



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

Mark scheme January 2004

GCE

History

Alternative U: Units 2 and 5

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**AS and A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners**

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's revised AS/A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objective-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specifications. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS and A2 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS/A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The revised 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 new 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 AS and 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 and across all the specifications offered by the Board.

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 for AS and Section C for A2) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section D).

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS**Level 1:**

The answer is excessively generalised and undiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and undiscriminating with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

Level 2:***Either***

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant but outline only description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but limited grammatically.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

Level 5:

As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

C: 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 AO1.1, 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 (AO1.2), 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 (AO2, 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 characteristics: 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.

D: 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.

January 2004**Alternative U: Britain, 1929-1998****AS Unit 2: Britain, 1929-1951****Question 1**

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

Comment on “fascist thuggery” in the context of Britain in the 1930s. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

L1: Basic explanation of the term using the source, e.g. references to right-wing violence; or basic identification of Mosley and the BUF. **1**

L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the term and its significance in relation to the context, e.g. gives specific examples of violent incidents during the 1930s (such as Olympia or Cable St; or precise reference to the ideology of Mosley and the BUF; or understanding of the way the British Right was following a pattern established on the continent by Hitler and Mussolini. **2-3**

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

How useful is **Source B** as evidence about the impact of Oswald Mosley and the BUF upon society and politics in Britain in the 1930s? (7 marks)

Whilst candidates are expected to deploy own knowledge in assessing the degree to which the sources differ/the utility of the source, such deployment may well be implicit and it would be inappropriate to penalise full effective answers which do not explicitly contain ‘own knowledge’. The effectiveness of the comparison/assessment of utility, will be greater where it is clear that the candidates are aware of the context; indeed, in assessing utility, this will be very significant. It would be inappropriate, however, to expect direct and specific reference to ‘pieces’ of factual content.

Target: AO1.2, AO2

L1: Basic evaluation of the utility/reliability of the source either from own knowledge or based on provenance, e.g. relies upon description of the contents of the Source or makes “all-purpose” general comments about the value of a contemporary journalist’s account. **1-2**

L2: Developed evaluation of utility/reliability of the source in relation to the issue linking source, own knowledge and provenance, e.g. makes the point that Gunther was a well known and well informed American journalist, or uses generalised own knowledge to show that later events proved Gunther correct in retrospect. **3-5**

L3: Developed evaluation, drawing conclusions about utility/reliability based on strengths and weaknesses and judged against the context, e.g. Gunther was an experienced journalist with many contacts with key figures involved in 1930s politics (or, he has only limited value as an outsider making judgements after a brief visit). Level 3 answers should deal with provenance, as well as with context and knowledge, **or** should show differentiation in evaluation. **6-7**

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

“The decisive factors maintaining stability in Britain in the 1930s were not political but economic.”

Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. *(15 marks)*

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations, which could apply to almost any time and/or place, based on *either* own knowledge *or* the sources. **1-4**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on description, but will have valid links.

Or

Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **5-8**

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. **9-11**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit and partial. **14-15**

Indicative Content

The focus of the question is on the relative importance of key factors in the relative stability of British society in the 1930s. Some answers will entirely agree with the quotation and bring in much own knowledge of the economic factors such as regional variations, the relative easing of the slump from 1934, and the references to ‘industrial recovery’ in Source

B and to ‘economic upturn’ in Source C. Other answers, taking their lead from own knowledge about the strong support for the National Government in the 1935 election (and the success of some of its policies) backed up by the sources (especially Source C), will look for decisive factors in the lack of any openings for radical politics because the main two parties did not collapse. There are good possibilities in Source C to include the Communist threat as well as Mosley and the Right. Complete or even coverage is not required but answers which refer only to the right-wing threat will probably be limited to Level 3. As usual, successful answers will combine a clear argument of agreement/disagreement with the statement with solid own knowledge and with sensible use of specific evidence from the source.

Note that there will probably be a number of answers which explicitly or implicitly compare “stable” Britain with the political collapse and rise of fascism elsewhere in Europe. Such an approach is indeed relevant and could be highly effective; but it is by no means essential. Answers might well reach Level 4 or Level 5 by a different route.

