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General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate’s response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate’s response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:

  i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear

  ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter

  iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.
GCE History Marking Guidance

Marking of Questions: Levels of Response
The mark scheme provides an indication of the sorts of answer that might be found at different levels. The exemplification of content within these levels is not complete. It is intended as a guide and it will be necessary, therefore, for examiners to use their professional judgement in deciding both at which level a question has been answered and how effectively points have been sustained. Candidates should always be rewarded according to the quality of thought expressed in their answer and not solely according to the amount of knowledge conveyed. However candidates with only a superficial knowledge will be unable to develop or sustain points sufficiently to move to higher levels.

In assessing the quality of thought, consider whether the answer:

(i) is relevant to the question and is explicitly related to the question’s terms
(ii) argues a case, when requested to do so
(iii) is able to make the various distinctions required by the question
(iv) has responded to all the various elements in the question
(v) where required, explains, analyses, discusses, assesses, and deploys knowledge of the syllabus content appropriately, rather than simply narrates.

Examiners should award marks both between and within levels according to the above criteria. This should be done in conjunction with the levels of response indicated in the mark schemes for particular questions.

At the end of each answer, examiners should look back on the answer as a whole in the light of these general criteria in order to ensure that the total mark reflects their overall impression of the answer’s worth.

Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level
The first stage is to decide the overall level and then whether the work represents high, mid or low performance within the level. The overall level will be determined by the candidate’s ability to focus on the question set, displaying the appropriate conceptual grasp. Within any one piece of work there may well be evidence of work at two, or even three levels. One stronger passage at Level 4, would not by itself merit a Level 4 award - but it would be evidence to support a high Level 3 award - unless there were also substantial weaknesses in other areas.

Assessing Quality of Written Communication
QoWC will have a bearing if the QoWC is inconsistent with the communication descriptor for the level in which the candidate's answer falls. If, for example, a candidate's history response displays mid Level 3 criteria but fits the Level 2 QoWC descriptors, it will require a move down within the level.
6HI02: Generic Level Descriptors

Part (a)

Target: AO2a (8%) (20 marks)
As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Comprehends the surface features of the sources and selects material relevant to the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       |      | **Low Level 1: 1-2 marks**  
The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 1: 3-5 marks**  
The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed. |
| 2     | 6-10 | Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify their similarities and/or differences in relation to the question posed. There may be one developed comparison, but most comparisons will be undeveloped or unsupported with material from the sources. Sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information. The source provenance may be noted, without application of its implications to the source content. |
|       |      | **Low Level 2: 6-7 marks**  
The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 2: 8-10 marks**  
The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed. |
| 3     | 11-15| Comprehends the sources and focuses the cross-referencing on the task set. Responses will offer detailed comparisons, similarities/differences, agreements/disagreements that are supported by evidence drawn from the sources.  
Sources are used as evidence with some consideration of their attributes, such as the nature, origins, purpose or audience, with some consideration of how this can affect the weight given to the evidence. In addressing ‘how far’ there is a clear attempt to use the sources in combination, but this may be imbalanced in terms of the issues addressed or in terms of the use of the sources. |
|       |      | **Low Level 3: 11-12 marks**  
The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 3: 13-15 marks**  
The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed. |
| 4 | 16-20 | Reaches a judgement in relation to the issue posed by the question supported by careful examination of the evidence of the sources. The sources are cross-referenced and the elements of challenge and corroboration are analysed. The issues raised by the process of comparison are used to address the specific enquiry. The attributes of the source are taken into account in order to establish what weight the content they will bear in relation to the specific enquiry. In addressing ‘how far’ the sources are used in combination.

**Low Level 4: 16-17 marks**
The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.

**High Level 4: 18-20 marks**
The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.

*NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*
Part (b)

Target: AO1a & AO1b (10% - 24 marks)
Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

AO2b (7% - 16 marks)
Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.

