

**AS**  
**HISTORY**  
**7041/2S**

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

---

Mark scheme

June 2020

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.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from [aqa.org.uk](http://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 © 2020 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, i.e. 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 attitudes to teenage behaviour in the early 1960s?

**[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

- this is valuable as a contemporary source from an 'establishment' individual – a magistrate – voicing his outraged reaction to the Whitsuntide 'riots' in Margate in 1964
- the source is of particular value given the hostility of the tone and language used, articulating the sense of moral panic felt by many of the adult generation in relation to teenage behaviour; in this context, the fighting between rival gangs of Mods and Rockers, which occurred in a number of British seaside towns
- its value might be questioned in a number of ways: how representative is his attitude; is he trying to make a name for himself – the riots made lurid front-page headlines in the national press; to what extent can he be accused of generalising/stereotyping?

### Content and argument

- the content of Simpson's speech might seem astonishing today, such is the vehemence of his verbal assault and his almost apoplectic rage; this could be considered of immense value in understanding contemporary fears of out of control teenagers
- he is arguing that the disturbances were premeditated, intentional and suggests that there was a danger to 'lives and property'
- the widespread reporting of rising rates of juvenile delinquency and crime associated with contemporary youth cultures might be referenced by students: the teddy boys in the 50s and the emergence of the Mods and Rockers by the early 60s
- further contextual material might be presented to explain the growth of teenage subcultures, such as: the ending of National Service (1960); the post-war baby boom, which had swelled the numbers of teenagers; the impact of affluence and new technology, which increased leisure time and put money in teenagers' pockets.

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

**Provenance and tone**

- the source is valuable as a first-hand, contemporary account from a teenager who had grown up in the post-war period; it is also valuable as a counterpoint to Source A, providing a view from a teenager's perspective
- the measured tone might also be considered valuable: it seems rational and relatively balanced compared to Source A's rant and invective
- the value of the source might be questioned because the teenager is being interviewed by journalists; he may be trying to defend teenagers and sugar-coating their behaviours; he seems to be trying very hard to suggest that teenagers are misunderstood by adults who simply react to external appearances or fashion; he might intentionally be underplaying the impact and extent of gang-like activities amongst teenagers.

**Content and argument**

- he is arguing that most teenagers are not the stereotypical anti-socials of many grown-ups' imagination; he is suggesting that most are just not 'that bad' and soon settle down
- it is valuable that he does acknowledge the existence of gangs, though students might question whether this is mainly a London phenomenon
- students might support the teenager's comments about their appearance by references to the new trends in clothes, fashion and music, made possible by the growing affluence of the period – the contemporary youth had more spending money than ever and their economic power opened up their horizons: the pop disc, transistor radios and radiograms, motor scooters and coffee bars
- students might place the emergence of the teenager in the context of American cultural influences or perhaps that teenage rebelliousness was a reaction against the general stuffiness and dullness of 'respectable' post-war British society.

Both sources offer a glimpse into conflicting attitudes about teenagers. Source A is valuable for demonstrating how older adults, particularly authority figures, felt panic or fear about this new social phenomenon. Simpson, who became something of a short-lived newspaper celebrity, reflects a perhaps extreme example of establishment angst, and this might reduce its value in some respects. Source B is valuable as a rebuff to Source A. Whilst the teenager acknowledges the existence of some gang culture the source seems to have a more balanced perspective than Simpson's knee-jerk 'flog 'em and fine 'em' attitude. It is also valuable in referencing at least one adult, working closely with teenagers, who has a different view to that expressed in Source A. On balance, perhaps Source B is more valuable as a first-hand view from a teenager, but equally it can be argued that Source A is more valuable because it clearly demonstrates the concerns of establishment society and the perceived rebelliousness of the teenage generation.

**Section B**

**0 2** 'Economic and financial considerations were the main influence on Wilson's foreign policy in the years 1964 to 1970.'

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 economic and financial considerations were the main influence on Wilson's foreign policy in the years 1964 to 1970 might include:**

- Wilson resisted President Johnson's request to commit British troops in Vietnam because Britain could not afford military involvement; since he needed American support for sterling – to avoid devaluation – Wilson compromised by offering moral support
- Wilson was ambivalent about joining the EEC but applied because he became convinced of the economic benefits of membership
- already in 1964 Labour knew it needed to cut defence spending: Healey instigated a series of defence reviews (1965–68) on the basis that Britain's defence forces were both over-stretched and under-equipped
- Labour entered government in 1964, committed to maintaining an 'East of Suez' military role but devaluation in November 1967, together with the already over-stretched defence budget, accelerated withdrawals from Singapore, Malaysia, Malta and the Persian Gulf; Wilson increasingly came to the view that Britain could not afford the role of world policeman.