Question 2

- (a) Comment on “famous report” in the context of Britain during the Second World War. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial explanation of the issue based on either the source or own knowledge, e.g. basic or partial definition of the Beveridge Plan; or literal material from the source on “more equal society”. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation demonstrating understanding of the issue based on both the source and own knowledge, e.g. uses the source to identify the way the war was the catalyst for the new “powerful mood”; or uses precise own knowledge of how the “famous” report was popular and widely known, laying down expectations that the welfare state would be established after the war. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why the war led to “shared experience” and greater social awareness in Britain. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue, e.g. by generalised comments about shared hardships due to the Blitz etc; or literal use of source evidence on a “social revolution”. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. shows awareness of the various ways that different areas of the country were affected, with urban and industrial areas hit very hard while other areas of the country were only slightly affected; or understanding changes in attitudes due to greater social mobility and the impact of government propaganda about the ‘People’s War’. **3-5**

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors, and prioritises, makes links and draws conclusions in order to provide an explanation. L3 answers will not necessarily do *more* than L2 answers – they will do *better* in terms of understanding. **6-7**

(c) How important, in relation to other factors, were the weaknesses of the Conservative Party in bringing about Labour’s “landslide victory” in the 1945 general election?
(15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**

L3: Demonstrates, by selection of material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative Content

Note that this question requires an assessment of relative importance. Many answers might focus at length on the failings of the Conservatives – both in the actual campaign and more long-term factors relating to memories of the 1930s. Other answers may treat Conservative weaknesses only briefly before developing other ‘more important’ factors in greater depth. A balanced answer need not be comprehensive or even-handed. The stimulus material clearly assumes that social change occurred on a big scale and did notably change attitudes – some answers, often good ones, may challenge this assumption and differentiate between cosy wartime myths and a more divisive reality. The chief focus of the question is on explaining the defeat of the Conservatives and the size of Labour’s ‘landslide’. A range of reasons could be offered: the role of Labour politicians in the wartime coalition; the interruption of the vaunted Conservative electoral machine by war; the memories of the Thirties; specific factors in the actual campaign including the special role of Churchill in 1945 (many voters did not connect him to the Tories at all). As usual, the basis of successful answers will be a balanced

overall assessment supported by precise and well chosen evidence. Answers at Level 4 will not necessarily have more sheer substance but will have precise definition of issues and the ability to differentiate relative significance.

Question 3

- (a) Comment on “system of social security” in the context of Britain after the Second World War. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial explanation of the issue based on either the source or own knowledge, e.g. generalised assertion about the welfare state. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation demonstrating understanding of the issue based on both the source and own knowledge, e.g. developed explanation demonstrating understanding of how important the Beveridge Plan was and how acceptance of the ideas of national health and national insurance was widespread after the war, in contrast to the hated memory of the ‘bad old days’ of the Thirties. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Britain faced “a time of serious economic and financial crisis” in the years after the Second World War. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue, e.g. implicit understanding in the form of general and unsupported statements about Britain being bankrupted by the costs of the war, or was under pressure because of the costs of empire and/or the Cold War. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. ever greater dependence on American help, especially the massive loans after the war (and the impact of the “dollar crisis” and the devaluation of sterling) culminating in 1947 with informing the Americans of the decision to pull out of Greece, Turkey etc and the need for yet more financial assistance. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors, and prioritises, makes links and draws conclusions in order to provide an explanation, e.g. the way in which Britain had been over stretched before 1947 by carrying the war alone; or explanation fo how there was a conflict between domestic and foreign commitments, making the burdens worse than they need have been. **6-7**

- (c) How important, in relation to other factors, was Marshall Aid in bringing about economic recovery in Britain between 1947 and 1951? (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative Content

The focus of this question is on economic recovery in Britain 1947-1951. Within this is the issue of external factors, both in intensifying the crisis Britain needed to recover from and in providing valuable help towards Britain's recovery through Marshall Aid. Some answers, often good ones, will challenge the assumption in the question that Britain *did* recover successfully – but such an approach is not by any means essential; the question implies some degree of successful recovery as a given.

There is a wide range of valid approaches from which candidates may choose. Many will see Marshall Aid as a key factor, devoting much space to the 'special relationship' and Britain's role in the Cold War. Others will focus on other factors, relegating Marshall Aid to a minor role, concentrating instead on the policies and personalities of the Labour government such as Attlee, Bevin, Cripps and "austerity". It is likely that many answers will deal at some length with the crisis of 1947 and to the heavy commitments to Britain's world role and to the welfare state. Such material could indeed be made relevant and effective, but the main focus of the question is on economic recovery; answers should reflect this.

January 2004**Alternative U: Britain, 1929-1998****A2 Unit 5: Britain, 1951-1997****Question 1**

- (a) Use **Sources A** and **B** and use your own knowledge.

