



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative R Unit 6W

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 R: Britain, 1895–1951

A2 Unit 6: Changes in the Provision of Education, 1918–1951

(a) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.

Assess the validity of the view in **Source A** about attitudes to secondary schools.

(10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- | | | |
|-----|--|-------------|
| L1: | Summarises the content of the extract and the interpretation it contains. | 1-2 |
| L2: | Demonstrates understanding of the interpretation and relates to own knowledge. | 3-5 |
| L3: | As L2, and evaluation of the interpretation is partial. | 6-8 |
| L4: | Understands and evaluates the interpretation and relates to own knowledge to reach a sustained and well supported judgement on its validity. | 9-10 |

Indicative content

Level 1 answers will summarise the content of the source, and/or contain limited knowledge about modern and technical schools being seen as less desirable than grammar schools for secondary education. At Level 2 there should be explanation of reasons given in the source about attitudes with consideration of at least two. Just one main reason is given for the unattractiveness of the modern school, its lack of prestige for parents, although there is also reference to the modern school as ‘a pale imitation’ of the grammar school. Four reasons are given for attitudes about the relative unattractiveness of technical schools: bitter rivalry from grammar schools; lack of LEA support; schools regarded as second best; lack of ‘distinctive personality’. The source ends by pointing out how few technical schools existed compared with the number of grammar schools by 1952. Own knowledge should be used to elaborate on some of those reasons and/or to consider others. Traditionally secondary education had been for the middle classes whilst working-class children went to elementary schools. The ‘scholarship ladder’ was used to enable some bright working-class children to attend grammar schools from the age of 11. However, the vast majority of working-class children were not entered for the scholarship exam/11+ during the 1920s, though many more were by 1939. The *Hadow Report* of 1926 initiated the gradual introduction of secondary modern schools, although many working-class children had to make do with senior classes in their elementary schools until reorganisation took place with the implementation of the 1944 Act after the Second World War. The main development of tripartism took place at the end of the period with the development of some technical schools after the 1944 Act. In some places they were called, or there were similar, central schools but were used for those children who came in the ‘second tier’ having failed to gain a grammar school place. The fact that more working-class children went to grammar schools and a fair proportion to the small number of technical schools did not change the public perception, held generally by all social classes, that the grammar school provided the most desirable type of secondary education which in turn made the technical and modern schools relatively unattractive.

At Level 3 answers will acknowledge the validity of the view in the source in identifying some of the most significant reasons for the relative unattractiveness of forms of secondary education

other than in grammar schools. However, the limitations of the source should be recognised. It is much fuller and stronger on technical schools than on modern schools, and senior classes in elementary schools are not mentioned at all. Apart from elaboration on the reasons given in the source about technical schools, there can be expansion on the reasons for the relative unattractiveness of the other types of secondary schools, despite support given to technical schools by both the Spens (1938) and Norwood (1943) Reports, for example the lack of any links with university education, the likelihood of entering lower-paid work than that of grammar school contemporaries or indeed finding a job at all in some parts of the country during the 1930s. The perception that grammar schools provided the most prestigious type of (academic) secondary education was not overcome. Modern schools (and even more so senior classes) were still regarded as being in the elementary school tradition right up to the Second World War and indeed still the case in 1951 for modern schools.

Level 4 answers will contain sustained judgement on the validity of the view in the source, using own knowledge to make a clear judgement. The source contains a brief, but perceptive, analysis of the major reasons for attitudes to secondary schools, though focus is on the technical schools. Responses at this level should consider not only negative factors about non-grammar secondary schools, but also the positive reasons for the attractiveness of grammar school education. Wartime experience and the 'egalitarianism' of Labour after 1945 did little to change attitudes. There will be a clear and well-justified conclusion based on a range of evidence (Aldrich, Gordon et al, McCulloch).

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

How useful is **Source B** as an explanation of the emergence of a tripartite system of secondary schools in the years 1926 to 1951? (10 marks)

Target: A01.1, AO2

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract in relation to the issue presented in the question. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates some appreciation either of the strengths and/or of the limitations of the content of the source in relation to its utility/reliability within the context of the issue. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates reasoned understanding of the strengths and limitations of the source in the context of the issue and draws conclusions about its utility/reliability. **6-8**
- L4: Evaluates the utility/reliability of the source in relation to the issue in the question to reach a sustained and well supported judgement. **9-10**

Indicative content

Level 1 answers will summarise the extract, paraphrasing some of the reasons and factors given in the source for the emergence of the tripartite system. At Level 2 there should be some explanation of the main factors and developments for the emergence of the tripartite system given in the source: encouragement of vocational education by the Board during the inter-war years, but resistance in the grammar schools; proposals of the Spens Report; proposals of the Norwood Report. The last two were highly significant in the emergence of tripartism. Some own knowledge should be utilised to address utility of the source as a summary of the main factors involved in the emergence of the tripartite system. The information given focuses on the two major reports from Consultative Committees of the Board of Education, so apart from the

first paragraph which does refer to the whole inter-war period, the thrust of the source deals with views given, though authoritative views, in the immediate pre-war and Second World War periods. However, in terms of utility the source is limited as it does not cover the whole period from 1926–1951. There were significant developments both before 1938 and following the Norwood Report of 1943.

