



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative U Unit 5

Mark Scheme

2007 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 © 2007 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 2007

Alternative U: Britain, 1929–1998

A2 Unit 5: Britain 1951–1997

Question 1

- (a) Use **Sources B** and **C** and use your own knowledge.
To what extent do these two sources agree in their view of the 1951 general election?
(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 use both extracts to show that it was a closely fought election. Level 2 answers should start to demonstrate a more accurate grasp of the evidence, pairing a series of source extracts to show differences of attitudes. Source B points out that Labour was unlucky in defeat – ‘we had almost everything against us’ whereas Source C concentrates mainly on the consequences and the fact that, despite winning the election, Churchill had to maintain the post-war consensus. For Level 3, candidates should show that there is a clear difference in the attitude and tone. Source B has a rather negative, bitter tone and suggests the Conservatives benefited unfairly, post-1951, from Labour’s tough policies after the war – ‘destined to coast along into the economically easy years of the 1950s.’ It further suggests that Attlee unnecessarily called an election and thus the Conservatives were again lucky. Source C develops the theme of the close result of 1951 and suggests that this was the reason why the Conservatives felt obliged to pursue policies laid down by Labour. Some recognition of Douglas Jay’s position, i.e. Labour’s Treasury Minister, and tone throughout Source B may be flagged up and commented on. Candidates should also note that Source C highlights a second consequence – that 1951 put Labour into the wilderness through in-fighting. Source B does not comment on this aspect directly, although it makes a brief reference to the Bevanite quarrel. To attain Level 4, candidates should develop fully the aspect of provenance and highlight the pro-Labour, wishful thinking of Douglas Jay’s extract – if only Attlee had not called an election when he did Labour would have got all the credit for the next few years. Candidates also may use their own knowledge to evaluate which view of 1951 is more ‘correct’. As always, Level 4 answers should highlight not only the importance of words and phrases but also the author’s interpretations and overall meaning.

- (b) Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.
 'Labour disunity, rather than the 'post-war consensus', was the main reason why the Conservatives dominated British politics in the years 1951 to 1964.
 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

The question demands a balanced assessment of the developments in British politics after 1951, resulting in 13 years of Conservative dominance. It focuses on Labour's own difficulties and divisions and balances them against the impact, real or debatable, of a post-war consensus. Candidates have a good amount of material to use both from the sources and own knowledge. They should be aware of the exhaustion facing Labour in 1951 and the open split between the Gaitskellites and the Bevanites which extended into the 1950s. Key policies should be referred to, especially nuclear disarmament and trade union power. Some candidates may appropriately examine the whole debate surrounding the phrase 'post-war consensus', but should make sure they link their evaluation to the question, which also requires an analysis of the reasons for Conservative dominance. In fact, was their success due to the consensus? Or was it just good luck inheriting 'the economically easy years'? How much did the unity and managerial competence of the Conservatives, such as MacMillan and Butler, play in their success? Clearly there are several possible approaches – we should not expect answers to be comprehensive or even in coverage of the factors and/or period. Successful answers will not just 'lift' phrases from the sources but use them selectively to support an argued case for or against the proposition and will make explicit use of the three sources.

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

'The Sixties saw an old world die and a new one born.'

How convincing is this assessment of society and culture in Britain between the late 1950s and the early 1970s? (20 marks)

Indicative content

This question requires a direct assessment of the types of social and cultural changes in Britain from the late 1950s to the early 1970s. Some candidates may pursue a line of attack used by Marwick, that there was an actual social revolution starting in 1958 and finishing in the early 1970s. This would support the quotation and better candidates should try and show change over time. However, candidates should not see the question as a simple 'was there a social revolution between these dates or not?' question. Better answers will also avoid a simple, stereotyping of the changes, particularly listing those of 'youth culture' and trends in music etc. Successful answers will allow a debate to take place, that suggests that some change took place but the 'new world' that came to birth, in fact, was not necessarily one for the better. Some candidates, of course, may strongly challenge the view that 'an old world' did in fact actually die. Effective answers will be synoptic in that they discuss the period as a whole. It is likely, and valid, that some answers, often good ones, will bring in ideas and material on change that go outside of the actual dates, as long as this is part of an argued case and not just description for its own sake.

Question 3

'Harold Wilson came to power promising a brave new world; the reality was an era of disappointment.'

How valid is this verdict on the Labour Government's record in power in the years 1964 to 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

This question offers a deliberately contentious theme – that Harold Wilson came to power in 1964 on a wave of expectation and idealism, fuelled by the 'white heat of the technological revolution'. By 1970, Labour was judged to be in some difficulty and its time in power seemed to be ebbing away. Candidates are asked to assess whether in fact this is a fair verdict on Labour's time in power and, if so, how much was Wilson to blame and/or what are the other factors in the difficulties which faced Labour? Candidates should respond with a balanced assessment, choosing to agree, to challenge or to re-define the premise of the question. Balance here means that Wilson's personal contribution, and the Labour Government's in general, must be examined, with particular focus on the situation confronting Labour in 1964 and how it dealt with the next 6 years. Wilson came to power with a high reputation based on his successes in opposition; by 1970 his government was in deep trouble. Good answers will differentiate between the self-inflicted actions of Labour and the attempts by Heath and the Conservatives to exploit the situation. Good answers will also be aware of the massive

difficulties Wilson faced in keeping such a fractious party together, especially over key economic and political issues between 1964 and 1970.

