

AS
HISTORY
7041/2S

The Making of Modern Britain, 1951–2007
Component 2S Building a new Britain, 1951–1979

Mark scheme

June 2022

Version: 1.0 Final



Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' 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 from aqa.org.uk

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges 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 schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2022 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining the beginning of the ‘troubles’ in Northern Ireland?

[25 marks]

Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will provide a range of relevant well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16–20**
- L3:** The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and having little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6–10**
- L1:** The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

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

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

In responding to this question, students may choose to address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

Source A: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:

Provenance and tone

- McLaughlin was a participant as a youth in the Bogside riots, making his evidence valuable as a first-hand account of what happened on the streets
- it is also valuable for its perspective, 40 years on, and in the context of his subsequent career as a Sinn Féin politician; however, hindsight stretching four decades might be considered a limitation, as could his obvious Catholic, Sinn Féin bias
- it is not an over-emotional piece of writing but McLaughlin's tone is clearly partisan.

Content and argument

- McLaughlin argues that the beginning of the 'troubles' lay in the inequality and discrimination experienced by the Catholic population of Northern Ireland: the Protestant/Unionist domination of the social, economic and political life of the province and their fear of the Catholic/Sinn Féin goal of a united Ireland
- he implies that the British army, sent in by the Wilson government in an attempt to keep the peace, treated the Catholics as if they were the perpetrators of the violence, despite the reality of Catholics being killed
- the source is valuable because McLaughlin, 40 years later, is unrepentant and unapologetic; he sees the 'troubles' and the loss of life and disruption it caused as worth it to take a step towards achieving the longer-term goal of a united Ireland
- students can add context to the source by referencing the civil rights movement and developing their understanding of the grievances outlined by McLaughlin, such as election boundaries being deliberately drawn to prevent Catholics from being elected to political office (gerrymandering); references to the Orange Order marches routed through Catholic areas, such as that of the Apprentice Boys that led to the Battle of the Bogside and the RUC violence to Catholics shown on British TV screens are equally valid.

Source B: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:

Provenance and tone

- Paisley was personally engaged in the ‘troubles’; his evidence may be thought more valuable given his position and status at the time as an elected MP to the British parliament, whereas McLaughlin was a youth at the time
- Paisley was both politician and religious leader, which perhaps adds value because it suggests he would have a broad understanding and experience of the sectarian divide. However, as a limitation, his sectarian bias is obvious
- Paisley’s tone and language is highly partisan, fiercely critical of the Catholics, which might be thought to add or detract value.

Content and argument

- Paisley’s views are valuable as a clear counter-argument to those of McLaughlin, expressing the Unionist view that it is Catholics who are initiating violence and intimidation to win concessions
- he believes that the only way to restore peace and security for everyone is through the firm imposition of law and order
- it is valuable that Paisley does not see the British army as neutral; he is critical, arguing that they are turning a blind eye to Catholic attacks
- students can add context by showing their understanding of the Unionist view – the Protestant majority – that they felt under attack and vulnerable, fearing that the IRA was behind the ‘troubles’ and using the civil rights movement as a smokescreen to pursue their goal of a united Ireland; Unionist loyalists set up their own paramilitary organisations to protect their communities.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might comment that the situation in Northern Ireland was very polarised and that both sources are valuable in demonstrating this divide, each speaker representing their communities as victims. Students can argue in favour of either source as the more valuable but should provide a convincing and supported judgement. Source A is valuable because McLaughlin has the advantage of having been on the barricades, an eye witness to the ‘troubles’, and has the experience of knowing what it was like to be in the minority; Source B is valuable because Paisley is a politician and decision maker, which, presumably, gives him important insights, though he is perhaps using the law and order argument as a shield to protect Unionist advantages. Both McLaughlin and Paisley believe absolutely that they are in possession of the true ‘facts’.

