



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative T Unit 6W

Mark Scheme

2007 examination – June series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

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

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

The specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section C).

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS

The relationship between the Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1.1, 1.2 and 2 and the Levels of Response.

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in AO 1.1, by writing a narrative or descriptive response, will restrict themselves to a maximum of 6 out of 20 marks by performing at Level 1. Those candidates going on to provide more explanation (AO 1.2), supported by the relevant selection of material (AO1.1), will have access to approximately 6 more marks, performing at Level 2 and low Level 3, depending on how implicit or partial their judgements prove to be. Candidates providing explanation with evaluation and judgement, supported by the selection of appropriate information and exemplification, will clearly be operating in all 3 AOs (AO 2, AO1.2 and AO1.1) and will therefore have access to the highest levels and the full range of 20 marks by performing in Levels 3, 4 and 5.

Level 1:***Either***

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

Or

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

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristic: they

- will lack direction and any clear links to the analytical demands of the question
- will, therefore, offer a relevant but outline-only description in response to the question
- will be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

- lack any significant corroboration
- be generalised and poorly focused
- demonstrate limited appreciation of specific content
- be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

IT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THIS TYPE OF RESPONSE AND THOSE WHICH ARE SUCCINCT AND UNDEVELOPED BUT FOCUSED AND VALID (appropriate for Level 2 or above).

Level 2:***Either***

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

Or

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

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

- understanding of some but not all of the issues
- some direction and focus demonstrated largely through introductions or conclusions
- some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of the language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

- arguments which have some focus and relevance
- an awareness of the specific context
- some accurate but limited factual support
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Level 3:

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

Exemplification/guidance

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

- the approach will be generally analytical but may include some narrative passages which will be limited and controlled
- analysis will be focused and substantiated, although a complete balance of treatment of issues is not to be expected at this level nor is full supporting material
- there will be a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed, not fully convincing or which may occasionally digress into narrative
- there will be relevant supporting material, although not necessarily comprehensive, which might include reference to interpretations
- effective use of language, appropriate historical terminology and coherence of style.

Level 4:

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

Exemplification/guidance

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

- sustained analysis, explicitly supported by relevant and accurate evidence
- little or no narrative, usually in the form of exemplification
- coverage of all the major issues, although there may not be balance of treatment
- an attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or summary
- effective skills of communication through the use of accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

Level 5:

As Level 4 but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 5 will be differentiated from Level 4 in that there will be:

- a consistently analytical approach
- consistent corroboration by reference to selected evidence
- a clear and consistent attempt to reach judgements
- some evidence of independence of thought, but not necessarily of originality
- a good conceptual understanding
- strong and effective communication skills, grammatically accurate and demonstrating coherence and clarity of thought.

C: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

These principles are applicable to both the Advanced Subsidiary examination and to the A level (A2) examination.

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: "What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?". Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates' responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid "bunching" of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills:**
 - generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
- well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid "double jeopardy". Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

June 2007

Alternative T: Liberal Democracies, c1787–c1939

A2 Unit 6: Great Britain and Appeasement in the 1930s

- (a) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.
Assess the validity of the view in **Source A** about the foreign policies of Baldwin and Chamberlain in the 1930s. (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

Ranson argues that Baldwin and Chamberlain were not the ‘guilty men’ they were accused of being by Cato in 1940. They worked for peace because of their idealism, optimism and courage and they were not blind to many of the realities of the situation. They were mistaken in their analysis of the situation, but we can only see this retrospectively. A Level 1 answer would identify the interpretation.

For Level 2 own knowledge is required. It could be used to develop all of the above points. Many revisionist historians have defended Baldwin and especially Chamberlain. They were not guilty of blindly appeasing as they also set out to rearm, hence Chamberlain as Chancellor began rearmament and as Prime Minister introduced conscription and ensured gas masks were distributed. They tried to avoid war out of conviction that it produced no winners, and concerns that Britain was vulnerable to German air power. It was not known at the time how relatively weak the German army actually was, even in 1938, or conversely, the strength of the Czech and Soviet forces. The idealism of Chamberlain could be related to the British view that the wrongs of Versailles were righted in the 1930s, including the grant of National Self Determination to the Sudeten Germans.

Answers that swiftly dismiss the validity of the view without developing it using their own knowledge would normally also lie in Level 2.

Evaluation of the validity of Ranson’s arguments should be made for Level 3 and above. Baldwin naively promised no major rearmaments to win the 1935 General Election campaign, even in the face of developing Fascist aggression. Chamberlain could have acted to save the Sudeten Czechs in 1938, but did not want to ally Britain to the USSR. He believed peace would win him the next election and protect his position as Prime Minister, yet government control of the media meant they could have introduced any policy. His anti-communism and personal hatred of war blinded him to the strong military reasons for going to war in 1938.