At Level 3 there will be clear consideration of factors given in the source as an explanation of the emergence of the tripartite system. Additionally there will be appreciation of other developments and factors. Before 1938, as the source indicates, the Board had encouraged the teaching of vocational subjects in the grammar schools, but its influence over both the LEAs and the schools themselves was limited. The first main development in what led eventually to tripartism came with the Hadow Report in 1926, which advocated ‘secondary education for all’. Whilst retaining the grammar schools it advocated a new type of secondary school for non-grammar pupils in ‘modern schools’ where there would be a bias towards ‘practical’ and ‘realistic’ education. It was the most important report of the Board of Education’s Consultative Committee in the inter-war period, although the attempts to implement its recommendations by the second Labour government failed. Nevertheless the Board accepted, without commitment to date, to re-organise education along ‘Hadow lines’. This began during the 1930s and was formalised following the 1944 Act. Both the Spens and Norwood Committees were influenced strongly by Hadow and by the educational psychologists. They developed the thinking to advocate secondary education for all, but in three different types of secondary schools, technical as well as grammar and modern. The 1943 White Paper and the 1944 Act, which are not mentioned in the source, finalised the position for the implementation of the tripartite system after the Second World War, even though the Act did not stipulate the precise nature of the types of secondary school. Responses at this level will see some limitations of, and omissions from, the source.

Level 4 answers will focus consistently on evaluation of the utility of the source as sufficient explanation of the emergence of the tripartite system through the period from 1926–1951. There will be sustained evaluation of the source, which gives important factors but with appreciation of its limitations in terms of coverage of all significant factors/developments (Aldrich, Gordon et al, McCulloch).

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

‘The attempt to achieve “parity of esteem” for different types of secondary schools had failed by 1951 because both governments and educational experts were half-hearted in their efforts to achieve it.’

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 appropriate 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 the wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

Answers should utilise both information in the sources and own knowledge to judge the validity of the view in the quotation. Source A begins with the judgement that the modern school throughout its existence did not match the prestige of the grammar schools in the eyes of parents. Indeed certainly during the 1930s and for much of the 1940s modern schools and senior classes in elementary schools were regarded as providing an education not too far removed from elementary. They were staffed by teachers trained for elementary schools, followed a curriculum that was different from that of grammar schools and, above all, were populated by working-class children. This was still the public and particularly the middle-class perception in 1951. Source A focuses mainly on the relative failure of the technical schools with reasons given for it. It points out that there were only 291 by 1951 compared with 1,189 grammar schools. It argues that the schools were seen as 'second best' despite the enthusiastic support of the Spens and Norwood Committees, which consisted of 'educational experts'. Source B argues that throughout the inter-war years the Board encouraged vocational training in grammar schools but met with resistance in the schools. Many Local Education Authorities were also unenthusiastic. Parents of grammar school pupils favoured the academic curriculum which led to relatively 'good jobs' or university. Graduate teachers in the grammar schools tended to regard the Teacher Training College non-graduate teachers, having been trained for elementary schools and later modern and technical schools, as inferior. Source B also focuses on the work of the 'educational experts' in the Spens and Norwood Committees who advocated the tripartite system of secondary education. Their views were essentially supported in the 1943 White Paper, by R. A. Butler and Coalition Labour ministers, and the 1944 Act. Source C, an extract from the 1943 White Paper, gives the clear view of the Coalition government that academic education was not right for many pupils and that the way forward was to develop vocational and technical education.

Generally, over the whole period from about 1926 to 1951, the attempts by many leading 'educational experts' to achieve 'parity of esteem' for all types of secondary schools were 'whole-hearted'. The evidence is clear from recommendations of the official committees and also individuals such as R. H. Tawney. On the other hand the attitudes and actions of governments, which possessed the powers to initiate and implement, varied. The Labour government of 1929–1931 wanted, but failed, to implement the main recommendations of Hadow, yet the Conservative and National governments before 1939–1940 were 'half-hearted' in their policies, favouring the continued position of the grammar school which catered in the

main for the middle classes. Where progress was made in relation to modern and technical schools it came from progressive Education Authorities. In Churchill's Coalition government of 1940–1945 leading Labour ministers took responsibility for much of domestic policy and strongly supported wartime developments and especially the 1944 Education Act, even though it is most closely connected with the Conservative, R. A. Butler. The Labour governments of 1945–1951 presided over the implementation of that Act and the establishment of the tripartite system, albeit with only a small number of technical schools. They saw the advance of the working classes educationally mainly through the enhanced development of the 'scholarship ladder' by the 11+ examination, but there was little effort by central government, nor indeed most LEAs, after 1945 to bring about parity of esteem for the three types of secondary schools (Gordon et al, Aldrich). The grammar schools had the graduate teachers and more resources. The brightest working-class pupils, it was presumed, would go in increasing numbers to the grammar schools alongside the middle classes. Before 1951 it was a minority in the Labour Party who advocated multilateral or comprehensive secondary schools, one of the objectives of which was to overcome the lack of 'parity of esteem' for the different types of schools. In practice the post-war Labour governments' policy involved essentially continuation of a class-structured educational system despite the changes which took place between the wars. The public school, catering for the upper and upper middle classes remained largely untouched and outside the 'state system'. Their prestige was higher than that of even the grammar schools within the 'state system', but parents and especially those in the middle classes, together with most politicians, continued to regard the grammar schools as superior to any other form of 'state' secondary education.

Level 1 answers will consist predominantly of limited description of some changes in the period and/or assertion. Level 2 responses will have fuller information, but will remain assertive and/or generalised in argument. At Level 3 answers will contain relevant information from the sources and wider own knowledge to evaluate whether the efforts of governments and educational experts were half-hearted. Level 4 responses will provide a wide range of evidence and argument to consider the reasons for the failure to achieve 'parity of esteem'. Level 5 responses will show conceptual awareness of the issue from at least the 1930s to 1951, provide clear selective evidence to assess the efforts of both governments and educational experts, explain why 'parity of esteem' was not achieved and demonstrate sustained judgement to reach a balanced conclusion (Aldrich, Gordon et al, McCulloch).