



General Certificate of Education

History 5041/6041

Alternative U Britain, 1929–1998

Mark Scheme

2005 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.

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 'objectives-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 indiscriminating 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 indiscriminating 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 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

Alternative U: Britain, 1929–1998

AS Unit 2: Britain, 1929–1951

Question 1

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

Explain briefly the meaning of “new coalition government” in the context of the political crisis in 1931. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Basic explanation of the term using the source, e.g. generalised references to the National Government. 1
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the term and its significance in relation to the context, e.g. gives specific evidence of the parties and personalities involved; or explains the circumstances of the crisis of 1931, such as the pressure from the King bringing MacDonald and Baldwin together. 2-3

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

How useful is **Source B** as evidence about Labour Party attitudes towards Ramsay MacDonald in 1931 and the years following? (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 leading politician’s memoirs. 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 Snowden was extremely well-informed about all aspects of the Labour leadership and MacDonald; that he had a leading role in the events as Chancellor of the Exchequer in the events of 1931; or uses appropriate evidence from the source, or generalised own knowledge, to show Snowden’s hostile view of MacDonald was shared by many others. 3-5
- L3: Developed evaluation, drawing conclusions about utility/reliability based on strengths and weaknesses and judged against the context, e.g. explaining that Snowden actually sided with MacDonald in 1931 and followed him into the National Government only
-

turning against him later; or analyses the bitter tone and emphasis of the source to point out the elements of self-justification in Snowden’s memoirs; or uses precise own knowledge to corroborate, or contradict, his views. **6-7**

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

“During the years 1931–1940, the Labour Party was undermined disastrously by internal divisions resulting from the crisis of 1931.”

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* 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 double focus of the question is on the impact of the trauma 1931 and on the consequences for Labour during the rest of the 1930s. Some answers will entirely agree with the quotation and bring in much own knowledge of the problems facing Labour. Candidates may point to the deep sense of betrayal in 1931 and the continuing bitterness over MacDonald after 1931 illustrated in Sources A and B; the fact that several key Labour leaders lost their seats in Parliament – Attlee was virtually unknown when he became party leader in 1935 – and the fact that Labour was open to criticism as the “party of devaluation” and economic mismanagement. Such answers may emphasise the fact that Labour only really

recovered its prestige as a result of its role in the Second World War. Other answers, however, taking their lead from own knowledge about the distortions of the “first-past-the-post” electoral system and Labour’s relative recovery in 1935, backed up by evidence in Source C, will argue that Labour’s core vote held up well and that the undermining of the party by 1931 was not disastrous. By 1935 Labour had won back most of the voters who had deserted in 1931. Most commentators agree that although Labour would probably not have won an election held in 1939 or 1940 it would have continued its electoral advance. Another argument might be that it was not Labour’s weaknesses and divisions but the National Government’s success in keeping support, helped by the beginnings of economic recovery, which held Labour back. As always, an effective, balanced answer will have a coherent central argument supported by well-applied evidence from the sources and from own knowledge. The key dates – 1931 and 1940 – leave some scope for differentiation by time perhaps separating the real period of crisis and division 1931–1935 from the later, more successful period. Reference may be made to Labour’s role in 1940 in bringing down Chamberlain and ensuring Churchill’s succession as prime minister and their own entry in government as part of Churchill’s wartime coalition. Comprehensive coverage of all aspects is not a requirement, as long as the answer shows awareness of the key issues and has an overview of Labour’s fortunes through the 1930s.

