



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative R Unit 5

Mark Scheme

2008 examination – June series

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

Copyright © 2008 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.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's 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 specification. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by A2 level candidates for a number of years.

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

The 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 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 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.

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) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section C).

B: 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.

C: 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.

June 2008

Alternative R: Britain, 1895–1951

A2 Unit 5: Britain, 1918–1951

Question 1

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

To what extent do these two sources agree on Britain's reluctance to become involved in war during the inter-war years? (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

Level 1 answers will be thin in material and/or assertive in argument. At Level 2, responses will give points from the sources. Source A opens with an observation from a senior Foreign Office civil servant in 1937 that Germany had more concern about Britain than any other power. However, it then proceeds to consider the years 1919 to 1931 and identifies the dramatic fall in defence expenditure by 1922 and its maintenance at that relatively low figure over the following decade. It also cites the Ten Year Rule and gives the views of the military leaders of the armed forces about Britain's military capacity in relation to a war in Europe in 1930 and 1931. Apart from the opening sentence of the source, which gives a different view, Source A shows Britain's lack of readiness, and it could be argued inability, as well as reluctance in policy, to become involved in war. Source B opens with general views about a collective wish to avoid war again, but then focuses on the main events of 1938 and 1939, and how British policy reluctantly turned from appeasement to preparation for war. Responses at this level may also refer to context with use of own knowledge in relation to changes in international relations over the period. Overall both sources agree about Britain's reluctance, but both have qualifications, Source A in its first sentence and Source B in its final paragraph.

Level 3 answers will show explicit understanding with selective evidence that both sources overall demonstrate Britain's reluctance through the views and information given. However, there may be consideration, if only briefly, of the qualifications made. There should also be some reference to context, e.g. British governments or Chamberlain had to deal with dictators

like Hitler in much of the 1930s compared with the governments of democratic (Weimar) Germany before 1933. Own knowledge does not have to be over-extensive, but assessment of the considerable degree of agreement in the sources should be demonstrated.

Level 4 responses will contain a sustained judgement on the extent of agreement with selective, relevant material from own knowledge to support the essential focus on a comparison of the detail and overall messages of both sources about the factors that made Britain reluctant to become involved in war.

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

'Neville Chamberlain's agreement with Hitler at Munich in September 1938 was as much the result of British public opinion during the inter-war years as it was fear of German power.'

Assess the validity of this view.

(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 is a synoptic question and reward should be given for argument which achieves balance in considering the relative significance of public opinion throughout the inter-war period and fear of German power in leading Chamberlain to make the Munich Agreement. Source A refers to government policies of limited defence expenditure, the Ten Year Rule, and the view of the

Chiefs of Staff in 1930 and 1931 that Britain had 'nil' capacity to intervene in a war on the continent. On the other hand the first sentence refers to Germany's 'uneasiness' about Britain's position rather than the reverse. The point may be developed by own knowledge that in September 1938 Chamberlain was actually prepared to go to war if Hitler invaded rather than make an agreement over the Sudetenland. There is no reference to public opinion in Source A. Source B on the other hand implies that public opinion (and probably British governments) wanted to avoid war, e.g. 'the horror' of the First World War and 'any compromise' being 'acceptable'. This is the source's context for Chamberlain's agreeing the secession of the Sudetenland and 'Peace in our time'. The second paragraph of the source describes the later change in policy given Hitler's outright aggression against Czechoslovakia and Poland. Own knowledge/comment may be made that this change was made reluctantly given previous governments' policies and especially Chamberlain's efforts to avoid war over the Sudetenland Crisis. The change in public opinion to face reality also came about reluctantly given the desire to avoid another Great War, evident since 1919 and perhaps most vividly illustrated by Chamberlain's rapturous reception on arrival back in Britain from the Munich Conference. Source C gives the recollection of one ordinary civilian in her reaction to both Munich and the outbreak of war, but was probably very much in line with general public opinion.