**Arguments challenging the view that economic and financial considerations were the main influence on Wilson's foreign policy in the years 1964 to 1970 might include:**

- Wilson's reluctance to commit troops to Vietnam was not purely an economic decision: the war was very unpopular in Britain (Grosvenor Square demonstration, 1968), especially on the Left; Wilson risked losing popular support if he committed troops
- strategic considerations played a key part in decision making: Labour put Cold War priorities and the Atlantic Alliance first, concentrating resources on European deployment in support of NATO rather than former imperial priorities 'East of Suez'
- there was no serious debate about giving up Britain's independent nuclear deterrent, despite its expense; Labour committed to upgrade the Polaris weapons system in 1967
- the withdrawal from 'East of Suez' was part of a longer trend of decolonisation; up to 1966 Wilson had preferred maintaining strong ties with the Commonwealth rather than looking for membership of the EEC.

In 1964 Britain still had considerable worldwide defence commitments and Wilson was positively committed to maintaining the global presence of Britain's armed forces. However, it was clear that the reality of Britain's long-term economic decline and the spiralling costs of military technology in many respects dominated Wilson's government, forcing him to trim and prioritise its defence spending. A strong argument can be presented, therefore, that economic and financial considerations played a predominant role in determining Wilson's foreign policy. But it was not the only factor – the maintenance of a very expensive nuclear deterrent indicated that. Moreover, long-term global trends played a part: Macmillan's 'wind of change' had already signalled a pull-back from Britain's imperial past and the Cold War and European integration had brought new strategic and diplomatic priorities.



**0 3** 'Heath's government, in the years 1970 to 1974, was a complete failure.'

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 Heath's government, in the years 1970 to 1974, was a complete failure might include:**

- Heath was forced into a U-turn on his key economic policies: he had wanted to reduce state intervention but was forced to nationalise Rolls Royce; he spent vast sums keeping Upper Clyde Shipbuilders in business, backtracking on his boastful pledge to end public subsidies for 'lame duck' industries
- the Industrial Relations Act (1971) did not work: it was opposed by both the TUC and CBI and led to a wave of major strikes in 1972
- the Industry Act (1972) failed to regulate wage demands, leading to the introduction of a disastrous three-day week at the start of 1974
- he failed to deal with union power: the 1972 national miners' strike made Heath look impotent and a second miners' strike in 1974 effectively brought down his government, losing the 'who governs Britain' election in February 1974
- the Sunningdale Agreement failed to provide a political solution to the problem of Northern Ireland; his decision to allow Republic of Ireland representatives to sit on the proposed Council of Ireland alienated Ulster Unionists.

**Arguments challenging the view that Heath's government, in the years 1970 to 1974, was a complete failure might include:**

- Heath's government was successful in taking Britain into the EEC and gained a reputation as an influential international statesman
- his government introduced a number of modernising reforms: the school leaving age was raised to 16; local government was reorganised; the British currency went decimal; it pioneered the sale of council houses to sitting tenants
- Heath's change of economic policy – the so-called U-turn – showed him to be both pragmatic and successful in the short-term: by 1973 unemployment had halved to 500 000
- the oil crisis triggered by OPEC in October 1973 was impossible to foresee and beyond the control of Heath's government; similarly, Heath was unfortunate in inheriting industrial relations already dominated by a new breed of intransigent, militant unionists
- the attempts to solve 'The Troubles' were undermined by deep sectarian divisions; the establishment of the principle of power sharing was a positive achievement but again the problems of Northern Ireland were almost intractable.

Heath's premiership has been widely criticised. Undoubtedly, his government can be harshly judged: the years 1972–74, especially, were marked by a series of industrial relations deadlocks and extended strikes; Sunningdale ultimately failed; he was forced to backtrack on his much vaunted economic policies. Heath's lack of personal warmth alienated many, particularly in his own party. His government, at times, certainly did not seem to be wholly in charge of events. However, he won the 1970 election against expectations and for most of the 1974 election campaign the Conservatives were ahead in the opinion polls and the result of the election was inconclusive, leading to a hung parliament. Overall, perhaps it is too harsh a judgement to argue that Heath's government was a complete failure but it clearly experienced great difficulties in steering a course through highly turbulent times as the post-war consensus began to be challenged on all sides.