



**General Certificate of Education
June 2011**

A2 History 2041

HIS3J

Unit 3J

The State and People: Britain, 1918–1964

Final

Mark Scheme

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 © 2011 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.

Generic Introduction for A2

The A2 History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since a good historian must be able to combine a range of skills and knowledge. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or low Level 2 if some comment is included. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at Level 2 or low Level 3 depending on their synoptic understanding and linkage of ideas. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(b)) and will have access to the higher mark ranges.

To obtain an award of Level 3 or higher, candidates will need to address the synoptic requirements of A Level. The open-ended essay questions set are, by nature, synoptic and encourage a range of argument. Differentiation between performance at Levels 3, 4, and 5 therefore depends on how a candidate's knowledge and understanding are combined and used to support an argument and the how that argument is communicated.

The mark scheme emphasises features which measure the extent to which a candidate has begun to '*think like a historian*' and show higher order skills. As indicated in the level criteria, candidates will show their historical understanding by:

- The way the requirements of the question are interpreted
- The quality of the arguments and the range/depth/type of material used in support
- The presentation of the answer (including the level of communication skills)
- The awareness and use of differing historical interpretations
- The degree of independent judgement and conceptual understanding shown

It is expected that A2 candidates will perform to the highest level possible for them and the requirements for Level 5, which demands the highest level of expertise have therefore been made deliberately challenging in order to identify the most able candidates.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- Depth and precision in the use of factual information
- Depth and originality in the development of an argument
- The extent of the synoptic links
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- The way the answer is brought together in the conclusion

June 2011

A2 Unit 3: The State and the People: Change and Continuity

HIS3J: The State and People: Britain, 1918–1964

Question 1

01 To what extent was the General Strike caused by the Trade Unions? (45 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**
-

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates will need to assess the extent to which the General Strike was caused by the actions of the Trade Unions, through consideration of evidence that the Trade Unions were responsible, as well as evidence that the Trades Unions were not responsible/other factors were responsible. These might include the actions of the mine owners, the government and the post-war economic context that created a sense of inevitability. Candidates may consider the post-war context of increased competition, falling exports and depression that made a clash likely, and/or focus on the specific events of 1925–1926 in the mining industry, from the announcement in the summer of 1925 by the mine owners that wages would be cut and hours increased, through to the Samuel Report in March 1926 and the responses of government, workers and employers.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in support of the premise that the Trade Unions caused the General Strike:

- the mining unions protested in the summer of 1925 in response to the mine owners' announcement that they would have to lower wages and increase hours as a result of the fall in exports. Despite Baldwin's subsidy and the creation of the Samuel Commission, the TUC made it clear in the summer of 1925 that they would support the miners. This strengthened the militancy of the miners and legitimised their slogan 'Not a minute on the day, not a penny off the pay'
- the miners refused to accept the report of the Samuel Commission despite the report arguing that the miners should not reduce wages and increase hours in the medium term, because it also argued that until the crisis passed there should be some wages reductions. This refusal to compromise hardened the owners attitudes
- the miners' announcement that they would strike on 1 May 1926 was made in the knowledge that the TUC would provide support, making a strike in one industry likely to become a General Strike. Ernest Bevin confirmed this support with his announcement that a General Strike would begin on 3 May 1926
- the critical day was 2 May, when mine unions leaders were absent from the negotiations, leaving them in the hands of the TUC
- the refusal by the print workers of the *Daily Mail* to print an article calling a General Strike a 'revolutionary act' led Baldwin to call off negotiations.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material to challenge the premise and argue that the Trade Unions did not cause the General Strike:

- the TUC welcomed the Samuel Report and tried to keep negotiations going in the spring of 1926
- on 2 May, the TUC carried out negotiations in the absence of the mining unions' leaders, and TUC representatives went to Downing Street in the early hours of 3 May to try and continue negotiations even after Baldwin had called them off in response to the actions of the print workers.