Section B

0 2 'In the years 1957 to 1964, the British economy was strong.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

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

Arguments supporting the view that in the years 1957 to 1964, the British economy was strong might include:

- Britain enjoyed a higher income per head than any other major country, except for the US
- most economic indicators were strong: living standards increased; weekly wages for men rose year on year; there were big increases in private savings; home ownership increased; people definitely felt more affluent and there was a significant growth in consumerism; leisure and travel opportunities increased
- Macmillan felt sufficiently confident, in 1957/58, to stick with an expansionist economic policy, rejecting Chancellor Thorneycroft's arguments that government spending needed to be reduced; the 1959 budget reflected Macmillan's optimism, providing tax cuts worth £370 million
- the British economy continued to grow throughout the period and was at its peak between 1960 and 1964.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1957 to 1964, the British economy was strong might include:

- Britain's industrial production lagged behind the US and its major European competitors; economic growth in Europe, especially in West Germany, was leaving Britain behind and trade with the Empire and Commonwealth was not enough to keep up
- Britain's productivity was well below that of German and French workers
- Britain was caught in a cycle of 'stop-go' economics; this economic cycle did not help export industries and led to periodic balance of payments crises
- underlying problems in the economy became increasingly apparent in the early 1960s, resulting in: an IMF loan in 1961; an application to join the EEC (1961; rejected 1963); the setting up of the National Economic Development Council (NEDC; Neddy) and a National Incomes Commission (NIC; Nicky), both in 1962, to address longer-term economic planning; the Beeching cuts in 1963.

Although the British economy continued to grow and living standards continued to improve throughout the period, the underlying trends in the economy were less encouraging. The cycle of 'stop-go' economics persisted as too many imports and rising wage demands led to periodic overheating of the economy. Britain continued to fall behind overseas competitors and the need for economic modernisation was only belatedly acknowledged. To the average person on the street the economy seemed strong but the application to the EEC and the Beeching cuts in particular symbolised more worrying realities; long-term structural problems suggest that the economy was not as strong as it appeared on the surface.

0 3 'Britain's 'special relationship' with the USA collapsed in the 1970s.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

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

Arguments supporting the view that Britain’s ‘special relationship’ with the USA collapsed in the 1970s might include:

- Heath was more oriented to Europe than the US; he refused to allow the US to use Britain as a go-between with Europe, insisting that the US should negotiate with the EEC as a whole
- relations between Britain and the US reached crisis point in October 1973 as a result of the Yom Kippur War: Britain joined with most European states to refuse permission for American planes stationed at NATO bases in Europe to airlift supplies to Israel; Heath also refused to allow US planes to refuel in Cyprus
- the relationship remained strained throughout the 1970s, partly because successive American administrations grew to doubt Britain’s value to the US, given Britain’s continuing political and economic weaknesses
- Wilson and Callaghan completed the British withdrawal from East of Suez against the wishes of the US.

Arguments challenging the view that Britain’s ‘special relationship’ with the USA collapsed in the 1970s might include:

- Britain and the US continued to work closely together as allies throughout the 1970s, despite disagreements, because of their common objective of containing communism; links were maintained through NATO and through their established nuclear and intelligence networks
- Britain followed the lead of the US in supporting Détente with the USSR and in opening up relations with China; Nixon visited China in February 1972 and Heath in March 1972
- Wilson and Callaghan did not share Heath’s antipathy to the Atlantic Alliance; Callaghan built a trusting relationship with Kissinger and negotiated with Carter in 1979 to replace Polaris with Trident
- by the end of the decade Thatcher and Reagan began a strong relationship based on common political philosophies and genuine friendship.

It might be an exaggeration to suggest that the ‘special relationship’ totally collapsed in the 1970s but it is clear that at times, and particularly in the first half of the decade under the premiership of Heath, that the relationship was put under considerable strain. Indeed, by the end of their respective terms in office Nixon and Heath had grown to detest each other personally. Overall, however, the factors holding the relationship together probably outweighed the tensions and crises that separated them.