Responses should utilise own knowledge to consider both the impact/influence of public opinion and fear of German power on Chamberlain's policy on seeking agreement with Hitler. After 1918–1919 public opinion was generally desirous of avoiding another horrific war. Few families had been without deaths or serious injuries. Some guilt complex emerged about the harshness of Versailles. Lloyd George was unpopular for his belligerent attitude over 'Chanak'. There was support for the 'Locarno spirit', the Kellogg-Briand Pact and working through the League. However, the main manifestations of pacifist/peace opinion emerged in the 1930s (at the time of development of Hitler's policies), for example with the PPU., the Oxford Union debate, the Peace Ballot, the Fulham by-election and culminated with Chamberlain's reception after Munich. Similarly own knowledge should be used to illustrate government policies which remained desirous of avoiding war during the inter-war period. During the 1920s the fear of German power receded with the realisation that Germany had been fully defeated and Weimar governments followed peaceful and co-operative policies. For example MacDonald's promotion of the Geneva Protocol and support for the League and collective security, agreement over the Dawes and Young Plans, Austen Chamberlain's work with Stresemann and Briand to reach international agreements followed by participation in the World Disarmament Conference in the early 1930s, essentially revealed no fear of German power. The change came after Hitler's accession to power. Accommodation with Mussolini and the attempted Hoare-Laval plan over Abyssinia (which was in this instance unpopular with the British public) and non-intervention in the Spanish Civil War illustrated policies of avoiding war. There were many reasons for appeasement. Fear of German power was one. It developed as appeasement failed to prevent Hitler's aggressive policies and his gains. This became apparent with acceptance of Hitler's breaking of the disarmament clauses of Versailles (which included the naval agreement), his remilitarisation of the Rhineland and occupation of Austria. Appeasement was well-established by government policies and supported by public opinion long before the Sudetenland Crisis. Chamberlain turned appeasement into an active policy which reached its culmination at Munich.

Level 1 answers will use material from own knowledge or the sources, which will be thin and mostly descriptive. At Level 2 material will be fuller in terms of information, but lack range and depth and/or will be assertive in argument. Level 3 responses will contain evidence from the sources and own knowledge (though not necessarily equally) considering and making some evaluation of the relative significance of both public opinion and fear of German power. Level 4 answers will cover in depth both elements, have consistent analysis and make clear judgements on the issues. There may be appreciation that governments in particular had to deal with a very different international situation and different government in Germany during most of the 1930s

compared with the international co-operation and democratic Weimar governments of the 1920s. At Level 5 there will be conceptual awareness with sustained judgement based on a wide, selective range of evidence. There may be reference to the historiographical debates on appeasement.

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

'He created the situation that led to his own downfall in 1922.'

'The Conservatives kept him in power only as long as they needed him.'

Which view about Lloyd George in the years 1918 to 1922 is the more convincing?

(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

This is a synoptic question and focus should be on both views given: Lloyd George's mistakes and weaknesses (as opposed to his qualities/successes) as against the Conservative's relations with, and need for, him within the Coalition government. A balanced view is sought, but responses may argue more in favour of one rather than the other. In 1918 Lloyd George was virtually unassailable as the leading politician in Britain. He was 'the man who had won the War'. His dominance was enhanced by the overwhelming 'Coupon' Election victory of the Coalition government (although the Labour Party had left and began to provide some clear opposition). His reputation as a statesman (and not just as a politician) was in part enhanced by his dominance of foreign policy, notably at the Paris Peace Conference, but also at other international conferences to 1922. However, even in 1919 his foreign policy was criticised. Some Conservatives regarded the Versailles Treaty as too lenient. Then intervention in Russia was unsuccessful, as was the Genoa Conference. The most significant failure however, in terms of relations with the Conservatives over foreign policy, was his belligerent approach to Turkey over the 1922 Chanak incident. What were perceived as developing failures in foreign policy by the public, as well as by many Conservatives, undermined considerably his previous reputation as a statesman and a competent national leader. Similarly in domestic policies there were increasingly mistakes rather than success as time passed from 1918–1922. Early successes in housing, industrial relations (in ending disputes involving miners and dockers), and National Insurance were undermined. The housing programme was cut along with other expenditure (e.g. in implementing the 1918 Education Act) by the Geddes Axe in early 1922; there was avoidance of a General Strike in 1921, but relations with the miners remained sour, and widespread unemployment developed. Lloyd George's Irish policy lurched from an attempt at outright repression (with brutality) to eventual compromise with Sinn Féin, a solution which many Conservatives (with their traditional support for Unionism) disliked intensely. The honours scandal and stories about Lloyd George's private life also undermined any reputation for honesty and integrity. Indeed his reputation by 1922 was quite different from that of four years earlier. The crucial mistakes, in particular the 'selling' of honours to raise funds for himself and Liberals in the Coalition, and the 'warmongering' approach in the Chanak crisis, were reflected in by-election losses for the Coalition candidates. In 1916 the Conservatives, who had not been in power on their own since 1905, had come back into government in the wartime coalition governments and their MPs provided the majority of Coalition supporters in the House of Commons and particularly after the 1918 Election. However, Lloyd George was hardly the 'prisoner of the Conservatives', as he has been called, at the end of 1918 when they needed him, perhaps more than he needed them, to be certain of remaining in government and in power. However, the mistakes and some policies, as mentioned above, led to growing Conservative disillusionment over the period. Many Conservatives disliked his 'dictatorial wartime style' carried through to peacetime and his neglect of the Commons (and their presence in it). Lloyd George was particularly weakened when Bonar Law, the Conservative