In addition, candidates may refer to some of the following material to argue that other factors caused the General Strike:

- the post-war economic depression made a clash between labour and the owners almost likely. The depression hit the mining industry hardest, because of competition from

German, Italian and Polish coal, and from gas, oil and electricity. The industry contained the most intransigent owners and the most militant unions

- Baldwin's government were culpable. The decision to return to the Gold Standard in April 1925 was unrealistic and made British exports too expensive. Nationalisation would have enabled the industry to respond to the growth in competition as it would have enabled reorganisation, but Baldwin's government would not contemplate such a measure. The government made no effort to force the Samuel Report through, despite the moderate mine-owner Sir Alfred Mond urging Baldwin to do so. In addition, Baldwin responded to the isolated and unofficial action of one group of print-workers by interpreting it as being official action approved by the TUC. When the TUC tried to continue negotiation on 3 May, he had closed the cabinet meeting and gone to bed
- the mine-owners had refused to modernise, blaming falling profits on high wages, rather than reorganising and introducing mechanisation to make their mines more efficient. They acted in an inflammatory way by announcing that wages would be reduced on 30 April 1926, which sparked the crisis that culminated in the General Strike. They were not prepared to compromise, seeking longer hours, lower wages and local agreements. Lord Birkenhead remarked that he thought the miners leaders were the stupidest men in the country until he met the mine owners.

In conclusion, candidates might argue that a clash was highly likely, given the impact of the First World War on British industry and the need for modernisation to compete in the international market. This problem may be placed in the context of a heavily unionised industry that refused to negotiate and which received unequivocal backing from the TUC because of fears that other workers would also see their wages reduced. Alternatively, the desire of the TUC for compromise might be contrasted with the actions of the mine owners and Baldwin which ensured that the dispute would develop a momentum of its own that saw the dispute become a nine day General Strike.

Question 2

- 02** To what extent was there a consensus between the two main political parties in the years 1951 to 1964? (45 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates will need to assess the extent to which a consensus had developed in British politics in the years between 1951 and 1964 with explicit or implicit reference to Butskellism and some of the following planks of consensus; commitment to the welfare state, full employment, conciliation of Trades Unions, the mixed economy and foreign policy.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in support of the premise that a consensus had developed in British politics between 1951 and 1964:

- there was agreement over the role of the welfare state, for example, Conservative support for the NHS created by the Labour government post-war, Macmillan's housing programme which out built Labour's housing programme, increase in state benefits, expansion of education with 6000 new schools and 11 new universities, plus colleges of advanced technology
- the Labour Party had begun the process of charging for prescriptions, continued by the Conservative party
- commitment to full employment had been set out in the 1944 White Paper and was accepted by the Conservatives in their 1950 manifesto which stated "We regard the achievement of full employment as the first aim of a Conservative government"
- full employment budgets from successive Conservative chancellors therefore strengthened the hand of the Trades Unions and led to the policy of the Ministry of Labour in the 1950s which was to conciliate the unions
- by 1963 public spending by Conservative governments was greater on social welfare than on the military and law and order
- Conservative governments accepted the nationalisation of coal, rail, electricity, gas, air and road transport
- there was a shared commitment to continued membership of NATO, Britain continuing to be a nuclear power, acceptance of the inevitability of Britain's decline as an imperial power and until 1961 front-bench agreement that Britain should not seek to enter the EEC.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material to challenge the premise and argue that the Conservative governments did not follow consensus policies and the Labour Party adopted policies which were not consistent with a 'consensus':

- the 1961/62 pay pause was imposed on the public sector against Union opposition
- iron and steel had been nationalised but were denationalised in 1953
- the Labour Party's defeats in 1951, 1955 and 1959 led to a reassessment of policy and groups within and outside the party campaigned for policies which were contrary to the consensus, for example, Gaitskill was forced to retain Clause 4 by the party and nuclear disarmament was advocated strongly outside the party by groups like CND
- from 1961 Conservative opinions changed and Heath was asked by Macmillan to investigate how Britain might join the EEC, whilst the Labour Party remained in opposition to the 'capitalist club'.

