



AS HISTORY 7041/2S

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

Mark scheme

June 2025

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](https://www.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 © 2025 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 Conservative management of the economy in the years 1951 to 1959?

[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

- Gaitskell is the Labour leader. His speech is valuable for understanding Labour's position on a key issue, in this respect the unusual need for a second Budget in 1955. It might be thought limited because it does not cover the whole period
- it is a Commons speech, which makes it valuable because it will attract much publicity and because it is a parliamentary speech it perhaps carries greater weight than a private statement
- Gaitskell's language and tone is very direct and critical, which provides particular value because he comes close to accusing the Conservatives of lying to the public for political advantage; this may be considered a limitation of the source, given Gaitskell has a vested interest in portraying the Conservative Party negatively.

Content and argument

- Gaitskell is arguing that the Conservatives knowingly misled the public about the country's economic situation prior to the 1955 election; that Butler (the Chancellor) was effectively 'buying' votes: Butler's 'give-away' April Budget provided the middle classes with £134 million in tax cuts
- Gaitskell maintains that the economy needed 'damping down'. Students can refer to the 'stop-go' economic cycle as context for Gaitskell's remarks; there was a balance of payments deficit in 1955, which necessitated a 'stop' rather than 'go' phase
- Gaitskell's criticisms of Butler encouraging spending when, in fact, the economy needed 'damping down', were echoed from within the Conservative Party later in the 1950s: Chancellor Thorneycroft and two junior Treasury ministers (Powell and Birch) resigned in 1958 in protest of this policy
- students might also demonstrate the same tactics being employed at the 1959 election: Heathcoat-Amory gave tax cuts of £370 million in his pre-election Budget.

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

Provenance and tone

- an election manifesto is valuable as a source for an historian for understanding how an incumbent government presents its record in power, as well as its future priorities. In this instance, it is a valuable summation of what the Conservative Party believes are its key economic achievements
- however, it might be thought to be limited because of the very nature of a manifesto in that it is unlikely to be balanced or to admit of any weakness or deficiencies in managing the economy
- the source has the merit of providing an overview over the previous 8 years rather than having a narrow focus. It is also valuable for its accessibility, being written in a form that is accessible to a national audience.

Content and argument

- the source argues that the party's record in managing the economy is deserving of their vote, drawing a clear line between the failings of post-war Labour and Conservative achievements
- students can link the manifesto claims to Macmillan's 'you've never had it so good' speech in 1957 and referencing, for example, details of the post-war boom, growing affluence and rising wages
- students can challenge the source's claims, pointing to the weaknesses of 'stop-go' or, for example, the periodic balance of payments problems or increasing competition from the Common Market countries, particularly West Germany
- it can be argued that the Conservative government was lucky in 1951: students might challenge the source by referring to this wider context, that the Conservatives came to power at a time of favourable global economic circumstances.

In assessing which source is the more valuable, Source A could be considered the more valuable because of the speaker's political prominence and its nature as a parliamentary speech targeted at a national audience. It could also be challenged on the same basis: that Gaitskell was playing party politics and was, therefore, partisan and not objective about the Conservative's management of the economy. It might also be thought more limited because the source focuses only on one issue, the Budgets of 1955. Nevertheless, given that there were also Conservative critics of 'stop-go', it might be thought a valid criticism, therefore adding to its value. However, students may argue that Source B might be thought more valuable because it identifies demonstrable achievements that reflected an economic reality for many voters. Moreover, the Conservatives won the subsequent election comfortably, indicating that Conservative management of the economy was effective in creating an overwhelming sense of prosperity for most people. Nevertheless, it could be thought limited because of its nature as electoral propaganda. Overall, both sources have their strengths and limitations. Source A is valuable for challenging Conservative claims of economic competence, whereas Source B is compelling for setting out a case that their management of the economy had, actually, made life better under the Conservatives.

Section B

0 2 'British society changed very little in the 1960s.'

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 British society changed very little in the 1960s might include:

- social conservatism remained strong: there was strong pushback against rising permissiveness, led by moral campaigners such as Mary Whitehouse, who set up the National Viewers' and Listeners' Association as a campaigning vehicle in 1965, growing to over 100 000 members
- progress towards female equality was also limited: traditional stereotypes of women's domestic roles continued to hold sway throughout the decade; the emerging feminist movement in the United States made little headway in Britain in the 1960s
- there is evidence that even among the youth, change had its limits: surveys on the sexual behaviour of young people in 1965 and 1969 found that for most young people traditional moral constraints held strong. In addition, the spread of the so-called 'drug culture' was wildly over-exaggerated: it is estimated that the number of young people who experimented with illegal drugs in the 1960s was fewer than 5%
- despite legislation in 1965 and 1968, discrimination on the grounds of race was widespread and opposition to immigration continued: though Enoch Powell was condemned by the liberal establishment and sacked from the Cabinet by Heath for his 'rivers of blood' speech (April 1968), a Gallup poll found that 75% of people agreed with his views.