(40 marks)

AO1a and AO1b (24 marks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Candidates will produce mostly simple statements. These will be supported by limited factual material, which has some accuracy and relevance, although not directed analytically (i.e. at the focus of the question). The material will be mostly generalised. There will be few, if any, links between the simple statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</strong>&lt;br&gt;The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks</strong>&lt;br&gt;As per descriptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>High Level 1: 5-6 marks</strong>&lt;br&gt;The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The writing may have limited coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>Candidates will produce a series of simple statements supported by some accurate and relevant, factual material. The analytical focus will be mostly implicit and there are likely to be only limited links between simple statements. Material is unlikely to be developed very far or to be explicitly linked to material taken from sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks</strong>&lt;br&gt;The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks</strong>&lt;br&gt;As per descriptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>High Level 2: 11-12 marks</strong>&lt;br&gt;The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The writing will have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. Some of the skills needed to produce effective writing will be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Marks</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3     | 13-18 | Candidates answers will attempt analysis and show some understanding of the focus of the question. They may, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question’s focus, or which strays from that focus. Factual material will be mostly accurate, but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor. At this level candidates will begin to link contextual knowledge with points drawn from sources.  
**Low Level 3: 13-14 marks**  
The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.  
**Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks**  
As per descriptor  
**High Level 3: 17-18 marks**  
The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 3.  
The writing will be coherent in places but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. Only some of the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are likely to be present. Syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present. |
| 4     | 19-24 | Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material, which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. There will be some integration of contextual knowledge with material drawn from sources, although this may not be sustained throughout the response. The selection of material may lack balance in places.  
**Low Level 4: 19-20 marks**  
The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.  
**Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks**  
As per descriptor  
**High Level 4: 23-24 marks**  
The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 4.  
The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes may not be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing but there may be passages which lack clarity or coherence. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors. |

*NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*
AO2b (16 marks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | 1-4  | Comprehends the sources and selects material relevant to the representation contained in the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.  
**Low Level 1: 1-2 marks**  
The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 1: 3-4 marks**  
The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed. |
| 2     | 5-8  | Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify points which support or differ from the representation contained in the question. When supporting the decision made in relation to the question the sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information.  
**Low Level 2: 5-6 marks**  
The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 2: 7-8 marks**  
The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed. |
| 3     | 9-12 | The sources are analysed and points of challenge and/or support for the representation contained in the question are developed from the provided material. In addressing the specific enquiry, there is clear awareness that a representation is under discussion and there is evidence of reasoning from the evidence of the sources, although there may be some lack of balance. The response reaches a judgement in relation to the claim which is supported by the evidence of the sources.  
**Low Level 3: 9-10 marks**  
The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 3: 11-12 marks**  
The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed. |
| 4     | 13-16| Reaches and sustains a conclusion based on the discriminating use of the evidence. Discussion of the claim in the question proceeds from the issues raised by the process of analysing the representation in the sources. There is developed reasoning and weighing of the evidence in order to create a judgement in relation to the stated claim.  
**Low Level 4: 13-14 marks**  
The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 4: 15-16 marks**  
The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed. |

*NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*
Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication
Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>AO1a and b Marks</th>
<th>AO2a Marks</th>
<th>AO2b Marks</th>
<th>Total marks for question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q (a)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q (b)(i) or (ii)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Marks</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% weighting</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 1 (a)