In conclusion, candidates may argue that there was a high level of consensus between the elite (the cabinet and shadow cabinet) and that matters of difference were minimal, but that this consensus became challenged as a result of consecutive Conservative victories. Alternatively answers might offer a longer-term perspective and point to the accessions of Thatcher in 1975 to party leader and 1979 as Prime Minister as the real challenge to the consensus.

Question 3

- 03** 'MacDonald was a more successful prime minister than Attlee.'
Assess the validity of this view. (45 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates will need to assess the relative success of MacDonald as prime minister in 1924 and from 1929 to 1935, compared with Attlee as prime minister from 1945–1951.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in support of the view that MacDonald was more successful:

- Wheatley's Housing Act of 1924 provided government aid in the building of council houses, an important extension to Addison's Act and one that stimulated the economy; the later 1930 Housing Act granted a subsidy for slum clearance and led to more slums being cleared between 1934 and 1939 than in the previous 50 years
- the 1930 Coal Mines Act reduced the working day from 8 hours to 7½
- the foresight to see that only political consensus could solve the economic problems and the ability to put country before party in 1931
- supervised measures to end depression; removing Britain from the Gold Standard in September 1931 ended the run on the pound and stimulated exports, building houses stimulated the economy, tariffs allowed recovery, cuts to the unemployed were ended in 1934.

However, these arguments can be challenged:

- cutting taxes for the rich as well as the poor in 1924 was inconsistent with Labour values and meant government spending was impossible at a time when public works were needed to deal with unemployment
- MacDonald insisted on taking the post of Foreign Secretary as well and the policy of rapprochement with the USSR was what brought down the government
- the 1930 Coal Mines Act left miners working ½ hour longer than they had before the General Strike
- by 1930 unemployment reached 2 million and MacDonald refused to take drastic measures, for example, as suggested by the Mosley Memorandum, preferring orthodox treasury management which only made the economic crisis worse
- failed to get agreement for the cuts which the commitment to orthodoxy required and therefore abandoned all principles in forming the National Government
- the National Government was formed to save the pound; removing it from the Gold Standard in September 1931 was a clear failure.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in support of the view that Attlee was more successful:

- the 1945–1950 government created the welfare state and through nationalisation of a range of industries managed by public corporations removed much of the pre-war conflict between classes. These measures were mainly accepted by successive governments
- Bevan allowed to organise the construction of 750,000 council houses; school building programme complemented raising the school leaving age to 15 in 1947
- significant advance for democracy with the reduction in the length of time the Lords could delay legislation
- he possessed the ability and lack of ego that allowed him to facilitate rather than direct.

However, these arguments can also be challenged:

- Attlee was merely the most senior survivor of the collapse of the Labour Party in the 1930s. His government added nothing that was not already planned and he provided little dynamism; even the growth of housing has been criticised for focusing on quantity rather than quality and there was a shortage of raw materials

- struggled to deal with economic problems post-war; the winter of 1947 and the balance of payments crisis and inflation caused by the Korean War which hit in 1951
- calling an election in 1950 demonstrated the lack of vision – with the pre-1945 plans realised Attlee ran out of steam and subjected the country to a second election in two years
- unable to unite the government which split over payments for dentures and spectacles and which was fundamentally divided between those on the right like Gaitskell and those on the left like Bevan and Shinwell.

In conclusion, candidates may argue that whilst MacDonald may have been disastrous as leader of the party, he was successful as Prime Minister in that Britain was showing signs of economic recovery by 1935 and Britain survived the greatest economic threat with democracy intact. Alternatively, his failure to recognise what was required until measures were forced upon him might be contrasted with Attlee's success in creating rather than re-acting, though in turn Attlee lacked the energy to solve his economic crisis.

Converting marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion