the Prime Minister herself. Many of Thatcher’s original team fell out of favour as the 1980s went on. (There is also room for differentiation over time, perhaps the argument that Thatcher succeeded at first but “lost it” later; perhaps the argument that she was on the point of failure and defeat in 1982 until “saved” by the Falklands War; perhaps the argument that indeed only Thatcherism could have killed off the ‘British disease’. Many effective answers will use 1990 and the poll tax as a focus for “social upheaval”, perhaps even going beyond 1990 to look at later consequences – but this is not essential.

Note that “balanced answers” will not necessarily be equal in coverage or comprehensive in their arguments. The key requirement is a relevant argument showing awareness of the issues in the context of the 1980s as a whole.

Question 7

“The key factor was not Blair’s remodelling of ‘New Labour’ but the fact that economic issues were so easy for Labour to exploit.”

How valid is this assessment of the reasons why Labour was able to recover so successfully in the 1990s from the disasters of the 1980s?

Target: AO1, AO2

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (without reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

This question might seem to be mostly about Tony Blair and the election victory of 1997 – but the time-scale is deliberately set to cover the 1980s and the 1990s as a whole, analysing the causes of Labour’s “disasters” as well as the factors in the recovery. Some answers may, legitimately, devote more depth and detail to Neil Kinnock and the recovery prior to 1992 than to the eventual victory in 1997. Equally, “reasons for” the Labour recovery were not necessarily completely or even mostly down to the Labour “rebirth”. Some answers might very effectively focus attention on the internal divisions of the Conservatives after (or even before) the ‘regicide’ of 1990; and especially the ‘economic issue’ of the ERM crisis and its effects.

As usual, L4 and L5 answers will prioritise a range of factors within a synoptic approach in order to resolve a coherent and balanced argument. Answers at L1 and L2 will be liable to uncritical assertions or to narrative description