

GCE 2005  
*January Series*



## Mark Scheme

### History Alternative U Units 2 and 5 *(Subject Code 5041/6041)*

---

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website:  
[www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2005 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres 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 centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

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 AQA, Devas Street, Manchester. M15 6EX.

*Dr Michael Cresswell Director General*

**CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:****AS and A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners****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 undiscriminating 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 undiscriminating 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 AO1.1, 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 (AO1.2), 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 (AO2, 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 characteristics: 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 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 A** and your own knowledge.

Comment on “switch-over from war-production” in the context of the post-war British economy. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Basic explanation of the term using the source, e.g. using the visual evidence of the source, aeroplane manufacturing changing to motor vehicle manufacturing. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the term and its significance in relation to the context, e.g. understands broader issue of need for industry to adjust from wartime to peacetime production. For Level 3, answers might develop this further by referring to the way British industry had been organised for five/six years on the basis of central wartime planning; and/or to the suddenness of the need to switch back following the cancellation of Lend Lease as soon as the Second World War ended. **2-3**

- (b) Use **Source B** and your own knowledge.

How useful is **Source B** as evidence about the state of the British economy in 1947? (7 marks)

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.

*Target: AO1.2, AO2*

- 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 or makes “all-purpose” general comments, for example, that it is a ‘primary’ 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. gives a detailed summary of the key problems afflicting the British economy in 1947: fuel and food shortages, balance of payments deficit, 1946 loans used up, run on Britain’s reserves, an ‘annus horribilis’ in Dalton’s own words. Recognises Dalton as an informed source i.e. Labour’s Chancellor of the Exchequer. Uses own knowledge to bring out further the usefulness

of Dalton's summary e.g. by referring to the convertability crisis and/or the other demands on the Treasury such as India, Palestine, Greece and Turkey. **3-5**

- L3: Developed evaluation, drawing conclusions about utility/reliability based on strengths and weaknesses and judged against the context, e.g. offers more evaluation of Dalton's usefulness and brings out limitations, e.g. lack of direct comment about the convertability crisis, possible measure of self justification in Dalton's memoirs such as pointing out that other ministers were responsible for the miseries of 1947 too, or candidates arguing that it is valuable source because it is a politician spelling out the problems and admitting his own failings. **6-7**

- (c) Use **Sources A, B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

“The Labour government achieved significant success in economic recovery in the years 1945–1951, despite serious problems both at home and abroad.”

Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. **(15 marks)**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

- 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* sources. **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* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **5-8**

- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from 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* from own knowledge, 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 and partial. **14-15**

**Indicative content**

The double focus of the question is on the seriousness of the economic situation facing Britain after the war, and on the extent of the economic recovery achieved by the post-war Labour governments during 1945–1951. Some answers will entirely agree with the quotation and bring in much own knowledge on the achievements of Attlee’s governments, e.g. stabilising the economy after the immediate post-war crisis, restoring exports, achieving a balance of payments surplus by 1950, maintaining full employment, paying for the welfare state, nationalisation, large armed forces and a major role in world affairs. Sources A, B and C can all be used as evidence of the enormous difficulties Labour faced, whilst Source C also refers to the economy turning the corner “from austerity to growth” after 1948. Those broadly in agreement with the quotation might also point to the tough measures Labour had to employ such as strict rationing and – probably good answers – may point out that the full success of Labour’s post-war economic policy can only be seen in the rise in living standards in the 1950s. Candidates may also argue the other way by using both own knowledge and the sources. They may point to failures such as the dollar crisis of 1947, devaluation in 1949, divisions within the government over spending in 1950–1951 and to Labour over burdening a struggling economy not only with a costly welfare programme but also with unrealistic policies abroad. Good answers might also point to Labour mistakes, e.g. lack of preparation over fuel stocks in 1946–1947, Dalton’s blunder over the Budget, the ground-nuts scheme and internal feuding between Bevan and Gaitskell. Source B provides evidence for some of these mistakes, whilst Source C provides evidence for the argument that it was Marshall Aid from America rather than Labour’s policies alone which turned the economic tide. The most effective answers will provide some degree of balance in their judgement, whilst having a coherent argument fully supported by appropriate own knowledge and well-applied evidence from the sources. The very best answers will, in their final judgement, differentiate between areas of policy with greater or lesser degrees of success as well, perhaps, as differentiating success by time.

