

---

AS

# History

The Making of Modern Britain, 1951–2007

Component 2S Building a new Britain, 1951–1979

Mark scheme

---

7041

June 2017

---

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 Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

June 2017

**The Making of Modern Britain, 1951–2007**

**AS History Component 2S Building a new Britain, 1951–1979**

**Section A**

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining the Labour government's decision in 1965 to reorganise secondary education? **[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 have 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

- this is the view of a Conservative politician, debating at the highest level of political decision making – the House of Commons
- it is very contemporary, from the debates preceding the publication of Circular 10/65 in July 1965
- its tone is authoritative and fervent, almost emotional.

### Content and argument

- Hopkins is defending the existing tri-partite system set up by the 1944 Education Act; he states that he is not opposed to comprehensive schools, but argues that 'great' grammar schools and 'good' secondary moderns should not be abolished or closed
- he contradicts the view that secondary moderns offered second-rate education and suggests that Labour's policy is motivated by 'egalitarian' considerations, i.e. not educational reasons
- the Conservative Party was in office when the first comprehensives were opened in the 1950s, supporting Hopkins claim that he (and by inference his party) was not opposed per se to such schools
- Conservatives such as Hopkins supported the existing system because they believed it aided social mobility, giving able children from working class backgrounds the opportunity to benefit from an academic education in a grammar or direct grant school; and provided an education geared to each child's needs and abilities.

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

### Provenance and tone

- this is the view of a writer / journalist who was a 'consumer' of the grammar school system
- he is looking back with a degree of hindsight, and from a left-wing standpoint
- his tone is relatively conversational and personal; he is reminiscing.

---

**Content and argument**

- Rosen is arguing that the selective system was socially divisive and failed many children academically
- he is particularly critical of the secondary moderns, arguing that they failed working class children
- criticisms of the tri-partite system had increased by the sixties; three-quarters of all pupils attended secondary moderns but many had low aspirations; and very few technical schools were opened
- Rosen can be supported by pointing to the fact that the number of children who actually went to grammar schools was often determined less by ability and more by the availability of grammar school places, which varied around the country; left-wing campaigners argued that the system benefited the middle classes rather than the working classes.

Source A is valuable in a number of ways; it gives a clear insight into the views of a member of the Conservative Party and it is a contemporary view, reflecting the arguments raised by politicians in parliament at the time. However, it has its limitations given that Hopkins has an interest in maintaining grammar schools in his constituency. Source B is a useful counter-balance to Source A. Its strength is Rosen's personal experience as someone who went through the system as a child. It also offers the benefit of hindsight. Overall, neither of the sources is from a particularly objective commentator, but Rosen's is perhaps more compelling given the first-hand nature of his account.

## Section B

- 02** 'Conservative political dominance, in the years 1955 to 1961, was due to divisions within the Labour Party.'

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 suggesting that Conservative political dominance, in the years 1955 to 1961, was due to divisions within the Labour Party might include:**

- the Labour Party faced a problem of 'identity': it was weakened by divisions between its left and right-wings, particularly between the pro-union Bevanites, who wanted a greater commitment to socialism, and Gaitskill and the parliamentary leadership, who represented the more moderate centre-right of the party
- split over unilateralism; Gaitskill favoured an independent nuclear deterrent; the left was attracted to the CND's anti-American, pro-Soviet position
- split over whether to join the Common Market; less marked than the unilateral split but no clear unity over Gaitskill's anti-European position
- split over economic policy: the left wanted a greater priority given to nationalisation and state control; Gaitskill remained committed to Keynesianism and a mixed economy.

**Arguments challenging the view that Conservative political dominance, in the years 1955 to 1961, was due to divisions within the Labour Party might include:**

- Conservatives benefited from the improvements in living standards, symbolised by Macmillan being able to claim that Britain 'never had it so good'
- linked to this: rises in real wages; growth of consumerism; credit boom – undercut the appeal of socialism
- Conservatives benefited from a period of consensus politics; Butskellism, for example, or 'the wind of change' – acknowledging the end of empire
- astute leadership of Macmillan (Supermac); mended rifts over Suez; a progressive 'one nation', forward-looking Conservative.

Labour's defeat in the 1959 election owed much to its divisions and increased its in-fighting as the left and right wings blamed each other for its loss; symbolised by the unions forcing unilateralism as the party's official policy at its 1960 conference, but being overturned by Gaitskill in 1961. Undoubtedly the Conservatives benefited from a divided Labour Party and its inability to be a more effective opposition. Nevertheless, this cannot be the whole explanation. Even at a time when the economy was in 'stop-go' mode, Macmillan was able to outmanoeuvre Labour and claim full credit for the perceived affluence of the years 1955 to 1961.

**03** 'Neither Wilson nor Callaghan was able to control the unions in the years 1974 to 1979.'

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 suggesting that neither Wilson nor Callaghan was able to control the unions in the years 1974 to 1979 might include:**

- Wilson's 'Social Contract' seemed ineffective in restraining excessive union wage demands
- the terms of the 1976 IMF loan – forcing the government to make public expenditure cuts and which contributed to a subsequent rise in unemployment – enraged the unions and further alienated them from the party
- Callaghan's announcement of maximum wage increases of 5% in December 1977 resulted in a mass of strikes; particularly by public sector unions in 1978/1979 – the so-called 'winter of discontent'; destroyed Labour's claim that it could control the unions
- Britain experienced a pattern of industrial unrest in the years 1976–1979; foreign journalists referred to the constant industrial stoppages as 'the British disease'.

**Arguments challenging the view that neither Wilson nor Callaghan was able to control the unions in the years 1974 to 1979 might include:**

- Wilson gained union goodwill in 1974 by repealing the Industrial Relations Act; this and the continuing 'Social Contract' suggested that Labour was more likely than the Tories to control the unions
- Wilson reached an agreement with the miners in 1974; this ended the state of emergency and reduced tensions with the unions
- the appointment of Michael Foot as Employment Secretary appeased the unions, and in 1976 the TUC agreed a limit of £6 per week in wage rises
- Callaghan had a degree of popularity with the unions because he had led the party opposition to Barbara Castle's 1969 paper 'In Place of Strife'.

It can be argued that neither Wilson nor Callaghan had any consistent control over the unions, though Wilson perhaps avoided the worst excesses of union action by hinting at resignation. The 'winter of discontent' might have been sensationalised by the media but it is clear that by 1978–9 Callaghan had no solution to the 'problem' of the unions. Nevertheless, it would be misleading to suggest that both failed absolutely. Indeed, it is possible to argue that both Wilson and Callaghan could take some credit from resisting the more sweeping demands of the unions through the mid-1970s. What is clear, however, is that the actions of militant unionism were a continuous and serious thorn in the side for both leaders.