

A-LEVEL

History

Paper 1G Challenge and Transformation: Britain, c1851–1964
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

Version: 1.0

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 Assessment Writer.

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

A-level History Paper 1 Specimen Mark Scheme

1G Challenge and Transformation: Britain, c1851–1964

Section A

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|
| 0 | 1 | Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to the growth of affluence amongst the working classes. | [30 marks] |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|

Target: AO3

Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Generic Mark Scheme

- | | | |
|------------|--|--------------|
| L5: | Shows a very good understanding of the interpretations put forward in all three extracts and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. Evaluation of the arguments will be well-supported and convincing. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. | 25-30 |
| L4: | Shows a good understanding of the interpretations given in all three extracts and combines this with knowledge of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. The evaluation of the arguments will be mostly well-supported, and convincing, but may have minor limitations of depth and breadth. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. | 19-24 |
| L3: | Provides some supported comment on the interpretations given in all three extracts and comments on the strength of these arguments in relation to their historic context. There is some analysis and evaluation but there may be an imbalance in the degree and depth of comments offered on the strength of the arguments. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. | 13-18 |
| L2: | Provides some accurate comment on the interpretations given in at least two of the extracts, with reference to the historical context. The answer may contain some analysis, but there is little, if any, evaluation. Some of the comments on the strength of the arguments may contain some generalisation, inaccuracy or irrelevance. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. | 7-12 |
| L1: | Either shows an accurate understanding of the interpretation given in one extract only or addresses two/three extracts, but in a generalist way, showing limited accurate understanding of the arguments they contain, although there may be some general awareness of the historical context. Any comments on the strength of the arguments are likely to be generalist and contain some inaccuracy and/or irrelevance. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. | 1-6 |
| | 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.

Note: in responding to this question, students may choose to respond to each extract in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach to individual arguments. Either approach could be equally valid and what follows is indicative of the analysis and evaluation which may be relevant.

Extract A: In their identification of Royle’s argument, students may refer to the following:

- Royle’s overall argument is that by the 1950s there was evidence of growing working class affluence; he implies that there was steady progress in this direction from the late 1930s
- he bases this interpretation on statistics which showed that real wages rose for ‘the bottom 12 million’ between 1949 and 1955, and that the proportion of personal income received by ‘the top 100,000 earners’ fell between 1938 and 1955
- thus, he argues that Britain was becoming a more egalitarian society as a result of ‘a reduction in inequalities of wealth’; he attributes this change to the welfare policies of the post-war Labour governments and to a gradual relaxation of austerity in the 1950s
- his final sentence, however, implies that this affluence was limited: he emphasises that the growth in affluence was ‘relative to the pre-war period’, and by using the qualification ‘so-called’ in describing the ‘never-had-it-so-good’ years of the late 1950s and early 1960s.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- in support of Royle’s argument, students could discuss Labour’s ‘New Jerusalem’ as evidence: full employment, free health care, free secondary education and comprehensive social security
- to support Royle’s claim that affluence was spreading students could deploy evidence of the consumer and material advances in the 1950s and early 1960s under the thirteen years of Conservative rule
- in order to challenge Royle’s view, students could emphasise aspects of continuity rather than change, such as the argument that much of the cost of Labour’s programme was still paid for by contributions from workers’ wages, whereas greater tax redistribution would have had much more of an impact on reducing differentials in wealth
- students might also argue that not only was the degree of growing affluence limited, particularly in the provision of new housing, for example, but that entrenched class privilege remained, making a mockery of the claim that Britain was becoming a more egalitarian society.

Extract B: In their identification of Todd’s argument, students may refer to the following:

- Todd challenges the view that the working classes experienced continuous economic improvement in this period; her overall argument is that by the 1950s the income gap between rich and poor was actually widening not narrowing
- she dismisses the notion of sustained progress, identifying three discrete phases: the development of a limited consumer culture in the 1930s; improvement under Labour’s auspices in the 1940s; further regression under the Conservatives in the 1950s
- Todd argues not only that economic progress was uneven, but also that the economic and political subordination of the 1930s, though challenged by Labour in the 1940s, persisted through the 1950s as inequalities in income increased
- students may acknowledge that her argument represents a strong left-wing refutation that the working classes experienced growing affluence.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- in support of Todd’s view, students may discuss the limitations of Labour’s welfare reforms: for example, the underfunding of the NHS, or the compromises Labour had to make in overcoming the opposition of doctors to health reform
- students could also support Todd by arguing that affluence did not necessarily equate to ‘egalitarianism’; deep inequalities persisted in education, at work and in peoples’ life chances
- in challenging Todd’s argument, students could identify a range of material improvements and cultural shifts which began during the war to argue that the quality of daily living for the working classes and their opportunities for social advancement were much greater than in the depressed decade of the 1930s in the post-war years
- the election of a majority Labour government in 1945, committed to nationalisation and social improvement, might also be used as evidence by students that an economic and cultural shift was underway.

