

GCE 2004  
*June Series*



## Mark Scheme

### History Alternative U Units 2, 5 and 6 (Subject Code 5041/6041)

---

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 from:

Publications Department, Aldon House, 39, Heald Grove, Rusholme, Manchester, M14 4NA  
Tel: 0161 953 1170

or

download from the AQA website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors

#### 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.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester, M15 6EX.

*Dr. Michael Cresswell Director General*

---

**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 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.



**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.

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

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

Explain briefly the meaning of “Marshall Plan” in the context of the British economy after 1945. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Basic explanation of the term using the source, e.g. generalised references to American and economic aid. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the term and its significance in relation to the context, e.g. gives specific examples of the crisis in 1947 that made American help so essential; or shows understanding of the way the British economy recovered in the years to 1951 partly or ‘decisively’ due to Marshall aid. **2-3**

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

How useful is **Source A** as evidence about British foreign policy under Ernest Bevin during the years 1945 to 1951? (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 Attlee was extremely well-informed about all aspects of Bevin’s career and foreign policy responsibilities; or uses appropriate evidence from the source, or uses own knowledge, to show Attlee’s favourable view of Bevin was justified. **3-5**

- L3: Developed evaluation, drawing conclusions about utility/reliability based on strengths and weaknesses and judged against the context, e.g. a fully developed explanation, using precise own knowledge to explain how the evidence from Source B is useful and reliable (or not); or perhaps discusses how Attlee's polite and 'official' memoirs are inevitable kindly and approving. Note that this point will be effective if supported by precisely selected evidence from the source, less so as an 'all-purpose' comment on the nature of memoirs in general. **6-7**

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

"During the years 1945 to 1951, British economic recovery was fatally undermined by unrealistic attempts to maintain a world role."

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

Level descriptors for response *with* use of sources and own knowledge

*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 *either* on own knowledge *or* the sources. **1-4**

- L2: ***Either***

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

***Or***

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

***Or***

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

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

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

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

## Indicative content

The double focus of the question is on the economic recovery and on attempts to maintain Britain's world role. Some answers will entirely agree with the quotation and bring in much own knowledge of expensive foreign burdens such as nuclear weapons, Cold War commitments, the economic costs of empire, the Korean War etc. Other answers, taking their lead from own knowledge about the successes of Ernest Bevin, backed up by evidence in Source A and Source B, will argue that British policies were remarkably successful and were not “undermined” at all. (Still another argument might be that Britain's economic recovery was indeed undermined but by the excessive costs of nationalisations and the welfare state, not by the world role). As always, an effective balanced answer will have a coherent central argument backed by both appropriate own knowledge and well-applied evidence from the sources. The key dates, 1945 to 1951, leave some scope for differentiation – perhaps separating the period of real crisis and overstretch during 1945-47 from the success and consolidation during 1947-1951 (or even differentiating between a mostly successful period of recovery to 1950 that was then derailed by the Korean War). Source C offers much ammunition in support of the key quotation. As usual, comprehensive or equal coverage of all aspects is not a requirement, as long as the answer shows awareness of the key issues and has an overview of economic recovery and the impact of foreign and imperial commitments in the years from 1945 to 1951.

## Question 2

- (a) Comment on “North-South Divide” in the context of Britain in the 1930s. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial explanation of the issue based on either the source or own knowledge, e.g. basic or partial definition of the “rich South – poor North”; or literal use of material from the source on “depressed regions” and “suffering”. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation demonstrating understanding of the issue based on both the source and own knowledge, e.g. uses the source to identify the way the depression was very uneven in its impact; or uses precise own knowledge of examples of regional differences. One of the distinguishing features of L2 answers will be recognition that the divide was not literally North and South at all but more complex – the term is somewhat simplistic. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why certain parts of the country experienced “spectacular growth” during the years of the Depression. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue, e.g. by generalised comments about staple industries being especially vulnerable but “new” industries not. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. shows accurate knowledge of awareness of the different areas

of the country where prosperity was found (some answers will quote J.B. Priestley's "three Englands" here) with some explanation of which economic activities were thriving, such as suburban house-building, the motor industry etc. **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. prioritises the significance of various causes of growth in some areas compared with others hit by the impact of depression. Note that L3 answers may deal with fewer factors, but do so better. Many answers at L2 will have a longer 'list' of factors but will not differentiate them. L3 answers will make links and draw conclusions in order to provide an explanation. **6-7**