Question 2

- (a) Comment on “post-war reconstruction” in the context of Britain in 1945. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial explanation of the issue based on either the source or own knowledge, e.g. the war had to lead to change or generalised statements about bomb damage. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation demonstrating understanding of the issue based on both the source and own knowledge, e.g. uses the source to identify ‘shifts’ of attitude during the war; or uses own knowledge of the 1945 Labour manifesto and its promises/policies such as nationalisation, modernisation, the welfare state, housing, full employment and educational opportunity. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why state control and planning “seemed increasingly normal” by 1945. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue, e.g. generalised comments about state controls such as rationing or state interference such as evacuation or about communal feelings of ‘togetherness’ in the war effort. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. refers to government propaganda, accurate knowledge of the effectiveness, for example, of state control and planning, Labour figures associated with effective wartime state planning such as Bevin as Minister of Labour. **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. there had been six

years of State control and regulation so people were used to it, associated with full employment, fairer distribution of food and resources; feeling that if state planning could defeat Hitler then why not Beveridge's 'Five Giants', memories of how return to 'laissez-faire' after the Great War had led to unfulfilled promises of social reform.

6-7

- (c) How important were “memories of the past”, in relation to other factors, in influencing the growth in popular support for the Labour Party during the Second World War? (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 appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the 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

This question requires an assessment of relative importance. Many answers may go into the importance of the Beveridge Report in a big way i.e. using own knowledge to contrast the lukewarm response of the Conservatives with all-out support from Labour and perhaps making use of parts of the stimulus source. Other answers may find the decisive factors elsewhere, perhaps by arguing that fundamental changes in social attitude – which again may be partly supported by the stimulus as well as own knowledge – was the key factor. Others may stress how Labour benefited from its role in the War Coalition with prominent Labour men such as Attlee, Bevin and Morrison holding key positions.

“Memories of the past” also affected attitudes to Churchill as well as the Conservatives. Many remembered his attitudes and image from earlier periods of his career such as the General Strike or his campaign against dominion status for India. Such memories were reinforced by his infamous ‘Gestapo’ speech and led some voters to distinguish between

Churchill as a war leader and as a future peace-time prime minister. The Conservatives too were associated in the memories of many voters with the mass unemployment of the 1930s, the means test and the failed policy of appeasement. Voters in 1945 seem to have distinguished between Churchill as the popular and inspirational wartime leader and Churchill the leader of the Conservative Party. This was reinforced by the fact that for most of the 1930s Churchill had been at odds with the majority views of the Conservative Party.

A balanced answer need not be comprehensive or even-handed. The stimulus material clearly assumes that genuine shifts in attitudes did occur. Some answers, quite likely good ones, may challenge that assumption and contrast the myth of the ‘people’s war’ with continued class divisions – again a factor in many voting Labour in 1945. As usual the most successful answers will provide a balance of assessment supported by precise and well-chosen evidence. Answers at Level 4 will not necessarily have more substance but will have more precise definition of issues, be highly focused and will show ability to differentiate the relative significance of a range of factors. At Level 5 these characteristics will have in addition some attempt at substantiated judgement.

Question 3

- (a) Comment on “making sterling convertible with the dollar” in the context of Britain’s financial position at the end of the Second World War. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial explanation of the issue based either on the source or own knowledge, e.g. generalised assertion about the pound’s financial weakness after the war, or about the ‘dollar crisis’. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation demonstrating understanding of the issue based on both the source and own knowledge, e.g. how the condition of an American loan in 1946 was that sterling balances should be fully convertible into dollars by 1947; how this meant that foreigners with money deposited in Britain were able to exchange pounds for dollars in 1947, or sets it into the wider context of Britain’s financial and economic problems after 1945. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why the British were “dependent on the Americans for their own economic survival” in the years following the Second World War. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue, e.g. shows some knowledge of the cost and damage to Britain of the Second World War, or literal re-use of the stimulus. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the importance of Lend-Lease during the war and the seriousness of its being stopped after the war ended; the dire economic situation of Britain in 1945 ‘financial Dunkirk’; or reference to Britain having to pull out of Greece and hand over to the Americans; or withdrawal from India and Palestine. **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's wartime debts and damage plus her commitments at home and abroad put her finances under great strain especially in 1947; reference might also be made to the importance of Marshall Aid to Britain in 1948 as further proof of her growing dependence on the United States. **6-7**

