



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative U 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 U: Britain 1929–1998

A2 Unit 6: Britain and Ireland, 1969–1998

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

Assess the validity of the view in **Source B** about the RUC's response to the situation in 1969. (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

The role of the RUC, and in particular the use of the B Specials in events in Northern Ireland, is a highly contentious one, especially from an extract about the 'Battle of the Bogside'. Therefore Sir Arthur Hezlet's tribute to a group of men he viewed as 'courageous' and 'much maligned' requires careful handling in terms of validity. Tim Pat Coogan has clearly voiced the opinion that the B Specials were the rock on which any mass movement by the IRA was built. Hence candidates need to be strongly aware not only of the provenance of the source but also its intention. Likewise a clear knowledge of the situation in 1969 and how the events unfolded is critical.

Clearly the emergence of the civil rights movement within the Catholic community posed a major threat to the stability of the province. What the campaigners publicly exposed was the sectarian nature of the Northern Irish regime – hence the distrust by Catholics of the RUC, and B Specials, who were seen as instruments of Protestant oppression.

Level 1 and Level 2 answers are likely to focus on the literal evidence of Source B – the RUC were just doing their job under 'intense provocation' and were trying to keep the two communities apart. It is implied that they were just a physical presence, with no political dimension to their work. This suggests an unsympathetic response to civil rights demands and tactics.

Good answers will obviously note the following:

- Hezlet's extract is defensive of the actions of the RUC and he is attempting to show the police as victims of an exaggerated propaganda exercise set up by republicans. He refers in Source B to civil rights campaigners as 'extremists', using 'intense provocation' and stirring up 'sectarian feeling'
- Hezlet uses the BBC as a sort of benchmark for honesty – a type of authority on the truth – to try and confirm that the RUC's job was virtually impossible and that it was 'magnificent' under pressure

- Hezlet also tries to smear the civil rights movement as a cover for the Catholics' real target – the police. He suggests that the Apprentice Boys' march was always orderly (not so) and that the Catholics were not really fighting the Protestants – their main target was the RUC (Protestant-dominated).

Better answers will start to use own knowledge, and Sources A, B and C, to challenge Hezlet's view as being 'wrong' and attempt to substitute a 'correct' alternative. Very good answers may refer to the fact that the RUC was unable control the violence and that subsequently British troops were brought in as peacemakers.

- Candidates should go on to use the source and also stress the RUC response to Protestant mobs and violence, as distinct from their reaction to Catholic marches etc.
- Hezlet does not actually refer to the fact that the RUC were stretched to the limit of their capacity – hence this may account for their reaction to the trouble in the 'Bogside'. Neither does he refer to Lord Hunt's enquiry into police action in 1969. In October 1969 the report suggested the RUC should be relieved of all military duties and disarmed. The B Specials were to be replaced by a locally recruited security force under army command
- Furthermore, by omission, he does not say that the B Specials retaliated in August 1969 and stormed the 'Bogside'. This rampage caused damage to both people and property, and, in fact, inspired the Catholics to build barricades and intensify the rioting. Caroline Kennedy-Pipe clearly stresses the point that at this juncture the IRA were asked to provide arms but had little to offer. The assessment showed that they had about 10 guns! According to Kennedy-Pipe, Protestant mobs burnt empty houses to provoke the Catholic community. She goes on to say that the Protestant mob was either directly aided by the RUC or abetted by them when the RUC did nothing to prevent the attacks.

The best answers will evaluate the possible interpretations and show depth and balance in their analysis.

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

How useful is **Source A** as evidence about the increase in communal tension in 1969?
(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

Gerry Adams is probably regarded as the most well-known and controversial leader in modern Irish history. His working-class background in West Belfast, with its close ties to trade unionism and republican movements, led him to engage in direct action on the issues of housing, unemployment and civil rights at an early stage of the Troubles. Therefore, as a man who was present at the start of the action, Adams can write with some authority. On the other hand his overtly hostile attitude to all things unionist, and British, make him anything but objective. His autobiography clearly has to be taken with some reservation. When it was written in 1996 he was self-styled the 'man of peace' – however, his writing is the product of 30 years of conflict and so his accounts of key events in 1969 may well be highly selective and stridently pro-republican.

Basic adequate answers will be able to summarise the literal evidence and/or offer opinions on Adams's pro-republican, anti-British stance. Better answers will go beyond this to evaluate the source, perhaps by:

- using own knowledge to explain precisely why Adams was so well-informed about events in 1969; the fact that he was present and involved in local politics, particularly related to housing in West Belfast
- using selected references from the source to show how he may be exaggerating the threat and intentions of the RUC, B Specials and the British – RUC re-routings, RUC ambush; reaction of unionism; the ferocity of the RUC etc.
- using the source to note the tone of Adams's voice and to note how he allies himself with the civil rights case – perhaps a highly reasonable one – and appearing not to be taking an extremist position
- using own knowledge and the other sources, especially the nominated texts, to confirm or refute Adams's comments.

As always in Unit 6W, 'own knowledge' refers just as much to familiarity with and awareness of the range of views in the nominated texts (and the candidate's own interpretation) as to specific events and background.

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

'In the years 1969 to 1972, the failure of the Stormont government to deliver reforms allowed the IRA to use the civil rights movement as a cover for its own republican agenda.'