(c) How important, in relation to other factors, were the policies of the National Government in enabling Britain to recover from the Depression? **(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**

Note that this question requires an assessment of relative importance. Many answers may go into the policies of the National Government in a big way (the reassuring leadership of Baldwin, work of Neville Chamberlain as Chancellor, the Unemployment Assistance Board, the Special Areas Act etc) – other answers may be more dismissive of all this and seek the decisive factors elsewhere, perhaps by arguing that the real recovery only came with preparations for war in the late 1930s, or that recovery happened of itself from 1934 and the

National Government had little to do with this. A balanced answer need not be comprehensive or even-handed. The stimulus material clearly assumes that genuine economic recovery did occur; some answers, often good ones, may challenge this assumption and differentiate between selfish middle-class myths and the harsh reality of long-term slump in key sections of society. As usual, the basis of successful answers will be a balanced overall assessment supported by precise and well-chosen evidence. Answers at Level 4 will not necessarily have more sheer substance but will have precise definition of issues and the ability to differentiate the relative significance of a range of factors.

### Question 3

- (a) Comment on “People’s War” in the context of Britain in the years 1940-1945.(3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial explanation of the issue based on either the source or own knowledge, e.g. generalised assertion about national unity and greater equality. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation demonstrating understanding of the issue based on both the source and own knowledge, e.g. developed explanation demonstrating understanding of how the war years were, during and after the war, contrasted with the bad memory of the divisive Thirties; or showing awareness of the extent to which the ‘People’s War’ was a convenient sentimental myth fostered by government propaganda whereas, in real wartime life, the old social divisions remained strong (or were even made worse by such things as evacuation). Impact on war on people – rationing, conscription, etc. Awareness of differences of impact between classes. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why there was little chance of Labour winning a general election in the late 1930s. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue, e.g. general and unsupported statements about divisions in the Labour Party after 1931, or about ‘stability’ in Britain; or makes literal, uncritical use of the source. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the successes of the National Government, long-term damage from the disasters of 1931 and 1935, economic recovery from 1934, etc. **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 first past-the-post electoral system resulted in only a small number of Labour seats from a relatively large popular vote; or various pro-establishment factors making the Tories the ‘natural party of government’. L3 answers may often deal with relatively few factors but with some depth and differentiation; whereas some L2

answers may have a more comprehensive ‘list’ of factors but lack evaluation or differentiation. **6-7**

- (c) How important, in relation to other factors, was the experience gained by Labour politicians in the wartime coalition government in strengthening acceptance and support for the Labour Party between 1940 and 1945? **(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

The focus of this question is an assessment of the relative importance of the various factors leading towards the Labour landslide of 1945. Some answers will be based on close agreement with the thrust of the question arguing that the experience gained by Labour ministers was indeed the key, and providing plentiful evidence about the roles of Attlee, Bevin and Morrison, perhaps others such as Hugh Dalton. The traditional Conservative claim that Labour was somehow ‘unpatriotic’ could hardly be effective by the end of the war. Other answers may credit this factor with much less significance outweighed by other issues – changed attitudes after the war, the idea of planning and the welfare state, weaknesses in the Conservative campaign etc. Some answers, often good ones, will analyse long-term factors from the 1930s as having brought Labour into a stronger position, arguing that the 1945 ‘landslide’ was less of a shock than it seemed – but this is not a requirement. Successful answers will provide a relevant, balanced assessment of a range of factors which underpinned Labour’s march out of the political wilderness of the 1930s, backed by well-chosen own knowledge of the way perceptions of Labour changed during and because of the

war. Level 4 and Level 5 answers will not necessarily have more massive detail but will usually show themselves by impressive depth explanation and differentiation.