(c) How important was the “special relationship” with the United States, in relation to other factors, in influencing Britain's foreign and imperial policies in the years 1947 to 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, 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 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 an assessment of the relative importance of the American alliance compared with the other factors influencing Britain's foreign and imperial policies 1947–1951. Areas to be considered could include Greece/Turkey 1947, Germany 1947–1948, Marshall Aid 1948, NATO 1949, the Korean War 1950–1951 as well as withdrawal from India, Palestine and Egypt. Some answers may argue that the ‘special relationship’ was central referring to the Truman Doctrine, Marshall Aid, Berlin Blockade, NATO and involvement in Korea as evidence. Others may argue that the ‘other factors’ were equally, or in some cases of greater importance. Amongst these might be the fear of Soviet expansionism into the Near East and Western Europe; Ernie Bevin's foreign policy agenda both in maintaining Britain as a Great Power and securing US commitment to the defence of Europe, as well as the desire to support the newly constituted U.N. In the case of the Empire, the forces of nationalism, Attlee's personal commitment to Indian independence, reaction to

British over-stretch and the problems of Palestine might also be considered. Some candidates may well argue that the ‘special relationship’ with America, especially in its financial sense helped pressure Britain into premature withdrawal in India and Palestine and pulled her into the Cold War in Europe and Asia. It could be argued that the real problem was Britain’s determination to maintain a World role it could no longer afford; or that traditional national and imperial interests and suspicions in Europe, the Middle and Far East, as much as the ‘special relationship’ with America mainly influenced its policies.

Successful answers will provide a relevant, balanced assessment of a range of factors which affected Britain’s post-war policies supported by precise, well-chosen knowledge. Candidates may also be able to make some use of the stimulus material though this is not essential. Level 4 and Level 5 answers will not necessarily have massive detail but will usually show themselves by depth of explanation and their differentiation of relative importance.

Alternative U: Britain, 1929–1998**A2 Unit 5: Britain, 1951–1997****Question 1**

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

To what extent do these sources differ in their view of Britain’s departure from the ERM in 1992?
(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

There are similarities in the two sources – both Major and Lamont argue that Britain’s departure from the ERM was a ‘calamity’ and a ‘disaster’. Candidates may also note that both sources refer to political disaster for the government – ‘a fifth Conservative victory became remote’ and ‘the scale of the political disaster’. Ironically both sources suggest that the economy itself might ‘turn for the better’ after departure. Stronger answers will highlight the difference in attitude over ERM – e.g. Major saw ERM as ultimately beneficial, whereas Lamont was ‘increasingly unenthusiastic’.

Good answers will begin to examine their provenance – why the two interpretations differ, recognising the position of the two men at the time and using their memoirs to retain their reputation. The best answers will also use the sources and own knowledge to evaluate the self-justification of the two sources and to show the bitterness Lamont developed when he was later sacked as Chancellor.

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

“By the end of 1992, the Conservative government was already doomed to defeat in the next general election, regardless of anything done by Major, or by his political enemies, in the years up to 1997.”

How valid is this assessment of Conservative decline in the 1990s? (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 a variety of issues but, above all, it requires a balanced argument about the relative importance of Black Wednesday and the “other factors” behind the decline and downfall of the Conservatives in the years 1992 to 1997. Many answers can be expected to agree with the central proposition – Major himself said “there was never any chance after that”; and the sources provide plentiful supporting evidence, (the phrase “by the end of 1992” also allows candidates to bring in relevant material about longer term factors from before Black Wednesday, concerning both Tory decline and Labour revival.) On the other hand, there will be many trenchant answers disagreeing strongly – using own knowledge to point out the role of Major’s many “political enemies”, both in the resurgent New Labour and the Eurosceptic rebels within his own party, not to mention many examples of weak leadership and poor judgement by Major himself. Some answers may look in close detail at the 1997 election, or at the key events of 1992; others may concentrate on issues and themes in the longer term. We should not expect answers to be comprehensive or even in coverage. At

