

**GCE**

**History A**

**Unit : Y113/01 Britain 1930 - 1997**

Advanced GCE

**Mark Scheme for June 2017**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.
















All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2017

These are the annotations, (including abbreviations), including those used in scoris, which are used when marking

Annotation	Meaning of annotation
	Blank Page
	Highlight
Off-page comment	
	Assertion
	Analysis
	Evaluation
	Explanation
	Factor
	Illustrates/Describes
	Irrelevant, a significant amount of material that does not answer the question
	Judgement
	Knowledge and understanding
	Provenance
	Simple comment
	Unclear
	View

Here are the subject specific instructions for this question paper

Use the following indicative content mark scheme in conjunction with the generic levels of response in the Appendix

## MARK SCHEME Section A

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1	<p><b>Using these four sources in their historical context, assess how far they support the view that the Conservatives lost the 1945 general election because of social changes.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>In discussing how Source A does support the view</b>, answers might refer to how the war was forcing a change in social habits, resulting in a greater sense of community and the realisation that a better world can be created.</li> <li>• <b>In discussing the provenance of Source A</b>, answer might consider that it was a radio broadcast in 1940, five years before the war ended, and might not reflect attitudes in 1945.</li> <li>• <b>In discussing the historical context of Source A</b>, answers might consider that it was written when Britain was under threat of invasion and forces had been evacuated from Dunkirk, with Churchill trying to rally the nation.</li> <li>• <b>In discussing how Source B does not support the view</b>, answers might refer to the impact of Churchill's election speech which equated socialism with a political police or gestapo, which lost the party much support.</li> <li>• <b>In discussing the provenance of Source B</b>, answers might consider that it is written by Churchill's private secretary and offers his view of the impact of the speech.</li> <li>• <b>In discussing the historical context of Source B</b>, answers might consider that Churchill's speech and his claims that socialism threatened liberty did cause great furor. Many were more concerned about his apparent lack of concern for social reform.</li> </ul>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No set answer is expected.</li> <li>• At Level 5 and above there will be judgement about the issue in the question.</li> <li>• To be valid judgements they must be supported by accurate and relevant material.</li> <li>• At Level 4 and below, answers may be simply a list of which sources support or challenge the view in the question.</li> <li>• Knowledge must not be credited in isolation, it should only be credited where it is used to analyse and evaluate the sources, in line with the descriptions in the levels mark scheme.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>In discussing how Source C does support the view</b>, answers might refer to Labour's claim that the Conservatives are a class party whereas they represent the nation.</li> <li>• <b>In discussing the provenance of Source C</b>, answers might refer to it being a Labour party political broadcast which was aimed at winning over voters.</li> <li>• <b>In discussing the historical context of Source C</b>, answers might refer to Labour's support for social reform, particularly the Beveridge Report.</li> <li>• <b>In discussing how Source D does support the claim</b>, answers might refer to the disappearance of old values and a lack of respect for those who had contributed to the war effort.</li> <li>• <b>In discussing the provenance of Source D</b>, answers might consider it is written by Churchill after the result and does not reflect the generally held explanation for the Conservative defeat.</li> <li>• <b>In discussing the historical context of Source D</b>, answers might consider that there had been a change in attitude, with many admiring Soviet planning and how it had helped gain victory, whilst Churchill's policies did not seem as relevant.</li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--	--

2*	<p><b>Mark Scheme Section B</b></p> <p><b>'Divisions within the Conservative party were the main reason for their defeat in 1997.' How far do you agree?</b></p> <p><b>In arguing that divisions within the Conservative party were the main reason for their defeat</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the split between Eurosceptics and pro-Europeans.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> that the issue of Europe dominated politics for much of Major's period and it exposed divisions and weaknesses within the party.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> that divisions made the party appear unelectable and Major appear weak.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> that the signing of the Maastricht Treaty and its approval by parliament showed there were clear divisions in the party and the public distaste for the undemocratic ratification of the treaty lost support.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> Major's failure to calm Eurosceptic fears with subsidiarity.</li> </ul> <p><b>In arguing that there were other reasons for the Conservative defeat,</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the nature of Major's leadership and inability to win the loyalty of his party.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the small majority the government had won in 1992 and the problem of remaining in office.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the impact of financial and sexual scandals on the party.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the recovery of the Labour party under Blair.</li> </ul>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No set answer is expected.</li> <li>• At higher levels, candidates will focus on 'how far'; but at Level 4, may simply list reasons for defeat.</li> <li>• At Level 5 and above there will be judgement as to whether it was the main reason or not.</li> <li>• At higher levels candidates might establish criteria against which to judge.</li> <li>• To be valid judgements, claims must be supported by relevant and accurate material. If not, they are assertions.</li> <li>• Knowledge must not be credited in isolation, it should only be credited where it is used as the basis for analysis and evaluation, in line with the descriptions in the levels mark scheme.</li> </ul>
----	---	----	---