Extract C: In their identification of Skidelsky’s argument, students may refer to the following:

- Skidelsky has none of the reservations of Royle or Todd; his overall argument is that this period was one of sustained material progress for all and that ‘affluence began to reshape society’
- Skidelsky develops his argument by offering a broad range of positive economic indicators which illustrated how, from the 1930s, capitalism was driving uninterrupted social and economic prosperity
- unlike Todd, Skidelsky presents the view that the change from a Labour to a Conservative government in 1951 promoted rather than hindered growing affluence and prosperity
- he offers a relatively right-wing interpretation, acknowledging positive change before 1951, but argues that affluence largely was the result of ‘the Tories’.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- in support of Skidelsky, students could emphasise that Conservative electoral success between 1951 and 1964 was an indicator that many working class voters recognised that they 'had never had it so good'
- in addition, students could argue that not only was growing affluence apparent in the range of material improvement experienced by the working class, but that their life chances too were measurably improved; such as, grammar schools offering working class children a new route to university, or how the NHS had removed the fear of falling ill
- students could challenge Skidelsky's argument that capitalism delivered equal improvements to all: the working class who achieved adulthood in the 1950s and early 1960s might have been materially better off than their parents, but that this did not necessarily amount to a fundamental re-shaping of society
- students might also deploy material to show that Skidelsky's broad assertions of home and car ownership were largely beyond most working class people.

Section B

0 2 'The British parliamentary system was transformed in the years 1851–1885.'

Assess the validity of 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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 the British parliamentary system was transformed in the years 1851–1885 might include:

- despite much indifference in the 1850s, there was a renewed interest in reform by the mid-1860s: Gladstone came out in favour; the National Reform Union was founded in 1864 and the Reform League in 1865
- the 1867 Act, which Derby called it a 'leap in the dark', implemented significant changes: the electorate increased from 1.4 to almost 2.5 million; working class voters were now in a majority in most major cities; some seats were redistributed
- the 1884 Act was a substantial step forward: it enfranchised all householders in the counties, achieving uniformity with the boroughs, and doubled the electorate to almost 5 million
- the 1885 Redistribution Act also brought considerable changes: it achieved a much better balance in seat distribution between North and South; single-member constituencies became the norm (647 out of 670)
- the 1883 Corrupt and Illegal Practices Act and the 1885 Registration Act added further safeguards, building on the 1872 Secret Ballot Act.

Arguments challenging the view that the British parliamentary system was transformed in the years 1851–1885 might include:

- there was very little political will to implement further parliamentary reform in the period 1851-65; Russell had Bills rejected in 1851, 1852, 1854 and 1860; Palmerston and Derby were strongly; in short, most in the House of Commons resisted change
- the 1867 Act left working men in the counties still largely unrepresented; the distribution of parliamentary seats was still anomalous; there was no secret ballot; corruption and intimidation persisted
- the 1884 Act was less than comprehensive: several categories of adult males were still deprived of the vote, such as domestic servants; the process of voter registration was complex and bureaucratic: about one-half of the electorate failed to fulfil registration requirements
- women were still denied the vote
- MPs were still not paid; very few working men entered parliament; parliamentary modes of procedure and convention all modelled and reinforced an age of privilege not of democracy.

Students could present a reasonably compelling argument that by 1884 the parliamentary system had been radically transformed, not only in terms of the increase in the number of voters but also in terms of attitudes: the ruling classes no longer argued that the social order was endangered by any further extension of the franchise. Moreover, the changes in distribution were significant: working class constituents were now in a majority in about 100 seats in Britain. The period 1883–85, in particular, brought about great changes.

However, this can be challenged. There was enormous continuity in terms of parliamentary membership. By and large the new voters were accommodated within the existing parties, each of which offered a fairly paternalistic view of the needs of the working class. In other words, it is perfectly possible to argue that the electorate increased and the distribution of seats better reflected social and economic changes, but in essence the same people were in power; there might be more voters, but the same people continued in power.

- 0 3** How successful was Gladstone in improving Anglo-Irish relations in the years 1868–1893? **[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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 Gladstone was successful in improving Anglo-Irish relations in the years 1868–1893, might include:

- the Church: the Disestablishment of the Irish Church in 1869 was a useful reform, removing a long-standing anomaly and which had caused much popular resentment in Ireland
- the ‘Land Question’: ownership of land was an intractable and fundamental problem: though the First Irish Land Act in 1870 had significant limitations, the Second Land Act in 1881 had greater success in limiting ‘exorbitant’ rents and evictions and meeting the demands of the Irish Land League
- Home Rule: Gladstone’s decision to pursue Home Rule for Ireland was an example of conviction politics – ‘conversion through conviction’ – at its best; Home Rule only failed in 1886 because of entrenched Conservative and Radical opposition, and in 1893 because the Conservatives used their majority in the Lords as a constitutional weapon
- coercion: Gladstone’s options for policing Irish unrest were very limited: the 1871 Coercion Act and the imprisonment of Parnell in 1881 were unpopular but necessary
- individuals: Gladstone’s ‘mission’ was creditable; it is disingenuous to blame Gladstone for any failure to improve Anglo-Irish relations; the failure perhaps lies with those resolutely opposed, such as Hartington, Chamberlain and Salisbury, or Parnell who also made errors of judgement in the 1880s.