Level 2, there may be exhaustive literal use of the sources with adequate links to the question; or superficial general arguments lacking depth of supporting evidence. (Sadly, there will be a number of promising and well-argued answers that cannot rise above Level 2 because they completely ignore the sources.) Answers at Level 3 and above will provide well-directed assessments, supported by selected evidence, both from the sources and from own knowledge. One feature of the most effective answers may be the depth of precise analytical and selective evidence, both from the sources and from own knowledge. One feature of the most effective answers may be the depth of precise and analytical selective evidence; another may be the skilful differentiation between the relative importance of a range of factors.

Section B

Questions 2-7 are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidates' responses 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

“The Labour Party was out of power for so long not because of Conservative strengths but because of Labour’s mistakes and internal divisions.”

How valid is this explanation of the reasons why the defeat of Attlee’s Labour government in 1951 was followed by thirteen years of Conservative rule? *(20 marks)*

Use standard mark schemes 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 demands an assessment of the relative importance of the various factors that underpinned thirteen years of Conservative political dominance. There is a wide range of possibilities – the post-war consensus; the long period of rising living standards that began about 1952; the skilful leadership of the Conservatives by men like Macmillan.

Clearly the key focus of this question is on Labour’s own difficulties and internal divisions. In 1951 these included the exhaustion of the older generation of Labour leaders and the already open split between Gaitskellites and Bevanites. These divisions contrived to grow through the 1950s and notably undermined Gaitskell as leader between 1955 and 1963. There was in fact a “leadership crisis” before the arrival of Harold Wilson – this crisis was intensified by the issues of trade union power and nuclear disarmament. How deeply answers probe all this will depend on the extent to which they agree or disagree with the quotation. As usual the best answers will show differentiation in assessing these economic, political and personality issue and in dealing with changes over time.

Question 3

“The ‘Sixties social revolution’ was a myth; in reality, continuity outweighed change.”

“There had never been anything like the Sixties before; everything changed.”

Which of these statements provides the more convincing assessment of society and culture in Britain between the late 1950s and the early 1970s? (20 marks)

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

‘Social revolution’ may, of course, be defined in a variety of ways – including legislation, youth culture, trends in music and fashion, and a host of others. Many answers will also take their lead from the second quotation and base the answer on a flat denial that a social revolution actually took place at all. The key requirements in the question are to assess the degree and speed of change and to identify the timescale within which change occurred. Arthur Marwick claim the Sixties started in 1958 and ended in 1973 – many answers will of course focus closely on the ‘Sixties’. But many answers will go back to the Second World War to track the origins of various aspects of social and cultural change; or will look forward to the ‘Thatcher Revolution’ of the 1980s. The key dates should be observed in the answer but the debate about the core issue could involve relevant material from outside “the late 1950s to the early 1970s – as long as this is part of an argued case and not description for its own sake.

Question 4

“A generation of economic mismanagement.”

“A time of sustained economic prosperity.”

Which of these statements provides the more convincing assessment of the development of the British economy from 1951 to 1973? (20 marks)

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 requirement is a clearly argued response to the twin quotations. Answers should be seeking to demonstrate one of them to be “correct” (or mostly so) and to refute the other; or perhaps rejecting or re-defining both statements in order to set out a third, better interpretation. Balanced answers will not necessarily be those that sit on the fence. Answers ought to have a synoptic view of the period from 1951 to 1973 as a whole but this does not mean “equal” or comprehensive coverage of all aspects. Many good answers may analyse such things as the policies of ‘Stop-Go’; the ‘post-war consensus’; the ‘consumer society’; the ambitious policies of Wilson’s government from 1964; and how this period culminated in the economic crisis of 1973–1974. Material after 1973 can be relevant but should not be

descriptive or at excessive length – it should only be used to support arguments about the trends up to 1973. Similarly, candidates may legitimately use evidence about 1945–1951 to explain the continuities of the Attlee legacy – but this should be applied to the question, not “background”.