Question 4

'A golden age.'

'A period of continuous decline.'

Which of these statements provides the more convincing assessment of the performance of the British economy in the years 1964 to 1979? (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 key requirement is a clearly argued response to the twin quotations. Answers should endeavour to demonstrate one of them to be 'correct', or mostly so, and in doing so refute the other. Strong answers may well reject or re-define both statements and suggest a third, more accurate interpretation. Balanced answers do not have to sit on the fence but must have a synoptic overview of the period, 1964–1979. Candidates are invited to assess whether there was continuous decline, perhaps uneven decline, or success in the period. Effective answers will examine the ambitious policies of the Wilson governments from 1964; the Heath period and the effects of the economic crisis of 1973/1974; and the run-up to the 'Winter of Discontent'. Good candidates may introduce material that either pre-dates 1964 or post-dates 1979 to add greater relevance to their case. However, a balanced answer need not involve complete or even coverage as long as both aspects of the question are addressed in context. This answer cannot properly be attempted merely by way of a descriptive account of the period – it requires differentiation across the period.

Question 5

'The economic advantages of being a member of the EEC far outweighed any political fears.'

How valid is this assessment of Britain's relationship with Europe in the years 1973 to 1997? (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

As this question examines a complex, highly controversial issue facing Britain over a period of more than 20 years, it is not essential to provide comprehensive coverage of all these years. The core of the question revolves around a contentious suggestion and good candidates should be able to debate Britain's dilemma – her decision to join, and remain in Europe after the 1975 referendum – in the context of the pluses and minuses of entry since 1973. Candidates should note the changing political stances of the two main parties, especially a paradox in that it was divisions within Labour that led initially to the 1975 referendum and the hostility to Europe was most pronounced on the Labour Left until the late 1980s; at this point the Eurosceptic tide started running more significantly in the Conservative Party, especially against Maastricht. Good candidates may use the 1975 referendum as a reference point – statistically it was successful but what agendas – positive and negative – did it release after this point within both parties and across Britain in general? All the key issues – Euroscepticism; further integration or not; loss of British sovereignty; her position on the world stage; political and economic control over her own destiny – should be examined. The best answers may well differentiate, showing for example that Mrs Thatcher's position changed over time; how the national press influenced the debate; or how divisions over Europe persisted within the Labour Party, although overshadowed by Conservative in-fighting. It is perfectly valid to highlight New Labour's and Tony Blair's position and the most effective answers will focus on explanation and assessment of the two main factors, not just comprehensive narratives. Candidates will not be rewarded for opinionated diatribes which are long on assertion and weak on argument.

Question 6

'Margaret Thatcher did not "turn Britain around" despite her claims to have done so.'
How convincing is this view of the record of the Conservative governments in the years
1979 to 1990? (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 question attempts to evaluate the achievements of Margaret Thatcher's governments over a period of eleven years by offering the premise that in terms of substance her impact and effect on Britain was less than successful. What is proposed is that she attempted to convince the public that she had made a difference. Candidates should look at her aims, and the policies of the Conservative governments in general, with a particular emphasis on the results and consequences of her period in power. Thatcher clearly is a highly contentious character; likewise the nature and impact of Thatcherism itself. Successful answers will be aware of the degree of change and 'revolution' achieved by 1990. Candidates should note the three phases to her time in power and differentiate between the successes and failures in each. Effective answers may well accept or reject the proposition of the question as a whole – or make a response that agrees with part of the question but challenge the other. Candidates can score highly using the timeframe of 1979 to 1990 but many strong answers may go outside the period to give further context to what Thatcher and/or Thatcherism achieved. As there is a wealth of information, much highly biased itself, candidates will not be expected to give equal coverage to all her periods. What is important is the ability to highlight the central proposition – were her achievements more illusory than real, in her attempt to 'turn Britain around'?

Question 7

'Conservative weakness, rather than any reorganisation of the Labour Party under Tony Blair, was the main reason for Labour's landslide victory in the 1997 general election.'

How valid is this explanation?

(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 question centres on the reasons behind Labour's landslide victory of 1997. It invites candidates to make a balanced assessment between the internal divisions and weaknesses of the Conservative Party and the re-emergence of Labour under Tony Blair. Candidates should note that, even though the timescale suggests a culmination in 1997, there are many valid factors before 1990 that might be deployed, affecting the chances of either main party. Some effective answers may view the 1980s and 1990s as a whole, analysing the long-term causes of Conservative decline – these may include the flawed record of Margaret Thatcher or paradoxically the long-term foundations of Labour recovery under Kinnock. Equally, many good answers will focus attention on the internal divisions of the Conservatives after 1992, such as BSE, 'sleaze', and particularly the economic minefield that was the ERM and the damage it did to Conservative economic competence. Some answers will argue that 1997 was simply a case for 'time for a change', much like 1951 and 1979, and that New Labour's influence has been greatly exaggerated. As usual, Level 4 and Level 5 answers should provide an analytical argument and selective evidence. They should prioritise and differentiate between a range of factors so that the result is a coherent, balanced argument.