Arguments challenging the view that Gladstone was successful in improving Anglo-Irish relations in the years 1868–1893, might include:

- the Church: the Church Disestablishment in 1869 was largely irrelevant to what was then the central problem of Ireland – the need for land reform
- the ‘Land Question’: the First Land Act was an awful failure, easily by-passed by the courts; the Second Land Act simply led to Parnell-led boycott of the Land Courts; the measure might have been welcome in 1870 but was too little and too late in 1881
- Home Rule: the failure of two Home Rule Bills caused significant damage to Anglo-Irish relations, raising expectations beyond what he could deliver and worsening anti-English sentiments in Ireland; not a ‘solution’ to Ireland’s solutions but an attempted solution to the Liberal Party’s own problems – ‘conversion through convenience’
- coercion: Gladstone was at a loss how to pacify Irish popular discontent: coercion simply stoked up opposition and the imprisonment of Parnell for ‘obstructionism’ was a gross error of judgement.

Ultimately, students may reach a judgement based either on Gladstone's legislative record, which has little to commend it, or on the sincerity of his moral crusade, which can be defended, or on whether a short-term or long-term view is taken. By bringing Irish affairs to the forefront of British politics it can be argued that in the longer term Gladstone succeeded in pushing the process of 'pacifying' Ireland further forward. Students might explore Gladstone's motivation and add or subtract credit accordingly; there is much to explore in discussing whether Gladstone was more interested in pursuing what he thought was 'right' or whether he was more interested in improving his own party's situation rather than improving Anglo-Irish relations.

0 4 'Rigid adherence to the ideology of free trade caused significant damage to the British economy in the years 1900–1939.'

Assess the validity of 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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- The answer is 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 a rigid adherence to the ideology of free trade caused significant damage to the British economy in the years 1900–1939, might include:

- 1900-14: Britain's growth rate, manufacturing output and GDP (not per capita) fell behind its main rivals, the United States and Germany, who maintained tariff barriers
- 1914-20: most European nations, and the United States, tried to insulate their economies against the damages caused by the First World War through strengthened tariffs, but Britain remained out of step
- 1920-29: the British economy stagnated; British governments stubbornly stuck to the belief that the old pre-war, unregulated, London-based, international economic world could somehow be revived – maintenance of free trade delusional
- 1929-32: Britain was too slow to jettison free trade as the Great Depression deepened: June 1930, the United States passed a new Tariff Act – the highest tariff barriers in its history; Britain did not follow suit until the Import Duties Act, passed in February 1932
- 1932-39: protection aided the re-structuring of British industry: for example, the rationalisation of the steel industry led to increased profitability: steel production was over 13 million tons in 1939, 40 per cent more than 1929.

Arguments challenging the view that a rigid adherence to the ideology of free trade caused significant damage to the British economy in the years 1900–1939, might include:

- 1903-05: the tariff reform controversy was as much about party political interests as economic benefit; Chamberlain saw tariff reform as a means of uniting the Liberals behind a single issue, arguing that imperial preference could finance social reform
- 1900-14: though slowing down, the economy was still growing – no compelling evidence that the economy was 'significantly damaged'; the Edwardian era overall was one of relative prosperity
- 1914-20: there was an overall decline in economic production, but this was due to the broader impact of the First World War, it was not directly attributable to free trade
- 1920-29: economic stagnation was attributable not only to the global impact of the War, but also to the long term decline of Britain's staple industries
- 1929-32: the Great Depression was caused by the U.S. stock market collapse not by the maintenance of free trade per se
- 1932-39: protection and imperial preference was more beneficial to the Empire than to Britain; the impact of tariffs on consumer prices overall was very small; protection contributed very little to solving the main economic problem of the decade – unemployment.

Students could provide a strong argument that Britain adhered to free trade for too long and that by doing so this contributed to Britain's economic difficulties in the 1920s and 1930s. There is a much less compelling case to be made for Britain's economy being significantly damaged by the continuing commitment to free trade before 1914. Students with a strong conceptual understanding could acknowledge that free trade symbolised Britain's industrial and commercial supremacy for close to a hundred years, and that this might explain why Baldwin in particular resisted protection for so long. Perhaps the most convincing riposte to the view expressed in the question is that protection did little to aid the British economy in the period 1932–39. Britain's overall level of trade was not boosted. Much had been expected but it proved only to have been of marginal importance, neither helping nor hindering the economy to any great extent.