Question 5

“Labour’s failures in government were not due to underlying economic problems but to weak leadership.”

How valid is this assessment of the governments led by Harold Wilson and James Callaghan in the years 1964 to 1970 and 1974 to 1979? (20 marks)

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 a deliberately contentious key theme (“weak leadership” causing “Labour’s failures”) – it would be perfectly appropriate for answers to directly challenge these assumptions. There is also room for differentiation, arguing perhaps that failures were to be found at some stages but not others; or assessing Wilson and Callaghan differently. Many candidates may choose to focus on the central issue – why did Labour lose in 1979? This could be very effective but a balanced answer requires at least brief treatment of the first term, 1964–1970. Above all, there should be an assessment of the relative importance of “other factors” besides the leadership of Wilson and Callaghan – for example, the role of the trade unions and of the Labour Left.

Question 6

“Margaret Thatcher failed to achieve any lasting transformation of society and the economy in Britain, but she revolutionised the Conservative Party.”

How valid is this assessment of the outcomes of Mrs Thatcher’s eleven years in power? (20 marks)

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 two distinct elements – the impact of the policies and ideologies of the Thatcher governments on the economy and society in Britain; and the parallel issue of Thatcher’s impact on the Conservative Party. Answers may well accept or reject the proposition in the question as a whole – or make a differentiated response that agrees with part of it but challenges the other. The timescale of the question is also open – good answers

might be confined within the framework of Thatcher's years in power from 1979–1990; but the focus on “outcomes” allows for valid material on the later consequences to be used effectively. Less likely but equally valid would be material on 1975–1979 used to assess Thatcher's role as a ‘revolutionary’ against traditionalists and Heathites from the time she became leader, (one feature of high quality answers will be the conceptual depth with which they address ‘Thatcherism’ as an idea.) Many answers are likely to analyse the downfall of Mrs Thatcher in 1990 as a key moment, possibly arguing that the fact she was turfed out by her own party and replaced by the emollient John Major meant she had not revolutionised the party at all.

Question 7

“The 1975 EEC referendum would have finally settled the European issue for Britain but for Mrs Thatcher's prejudices.”

How valid is this view of the reasons why ‘Europe’ continued to divide Britain in the years 1975 to 1990? (20 marks)

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 involves analysis of a complex issue over a period of more than twenty years; comprehensive coverage should not be expected. The core of the question is a negative – why was the European debate not finally settled in and after 1975? It also involves something of a paradox in that it was divisions within Labour that led to the 1975 referendum, and hostility to Europe was most pronounced on the Labour Left until the later 1980s; but then the Eurosceptic tide started running more strongly in the Conservative Party, especially against Maastricht. Good answers may differentiate effectively – showing, for example, how Mrs Thatcher's position changed over time, or the changing influences of the national press, or how divisions persisted within the Labour Party although overshadowed by noisier conflicts within the Conservatives. The most effective answers will be those focusing on explanation and assessment of the relative significance of a range of factors, not comprehensive narratives.

A decisive, even partisan, approach to this question is very acceptable – but only as a coherent, well-supported argument. We should give short shrift to opinionated diatribes, long on assertion and weak in argument.

Alternative U: Britain, 1929–1998

A2 Unit 6: Britain and Ireland, 1969–1998

Question 1

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

Assess the validity of the interpretation offered in **Source C** about the origins of the 1994 IRA ceasefire. (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

Collins is indeed a well-informed source, writing at great personal risk about his role inside the IRA and his “conversion” to the need for peaceful reconciliation. Many answers may consider his interpretation to be very convincing – stressing the important role of the paramilitaries (on both sides but above all Gerry Adams) in turning away from violence and towards negotiation. Such answers might not only analyse Collins’s view but also be able to show how the evidence of both the other sources seems to support it. Other answers, however, will challenge this interpretation, using own knowledge to show the significance of other explanations, such as:

- Success of the security forces in “defeating” the campaign of violence - how political realities forced Sinn Fein – IRA to soften their natural reluctance to compromise
- Changed policies and personalities in London and Belfast (and Washington) enabling political progress where it had not previously been possible.

