

AS
HISTORY
7041/2S

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

Mark scheme

June 2024

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.

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

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 © 2024 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 Harold Wilson's leadership of the Labour Party in the years 1964 to 1970?

[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

- Healey was an important Cabinet minister, a so-called ‘big hitter’ in the party (he later fought two leadership elections); his views, therefore, carry weight and value
- political autobiographies can be considered positively and negatively in terms of value: either, authentic, insider commentaries offering important insights, or partial and subjective recollections from participants pushing their own personal agenda; similarly, it can be argued that writing long after events adds perspective or that judgement becomes clouded
- Healey’s tone and language are almost totally critical; it might be thought, therefore, to be less valuable because it lacks balance.

Content and argument

- Healey is arguing that Wilson had significant limitations as party leader: that he was pragmatic (short-termist) rather than principled and that he interfered too much; he implies that Wilson lacked trust/faith in his colleagues
- Healey also argues that Wilson shifted ministers around too often, fearing challenges to his leadership – this could refer to his senior colleagues: Brown, Callaghan and Jenkins; he moved Brown from the DEA to foreign affairs in 1966 and replaced Callaghan as Chancellor with Jenkins in 1967
- as examples of Wilson’s short-termism, students could refer to devaluation (he opposed it in 1966 but devalued a year later), or abandoning the DEA, or moving from informal co-operation with the unions (‘beer and sandwiches’) to statutory restrictions (In Place Of Strife)
- Healey’s allegations of fluctuations in policy direction might be supported by reference to immigration and race policies: passing a liberalising Race Relations Act in 1965 but restricting immigration by the Commonwealth Immigration Act, 1967.

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

Provenance and tone

- Donoghue was not a political insider in the years 1964–1970, so this could be thought to detract from the value of the source, though his insights as a Politics lecturer can add credibility to his views
- Donoghue’s job as a university Politics lecturer would make him well placed to comment on Wilson’s strengths and weaknesses as a leader and would be valuable for an understanding of his core beliefs/ideology
- it might be argued that the long time gap between this lecture and events is a limitation; another limitation could be his obvious personal bias/loyalty: his personal relationship with Wilson might also be thought to cloud his judgement, as could his lifelong commitment to the party.

Content and argument

- Donoghue argues that Wilson was a highly skilled politician, keeping the party united through difficult times and modernising its outlook
- support for this argument could be Wilson’s embracing of ‘the white heat’ of technological change and avoiding the very public splits that had plagued the party in the 1950s and early 1960s; it was a difficult time because the post-war consensus was under threat
- he also argues that he achieved a great deal; evidence of this could be: the improvement in the economy from 1969; liberal reforming legislation; school reform and the expansion of higher education and the introduction of the Open University
- students can develop the reference to Wilson’s relaxed personal style: his down-to-earth image helped the party to appear more ‘in touch’ (in comparison to the Conservatives), contributing to its election victories in 1964 and 1966.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might consider Source A to be more valuable because Healey was a prominent, senior Cabinet member who had direct experience of Wilson as party leader in this period. It could be argued, however, that Healey may have felt that Wilson’s controlling nature hindered his own freedom of action at times, thus limiting the source’s value. Source B could be thought less valuable because Donoghue was not a political insider in 1964–1970. Nevertheless, this might be considered a strength because it could make him a more objective observer of Wilson’s leadership style. His role as one of Wilson’s close-knit circle of advisers in his second term could also be considered valuable because it would have given him a good insight into Wilson’s strengths and weaknesses as a leader.

Section B

0 2 'Affluence and consumerism transformed British society in the 1950s.'

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 affluence and consumerism transformed British society in the 1950s might include:

- the easy availability of ‘cheap money’ and credit opened up consumer purchases to all classes; goods such as TV sets, fridges, washing machines and vacuum cleaners transformed most people’s daily lives; easier access to cheap mortgages fuelled a housing revolution: the spread of ‘suburbia’ and the building of new towns went hand-in-hand with large scale slum clearance
- high street innovations such as chain stores and supermarkets transformed the way people shopped and interacted; the weekly trip to the supermarket began to replace the daily visits to the corner shop; the growing availability of convenience and ‘foreign’ foods began a revolution in the British diet
- the motoring boom brought dramatic changes to the landscape and environment and facilitated new social and career opportunities; increasing car ownership, and the status that came with it, represented a democratising process, promoting a degree of social mobility and aspiration, particularly for the middle classes
- affluence and having more disposable income and leisure time led to a growth in popular mass culture, particularly discernible in the emergence of youth culture, changing fashions and music; new youth subcultures emerged, such as the Teddy Boys.