**Question 2**

- (a) Comment on “Jarrow Crusade” in the context of Britain in the 1930s. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial explanation of the issue based on either the source or own knowledge, e.g. march of the unemployed from Jarrow to London, or march from Jarrow to call attention to the depressed areas. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation demonstrating understanding of the issue based on both the source and own knowledge, e.g. the way Jarrow became a symbol of those towns with excessively high unemployment and with the collapse of their main industries. Some good answers might make reference to Ellen Wilkinson and her book *The Town that was Murdered* (though this is not to be expected), others to the widespread feeling in unemployment black spots like the North-East and South Wales that the government was ignoring their plight. Very good answers will use either own knowledge, or the extract, to put the Jarrow Crusade into the broader context of the regional variations in unemployment and economic growth which was such a feature of the 1930s. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why the problem of unemployment was so severe in parts of Britain in the 1930s. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue, e.g. that there were some areas with much higher levels of unemployment than others, uses extract to quote Jarrow as an example. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. decline of major industries such as shipbuilding (for Jarrow), coal, cotton, in the old industrial areas of the North and West. By contrast candidates may point out that the growth industries – motor vehicles, electrical goods – tended to locate away from the old industrial areas, i.e. in Greater London, the South-East and the Midlands. Good answers may indicate a range of other reasons for the severity of the depression in some regions, such as foreign competition, competition from substitutes, over-dependence of some towns, e.g. Jarrow on one industry, electricity making relocation of industry easier, attraction of large, affluent markets such as London for the growth industries of the 1930s, or the National Government’s lack of an effective policy for the regions. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors, and prioritises, makes links and draws conclusions in order to provide an explanation, e.g. as well as giving an extensive range of factors the candidate will identify key factors be it over-dependence, structural decline or government policies. Alternatively, candidates may have a smaller range of reasons but show deeper understanding, make links between several factors and provide an overall explanation. **6-7**

- (c) Explain the importance of the actions of the National Government, in relation to other factors, in bringing about a degree of economic recovery in the years 1931 to 1939.  
(15 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

- 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. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.
- Or***  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant 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 and 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

This question requires an assessment of the relative importance of the National Government(s) policies – economic, but the wording could also include foreign and other domestic policies – in bringing about the degree of economic recovery which did take place by the later 1930s. Most answers will probably go into the economic actions of the National Government and, hopefully, try to assess their impact on recovery. Such actions may well include: coming off the Gold Standard; low interest rates; tariffs; the Special Areas Act as well as the reassuring stability provided by the government's huge parliamentary majority. Coming off Gold did allow for devaluation of the pound and so cheaper exports, though this was soon offset by other nations following suit. Similarly, tariffs helped some industries but were offset by tariffs in other countries so reducing world trade. The Special Areas Act was again a limited measure being more concerned to move unemployed workers than bring new jobs to the depressed regions. Other candidates might well argue that the real causes of the recovery were either due to factors other than government policies, or to policies forced on the government by external events. Such candidates may point to the growth in consumer spending brought about by falling prices, rising real incomes for those in regular work, falling family size and the spread of advertising and hire purchase. They may also argue that although Rearmament did benefit new old industries it was forced on a reluctant government by fear of Nazi Germany and that it did get seriously under way until after 1938. A few – usually good answers – may argue that some actions of the National Government may have

damaged recovery, for example, the cuts in government spending in 1931–1932 which may only have deepened the Slump rather than offset it. Some candidates – again usually good ones – may question how far recovery did take place and differentiate by industry or region or date. As usual the basis of successful answers will be the ability to provide a balanced overall assessment supported by precise and well chosen evidence. Answers at level 4 will not necessarily have more knowledge but will have closer definition of the issues, show an ability to identify and challenge assumptions in the question and/or to differentiate the significance of a range of factors.