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

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

To what extent do **Sources A** and **B** differ in their assessment of the achievements of the Conservative governments led by Margaret Thatcher? *(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 – neither author is an admirer or supporter of Mrs Thatcher; both agree that she made a big impact on British politics. But the sources differ markedly in tone and emphasis – Hennessy’s “formidable list by any standards” is much more positive than Hobsbawm’s “and not for the better”. Source A is more balanced and dispassionate, whereas Source B (from a committed Marxist) is more of a denunciation. As usual, answers which differentiate between degrees of similarity and difference should score higher than exhaustive literal description of the textual evidence. Own knowledge might include awareness of Hobsbawm’s socialist credentials – but is more likely to involve judging which of the two interpretations comes closest to the candidates’ own understanding of the ‘Thatcher legacy’.

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

“The Thatcher Revolution changed Britain forever and for the better.”

How valid is this view of the Thatcher legacy?

(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 requires an overall retrospective assessment of the achievements of Thatcher and Thatcherism – how important were they? How lasting? How much for the better? The evidence used in successful answers may well be mostly or wholly about the years of Thatcher in power, 1979-1990, but there is clearly scope for post-1990 material about the “legacy” to be used; and also perhaps for some synoptic assessment of what went before 1979 – the “post-war Attlee consensus” etc. The most effective answers will deploy selected evidence to support a clearly-argued case, for or against the key proposition. (Or to reach a less certain conclusion – Peter Clarke’s mostly admiring tone in Source C is softened at the end by doubt, for example). It is likely that many answers will argue that Thatcher’s genuine successes were undermined or “betrayed” by her successors since 1990; or, alternatively, see her overall negative impact as the cause of later disasters for the Conservatives, and/or for the country. One interesting line is opened up by Source C and implicitly supported by Source A

– that Thatcher had a major impact on the Left in Britain. Answers might legitimately emphasise any one of these approaches more than another and we should not require equal coverage, as long as a range of evidence is applied purposefully. As usual, a balanced answer will have a valid argument in response to the question, sound own knowledge used selectively, and explicit use of the three sources.

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**

Why was the Conservative Party so politically dominant in Britain in the years from 1951 to 1964? (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 to this question is the demand for a balanced assessment of the reasons behind long-standing Conservative dominance (and by extension, therefore, to explain Labour's recurrent lack of electoral success). There is a wide range of synoptic and analytical issues from which candidates can select and prioritise – in the broader view, there is scope for an overview of the thirteen years of Conservative success over Churchill, Eden and Macmillan, perhaps above all the Fifties prosperity which underpinned it. There was also 'Butskellism' and the so-called "post-war consensus", which may have seen the Tories as beneficiaries of Labour's post-1945 achievements. Some answers may focus on Suez in 1956 as a 'turning-point' that did not turn, showing how the Conservatives recovered with apparent ease from a crisis which might have been expected to bring them down. Others may give special attention to Macmillan's skills in political management. A feature of answers at Level 4 and above will be the ability to differentiate between various factors, not simply to assemble an impressive "list" of valid reasons.

**Question 3**

"By the early 1970s, Britain had become a fundamentally different society from that of 1951."

How justified is this view of social and cultural change in Britain in the 1950s and 1960s? (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 requires a direct assessment of social (and cultural) change in Britain from 1951 to the 1970s. Was there a 'social revolution', or was there simply a Sixties myth exaggerated in importance by sentimental '68ers' and historians like Arthur Marwick? The key words here are fundamentally different. Basic, adequate answers may provide masses of relevant examples of change but in a descriptive and accumulative fashion, with rather

uncritical assumptions about the ‘old-fashioned’ 1950s. More effective answers will make evaluative judgements of which factors were more significant than others; and will balance change against continuities. Although causation is not a specific requirement of this question, many answers, often good ones, will buttress their arguments on the extent and importance of social changes (or lack of change) by explaining the factors that caused them, or prevented them from having lasting effect.

Effective answers will be synoptic in that they discuss the period as a whole and trace change over time. But coverage should not be expected to be complete or comprehensive. Detailed evidence may well be found within certain key patches of the period as a whole. It is also likely that some answers, often good ones, will bring in ideas and material on ‘change’ that goes back to the Second World War or even before. This approach could be highly relevant but it is not essential; many high-quality answers will be confined within the key dates of the question.