Arguments challenging the view that affluence and consumerism transformed British society in the 1950s might include:

- not everyone had their lives transformed by growing affluence and consumerism: the value of pensions decreased as prices rose, for example, and a lack of social mobility for the working classes persisted, irrespective of the trend to greater affluence; it can be argued that consumerism also had a darker side, promoting materialism and hooliganism
- women’s domestic lives may have been eased by new labour-saving devices but any transformation or emancipation from their traditional roles remained distant; women’s domain was still predominantly the home and the family; by the end of the decade it was still relatively uncommon for married women to go out to work
- though home ownership increased, much of Britain’s housing stock remained sub-standard; any transformation was largely limited to the middle and aspiring working classes; private house building outstripped the provision of new council houses; rent rises hit those at the bottom of the housing ladder as a result of the 1957 Rent Act
- affluence and consumerism had limited impact on class: Britain remained a class-ridden, socially conservative society; despite the growth of mass culture and the emergence of the teenager, British cultural life overall saw little transformation from the patterns of the 30s and 40s.

A strong argument can be made that affluence and consumerism did have a considerable transformative effect on Britain’s social and cultural landscape, fuelling a rising standard of living for many and opening new horizons. By the end of the 1950s only the USA had a higher income per head of population than Britain. However, this view can be qualified. The traditional social order was barely dented and the gap between rich and poor remained as wide, if not greater, than it had been at the start of the decade. On balance, one can see large strands of continuity as well as some profound change.

0 3 'The unions were responsible for the defeat of Edward Heath's government in 1974.'

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 the unions were responsible for the defeat of Edward Heath's government in 1974 might include:

- Heath had to deal with waves of strikes from militant, intransigent unions right from the start (for example, the strike of the Upper Clyde Shipbuilders in 1971), which seriously undermined his government's effectiveness and popularity throughout its time in office
- the Industrial Relations Act, 1971, aggravated rather than calmed industrial relations; it sparked a series of major strikes in 1972, forcing the government to declare a state of emergency and making it look weak and out of control; 24 million working days were lost in 1972 alone
- the Industry Act, 1972, which aimed to involve the TUC and CBI in agreeing wages, also failed to solve the industrial relations crisis; the 1972 miners' strike was a major defeat, breaking the government's wage controls
- the trigger for Heath's defeat in 1974 was a further conflict with the miners, forcing the government to introduce a three-day week; Heath refused to meet the miners' wage demands and called a snap election ('Who governs Britain'), gambling, wrongly, that the public would support his hard line stance against union power and strikes.

Arguments challenging the view that the unions were responsible for the defeat of Edward Heath's government in 1974 might include:

- the fundamental weaknesses of the British economy, inherited by Heath, were a major factor in his defeat; the end of the post-war boom undermined the government's policies, causing a succession of political and economic crises, forcing Heath into a series of humiliating U-turns and destroying his government's credibility; by the end of 1973 inflation was at 15% and there was a balance of payments deficit of £3 billion
- external factors beyond Heath's control contributed to his defeat, particularly the OPEC oil crisis triggered by the Yom Kippur war in 1973
- Heath not only had to deal with damaging economic and union issues, but also the Troubles in Northern Ireland; it can be argued that Heath's government was overwhelmed by a number of intractable issues such as this that would have challenged any government
- internal party issues and personal failings also played a part in Heath's defeat: his U-turns lost a lot of support from his party's 'New Right' who favoured the 'Selsdon Man' agenda; he was a poor political operator, lacking personal warmth and considered by many to be good at policies not at politics; the Liberals also performed strongly, increasing their representation to 14 seats (up from 6).

A strong argument can be maintained that the unions, particularly the miners led by Arthur Scargill, were the catalyst for the downfall of the Heath government. Scargill was crystal clear that his intention in 1972 and 1974 was to defeat Heath and his policies. As important as failures in industrial relations were, it can equally be argued that his government was defeated by a perfect storm of factors, many of which were inherited or beyond his control, combined with personal failings. Nevertheless, in the end the election was a close-run thing.