3*	<p><b>'Britain's relationship with the USA was close throughout the period from 1951 to 1997.' How far do you agree?</b></p> <p><b>In arguing that Britain's relationship was close,</b> answers might argue that Britain had strong ties of culture, language, trade and history.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> that there was a 'special relationship'.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the impact of fighting alongside the USA in the Second World War.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the support given by Britain to the USA during the Cold War.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> how membership of NATO reinforced the relationship.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the co-operation over nuclear weapons and secret intelligence.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the relationship between specific PMs and Presidents, such as Thatcher and Reagan.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the support given by Britain over issues such as the bombing of Libya.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the relationship in the First Gulf War and Bosnia.</li> </ul> <p><b>In arguing that the relationship was not close throughout the period,</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Answers might argue</b> that it was limited by Britain's economic decline, which meant it could offer only limited support.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> that the USA had concerns outside Europe that did not concern Britain.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> that US attitudes over Suez showed the relationship was not always close.</li> <li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> US attitudes towards the</li> </ul>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No set answer is expected.</li> <li>• At higher levels, candidates will focus on 'how far'; but at Level 4, may simply describe aspects of the relationship.</li> <li>• At Level 5 and above there will be judgement as to whether it was close throughout the period.</li> <li>• At higher levels candidates might establish criteria against which to judge.</li> <li>• To be valid judgements, claims must be supported by relevant and accurate material. If not, they are assertions.</li> <li>• Knowledge must not be credited in isolation, it should only be credited where it is used as the basis for analysis and evaluation, in line with the descriptions in the levels mark scheme.</li> </ul>
----	---	----	---



			<p>British Empire.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> the lack of British support for the US in Vietnam.</li><li>• <b>Answers might consider</b> issues over which Thatcher and Reagan differed, including Grenada, SDI and in talks with Gorbachev.</li></ul>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

APPENDIX 1 – this contains the generic mark scheme grids.

	<i>A02: Analyse and evaluate appropriate source materials, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.</i>
	<b>Generic mark scheme for Section A, Question 1: How far do the four sources support the view? [30]</b>
<b>Level 6</b> 26–30 marks	The answer has a very good focus on the question throughout. The sources are fully evaluated, using both provenance and detailed and accurate knowledge of their historical context in a balanced way, in order to engage with the sources and reach a convincing, fully supported analysis of them in relation to the issue in the question.
<b>Level 5</b> 21–25 marks	The answer has a good focus on the question. The sources are evaluated, using both provenance and relevant knowledge of their historical context, in order to engage with the sources and reach a supported analysis of them in relation to the issue in the question. There may be some imbalance in the analysis between use of provenance and use of knowledge.
<b>Level 4</b> 16–20 marks	The answer is mostly focused on the question. The sources are evaluated, using both provenance and generally relevant knowledge of their historical context, in order to engage with the sources and produce an analysis of them in relation to the question. The use of provenance may not be developed.
<b>Level 3</b> 11–15 marks	The answer is partially focused on the question. There is partial evaluation of the sources, with use of some knowledge of their historical context, in order to engage with the sources and produce a partial analysis of them in relation to the question.
<b>Level 2</b> 6–10 marks	The answer has only limited focus on the question. Evaluation of the sources is very general. There is limited use of generalised knowledge of historical context to engage with the sources and produce a basic analysis of them in relation to the question.
<b>Level 1</b> 1–5 marks	This answer is on the wider topic area, but not on the detail of the question. The sources are evaluated in a very basic way, primarily being used as a source of information with understanding of them being only partial. A very generalised knowledge of historical context is used in a very limited way to engage with the sources and to attempt a very simple analysis of them in relation to the question.
0 marks	No evidence of understanding or reference to the sources.

	<i>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.</i>
	<b>Generic mark scheme for Section B, Questions 2 and 3: Essay [20]</b>
<b>Level 6</b> 17–20 marks	There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. Accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding is demonstrated throughout the answer and is consistently evaluated and analysed in order to reach substantiated, developed and sustained judgements. There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent and logically structured. The information presented is entirely relevant and substantiated.
<b>Level 5</b> 13–16 marks	There is a mostly consistent focus on the question. Generally accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding is demonstrated through most of the answer and is evaluated and analysed in order to reach substantiated judgements, but these are not consistently well-developed. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and in the most part substantiated.
<b>Level 4</b> 10–12 marks	The question is generally addressed. Generally accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and understanding is demonstrated through most of the answer with evaluation and some analysis, and this is used appropriately to support the judgements that are made. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.
<b>Level 3</b> 7–9 marks	The question is partially addressed. There is demonstration of some relevant knowledge and understanding, which is evaluated and analysed in parts of the answer, but in places knowledge is imparted rather than being used. The analysis is appropriately linked to the judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements may not always be made explicit. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.
<b>Level 2</b> 4–6 marks	The focus is more on the topic than the specific demands of the question. Knowledge and understanding is limited and not well used, with only limited evaluation and analysis, which is only sometimes linked appropriately to the judgements made. The information has some relevance, but is communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.
<b>Level 1</b> 1–3 marks	The answer relates to the topic but not the specific question. The answer contains only very limited relevant knowledge which is evaluated and analysed in a very limited way. Judgements are unsupported and are not linked to analysis. Relevant knowledge is limited, generalised and poorly used; attempts at argument are no more than assertion. Information presented is basic and may be ambiguous or unstructured. The information is supported by limited evidence.
0 marks	No evidence of understanding and no demonstration of any relevant knowledge.

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**1 Hills Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB1 2EU**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
**is a Company Limited by Guarantee**  
**Registered in England**  
**Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU**  
**Registered Company Number: 3484466**  
**OCR is an exempt Charity**

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**Head office**  
**Telephone: 01223 552552**  
**Facsimile: 01223 552553**

© OCR 2017