### Question 3

- (a) Comment on “stunning surprise” in the context of the 1945 general election.  
(3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial explanation of the issue based either on the source or own knowledge, e.g. the size of the Labour landslide was not expected, the defeat of Churchill and the Conservatives had not been expected. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation demonstrating understanding of the issue based on both the source and own knowledge, e.g. figures on size of Labour victory, 393 seats and an overall majority of 146, may contrast with the two earlier minority Labour governments. More developed answers may argue that people should not have been so surprised because opinion polls pointed to Labour success; or that Labour’s leaders were well known and respected by 1945 because of their role in the wartime coalition; or that the voters differentiated between gratitude to Churchill as a war leader and blaming the Conservatives for the problems of the 1930s. **2-3**

- (b) Explain the main reasons why the campaign fought by Churchill and the Conservatives in 1945 was a “self-inflicted” failure.  
(7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue, e.g. uses stimulus to identify failure to exploit Churchill’s personal popularity; or generalised statements on the Conservatives doing much to lose the election. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. Churchill’s ‘Gestapo’ speech, Conservative over confidence, poorly planned campaign, uninspiring manifesto. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors, and prioritises, makes links and draws conclusions in order to provide an explanation, e.g. Conservatives having to overcome bad memories of mass unemployment in the 1930s and of the failure of appeasement. Answers that reach level 3 will do so by considering the relative importance of factors in 1945, perhaps by differentiating between background factors and those more specific to the election campaign. Others may pick up on the stimulus and perhaps try to determine whether Churchill was more of a liability than an asset to

the Conservatives in 1945. A few – and probably good answers – may point out that despite all their mistakes the Conservatives still polled over 40% of the vote in 1945.

**6-7**

- (c) Explain the importance of the role of leading Labour politicians in the wartime government, in relation to other factors, in explaining why public support for the Labour Party was so much greater by the end of the war than it had been in the 1930s.

*(15 marks)*

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

- 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. **1-4**

- L2: ***Either***

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

***Or***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant 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 issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and 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 the question is an assessment of the relative importance of the factors that gave Labour such a boost in public support during the war years. The suggestion is that it was in large measure due to the “role of leading Labour politicians in the wartime government”. Answers should therefore refer to the roles of Attlee, Bevin, Morrison, and possibly, but do not expect, Dalton and Cripps too. Candidates should also consider the way their roles made them, and Labour, better known and more respected than before 1940. Some answers, legitimately, might argue that though the role of leading Labour figures made a contribution, it was the ‘other factors’ that had more importance. Amongst these might be: underlying changes in social attitudes during the war, e.g. in regard to social equality and opportunity; the role of the State; belief in planning and the hopes these changed attitudes aroused for the post-war world. Reference may well be made to the impact of wartime reports such as Beveridge and the failure of Churchill to give the impression that the Conservatives were determined to implement its recommendations. There is scope too for arguing that Labour

was already recovering from the debacle of 1931 well before the outbreak of war and that, after a decade of Conservative dominance in the 1930s, a swing of the electoral pendulum might have been expected in the 1940s. Some candidates may well argue that despite Labour's role in the war years the degree of support it won in 1945 was still to a considerable extent dependent on the 1945 election campaign and that after all Labour won less than 50% of the votes cast.

Successful answers will provide a relevant, balanced assessment of a range of factors, backed by well-chosen own knowledge, influencing the shift in public support for Labour by 1945. Level 4 and level 5 answers will not necessarily show themselves by massive detail but by depth or width of explanation, and by their ability to differentiate between factors of more or less significance.

**Alternative U: Britain, 1929-1998****A2 Unit 5: Britain, 1951-1997****Question 1**

- (a) Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

To what extent do these sources differ in their views of the failure of Britain's 1961 application for membership of the EEC? (10 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- 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**

There is plentiful evidence in the sources for establishing differences, not least in the nature of the sources – Morgan's is a historian's view from long after the event; Heath was a major participant totally committed to British entry at the time (and plainly liable to wishful thinking about what the prospects were). Both sources agree that De Gaulle played a vital role in blocking the application; but where Heath implies this was the sole cause, Morgan notes 'insular' attitudes in Britain, as well as doubts and divisions in both major parties, almost to the point of seeing De Gaulle as being justified in his doubts about Britain 'accommodating to the Six'. Answers at Level 2 will tend to rely exclusively (often at great length) on the literal evidence of the sources; better answers will be able to differentiate, to apply own knowledge and understanding of the context – and to evaluate the sources, "testing" them against the candidate's own view.