Candidates may well start with Source 3 which categorically absolves Churchill of blame for the election defeat in 1945. The reference in the last sentence to the impact of the memory of Tory misrule in the 1930s can be cross-referenced with Thatcher’s citing of Attlee in Source 1 to highlight the role played by long-term factors in the outcome of the 1945 election. However, those performing at higher levels should take into account the provenance of the sources and recognise that, as Macmillan was a political ally and Thatcher an ideological supporter, both authors had reason to downplay Churchill’s responsibility for defeat. Some may also argue that both sources smack of being wise after the event. The case in support of the contention in the question is most clearly presented by Source 2. Butler’s view that the ‘Gestapo’ speech was the ‘pivotal event’ in the election can be cross-referenced with both Sources 1 and 3. Although Macmillan is attempting to downplay the repercussions of the broadcast, he is, nonetheless, prepared to admit that it did not go down well with the public. Similarly Thatcher, notwithstanding her sympathy with the ‘logic’ of Churchill’s argument, acknowledges that the speech went ‘too far’. Again, the more perceptive may qualify the certainty of the viewpoint adopted by Butler by reference to the attribution. Whatever judgement is reached should be backed by appropriate evidence with the better candidates appreciating the role that both hindsight and political affiliations can play in shaping memories.
Question Number | Indicative content                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Mark |
---|---|---|
1 (b) (i) | The question is focused on the Conservative government’s policies towards the economy in the 1950s. Candidates may well start with Source 4 from which the quotation in the question is drawn. Although the relative prosperity of the 1950s is not denied, it is seen to be the result of world economic conditions and not government economic policy. The more knowledgeable should be able to use the references to ‘stop-go’ policies and ‘missed opportunities’ to present and exemplify the argument that by adopting a policy of ‘trimming’ and ‘bolstering’ according to prevailing economic conditions, the government restricted growth. Thus, the failure to push ahead with ‘Operation Robot’ in 1952 or support Thorneycroft in 1958 may be cited as examples of missed opportunities. Although the question ends in 1959, candidates may use their knowledge of the problems of the early 1960s to suggest that underlying economic difficulties had not been tackled during the 1950s. Indeed, for some this may be indicated by the relatively high unemployment figure of 1959. The alternative viewpoint is presented in Sources 5 and 6. Source 5 points to the success of ‘stop-go’ economic management in the period by emphasising that expansion was ‘non-inflationary’. Many of the indicators of economic expansion presented by Schulz in Source 5 can be cross-referred to the claims made in the Conservative manifesto of 1959 (Source 6). However, the more perceptive will take into account the subjective nature of the source and note the conditional tone of much of what is being said. From their own knowledge, candidates should be able to extend the assertion that this period was a success by noting the rise in economic indicators such as real earnings and consumer spending. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of the sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the impact of government policy on economic development in this period, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the view. | 40 |
The question is focused on the domestic policies of the Thatcher governments. Candidates will probably start with Source 7, which presents a firm case in support of the view in the question. Pugh establishes a range of areas in which state control was reduced, from education to health, local government to the nationalised industries. Candidates should be able to cross-reference much of what Pugh says with Thatcher's speech at the Conservative Party conference in Source 9 and with the admission in Source 8 that nationalisation represented ‘a considerable lessening of state control’. However, the more perceptive will be aware that Thatcher would wish to present an audience of dyed-in-the-wool conservatives with the impression that her government was acting vigorously on what was a central plank of party policy at the time. Although she does point to the denationalisation of some key industries, the speech deals more with intentions than achievements. From their own knowledge, candidates should be able develop many of the issues raised in the two sources. The extent of privatisation (British Telecom, British Gas, Rolls-Royce, British Airways, British Airports Authority), the sale of council houses, the abolition of the GLC and the impact on education of the Acts of 1980 and 1988 are all likely areas for discussion. The counterview is clearly presented in Source 8 and the observation that local government was merely supplanted by central authority should act as a platform for the more knowledgeable to develop this line of argument further. Here, the failure of the marketisation of the health service to reduce public spending may well feature. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the extent to which Thatcher’s policies resulted in a rolling back of the state, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.