As usual, answers at Levels 1 and 2 are likely to focus on the literal evidence of Source C. Better answers will use provenance, own knowledge and understanding to make a direct evaluation – either challenging Collins’s view as being “wrong” and substituting a “correct” alternative; or showing depth and balance in their analysis of why his view is justified.

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

How useful is **Source B** as evidence about unionist and loyalist attitudes towards calling a ceasefire? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, 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

This source reflects a wide spectrum of perspectives under discussion within the unionist and loyalist communities regarding the ceasefire. Candidates may know that MacDonald is a moderate unionist who is slightly critical of Trimble and his political line. Source B highlights the conversation going in the unionist and loyalist movements and basic, adequate answers will be able to summarise the literal evidence, e.g. the differences between John Taylor, David Trimble and Ian Paisley within the UUP and the difficult situation Trimble was in, being criticised on both sides. The context of the time should be examined and candidates should decide whether this source is an accurate reflection of the “historic” change of approach by loyalist leaders. Also, has the importance of this “conversion” been exaggerated by the source.

Better answers may use the evidence of Sources A and C to show elements of agreement or use own knowledge of other sources, especially the nominated texts, to put forward a different perspective; for example, Tim Pat Coogan would clearly put forward a very different critique of the situation circa 1994 regarding both unionist posturing and IRA thinking and tactics.

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

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

“All the other factors leading towards peace in the 1990s had been there before; the new and all-important factor was the involvement of the paramilitaries in the political process.”

How convincing is this view of the reasons for the success of the “peace process” in the years 1994 to 1998? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative. **1-6**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

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

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

Indicative content

This question focuses on the years from the first IRA ceasefire in 1994 to the Good Friday Agreement of 1998, especially on the parallel moves of republican and loyalist paramilitaries towards political action. The quotation offers a genuine choice. Answers agreeing with the quotation have much potential material to work with, both from own knowledge and especially from the sources, all three of which lend support to the central proposition. Collins credits Gerry Adams with seeing the light before Collins himself, Source B gives similar prominence to John Taylor, Wichert sees Peter Brooke as paving the way for both sides to move. There is much scope for own knowledge about British policy, both under Major and Blair, in encouraging paramilitary involvement. But answers that choose to challenge the quotation also have much powerful ammunition to support an argument that the long-term war peace process owed much more to other, deeper factors than a bunch of terrorists

stumbling towards political common sense – e.g. it was all down to British resolve and security successes that republicanism had to increasingly choose the ballot box rather than the bullet (leading to the talks between Adams and John Hume); or that the real key was the political partnership between Major and Reynolds (and later Blair and Ahern); or that the support of President Clinton and the promise of American financial assistance was crucial.

As always, we should not expect “balance” to mean even-handed, ‘middle-of-the-road’ assessments, nor comprehensive coverage. Many effective answers may be trenchantly unionist or nationalist in tone – just as long as they are well argued, backed by specific evidence from own knowledge, from the three sources, and (at Levels 4 or 5) from a grasp of other perspectives from the nominated texts or from wider independent reading.

Note that the question focuses on the years 1994–1998. The sources all refer primarily to beginnings in 1994. One feature of the more successful answers will be the ability to use own knowledge about the wider “reasons for the success of the peace process”. Many excellent answers may be enclosed entirely within the key dates – but due credit should be given to those answers which make relevant arguments out of pre-1994 material. Such material is not required, nor should it be descriptive or unbalanced – but, if well applied, it could be highly effective.