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

This question requires an evaluation of the origins of the Troubles, specifically 1969, and the quotation offers candidates a range of possible lines of argument. Answers can readily use own knowledge and the sources to provide a basis for a balanced assessment of the events of 1969 and how all sides descended into conflict by 1972. The quotation demands that candidates examine the civil rights movement which developed in the 1960s, its constituent membership and their agendas. Then, to assess whether the revival of the IRA was due to the Stormont government's inability to produce reforms, which would satisfy an emerging, assertive Catholic middle class who would no longer accept alienation from the political process; or indeed, was the IRA re-invigorated by other factors? The sources offer much potential material to work with. Clearly Adams, and Hezlet, view the civil rights campaign from very different perspectives. Source A suggests the movement was not seeking in 1969 the ultimate republican agenda – a united Ireland. What it wanted was more fundamental – housing for all on a fair basis. Adams believes that the reaction of unionism and its inability to reform, or offer meaningful reforms, would lead to a fracturing of society in Northern Ireland. In this sense the civil rights movement radicalized the Catholic community and placed the Protestants in a difficult political position. Source B suggests that it was extremists who were driving the civil rights movement and that their agenda was to physically attack the vehicle for maintaining power in the state – the police. Source C suggests a certain naivety on behalf of the civil rights campaigners. Many felt simply marching would produce 'British rights for British citizens.' Loughlin explains that, to the Paisleyite wing of the unionists, power lay in territorial control. Loughlin ends by implying that the civil rights movement should have embraced the concerns of the Protestant community more diligently. To concentrate so much on the Catholic sector, meant an increase in sectarianism and eventually the possibility of not only the emergence of a highly radicalized republican group but also a disenchanting Protestant community split over which way forward, if forward at all.

- although the specification starts in 1969, the nature of the subject matter means that candidates will need a thorough understanding of the reasons behind the Troubles. Many effective answers may be entirely focused on 1969 to 1972 but due credit will be given to those arguments which project forwards beyond this date
- candidates should be aware that the leaders of the civil rights movement were a long way from being terrorists – in fact the movement at first was not solely Catholic and publicly

claimed to be non-sectarian. It encompassed supporters of the Nationalist party, members and supporters of the IRA, communists, liberals, trade unionists, radicals, students etc. By 1969 the movement met with loyalist violence, which in turn produced counter-violence, and the rise of the Provisional IRA. At the time of the onset of violence in 1969, the IRA was weak and divided, lacking in military hardware and in fact was caught unaware. The IRA helped set up NICRA in 1969 but it was only a directing force. As events unfolded, those in the IRA who favoured force, were given numerous opportunities to gain support inside the civil rights movement. The new generation of Catholic middle class interestingly regarded the Nationalist party as outmoded and ineffectual and viewed the IRA and Sinn Fein as belonging to the past

- the role of the British government, led by Harold Wilson, and later Edward Heath, and the key Stormont politicians – O'Neill, Chichester-Clark and Faulkner – should be central to any analysis of this question. Wilson and Callaghan applied a great deal of pressure on O'Neill but many in his party were slow to see the impact of the civil rights movement and how demands were growing. O'Neill by 1969 had been in power for 6 years but his reform proposals seemed to be confined to the realms of rhetoric. The problem for Nationalists was whether O'Neill was a genuine reformer, a cunningly unreconstructed Unionist or a well-intentioned man who was simply out of control of his own party. To most Catholics O'Neill's reforms would mean a continuation and consolidation of unionist power. Therefore why prop up a more intelligent form of unionism when you might instead sponsor a genuine breakthrough for your own community?
- candidates may be aware of McKitterick's and McVea's work – they confirm Loyalist claims, particularly William Craig's, that the IRA was intimately involved in the civil rights movement, to be correct. Prominent IRA members were present at the birth of the movement but this was by no means the whole story. The IRA had had to make a major re-think after being ineffective in the 1950s and for much of the 1960s. It had moved away from the idea of using violence as its only tactic and had become a left-wing pressure group agitating on issues such as housing. Therefore by definition the IRA were involved in many of the issues which the civil rights movement supported. The civil rights movements gave the new-style IRA the chance to operate on another front and it pursued it readily. Unionists such as Craig were correct in recognising the IRA impact in the movement but wrong in thinking the IRA was using the movement to foment trouble before a new round of violence. A later official report confirmed that whilst they were members of the civil rights movement, 'there is no sign that they were in any sense dominant or in a position to control or direct policy.'

As always we should not expect 'balance' to mean even-handed, 'middle-of-the-road' assessments, nor comprehensive cover. Typically a strong candidate may produce a trenchant unionist or nationalist answer and be rewarded well – as long as the argument is persuasive and supported by specific evidence from own knowledge and from the three sources. Level 4 and Level 5 answers will come with an awareness of other perspectives, the use of the nominated texts and wider independent reading. This could involve many contemporary sources, both unionist and republican, coming out of Ireland in the press at the present time. This should enhance the use of sources at the same time but critically it allows for a candidate to move away from the nominated texts and use material which can add greater balance, interpretation, differentiation and judgement. In this sense a narrow answer, relying on a mono-causal approach to Question 1(c), can be avoided. It also allows the better candidate to go outside of the strict dates of the question and bring in further relevant material.