To what extent do these sources differ in their assessment of the importance of the Profumo Affair? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Extracts simple statements from the sources or refers to own knowledge to demonstrate agreement/disagreement on the issue/event which is the subject of debate. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates explicit understanding of aspects of agreement/disagreement on the issue/event which is the subject of debate, with reference to either sources and/or own knowledge. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of similarity and difference of interpretation in relation to the debate and offers some explanation. **6-8**
- L4: Uses appropriately selected material, from both sources and own knowledge, to reach a sustained judgement on the extent of similarity and difference in interpretation in relation to the debate. **9-10**

Indicative Content

Answers at Level 1 will fail to make the required comparison, being incomplete (based on only one source) or wholly literal and descriptive in dealing with the source evidence. Answers at Level 2 will adopt a comparative approach, with more or less skill and thoroughness in analysing the specific textual evidence, but they will lack explanation. Own knowledge will be largely absent, or else deployed as literal factual description. Answers at Level 3 and above will show one or more of the following:

- differentiation between degrees of similarity and difference, according to tone and emphasis. For example, Source A says “death-blow to the government”, but Source B has “can be exaggerated”.
- use of own knowledge to explain the context.
- effective explanation through implicit understanding of the issues.
- comparative evaluation of the nature and provenance of the two sources. Both sources are secondary historical works from the 1990s.

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

“The Conservatives lost the 1964 election because the Labour Party was much more in tune with fundamental changes in Britain society and culture.”

How valid is this view of the reasons for the decline of the Conservatives in the years 1962 to 1964? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-6**
- L2: ***Either***
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance.
- Or***
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with a selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative Content

This question involves two large issues: the decline and fall of the Conservatives in 1964 after long years in power; and the impact of social and cultural change in the late Fifties and early Sixties. Answers might legitimately emphasise one of these more than the other and we should not require equal coverage as long as both aspects are addressed. Similarly, the question involves both Labour success and Tory failure, answers may well be more fully developed on one party than the other. As usual, a balanced answer does not necessarily demand equal treatment. The key requirement is a relevant central argument explaining the reasons why Labour fortunes rose and Conservative fortunes fell during 1962-64 and linking those reasons to the question of social and cultural change.

All the sources and especially Source C have plentiful material related to social change. Both Source A and Source B make direct judgements about the political atmosphere in the run up to the 1964 election. Candidates should be able to explain the content (perhaps including long-term factors as well as short-term ones) of the sudden difficulties faced by the Conservatives during 1962-64 so relatively soon after the high point of Supermac's victory in 1959 – the 'Night of the Long Knives', the impact of scandals and "events", the illness and resignation of Macmillan, the divisive leadership campaign and the emergence of Douglas-Home as leader. There is also a valid point to be made about Labour becoming a more formidable force under the new leadership of Harold Wilson from 1963. Such factors as these can be used as the basis of an argument which challenges the key quotation with other arguments; or as additional factors in an answer which broadly agrees.

Section B

Questions 2-7 are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidates should be clearly linked to the range of factors or issues covered in the generic A2 Levels of Response mark scheme and by the indicative content in the specific mark scheme for each question.

Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2 (*without reference to sources*)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: ***Either***

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis, but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such responses will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-6**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, implicit understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **7-11**

L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Question 2

Assess the validity of the claim that “the main reason for the political dominance of the Conservative Party throughout the 1950s was the willingness of Conservative leaders to protect the welfare state”. *(20 marks)*

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative Content

The key to this question is the demand for a balanced assessment of the reasons for Conservative political dominance (and thus for Labour’s lack of electoral success). As usual, there is a wide range of issues from which candidates can select and prioritise – the broader overview of the thirteen years of Conservative success under Churchill, Eden and Macmillan, perhaps above all the Fifties prosperity which underpinned it. The key quotation emphasises the importance of ‘Butskellism’ and the so-called “post-war consensus” and the role of the Tories as beneficiaries and “protectors” of Labour’s post-1945 achievements. Answers focusing on Labour’s failings might emphasise party divisions and Gaitskell’s problems as leader with the unions, CND etc. Some answers may devote considerable attention to key personalities in both main parties – or perhaps focus close attention on the 1959 election. Successful answers will use selective material to support a balanced assessment of a range of factors leading to Conservative dominance. The quotation includes the phrase “throughout the 1950s” and answers should reflect this timescale.

Question 3

With what justification can it be claimed that “Britain experienced continuous economic decline from 1951 to the 1990s”? *(20 marks)*

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative Content

This question invites a direct assessment of Britain's economy from 1951 to the 1990s. Was there continuous decline? Or decline that was not continuous but uneven? Or sustained economic success through 'the long post-war boom'? Or, a period of stagnation up to 1973 and the oil-price crisis, or 1979 and the Winter of Discontent, followed by the bracing uplift of Thatcherism? (There are other theories as well!)

Effective answers will be synoptic in that they discuss the period as a whole and analyse a range of economic factors. But coverage should not be expected to be comprehensive. Detailed evidence may well be found within certain key patches of the period as a whole. It is also likely that some answers, often good ones, will bring in ideas and material on 'decline' that pre-dates 1951, perhaps even going back well before the Second World War. This approach could indeed be highly relevant and productive but it is certainly not a requirement, and it should not unbalance the answer.