leader and his main Conservative ally in the Coalition, suffered from ill-health. By 1922 Lloyd George was seen by most Conservatives, much of the press and many of the public as a scoundrel who had failed to deliver the promises made in 1918 at the time of victory and was abusing his position as Prime Minister. By-election defeat of a Coalition candidate by an independent Conservative helped persuade most Conservative MPs at the Carlton Club meeting in the autumn of 1922 that 'a dynamic force is a very terrible thing' (Baldwin). Over the four years from 1918 Lloyd George's reputation increasingly worsened in the eyes of Conservatives and the public. Disillusionment reached a peak in 1922. Most Conservative MPs, many of whom had their loyalty to Lloyd George stretched too far by the Prime Minister's actions, realised that they no longer needed him to remain in government and that they could win the next Election on their own. Labour and a still bitterly divided Liberal Party were unlikely to be able to amount a serious challenge to a Conservative Election victory in 1922. Despite Austen Chamberlain's efforts to save Lloyd George and the Coalition, the views of Baldwin and those who believed Lloyd George had become a liability through his mistakes, rather than the major asset he had once been, prevailed at the Carlton Club.

Level 1 responses will be thin in information and/or assertive in argument. At Level 2 answers will be fuller in descriptive information, but still limited in range of material and/or judgement in relation to both views. At Level 3 responses will have clear evidence about both Lloyd George himself creating the situation bringing about his downfall and the degree to which he was in effect used by the Conservatives over the period. Level 4 responses will have developed assessment on both views over the period and integrate them in a balanced argument and conclusion. Neither view is mutually exclusive. Level 5 answers will contain sustained judgement on the issues supported by a range of selective supporting evidence.

Question 3

'Economic rather than social factors brought about the changes in the leisure pursuits of British people in the years 1918 to 1951.'

How valid is this judgement.

(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

This is a synoptic question, the demands of which are to link changes in leisure pursuits with causation by economic and social factors throughout the period. There should be explanation of which kind of factor, economic or social, was more significant. Some of the changes were made possible by improvements in transport. Rail had been available for decades, but cycling became popular, not only as a means to travel to work, but also for leisure. As a relatively cheap form of activity it thrived during the 1930s Depression. Economic and technical advances made not only cycling a social activity accessible to many but also had effects in many other areas of leisure activity. The motor car made an impact, although it was not affordable to the less than wealthy until the 1930s. The 1939–1945 War temporarily halted its use for leisure, and there was only limited revival during 'austerity' before 1951. Longer holidays, especially with the 1938 Holidays with Pay Act, which was a political initiative, led to seaside resorts (and Butlin's) developing in the 1930s and again after the War. The working classes in particular took advantage of affordable holidays. Hotels, boarding houses and youth

hostels all expanded in number both before and after the Second World War. More routine activities such as leisure reading, use of libraries, visits to the countryside, all increased. The major developments in media in the inter-war period were of radio and cinema with the latter becoming a main social activity of vast numbers including the unemployed for whom it was affordable. ('Going to the dogs' (greyhound racing) was also affordable by the unemployed.) Television had limited impact before 1951 with sets being expensive and beyond the reach of most of the working classes. Dance halls and 'pubs' continued to thrive. Essentially economic and technical progress, seen most clearly in the development of new industries, helped to improve the standard of living for most with increases in real wages even during the Depression years, the Second World War and from 1945–1951. This enabled them to enjoy new and changing leisure activities. The most disadvantaged in terms of leisure were the unemployed between the wars. Many of the changes in leisure activities were accelerated by the new social roles of women after the First World War and helped by time-saving household gadgets available in the home, brought about by economic and technical advances in which the spread of the use of electricity was central. More women participated in sport, although the main games of football and cricket were still mainly watched by male spectators. Nevertheless the lowering of class barriers during the Wars helped to make available a greater range of leisure pursuits to both men and women. American influence on leisure pursuits was also significant. Overall both economic and social changes produced both the spare time and relative affluence for the increase in range and pursuit of leisure activities. The development of the Welfare State and education after 1945 also assisted in providing opportunity to participate in leisure pursuits. In the later part of the period celebration of VE Day and visits to the Festival of Britain perhaps typified the change for many Britons that life was about enjoyment and relaxation as well as work.