On the surface Sources 10 and 11 would seem to pose a considerable challenge to Source 12. The fan in Source 10 clearly has doubts about the Beatles’ apparent affinity with the fans and this is supported by Lennon, in Source 11, who is keen to deny that the band represented anyone but, at best, a ‘minority’. These stances are in direct conflict with Hoffman’s claim in Source 12 that the Beatles spoke for his generation. Those operating at this level will not move beyond L2. However, higher performing candidates will be able to go some way towards reconciling the sources through closer reading and careful consideration of the attributions. Thus, the fan in Source 10 clearly feels a strong attachment to the band, evidenced by the use of the question mark and the extravagance of her purchases, while implicit in Lennon’s denial that the group ‘represented the new youth’, in Source 11, is the existence of a widely held belief that this was exactly the case. The more perceptive will weigh the evidence by placing both sources in context. Thus, the fan’s sense of distance may well be a reaction to the growing commercialisation of the band, while Lennon’s views are typical of his wish, in the aftermath of the Beatles’ split, to downplay received truths about the group’s cultural significance. Equally, high achieving candidates will appreciate that not only is Hoffman in Source 12 hardly representative of his generation (very few were ‘activists, organisers and counter-culture people’) but that his assessment may well be shaped by nostalgia for a mythical Sixties. Whatever judgement is reached must be backed by appropriate evidence with the best able to temper the extent of any challenge by close examination of the context and provenance of the source material.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (b) (i)</td>
<td>The question is focused on the relationship between the mass media and changes in attitudes and values in British society. All three sources can be used to challenge the contention in the question. Source 13 categorically states that ‘television and film shape society’, while both Gorman and Forman, in Sources 14 and 15 respectively, are prepared to accept the possibility of some causal link between the visual media and public behaviour. However, the more perceptive will be aware of Mediawatch-uk's remit when weighing the evidence of Source 13, recognising that the group is an example of the ‘moral reformers’ referred to in Source 14. The more knowledgeable should be able to develop this theme further by exploring the impact of the campaigns of Mary Whitehouse and the NVLA. Sources 14 and 15 present the argument in favour of the view in the question. Gorman, in Source 14, sees the influence of the media as ‘greatly exaggerated’, while Forman, in Source 15, holds that the media reflects rather than shapes. However, those performing at higher levels will appreciate that Forman’s position is likely to shape his view, and that the defensive tone of his letter suggests that there is a significant body of opinion opposing him. The question has a broad scope, covering the entire mass media from 1945 to the present day and, consequently, a wide variety of own knowledge is to be expected. Candidates will, therefore, be rewarded according to the relevance, range and depth of the exemplification they deploy. It is likely that such areas as the impact of soap operas on public attitudes, the role of censorship and classifications, the public’s response to the portrayal of minorities on film and TV and the consequences of the growth of the visual media through satellite, cable and the internet will feature. However, there is no specific content requirement and candidates will, therefore, be rewarded according to the relevance, range and depth of the exemplification they deploy. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the nature of the relationship between the mass media and public values and attitudes, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Number</td>
<td>Indicative content</td>
<td>Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (b) (ii)</td>
<td>The question is focused on the impact of satire on public attitudes towards established authority in society. Candidates may well start with Sources 16 and 18 which, together, present a strong case for the argument that the satire boom had a significant impact on public attitudes, by suggesting that it resulted in a loss of public respect for authority and authority figures. Superficially, both sources point to the importance of <em>TW3</em> in initiating this shift in public values. However, a close reading of both the content and provenance of the sources should lead the more perceptive to qualify this stance. Thus, Marwick, in Source 16, makes clear that anti-establishment ideas had already been ‘circulating in the late fifties’ and that satirical television programmes merely made explicit rather than instigated any changes. Similarly, Waterhouse’s self-serving anecdote about Heath in Source 18 paints a rather comic picture of a politician who, despite being out of touch with popular culture (‘never heard of’ a successful TV show), nonetheless holds strong views about it. David Christopher, in Source 17, can be used to present the counterview to the contention in the question. Although he acknowledges that there is a commonly held belief that satire affects attitudes, citing the impact of satirical TV programmes on voting behaviour, he uses Thatcher’s 1987 election triumph to dismiss such a claim. From their own knowledge, candidates should be able to extend the arguments both for and against the contention in the question by reference to a variety of programmes and media. For instance, the Ealing films in the late 40s and 50s gently satirised conventional society and the authority of the upper-classes, the Sex Pistols’ <em>God Save the Queen</em> aggressively satirised the nation’s obsession with the royal family in general and the Queen’s silver jubilee in particular and TV ‘chat’ shows like Mrs Merton, in the 1990s, challenged conventional deference to celebrity. There is no prescribed content and candidates should be rewarded according to range, depth and direction of the material they deploy. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the nature and extent of the impact of satire on the public’s attitude to leading figures in society, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>