Question 4

"It was economic issues much more than political ones that kept Britain out of the European Economic Community before 1973."
How convincing is this explanation? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative Content

There are three requirements for an effective answer: why Britain was minded to join at all; the various economic factors that may have contributed to keeping Britain out; and the political issues that were also involved. The focus of the question is on factors keeping Britain out – answers may make valid points on the changed situation which led to Britain finally joining in 1973 but this is not essential and it must be applied to the question, not deployed for its own sake. As long as the synoptic demands are met, equal attention to the three aspects should not be demanded; as usual, a balanced answer does not need to be comprehensive or even-handed. The Unit begins in 1951 and successful answers may well confine themselves to the years 1951-1973, but there is scope for relevant material on long-term factors from 1945 or even earlier militating against entry. Answers ought to cover: the 1950s and Britain's opting out from the Messina conference; 1961-63 and the rejection of Britain's first application; the story of Labour divisions and Wilson's failed attempt in 1967; Edward Heath's election victory in 1970 and the significance of the departure from the scene of Charles de Gaulle. Material after 1973, perhaps factors still influencing the Eurosceptics, can be applied to the question in a relevant way but should not be descriptive or unbalance the answer.

Question 5

“It is wrong to claim that Labour’s failures were caused by weak leadership; the real reason was unfavourable economic circumstances.”

How valid is this view of the Labour governments led by Harold Wilson and James Callaghan, 1974-79? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative Content

The question offers contentious key words – “divisions” and “disillusionment” but only one central issue – why was Labour ultimately so unsuccessful after the high hopes of the early 1960s? (And, perhaps, why did 1979 lead to long years in the political wilderness?) The period should be seen as a whole, if not with equal or complete coverage: Wilson’s government of 1964-70, then the Heath interruption until 1974, then Wilson’s return, and finally Callaghan’s struggles from 1976 to 1979. Some might focus on personalities: Wilson’s strengths early on compared with his, and Callaghan’s, failings later. Some might focus on “events”: the oil price crisis and the years of recession undermining Labour in the 1970s. Some might be structural: long-term social and economic trends undermining ‘Old Labour’ and flowing with the future Thatcherite and monetarist agenda. Answers should not be expected to account for all, or even most, of these possibilities. Successful answers should have a synoptic approach, assessing the successes and failures in the light of selective evidence. Answers dealing *only* with either Wilson or Callaghan will be badly unbalanced – but answers dealing briefly with one, and in more depth with the other, can be entirely valid.

Question 6

“In 1990 the greatest prime minister since Churchill became the victim of the most ruthless act of political ingratitude in modern British history.”

“By 1990, Thatcher was the main obstacle to the Tories winning the next election. The change in leadership came just in time.”

In the light of these contrasting statements, explain why Margaret Thatcher’s eleven years in power ended with her rejection by the Conservative Party. (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative Content

This question comprises a choice between three distinct approaches to the evaluation of the achievements of the Thatcher governments: one broadly in favour of the “greatest” prime minister; one broadly supporting the view of Thatcher as an election-losing liability by 1990; or a third, more balanced, assessment which attacks both quotations, wholly or in part, and sets out its own viewpoint. Successful answers will assert a coherent case and show awareness (if not full and detailed coverage) of the issues raised by the key quotations. They will also show some grasp of the “eleven years”, differentiating between the three phrases of Thatcherism and perhaps measuring change over time. Note that the wording of the question specifically distinguishes between Thatcher and leader and the Conservative Party – answers at Level 4 and above will show the ability to differentiate between various elements of the Party, for and against Thatcher – and possibly to analyse the different (and changing) attitudes of key personalities such as Heseltine, Tebbit, Lawson and Howe.

Question 7

“The remarkable recovery in Labour’s fortunes between 1992 and 1997, which led to the landslide in 1997, owed more to the divisions and weaknesses within the Conservative Party than to the re-branding of the Labour Party as ‘New Labour’.”
How convincing is this view? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative Content

Answers to this question might be focused mostly on John Major and the internal problems leading to the decline of the Conservatives from 1990, or mostly on the factors which relate to Tony Blair and the ‘rebirth’ of New Labour as the electable alternative, heightening Conservative problems and leading to the election earthquake of 1997. Although the time scale of the question is the 1990s, there are many valid factors from before 1990 that might be deployed, affecting either or both parties. Some answers indeed may view the 1980s and 1990s as a whole, analysing the long-term causes of Conservative disasters, perhaps especially the “flawed legacy” of Thatcherism (or the long-term foundations of Labour recovery before Blair). Equally, many answers might very effectively focus attention on the

internal divisions of the Conservatives after 1992: Europe, BSE, 'sleaze', and perhaps especially the 'economic issue' of the ERM crisis and its effects on the Tory reputation for economic competence. As usual, Level 4 and Level 5 answers will prioritise, differentiating between a range of factors in order to resolve a coherent and balanced argument.