Arguments challenging the view that British society changed very little in the 1960s might include:

- the expansion of the mass media, liberalising of rules on censorship and the growth in leisure opportunities were powerful indications of a changing society and a broadening of people's horizons; programming on TV saw ground-breaking developments, particularly in the areas of satire and drama; the expansion of popular radio and print media also reflected changing tastes and mores across the population spectrum
- there were important steps towards female equality, manifested in the liberal reforming legislation from 1964–70; more effective methods of contraception ('the pill') and easier divorce were liberating developments for many women
- an emerging youth culture was a distinctive feature of the 1960s: improvements in living standards and changes in education, fashion and leisure, ushered in new behaviours and ways of thinking, often manifesting themselves in anti-authoritarian attitudes, illustrated, for example, in protests against the Vietnam War
- there is evidence that some progress was being made towards better race relations, both through the law and exemplified by events such as the Notting Hill carnival.

The view that British society changed very little in the 1960s can be convincingly supported. The argument that social conservatism and traditional moral constraints remained strong across all demographics can be evidenced. Nevertheless, the 1960s also saw many changes and the so-called 'Swinging Sixties' has become iconic in British culture as a time of growing permissiveness, experimentation and the loosening of moral chains. Perhaps, on balance, the 1960s saw as much continuity in British society as it did change.

- 0 3** 'In the years 1976 to 1979, James Callaghan successfully dealt with the problems faced by his government.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

Arguments supporting the view that in the years 1976 to 1979, James Callaghan successfully dealt with the problems faced by his government might include:

- Callaghan inherited an economy in freefall but the economic situation improved considerably under his government: inflation rates, unemployment and the number of days lost to industrial disputes all fell by 1978; it can also be argued that the impact of the winter of discontent was exaggerated by his political opponents
- Callaghan avoided a sterling crisis in 1976 by obtaining an IMF loan; his negotiations with the USA and Germany illustrated his high-level diplomatic skills and experience; it can be argued, therefore, that he was a genuine statesman of global stature
- he strengthened his government by making the 'Lib-Lab pact' in 1977, which restored the government's majority in the House of Commons and enabled Labour to continue in office by defeating a Conservative motion of 'no confidence'
- Callaghan was an ideal leader for maintaining internal party unity ('a safe pair of hands'); he had good links to the unions and was much more inclusive and collegiate with Cabinet colleagues than Wilson.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1976 to 1979, James Callaghan successfully dealt with the problems faced by his government might include:

- it can be argued that the IMF loan was more a humiliation than a success, reinforcing the image of Britain's national decline; it damaged party unity (the left of the party argued it was tantamount to grovelling to international financiers) and provoked union militancy
- the winter of discontent was highly disruptive, had a very negative effect on the public mood and was a significant contributor to Labour defeat in 1979; his handling of the crisis can be criticised as poor and out of touch; a failure rather than a success
- the 'Lib-Lab pact' can be seen as an act of weakness: it committed Callaghan to support devolution for Wales and Scotland but when this failed the Scottish Nationalists withdrew their support, causing Labour to lose a motion of 'no confidence' in 1979; the pact could be considered a key contributory factor in Labour's loss of office
- Callaghan can be criticised for showing poor political acumen and can be accused of complacency when he decided against calling an election in favourable circumstances in 1978; Callaghan's inability to control the industrial unrest of 1978/79 completely failed, undermining his and the party's credibility in the subsequent election.

Judgements of the way Callaghan dealt with the problems faced by his government may be very negative. His government was castigated from all sides during the winter of discontent. For Labour supporters, particularly on the left, Callaghan was unsuccessful as Prime Minister in that his perceived mistakes allowed Margaret Thatcher to take power. The IMF crisis can also be regarded as a blot on his economic record, forcing the government to make big spending cuts. However, an alternative viewpoint can be maintained: Callaghan successfully chartered stormy economic waters, arguably leaving the economy in better shape than he found it. He was largely successful in preserving Labour's fragile party unity and majority in very difficult circumstances.