Level 1 answers will have only limited information and/or be assertive in attempted argument. At Level 2 responses will have fuller material, but be limited in range and argument. Level 3 answers will contain information about changes in leisure activities clearly linked with economic and social factors. At Level 4 responses will have overall clarity with emphasis on both economic and social factors (and possibly a wider range of factors) as the causes of change in leisure pursuits across the period. Level 5 answers will have sustained judgement in analysing the part played by both economic and social changes and also refer to other factors such as political action or technical innovation.

Question 4

'In the years 1929 to 1935 Ramsay MacDonald, as Prime Minister, was in office, but it was Stanley Baldwin who was politically dominant.'

Assess the validity of this statement.

(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

The synoptic demands require an assessment of the relative positions of the two leaders in terms of political power and influence. There were two clear periods, the first of the Labour government from 1929–1931 and the second of the National government from 1931–1935.

The formation of a Labour government in 1929 was not surprising as it was the largest Party following the 1929 Election, gaining 288 seats, 28 more than the Conservatives, and had benefited from a moderate stance. The Liberals, despite their far-sighted programme, had failed to attract the electorate, partly because Lloyd George was still not trusted, and won just 59 seats. Nevertheless they held the balance of power and, as previously in 1924, chose to allow MacDonald to form a government, but again as a minority Labour administration. This status put MacDonald and the government in a vulnerable position. There were some successes (Housing Act, reduced hours for miners, Agricultural Marketing Act, origins of unified London Transport), but attempts at constitutional reform, raising the school leaving age and repeal of the Trade Disputes Act all failed, essentially because of Conservative (and Liberal) opposition. Baldwin was in a strong position as Opposition leader to damage MacDonald and his government (as, it could be argued, he did in 1924). However, MacDonald pursued moderate policies and had the 'Red Clydesiders' well under control. His position reflected the reality of not having an overall majority in the Commons. Baldwin chose to act moderately also and frequently adopted a muted critical approach to the government. Indeed he came under intense criticism from some sections of the Conservative Party for his perceived lacklustre, and certainly less than robust, opposition to MacDonald. Until the crises of 1931 MacDonald was an effective Prime Minister in power as far as he could be, given his minority position. However, the government's life came to be dominated by the increasing unemployment and finally the financial and political crises of 1931. The government was not in control of the effects of the Wall Street Crash (although it can be argued that the adoption of solutions offered by Keynes and Mosley might have produced some amelioration at least). As a minority government it was not surprising that deciding how to react to crises on such a scale split the Labour Cabinet and led to the resignation of the government. MacDonald believed that a national approach involving all Parties was needed, though he could persuade only a few of his Party to go with him. In 1931 he was seen as a traitor by the vast majority of Labour MPs and members, and indeed was expelled from the Party. Baldwin (and the King) played a crucial role in persuading MacDonald to head the new Coalition government. The new Cabinet had four Labour, four Conservative and two Liberal members initially. The Conservatives and most Liberals supported it. However, Baldwin became the real leader of the National government after the 1931 Election with its overwhelming victory for that government with 554 MPs of whom 473 were Conservatives. Though MacDonald was Prime Minister, policy was essentially decided by Baldwin and the Conservatives. It was useful politically for them to have MacDonald (with Snowden as Chancellor) as the figurehead of a government which increased taxes, cut salaries of government employees, left the Gold Standard and introduced protection. National government policies in relation to the depressed economy and unemployment did include measures such as 'cheap money' and the 1934 Special Areas Act. Whilst of some help, the small number of Opposition Labour MPs advocated much stronger measures. Like domestic policy, foreign policy was also directed by Baldwin and the Conservatives, though there was not great debate about its direction. Opposition to war was widespread throughout the Parties. There was general agreement to work through the League and collective security. Japan and Italy were allowed to go largely unchecked by Britain in Manchuria and Abyssinia respectively. MacDonald was essentially still a pacifist as was Lansbury as Opposition leader. Baldwin was not, and actually included a proposal to re-arm in his 1935 Election campaign, but the Conservative hold on the Foreign Office and indeed the government itself meant developed appeasement policies which gained general support. The economic situation did not encourage extensive spending on defence. Politically MacDonald, though remaining as Prime Minister, had been broken by the 1931 crises. Failing health and declining influence within the Coalition in terms of leadership as well as policy, led to his decision to stand down in 1935. Though the number of Coalition MPs was reduced in that Election, the proportion of Conservatives actually increased. Baldwin became Prime Minister to gain the office which he had increasingly and effectively dominated from 1931.

