



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative R Unit 6W

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 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 the introduction of free secondary education for all in England and Wales. (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 attempts to make secondary education free for all. At Level 2 there should be explanation and some elaboration of some developments mentioned in the source (and possibly some which are not) about attempts to make secondary education free. The (Conservative) 1902 Education Act led to the establishment of ('state') county secondary schools, which were essentially grammar schools. In 1907 the Liberal government decreed that all such schools must provide free places for 25% of their annual entry. Though many grammar schools had (normally just a few) existing scholarship places, this Free Place system was formally the beginning of the scholarship ladder. Later, when the entrance tests came to be much influenced by educational psychologists, they were called the '11 plus'. Though the 1907 Free Place system was introduced well before 1918, when the period of study for this unit begins, candidates should be familiar with it as it remained in place, though amended, until 1944. Official reports in the inter-war period were many, but the most influential was the 1926 *Hadow Report* (initiated by Labour). Two influential members were R H Tawney and Ernest Barker. Under their influence the *Report* advocated secondary education for all with the implication that it would be free including eventually for all pupils in the grammar schools. There was to be an expansion in the number of grammar schools, but also a new kind of secondary education in the form of the modern school. The 1929 Labour government failed with its education legislation, but nevertheless re-organisation on the Hadow lines, with support from all Parties, took place during the 1930s. The Depression meant that a means test was introduced for the scholarships/free places in grammar schools. Nevertheless, by 1937 72% of children aged 11-14 in council schools and 32% in voluntary schools were experiencing some kind of 'secondary' education, most of them in modern schools, or 'senior classes' attached to their elementary schools. They received free education, which in most cases was post-primary rather than the curriculum of secondary education in the grammar school sense. Nearly all left formal education at the age of 14. The 1938 Spens Report and the 1943 White Paper advocated free secondary education for all when national finances would allow. The 1945 Labour government took the decision to implement the Butlers Act's provision for free

secondary education (though the 11 plus 'scholarship' examination remained for grammar school entry). At Level 3 answers will acknowledge the validity of the view in the source that free secondary education took time to come about, but debate how significant were the long-term factors as opposed to the 'new mood' for change and equality which developed during the War and led to radical reform in many areas and not just education. Answers may notice that the 1918 Act actually introduced the free Continuation Schools up to the age of 18, but these were sacrificed in the Geddes Axe (except in Rugby). However, the first significant official *Report* supporting free secondary education, as opposed to individuals like Tawney was that of Hadow in 1926. Even then it did not advocate free grammar school education for all. After that the difficult state of the country's finances during the Depression years, Conservative reluctance to spend additionally on education and the Second World War delayed a clear decision on free secondary education until changed general attitudes and advocacy of radical change developed during that war. Level 4 answers will contain sustained judgement on the validity of the view in the source using a range of evidence from own knowledge to make a clear judgement balancing the view that free secondary education is properly seen as the result of long term pressures and the view that it was essentially the product of changed approaches brought about by wartime experiences, (Aldrich, Gordon et al, McCulloch).

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

How useful is **Source B** as an explanation for the 1944 Education Act being a product of the experience of the Second World War? (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 connections between the War and the 1944 Act. At Level 2 there should be some explanation of the utility of the source in showing the Act being a product of wartime experience. It associates the passing of the Bill through the Commons with D-Day and German bombing. Overall it associates educational reform through the Act with 'the vigour of the British war effort'. It sees the Act as a bridge between the War and peacetime. Own knowledge should be utilised to place the source in context. There is little doubt that the War (as happened in the Boer and Great Wars) provided the catalyst for significant and, some would argue, radical educational change). There should be some attempt to assess the limitations of the source, e.g. it does not mention crucial factors during the War such as revelations about the condition of evacuees and their generally low educational standards, and/or longer term factors involved with promotion of change, such as secondary education for all, during the inter-war period. At Level 3 there will be clear

consideration of the factors given in the source and its limitations in assessing utility. Churchill's Coalition government was unable to implement many wartime proposals for reconstruction, e.g. the Beveridge proposals, given the necessity of first winning the war. Indeed the Prime Minister was lukewarm about them. The exception was the Butler Education Act. As the source indicates, it was a bridge between wartime and improvement for peacetime. However, amongst the most important factors not indicated in the source were the revelations about the low standards of education experienced by evacuees in their original schools whether they were elementary, senior classes or the new modern schools. The War demonstrated the need for a more highly educated (and trained) workforce beyond the elite which emerged from the public and grammar schools. Also wartime dislocation, which involved in many cases evacuation of whole schools from the cities, provided the opportunity, seized by Butler and supported by Labour in particular, to provide not only an improved system of education for all children, but also one which was better organised. The source does not mention the longer term factors and pressures for change. Also not mentioned in the source is the fact that the pressure was continued in the wartime *Norwood Report* and the governments own *White Paper*, both in 1943 with the latter accepting and committed to the changes which were brought forward to become the Education Act in the following year. 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 Act being a product of the experiences of the War. This sustained evaluation will expand on the links of the War with the Education Act, recognising that the source rather eulogises those links and also demonstrate 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 various pressures for, and arguments about, educational change from 1918 were resolved by the provisions of the 1944 Education Act.'

