

AEA

Edexcel AEA

History (9846)

Summer 2006

Mark Scheme

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information please call our Customer Services on 0870 240 9800, or visit our website at www.edexcel.org.uk.

Summer 2006

Publications Code UA 018335

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2006

Contents

Title	Page
Instructions on Marking	1
Section A	4
Section B	9

Instructions on Marking

Principles of Assessment

Examiners are encouraged to exercise their professional discretion and judgment in the assessment of answers. The schemes that follow are a guide and may at times be inapplicable to answers that tackle questions in an unusual, though acceptable, manner. Where examiners find it necessary to adapt the mark scheme to the needs of such answers, written comments should make clear the basis on which such decisions were made.

Examiners should at all times mark positively rather than negatively, i.e. reward candidates for what they know and understand rather than penalising them for what they do not know or understand. Examiners should bear in mind that the examination is designed for a wide ability range and should therefore make full use of the whole range of marks available.

Date of marking

Do **NOT** date scripts. Each script should be numbered consecutively and marking should be completed in centre number order.

Addition of marks

Marks for each sub-question should be placed in the right hand margin. The final total for an answer must be ringed and placed in the right-hand margin and transferred to the front sheet. Do not write comments in the right hand margin. The level awarded should be noted in the left-hand margin as L1, L2 etc.

Annotation

The marking of questions is discussed in paragraph 5 below. Examiners must ensure that their marking is not only accurate and consistent, but that it is easy to follow. Marking conventions as described in the mark schemes and exemplified at standardisation must be followed. Every answer must show evidence in the body of the work that it has been marked.

Answers should be analysed as follows:

- Underline with a straight line the key points of reasoning and argument; indicate flawed reasoning, irrelevance or error with a wavy line (in the left hand margin if the passages are lengthy).
- A cross or encirclement may be used for errors of fact; a question mark may be used to indicate a dubious or ambiguous assertion; an omission mark to indicate the absence of material that might reasonably be expected.

Marking of questions

(a) Levels of response

The mark scheme provides an indication of the sorts of answer that might be found at different levels. It will be necessary, therefore, for examiners to use their professional judgment 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.

Maps and diagrams drawn by candidates

A map or diagram which relates directly to the set question, which is substantially accurate and which suggests (e.g. by location of places and boundaries) firmer historical understanding of the question than that shown by the candidate's written work alone should receive credit.

Note form

If you encounter the use of note form treat it on its merits. Unintelligible or flimsy notes will deserve little, if any, credit. If an answer consists of notes which are full and readily intelligible, award it the appropriate conceptual level but go to the bottom end of that level.

Comments by examiners on answers and on scripts

Examiners should feel free to comment on a part of an answer, a whole answer or a complete script to clarify the basis on which marks have been awarded. Such comments are of assistance to Team Leaders and to any others who may have reason to look further at a marked script at a later stage. These comments must represent professional judgements and must be related to the criteria for the award of marks. Negative comments should not, of course, be employed as an opportunity to vent the examiner's frustration. For example, 'irrelevant' may be an acceptable comment; 'hopeless' is not.

Consistency

Examiners should apply a uniform standard of assessment throughout their marking once that standard has been approved by their Team Leader. They should not try to find extra marks for candidates. It is the duty of an examiner to see that the standard of marking does not vary in any particular area of the mark range.

Spread of marks

Undue 'bunching' of marks is very undesirable. In particular, examiners should not hesitate to give high marks, and should go up to the maximum if it is deserved.

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.

Rubric offences

- (a) A candidate who offends against the rubric of a paper should have all the answers marked and the best answers counted up to the required number within a particular paper or section of a paper.
- (b) A candidate who offends against the rubric of a question which allows an internal choice should have the entire question marked, and should be credited with the parts best attempted, counted up to the required number. An answer that offends against the rubric and that does not score should be indicated thus: QU.2. RUBRIC OFFENCE. DO NOT SCORE.

Illegibility

Scripts which are impossible to read or which contain offensive or disturbing comments should be marked 'E' on the front cover and forwarded (separately) to the Assessment Leader for History at Edexcel after the script has been marked and the mark recorded. Such scripts will be considered separately by the Principal Examiners at the conclusion of the awarding meeting.

Quality of written communication

The marking of the quality of written communication is embedded within the levels of response of some questions. It forms one of the considerations for deciding reward within a level.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS (applicable to both Sections A and B)

In questions where each level contains a range of marks, bullet points one and two should be used to decide the level which the answer has reached. When awarding marks within a level, move up or down from the mid-point according to the extent to which the remaining criteria are met.