Level 1 answers will contain only outline information and/or be assertive in argument. Level 2 answers will be fuller in terms of factual evidence, but be limited in range and argument about the relative positions of MacDonald and Baldwin. At Level 3 answers will demonstrate clear knowledge and understanding about the relative positions of the two leaders and how they changed over the whole period. Level 4 responses will demonstrate clarity on the synoptic demands to deliver a balanced answer, with differentiation in conclusions about the two periods and governments, 1929–1931 and 1931–1935. Level 5 answers will display sustained judgement in dealing with the synoptic demands and justify a balanced conclusion.

Question 5

'Britain's economic recovery in the years 1931 to 1939 took place because new industries compensated for the decline of the staple industries.'

Assess the validity of this statement.

(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

This is a synoptic question and focus should be on a synthesis to produce a balanced argument and evidence concerning both aspects in the context of recovery of the economy following the disruption and the high unemployment of the worst Depression years after the Wall Street Crash. In fact unemployment figures peaked in 1932 so recovery can hardly be said to have been started before that date. Regional variations should be taken into account. Those parts of the country largely reliant on the old staple industries suffered the worst unemployment levels and deep depression. The four great staple industries, textiles, coal, iron and steel, and shipbuilding had dominated Britain's exports before 1914 and briefly during the short-lived boom after 1918, but only limited investment and modernisation were introduced during the inter-war years. Decline was evident during the 1920s and exacerbated by depression during the 1930s. Crucially, staple exports were no longer in such great demand following abandonment of most exports during the Great War and establishment of severe competition in the pre-war markets. Moreover oil and electricity had begun to replace coal as a source of power, artificial fibres (e.g. rayon) reduced demand for textiles, and greater carrying capacity in ships reduced orders for new ones. Generally there was poor management in all of the staple industries to accompany the lack of modernisation of equipment and methods, most noticeably in the coal industry. The return to the Gold Standard from 1925 had hit the staple industries and particularly coal hard. Even its abandonment in 1931 did not help in the context of the onset of the world depression. Decline and the rate of unemployment might have continued during the 1930s in a similar way to that of the previous decade, but was intensified by the 'Great Depression'. By the end of 1930 there were about two and a half million unemployed, and in 1932 over three million, the bottom of the trough in the Depression. The workers and communities hit hardest were those where the old staple industries dominated, especially in the north-east, industrialised Scotland and South Wales. Undoubtedly throughout the 1930s the decline of the staple industries was responsible for most of the ongoing unemployment and 'depression' of the British economy. Unemployment still stood at the 'intractable million' in 1939. However, the gradual introduction of re-armament did help recovery with some increased demand for steel and ships in particular. By way of contrast some parts of Britain saw the emergence and development of new industries, mostly powered by electricity during the 1930s. In the main they were not based in

the areas of the staple industries, but in the Midlands and South. The major growth was in cars, transport especially in London, household and consumer electrical goods, chemicals, large retail stores, cinemas, the 'holiday industry', and, perhaps most importantly, construction especially of housing. Some unemployed workers did move to areas which were relatively unaffected by unemployment, but the vast majority could or would not. Unemployment statistics showed a marked contrast between some towns in the South of England with little unemployment (e.g. Oxford, St Albans) with others with extensive unemployment in the North, Scotland and South Wales (e.g. Sunderland, Glasgow, Merthyr Tydfil). Many, especially those in the Midlands and the South, saw a rising standard of living during the decade of the 1930s with the developments in industry, housing and transport. Undoubtedly the growth of the new industries helped recovery and balance in the economy. They offset the ravages in the parts of the country dominated by the staple industries. Answers may refer to other factors which helped economic recovery and in particular government policies. They did little directly to tackle the causes of unemployment and were largely reactive. Their effects were limited in reducing unemployment especially in the staple industry regions. Protection did help British industries but mainly in the longer term. Low interest rates did help expansion of new industries. They also greatly stimulated house building with relatively cheap mortgages available. The Special Areas Act of 1934 gave only limited financial aid to areas hit by the Depression. Changes in the dole, including abolition of the means test, also did little to stimulate economic activity and thereby reduce unemployment in the worst hit areas. On the other hand re-armament programmes helped to reduce unemployment from c1935.