- (b) Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

“Britain’s failure to enter the EEC before 1973 was due to the simple fact that political and public opinion in the country was unenthusiastic about Europe.”

How valid is this explanation of the reasons why Britain was not involved in the process of European integration in the years 1955 to 1973? (20 marks)

*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 Britain “missing the European bus” on three occasions – 1955, 1961–1963 and 1967. As is indicated in the sources, there should be special emphasis on Macmillan’s 1961 bid but the over-arching question is why Britain did not join the EEC before 1973. The years after 1973 are not an essential requirement here – but many answers, often good ones, will use their knowledge of later developments down to the 1990s to explain the strength and depth of the factors and “unenthusiastic” attitudes keeping Britain out. If used as part of a relevant argument, such material could indeed be very effective. Most candidates will probably make a choice between “it was De Gaulle” (in different ways all three sources support this) or “other factors” (there is a range of possibilities in Source A and Source C). Some answers may look in close detail at the rejection of Britain’s 1961 application, with relatively brief balanced coverage of the wider period; others may concentrate analytically on the various elements of

political and public opinion over the period 1955–1973, with perhaps more brief attention given to 1961–1963. Either approach is valid as long as there is balance on the long and short term. Answers at Level 2 are likely to be based on thorough, but literal use of the sources with adequate links to the question, or on superficial general arguments lacking depth of supporting evidence (sadly, there will be a number of promising and well argued answers that cannot rise above Level 2 because they completely ignore the sources). Answers at Level 3 and above will make direct attempts at assessment, supported by selected evidence. One feature of the most effective answers may be the depth of precise and analytical selective evidence; another may be skilful differentiation between the relative importance of a range of factors; or the depth of conceptual understanding of “political and public opinion”.

## Section B

Questions 2-7 are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidates’ responses 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 the 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***

Answer 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 to almost 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

How significant was the political and economic impact of the Suez Crisis upon the so-called “post-war consensus”, 1951–1970? (20 marks)

Use standard mark schemes 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 what the post-war consensus was – and how far did the Suez Crisis impact on it. Simple narratives of the actual Suez Crisis will receive little credit. As usual, there is a wide range of issues from which candidates can select and prioritise – the political, economic, foreign policy and emotional aspects of the ‘post-war consensus’; and the possibility that answers may challenge the idea that such a consensus actually existed. Within this framework, some answers may argue for or against the impact of Suez- perhaps arguing that this (1956) was when the ‘post-war consensus’ ended; or that Suez had no lasting effect; or that there was a sharp brief impact that had no lasting effect; or that there was indeed a long-lasting shift in attitudes leading towards the ‘wind of change’, the Labour victory of 1964, to CND and the rebellious anti-war mood that characterised the ‘social revolution’ of the Sixties. Other answers might see 1964 as a turning point, showing how deep party differences were by then. There is also scope here for an overview approach of ‘Butskellism’ and Conservative continuation of the Attlee legacy, with relatively little detail on events. Answers cannot be expected to be comprehensive or equal in coverage; the key requirement is a balanced argument with a synoptic view of a 20-year period.

**Question 3**

To what extent did Britain experience “fundamental social and cultural change” between the 1950s and the 1990s? (20 marks)

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**

“Fundamental social and cultural change” may be defined in a variety of ways- including a flat denial that a social revolution actually took place at all. The key requirements in the question are to assess the degree and speed of change and to identify the timescale within which change occurred. Arthur Marwick claims the Sixties started in 1958 and ended in 1973 – many answers will focus closely on the ‘Sixties’ with adequate but limited material up to the 1990s. But many answers, often good ones, will go back to the Second World War to track the origins of various aspects of social and cultural change; or will concentrate on the ‘Thatcher Revolution’ of the 1980s. Some answers may argue effectively about causation and the long post-war boom. Thus there is a wide range of valid approaches; we should not expect answers to be comprehensive but there should be some attempt to assess across the period given. Successful answers will provide a balanced view of the extent of change and continuity, backed by their own assessment of the “turning-points” of the period, and how far the Britain of the 1990s was fundamentally different (or not) from the Britain of the 1950s.