Judgement at Level 4 might involve arguing that the military advice was not wholly ignored – after all General Ismay stressed that war would be better in 6-12 months when asked for his opinion as Secretary of the Committee of Imperial Defence during the Munich crisis.

- (b) Use **Source B** and your own knowledge.
How useful is **Source B** as evidence of the military reasons for the failure of Britain to support Czechoslovakia in September 1938? (10 marks)

Target: A01.1, AO2

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract in relation to the issue presented in the question. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates some appreciation either of the strengths and/or of the limitations of the content of the source in relation to its utility/reliability within the context of the issue. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates reasoned understanding of the strengths and limitations of the source in the context of the issue and draws conclusions about its utility/reliability. **6-8**
- L4: Evaluates the utility/reliability of the source in relation to the issue in the question to reach a sustained and well supported judgement. **9-10**

Indicative content

A Level 1 answer may describe the source with very limited assessment of utility. The source shows that at the time Britain was deciding whether to support Czechoslovakia, the British army numbered 2 divisions in Europe, compared to 81 German divisions.

At Level 2, answers should appreciate that the source has clear strengths and link them to the decision not to support Czechoslovakia in September 1938. Source B allows a comparison of Britain's military position with other powers, and also makes clear that the combined Anglo-French forces available was not as large as the German army. Nor was Britain keen to act in support of Czechoslovakia with France, as such a war may involve Italy and a combined Anglo-French-Czech army of 99 divisions was far inferior (in terms of military divisions) to an Axis force of 154 divisions. The data comes from January 1938 and is therefore of some use in explaining the decisions taken in September 1938.

An answer that covers strengths and limits without depth or reasoned understanding would also gain a Level 2 award.

At Level 3, answers will consider strengths and limitations with reasoned understanding. The source has clear limitations. It only refers to army divisions, yet Britain's lack of aircraft was held to be most significant in 1938. It reveals nothing of the quality of the units – Britain's decision not to go to war alongside the signatures of the 1935 Mutual Assistance Pact was driven by concerns that the French Army was rotten to the core and that the Soviet Army had been decimated by the purges and could not be trusted, despite its great size. Furthermore, the Soviet Union could not intervene in Czechoslovakia without transit rights from Poland, and the French Army's 'Maginot mentality' made aggressive war almost impossible.

Judgement at Level 4 may take the form of arguing the source could be used to support the decision taken, but the military advice not to go to war was made for more qualitative than quantitative reasons.

- (c) Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.
 'Public opinion forced Chamberlain's government into the decision to go to war in September 1939.'
 Assess the validity of this view. (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Indicative content

The question requires consideration of the role of public opinion in September 1939, balanced against other more objective factors.

Public Opinion clearly was significant. The vehement support for Chamberlain seen at the time of the Munich Agreement had dissipated by 1939. Reference to the Bridgwater by-election and the public reaction to the invasion of Prague on 15th March 1939 could be seen, linked to Chamberlain's Birmingham speech of 16th March 1939. The April guarantees could be seen as the government's response to the new public mood and the decision to go to war to uphold the Polish guarantee was the final triumph of public opinion, in opposition to Chamberlain's wishes (Source C and Smart).

Answers at Level 3 and above require balance, provided by considering other factors responsible. Chamberlain and other leading decision makers had changed their opinion following the invasion of Prague, as the national self-determination idealism (Source A) that had driven appeasement was crushed by Hitler's imperialist acquisition of Bohemia and Moravia. Furthermore, Chamberlain saw no personal political benefit in continuing to appease, as his own party, as well as the rest of Parliament, were in favour of action (Source C). The military position had improved – not only had Britain and France more European divisions (Source B and Ranson), but she also had the aircraft to stop the bombers getting through, as well as radar. The diplomatic picture had also improved, as Australia, South Africa and Canada would also join in a declaration of war, as well as loyal New Zealand; in January 1939, Roosevelt had spoken out against the Neutrality Act.

Answers at Level 4 should show appropriate historiographical understanding, with reference to the 'guilty men' Cato attacked (Source A) as well as the revisionist defence of Chamberlain. They should use all the sources.

At Level 5, an answer should have sustained judgement that places the debate within the context of their own independent viewpoint, perhaps that Ranson (Source A) is too generous as we do not need the benefit of hindsight to recognise that war would have been better fought in September 1938, therefore public opinion was not the reason for action a year later, rather Chamberlain facing political pressure.