Level 1 responses will be thin in information and/or assertive in argument. At Level 2 answers will be fuller in descriptive information, but still limited in range of material and/or assessment of the relative significance of decline of the staple industries and success of the new. At Level 3 responses will have clear evidence on the decline of the staples and development of new industries to achieve a balanced argument about their effects on economic recovery. Level 4 responses will have clarity and developed assessment in comparison of the two kinds of industries to present a balanced view. Historiographical debate may be cited. Level 5 answers will contain sustained and balanced judgement on how far the new industries' relative successes did compensate for the decline in the staples supported by a range of selective evidence.

Question 6

'Labour won the 1945 General Election because of the poor record of the Conservatives in the 1930s rather than because of its own appeal.'

How convincing is this view?

(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

This is a synoptic question and answers should weigh the arguments about Labour's appeal (by and in 1945) and the Conservative record before the War. Labour's appeal was based on the political climate favouring a fresh start for Britain after six years of total war. It produced a manifesto, *Let us Face the Future*, containing constructive proposals based on its experience in

war with the country having experienced 'wartime socialism' through government, state and collective action for the public good. Planning and increased egalitarianism had been hallmarks of wartime experience and Labour intended to carry them forward. Its programme had much broader appeal than just to the working classes as had been the case in the 1930s. Young people, many of them voting for the first time, and particularly huge numbers in the forces were attracted to Labour's programme. At its heart were firm commitments to full implementation of the *Beveridge Report*, proposals to (re)construct housing through central planning, nationalisation, and a promise to continue to weaken class divisions. Labour's leading members had had successful ministerial experience, especially on the home front, in Churchill's Coalition government. Labour ministers had been seen as effective as Conservatives in bringing Britain to victory in the War. Attlee as Labour leader, though lacking the dynamism of Churchill, suited the mood of peacetime.

For the Conservatives there was a lack of trust in 1945 about the future and even Churchill's war leadership record could not overcome the highly significant tainting of the Conservative Party's record in office during the 1930s. In particular they were associated with mass unemployment, social deprivation and appeasement. Not until the War had the 'intractable one million' found work and the experience of the War made Conservative efforts to reduce unemployment and ameliorate poverty during the 1930s seem feeble in the eyes of many – and not just in the working classes. Lack of preparedness for war and appeasement of the dictators, especially by Chamberlain, came to be seen as totally inadequate responses to the demands of Hitler in particular and in part responsible for the outbreak of the war and also its long duration. The Conservatives as a Party retained an outdated image from the 1930s in 1945 and lacked clear policies for post-war Britain especially when compared with Labour's programme.

Also important as a factor in the outcome of the 1945 Election was the performance of the Conservatives in the campaign itself. Churchill was their main electoral asset, but he made mistakes in making what came to be regarded as rather absurd attacks on his erstwhile Coalition partners in the Labour Party especially in his 'Gestapo' speech. However, analysis of the outcome of the 1945 Election and explanation of the Labour landslide came mainly after the event. The results surprised both Labour and the Conservatives with the expectation at the time that Churchill, given his record both in opposition to appeasement and then as wartime leader, would be returned to power. He remained popular, but this was not sufficient to overcome the record of his Party during the 1930s.

Level 1 answers will be limited in argument and mostly descriptive. At Level 2 material will be fuller in terms of information, but lack range and depth and/or will be assertive in argument. Level 3 responses will contain evidence about both Labour's appeal and the Conservative record and how they compared in the 1945 Election. Level 4 answers will cover in depth both aspects affecting the Election result, have consistent analysis and make clear judgements about the issue for both parties. At Level 5 there will be conceptual awareness with sustained judgement based on a wide, selective range of evidence to produce a clear synthesis.

Question 7

How far was Britain's limited role in the reconstruction of Europe, in the years 1945 to 1951, the result of her economic weakness rather than a lack of political will?