**Question 4**

“Between 1974 and 1987, the Labour Party became quite simply unelectable.”  
How justified is this verdict on the image and the leadership of the Labour Party in these years?

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 covers the years when Labour was in power under Wilson and Callaghan, and then years in opposition, including successive heavy electoral defeats at the hands of Mrs Thatcher and the Conservatives. The deliberately provocative contention in the quotation is that these years represented a catalogue of self-imposed disasters. Many answers may follow this line – tracing the growing internal problems that undermined Wilson and Callaghan, culminating in the ‘winter of discontent’ and the defeat of 1979, followed by the virtual disintegration in the early 1980s, with the rise of the Bennite Left and the breakaway of the

SDP. The key words, “image and leadership” provide scope for a range of issues to be addressed, including perhaps a special focus on the 1983 election and the role of the media in politics. Other answers, however, might legitimately challenge the implicit assumptions of the question and focus on the positive factors behind Thatcher’s dominance, or on the way the Falklands War “saved” the Conservatives from imploding. There is, as usual, a range of valid approaches; the key requirement is a direct argument, backed by selected evidence. One feature of the best answers may be an ability to differentiate – for example between times during these years when Labour was ‘unelectable’, compared with other times (before 1978? 1985–1987 under Kinnock?) when this was *not* the case.

### Question 5

How significantly was Britain affected during the 1970s and early 1980s by the economic and political impact of the 1973 “oil-price crisis”?

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 itself, the political impact to the early 1980s, and the economic impact to the early 1980s. 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 c1983; but “balanced” does not mean “equal”. Many good answers may analyse 1973-1974 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’ and the turning-point election of 1979. Some answers may devote some time and space to Northern Ireland and the collapse of the Sunningdale agreement, but this is not essential. Economically, there should be some coverage of the recession and the crisis in public services – both up to 1979 and in the early stages of Thatcher’s government. The best answers will offer a balanced explanation of key factors, with specific examples, rather than comprehensive narratives of the period.

**Question 6**

“Thatcher’s fall had little to do with policies and everything to do with personalities.”  
How convincing is this view of the rejection of Mrs Thatcher by her own party in 1990?

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 (“rejection by her own party”; and “everything to do with personalities”) but only one central issue – why did Mrs Thatcher fall so suddenly from power after being so dominant for so long? Some possible arguments will be very personalised – perhaps about Thatcher’s strengths and how she was betrayed by her own disloyal colleagues; or about her own personality driving those colleagues into justified rebellion against her- including some or all of Heseltine, Lawson and Howe. On the other hand, many answers will challenge the quotation and focus on policies that *were* crucially important- not least the poll tax. Others again may argue that Thatcher’s dominance had always been based on the weaknesses of her opponents and Labour was now a credible opposition – one of the key personalities could be Neil Kinnock. Answers could not reasonably be expected to account for all, or even most, of these possibilities, only to choose one valid approach to the quotation and support it with well-chosen evidence.

**Question 7**

“The revival of the Labour Party in the 1990s was due above all to the modernising policies and brilliant leadership of Tony Blair.”

“Between 1990 and 1997, the Conservative Party committed electoral suicide; New Labour inherited power by default.”

Which of these statements provides the more convincing assessment of the political developments of the 1990s?

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 has a broad focus on both the major parties throughout 1990–1997. Many answers might legitimately concentrate closely on the causes of the ‘turning point’ election of 1997 – but the key date of 1997 has been deliberately included; this should be addressed. It is also possible, though not a requirement, that valid use could be made of material from the 1980s as relevant evidence of long-term factors behind the reversals of 1990–1997. In terms

of argument, it is equally valid to focus in more depth on either Labour strengths or Conservative failings – we should not expect “balance” to mean even or comprehensive coverage. On the Labour side, possible factors include personalities (Kinnock, Smith, Blair, Brown, Mandelson) and the “modernising policies” beloved of New Labour. Answers focusing on the internal divisions of the Conservatives will refer to issues such as the ‘regicide’ of 1990; the economic ‘own goal’ of the ERM crisis and Black Wednesday; the intense debate over ‘Europe’ and its damaging effects on John Major’s leadership. As usual with such questions, the key is to “prove” the validity of one quotation and “disprove” the other; or to reject or redefine both quotations and substitute a third, better, interpretation instead.