SECTION A

QUESTION 1 (a)

Study Source 1.

Why, according to the author of Source 1, have 'Popular history and the heritage industry' become 'key zones for the "dumbing down" of British culture' (Source 1, lines 19-20)?

(6 marks)

GENERIC LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Level 1

The answer shows the ability to:

- comprehend and begin to analyse the key points of argument.
- select appropriately from the source material in support of the analysis offered.

(1-2 marks)

Level 2

- The answer shows the ability to understand the basis of the arguments offered by the author.

(3-4 marks)

Level 3

- The answer shows the ability to explore the arguments offered with confidence and discrimination.
- Treatment of argument and discussion of evidence selected will show that the work has been fully assimilated.

(5-6 marks)

INDICATIVE CONTENT

Effectively a 'comprehension' starter. Reasons are dotted through the text rather than being concentrated in one place: some capacity for inference is needed to access the highest level. The main reasons identified in the text are

- Popular history and the heritage industry simplify the past, reducing it to soundbites and easily digestible morsels: complexities are avoided
- Popular history and the heritage industry are obsessed with celebrity and focus on the lives of the great and famous
- Popular history and the heritage industry offer a falsified/ inaccurate view of the past and create and perpetuate myths

L1: **Simple statements** extracted from the source ie quotation / citation rather than explanation

(1-2)

L2: **Developed statements**, in which an individual reason or reasons are explained with secure reference from the source. Expect **two** of the differences identified above to feature at this level.

(3-4)

L3: **Developed explanation**, with a range of reasons clearly explained and some overall structuring of the explanation. Normally all three points identified above should feature if higher L3 is to be awarded, but an answer focussing on two of them (for instance, excluding the 'celebrity' point) which is notably incisive, well-organised and well-referenced could be considered for higher L3.

(5-6)

QUESTION 1 (b)

Use your own knowledge.

The author of Source 1 suggests that views about the past that do not correspond with historical reality sometimes achieve widespread popularity. Identify one example (other than Dick Turpin) of an historical personality, episode or issue where you believe this to be the case, and explain in relation to your chosen example the ways in which popularly held views differ from the historical reality. Develop your answer by reference to any historical period you have studied.

(14 marks)

GENERIC LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Level 1

- The answer shows adequate understanding of the proposition and demonstrates some conceptual awareness.
- Historical knowledge deployed in relation to the question is adequate and appropriately selected.
- The answer offers some development of the analytical points made.
- The candidate will be able to analyse complex historical ideas which will be communicated in logical and generally well-structured ways.

(1-5 marks)

Level 2

- The answer shows a clear understanding of the analytical demands of the question, demonstrating secure conceptual awareness.
- The historical knowledge deployed in relation to the question will be secure, and well selected, demonstrating an understanding of period, as appropriate.
- Points are adequately developed and some may be convincingly thought through.
- The candidate's ability to analyse complex historical ideas will be communicated in writing which is controlled, coherent and well-directed.

(6-10 marks)

Level 3

- The answer shows a clear and complete understanding of the analytical demands of the question
- Historical knowledge will be related precisely and effectively to the question set, demonstrating confidence in moving between generalisation and detailed discussion.
- The author's argument is fully analysed and the candidate's argument in response is convincingly developed.

- The answer displays independence of thought in its ability to assess the validity of the author's view
- The candidate's ability to analyse complex historical ideas and concepts will be communicated in writing which is controlled, coherent and well-directed throughout.

(11-14 marks)

INDICATIVE CONTENT

This question is designed to give candidates an opportunity to do some empirical history and to show awareness of ways in which the past has been interpreted. The main criteria for deciding between levels here are

- appropriateness of personality / episode / issue chosen
- quality of the explanation of the 'popularly held view', the historical reality and the differences between them
- quality of supporting evidence.

L1: Simple statements. A plausible personality / episode / issue will be identified; the treatment is likely to have a strong descriptive / potted biography element but there will be statements, generalised and not well supported, which relate to widespread view / reality and the differences between them

(1-5)

L2: Developed statements. Well-chosen personality / episode / issue; developed, though possibly unbalanced and not necessarily sophisticated or controlled explanation of the 'popularly held view', the reality and differences between them; supporting evidence secure but possibly lacking depth, range or really precise focus.