(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

This is a synoptic question that should produce responses which are balanced in assessing economic and political factors. Better answers may question whether Britain's role was in fact limited, at least in the context of European countries, as opposed to the dominant role of the USA. The full extent of Britain's relative loss of not only economic strength but also international political influence was not fully appreciated in 1945 as Britain had been on the victorious side in the War against Germany and Japan. Carrying the burden of wartime destruction, dislocation and huge debts, many of which were under the Lend-Lease arrangements with the USA, the British economy was heading for bankruptcy after 1945, but was saved largely by American action. The Labour government, despite its enormous post-war problems at home, wished to assist in the economic recovery of Western Europe, but this amounted to relatively little because of Britain's own economic weakness and requirements for recovery after the War. Indeed Western European economic recovery, including that of Britain itself, was derived from American aid. Britain gained an initial large loan (\$3750 million/£1100 million) and easing of payments on the Lend-Lease debt, negotiated by Keynes. The new arrangements were crucial in allowing government expenditure on reconstruction and indeed getting the peacetime economy off the ground. However, the loan had been entirely used by 1947 and economic prospects were further damaged by the cold winter. Real recovery of the British economy did not begin to take off until late in 1947 with Marshall Aid from which Britain gained more (£700 million from 1948–1951) than any other country. That aid was a gift. However, Marshall Aid was linked to, and implied co-operation with, the political and military policies of the Truman Doctrine in the Cold War. Improved standards of living in Europe were to make communism appear less attractive. Britain, as the main European ally of the USA, had to be made stable economically so it could play a political and military role, which the Labour governments wished to do. Bevin, as Foreign Secretary, was instrumental in responding to Marshall Aid and formation of the OEEC in 1948 to administer the programme of economic recovery. However, economic problems and financial difficulties forced the withdrawal of British military help to the Greek and Turkish governments in their struggles with communism in 1947. The state of the economy and finances might have forced a similar withdrawal from India and Palestine if the Labour government had not in any case decided to withdraw from both. In fact British withdrawal from India was the most significant retreat of British power in the twentieth century up to that time and, even if part of Labour government policy, was nevertheless a reflection of not only Britain's loss of pre-eminence as an international power after 1945, but also made necessary by her economic position. Withdrawal did enable Britain to pay more attention to continental Europe. It was, after all, from Europe that war had originated in 1939 and near invasion in 1940.

With the support from Marshall Aid it became possible for Britain to play a role based on political action in the reconstruction of Europe. However, it was a subsidiary role, given that it was her two main wartime allies, which emerged as the 'superpowers' despite the government's

determination to develop nuclear weapons. At the end of the Second World War Churchill had advocated closer European Union and was the first to use the term 'Iron Curtain'. Bevin was determined that Britain should still play a significant role in international affairs alongside the two superpowers. Britain developed closer, direct political and military links with her near continental neighbours in the Dunkirk (1947) and Brussels (1948) Treaties. Initially these 'alliances' were aimed at a possible revived Germany, but in practice the USSR became the enemy. Britain joined the new Council of Europe in 1950, but Attlee's government was lukewarm on this aspect of European links and ensured it had little positive role and vague aims. More crucially important, politically and militarily, was reaction to the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia and the Soviet blockade of Berlin in 1948. Stalin reacted to the close union of the western zones in Germany and Berlin. The military co-ordination, particularly of the USA and Britain (recalling Second World War co-operation) in defeating the blockade led directly to the establishment of NATO. It gave collective security to its members and implied collective action, if necessary, against the USSR. It also led to the involvement of Britain in the Korean War in the belief that Communist success in the Far East could lead to new aggression in Europe. Overall the USA took the lead in both the economic reconstruction and political/military measures to rebuild Western Europe in the period, but Britain was her closest ally in all of these aspects. Her input was made decidedly greater politically, and also militarily, given the help with her own economic revival. Britain's role, therefore, in the reconstruction of Europe was limited, but in some ways more extensive than might have been expected in 1945 at the end of the War.

Level 1 responses will be thin in factual content and/or assertive in argument. Level 2 answers will have fuller information, but still be limited in evaluation of Britain's role in the reconstruction of Europe. At Level 3 responses will be clear about Britain's role in the reconstruction with clear links to both economic weakness and political will. Level 4 answers will consider the limitations on Britain's role within a clear and developed context of economic and political factors, with understanding of Britain's reduced international status after 1945, to provide an informed and balanced synopsis. At Level 5 responses will provide a wide range of evidence to support sustained judgement and balanced conclusion.