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 opens up the debate about longer term factors and the impact of the Second World War in relation to the advent of free secondary education, the future of the elementary school, forms of post-primary/secondary education, political pressures and that for a significant education bill. However, Source A does not go into detail about the arguments over what kind of educational change. Source B, whilst eulogising about the link between the Second World War and the 1944 Education Act, and the importance of the Act, implies a successful measure in dealing with the hopes for the future in peacetime and some consensus about the future direction of education in England and Wales. Source C continues the theme, seeing the war as a catalyst for change and Butler's leadership towards consensus in contrast with differences and arguments of the past. LEAs, the churches and educational organisations are mentioned as more than consultees and are involved actively in the discussions.

Own knowledge should be used to expand on relevant material in the sources and in particular to consider the pressures and arguments about the way forward for education since 1918. On the whole consensus was achieved by 1944. The Act of that year abolished elementary schools

and instituted a universal system of primary and secondary (and further) education. The newly created office of Minister of Education, with a seat in the Cabinet, was to have responsibility. It can be argued that the provisions of the Act reflected the pressures from inter-war developments and especially that for secondary education for all, most closely associated with R H Tawney and the Labour Party, but coming also from official *Reports*, notably those of *Hadow* and *Spens*, the latter particularly emphasising the need for a tripartite system of secondary schools. Although the Act will be forever associated with the (moderate) Conservative, R A Butler, in many ways it was victory for Labour's views on educational change, attempts at which by Labour, when in office, had largely failed. Apart from advocating secondary education for all and free secondary education it also supported the raising of the school leaving age to 15, and the extension of the scholarship ladder including scholarships to the universities. The movement for 'multilateral schools' within the Party was limited in 1944 (though advocated by some).

The main brake on the reform during the inter-war years had come from Conservatives, who were basically responsible for the means testing of 'Free Places'/scholarships to the grammar schools, limitations on educational expenditure and caution about extending education for the working classes beyond elementary except for a minority to act as a safety valve. However, the largely Conservative dominated National governments of the later 1930s had allowed gradual emergence of modern schools and senior classes in elementary schools. The evidence from the condition of evacuees persuaded many, who had previously favoured limitations on schooling of the working classes, that their education should be extended. In any case two parts of the tripartite system differentiated between grammar schools mainly populated by the middle classes and modern schools predominantly for the working classes. Butler as a moderate, reforming Conservative, reflected most Conservative opinion in 1943–44, which had become during the War not too distant politically from the collectivist social welfare aims of the Labour Party with its influential Ministers in the Coalition government who wanted progress in implementing Beveridge principles as soon as practicable. One was to tackle ignorance. Advocates of increased technical, scientific and vocational education, including members of the Spens and Norwood Committees, took comfort from the intention to promote more technical schools, although tripartism as such was not mentioned in the Act. Local Education Authorities were to be responsible for the precise forms of provision of different kinds of secondary schools in their areas. The objective of many leading 'educational experts' from 1926 was to achieve 'parity of esteem' for all types of secondary schools, established forms and new. It was advocated by not only R H Tawney, the Spens and Norwood Committees, but also by the coalition government and Butler in the 1943 *White Paper*. Disappointment came not in the Act itself, but from continued public (and educational) opinion about the superiority of grammar schools after the War.

One of the major issues historically with which Butler had to deal was the position of the churches, essentially the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church as major providers of schools. Though the form of the 'Religious Question' had changed during the 19th and 20th centuries, Butler wanted resolution of issues on this as on other areas of concern. The bitter disputes over the 1902 Act had to be avoided. New attitudes brought about by wartime experiences helped him. The Church of England, so often in the past in conflict with state action, was in the main content with the Bill and prepared to accept LEA voluntary controlled Church schools, where Anglican schools were not financially strong enough to justify voluntary aided status. (Many school buildings pre-dated 1902 and were in a state of disrepair.) Nonconformists had essentially gained what they wanted in terms of undenominational religious teaching in 'state' schools back in 1870 and had ceased to maintain 'British' schools. Their main concern was over the Church of England monopoly of school education in some, mainly rural, areas. 'Controlled' status helped them, although some nonconformists remained hostile to Catholic and Anglican schools receiving funding from taxation and especially local rates

(echoing a major dispute of 1902). The Catholic Church had two concerns about proposals before the Act. Firstly it insisted that denominational religious education continue in schools and was ultimately allowed, as was the Church of England, to do that. However, in fully maintained schools although religious education and acts of collective worship were compulsory, they had to be undenominational. More significantly for the Catholic Church it was adamant that it should retain overall control of 'its' schools, including finance. Voluntary controlled status was therefore unacceptable. Not as unacceptable was aided status, but there were extensive concerns and lobbying over the 50% limit on public grants for maintenance and capital building. The different more conciliatory position of the Church of England can be explained from its position as the Established Church in that the line between Church membership and citizenship was blurred, whereas for the Catholic Church the roles were quite different. In the end, despite the concerns of the Catholics, the 1944 Education Act largely ended the religious disputes which had plagued English education for so long.

Level 1 answers will consist predominantly of limited description and/or assertion about some changes in the period and/or pressures and arguments about change. 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 different pressures and views were resolved by the provisions of the 1944 Act. Level 4 responses will provide a wide range of evidence and argument to consider both pressures and arguments and the extent to which they were resolved. They will recognise the general political (and public) consensus, but that some areas of disagreement and differences remained. Level 5 responses will show conceptual awareness of the issues from 1918 to 1944, and provide clear selective evidence to assess how far they had been resolved. Examples may include political issues over secondary education for all, free secondary education, raising of the school leaving age, and within the Conservative Party some resistance still to extend education for the working classes by abolition of the elementary schools, and over religious issues, (Aldrich, Gordon et al, McCulloch).