#### Question 4

“Harold Wilson’s personality and leadership were not only the key to Labour’s electoral successes in 1964 and 1966 but also the key to Labour’s failure in 1970.”  
How valid is this assessment? (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

There are three elections to be accounted for here but one synoptic main theme – what went wrong with the expectations and idealism associated with Wilson and the Labour victory in 1964 and the “white heat of the technological revolution”. The implicit focus of this question is on the failure of Labour to sustain itself in power at a time when social and economic trends seemed to be flowing its way – and thus on an assessment of the leadership of Harold Wilson. Answers may well fall into two broad categories – the overview answer assessing the strengths and weaknesses of Labour under Wilson, perhaps taking a structural view of party divisions and problems such as the unions, the civil service and the residual influence of the establishment and the ‘Tory press’; or a more close-up approach, stressing the roles of key personalities like Crosland, Castle, Jenkins and George Brown, or psephological analysis of the specific issues in the three elections. As long as the synoptic demands are met, equal attention to all these aspects should not be demanded – as usual, a balanced answer does not need to be either comprehensive or even-handed.

**Question 5**

“Noisy, persistent and doomed to failure.”

How valid is this verdict on the various groups who opposed Britain’s closer involvement in the process of European integration between 1970 and 1997?(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 requires an overall assessment of the opposition to British “involvement” (which could mean anything from those against the Euro and a ‘federal superstate’ to those opposed to being members at all). The most effective answers, therefore, will not only be able to assess the validity (or not) of the key words “doomed to failure” – they will be able to define precisely and to differentiate between the “various groups”, such as Eurosceptics within the two main parties, and special pressure groups like the Independence Party, and key sections of the press. Some “groups” will also be defined as the supporters of key personalities, perhaps Thatcher and Benn. As usual, the key dates provide a synoptic framework – answers should provide a balanced assessment of the period from Heath’s victory in 1970, when the Conservative agenda was mostly pro-Europe, to the 1997 election, when the issue of Europe seemingly tore the Conservatives apart – but coverage of the period need not be even or complete. Successful answers will assert a coherent case, supported by selective evidence and will show awareness of a range of issues.

**Question 6**

How serious was the political and economic impact of the oil price crisis upon Britain from 1973 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 specifies both political and economic consequences within a tightly defined period. The key word is “impact”; one central issue is economic – how and why did the 1973 oil-price crisis influence the succeeding years of recession and industrial strife? The other strand leads towards deep political problems in both major parties – Heath and his three-day week (and perhaps the failure of the Sunningdale Agreement) and the rise of Thatcher; on the Labour side, Wilson’s second term, the problems faced by Callaghan, and the rise of the

Bennite Left. A balanced answer need not involve complete or even coverage, as long as both aspects of the question are addressed on context, answers might be more “economic” or more “political” in evidence and emphasis. But there must be a due focus on 1973 and its effects – a relatively brief analysis of the oil-price crisis in 1973-74 might indeed be sufficient but this question cannot properly be answered merely by way of a descriptive account of the Winter of Discontent and how Thatcher won in 1979. Quality answers at Level 4 and above will often be revealed by their ability to differentiate between the importance of various factors, or key events.

### Question 7

“The revival in Labour’s electoral fortunes in the period 1987 to 1997 owed at least as much to the work of Neil Kinnock and John Smith as it did to the supposed miracles worked by Tony Blair’s New Labour.”

How justified is the view? (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 might seem to be mostly or entirely about the Labour Party and its return from the political dead in the 1990s – but, as always, relevant material on John Major and the internal problems leading to the decline of Conservatives, and thus to opening the path for Labour, could be used very effectively. On the other hand, there may well be some much less creditable answers attempting to set out a rigidly-prepared response to a different question. The direct focus of answers should be on the relative importance of a range of factors which explain the Labour recovery, and specifically the contributions of key personalities (not only the three leaders but perhaps also the ‘backroom boys’ of New Labour such as Campbell, Gould and Mandelson). The key quotation is provocative in tone, very negative towards Blair and New Labour in general. Effective answers will pick this up and respond to it through argument and evaluation, either accepting the main argument; or challenging the quotation by giving decisive credit to Blairism; or by a critical demolition of the quotation which then leads to a different explanation of the phenomenon altogether. The key dates provide a synoptic framework from Labour’s crushing defeat of 1987 to the landslide of 1997 – answers should show awareness of developments across this time-scale but the analytical detail may not necessarily be even or complete.

**June 2004****Alternative U: Britain, 1929-1998****A2 Unit 6: Britain and Ireland, 1969-1998****Question 1**

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

How valid is the interpretation of the impact of the 1981 hunger strikes provided in **Source B**?  
(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**

Loughlin (a nominated text) is a well informed historian, writing from a moderate unionist standpoint. Answers at Level 1 and Level 2 will be able to show understanding of the literal evidence about Mrs Thatcher's hostile attitude to the IRA campaign, and how the conflict was "internationalised, especially in the USA". Better answers will evaluate Loughlin's view in the light of other perspectives, such as:

- Comparing its unsympathetic tone and emphasis in assessing the republican cause with other more favourable views.
- Using own knowledge (and perhaps sensible references to Source C) to show how political realities often forced Thatcher to soften her natural reluctance to compromise – she was more pragmatic and conciliatory in reality than her public 'Iron Lady' image would suggest – or to show how the IRA leadership was originally very hostile to the hunger strikes before they realised its actual impact.
- Using own knowledge and understanding to make a direct evaluation, e.g. challenging Loughlin's view as being "wrong" and substituting a "correct" alternative, perhaps arguing that the people who really changed were the republicans who now began to involve themselves in democratic politics.



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

How reliable is **Source C** as evidence about the political consequences in 1985 of the 1981 hunger strikes? (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

Tim Pat Coogan is perhaps the best-known and most obviously partisan of the five nominated texts. As a massively well-informed journalist with almost unrivalled contacts in the republican movement, he can write with great authority. On the other hand, his hostile attitude to unionism (and even more outspoken criticism of the role of British governments) makes him anything but objective. Basic, adequate answers will be able to summarise the literal evidence and/or offer opinions about Coogan's 'pro-IRA' stance; better answers will go beyond this to evaluate the source, perhaps by:

- Using own knowledge to explain precisely why Coogan is so well informed.
- Using precisely selected references to show how Coogan might be exaggerating the importance of the "historic" victory; or is blatantly partisan in his opinions about Mrs Thatcher's "concealed" (and failed) attempt to shore up the SDLP; or is too ready to flatter and congratulate Gerry Adams and the "young tigers".
- Using knowledge of other sources to put forward a different perspective from Coogan's.

As always in Unit 6W, "own knowledge" refers to 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.

"Margaret Thatcher won the short-term battle against the hunger strikers in 1981, but by the later 1980s it was clear that she had lost the long-term war against republicanism."

How valid is this assessment? (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 hunger strike in 1981 to the late 1980s, especially the Anglo-Irish Agreement in 1985. Answers agreeing with the quotation have much potential material to work with, both from own knowledge and from the sources: Coogan, Loughlin and Geraghty all suggest long-term gains by Sinn Féin/IRA; and there is much scope for own knowledge about British policy, Loyalist unhappiness and republican advances in political credibility, particularly in support from the United States. But answers challenging the quotation also have much powerful ammunition to support an argument that the ‘long-term war’ was actually going in a different direction altogether, 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 later axis between Gerry Adams and John Hume); or that the Brighton Bomb was actually a signal failure for the IRA; or that the Anglo-Irish Agreement was a big success for British in drawing Dublin away from extreme republicanism towards co-operation and political respectability.

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 Level 4 or Level 5) from a grasp of other perspectives from the nominated texts or from wider independent reading.

Note that the question focuses on 1981 to the late 1980s; many excellent answers may be enclosed entirely within this time frame. But due credit should be given to those answers which make relevant arguments out of post-1980s material, using it to buttress arguments about Britain “losing” (or winning) the ‘long-term war’. Such material is not required, nor should it be descriptive or unbalanced; but, if well applied, it could be highly effective.