(6-10)

L3: Developed explanation. Highly apposite personality / episode / issue identified; tightly-focused, well-supported, systematic explanation of both the popularly held view and the reality and the differences between them; an impressive explanation of the circumstances in which the 'popularly held' view developed - in other words, how the 'myth' was propagated - is likely to be a marker for Level 3; another marker for L3 would be explicit evidence of wider reading and / or historiographical awareness - though nb beware rote-learned historical 'interpretations'.

NB historical 'myths' can originate from historians' misinterpretations (eg Bad King John), from popular misconceptions (eg Robin Hood) or from distortions by political regimes (eg the 'personality cult' which saw Stalin projected in the USSR as human and benevolent). In the context of this question all are valid approaches. What we should not, however, be swift to reward is the candidate who simply describes two different historians' interpretations, neither of which has achieved genuinely widespread popular currency and neither of which can be shown definitively to be false - for example, the candidate who presses into service structuralist and intentionalist interpretations of the Third Reich: work of this kind won't really have addressed the question as set and is likely to get beyond L1.

(11-14)

QUESTION 1 (c)

Study Sources 1 and 2, and use your own knowledge.

'Historical accounts are riddled with most of the same defects that critics think peculiar to heritage' (Source 2, lines 5-6). To what extent do you agree with this opinion? You should develop your answer by reference to Sources 1 and 2 and to your own historical studies.

(20 marks)

GENERIC LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Level 1

- The answer shows adequate understanding of at least one proposition and, in considering it, demonstrates some conceptual awareness.
- The historical knowledge deployed in relation to the question is adequate and appropriately selected.
- The answer offers some development of the analytical points made.
- The candidate will be able to analyse complex historical ideas which will be communicated in logical and generally well-structured ways.

(1-6 marks)

Level 2

- The answer demonstrates secure conceptual awareness, showing a clear understanding of the arguments of at least one source and offering integrated responses calling on other reading and appropriately selected historical knowledge.
- The historical knowledge deployed in relation to the question will be secure and well selected, demonstrating an understanding of period, as appropriate.
- Points are adequately developed and some may be convincingly thought through.
- The candidate's ability to analyse complex historical ideas will be communicated in writing which is controlled, coherent and well-directed.

(7-14 marks)

Level 3

- The answer shows a clear and complete understanding of the analytical demands of the question and its full conceptual demands are met.
- Historical knowledge will be related precisely and effectively to the question set, demonstrating confidence in moving between generalisation and detailed discussion.
- The authors' arguments are assimilated and the candidate's argument in response is convincingly developed.
- The answer displays independence of thought in its ability to assess the validity of the presented views (Sources 1 and 2) in the light of own knowledge and reading
- The candidate's ability to analyse complex historical ideas and concepts will be communicated throughout in writing which is well-controlled, coherent and well directed throughout

(15-20 marks)

INDICATIVE CONTENT

The starting-point of secure work here is identification of what these 'defects' are.

In Source 1 it's suggested that (i) heritage **simplifies the past and is inaccurate** (so, true of history as well?). In Source 2 it's suggested that (ii) heritage and history both **lack objectivity** and (iii) that both heritage and history **interpret the past rather than reconstructing it**.

(NB The two authors seem to be at odds on (i) and (ii) but on (iii) it's complex because James Sharpe in Source 1 talks at one point about 'reconstructing historical reality' and at another about 'recreating' the past (something which Source 2 deems impossible) but at another acknowledges that historical interpretations are products of a particular time and culture.)

Answers should ideally focus on the validity of the claims (i), (ii) and (iii) above with objectivity likely to be the one which attracts most attention. The objectivity point may well prove to be a magnet for some candidates (schooled as many are in 'Is history a science?' and 'Can the historian be truly objective?') and answers which focus on the impossibility of total objectivity to the exclusion of other points are a distinct possibility. If very well done - top L2, maybe low L3.

L1: Limited awareness of alleged 'defects' (eg answer focuses on one point only or offers a range of points but lacks secure understanding). Answers are based on either sources or own knowledge or on both but in a lightweight fashion.

(1-6)

L2: Developed awareness of alleged 'defects' - answer shows good understanding but is weighted / unbalanced in the direction of one of the defects, probably objectivity. So, very secure answer focussing on historical objectivity alone would be top level 2. Answers make use of sources and 'own knowledge' but weighted in the direction of one of them.

(7-14)

L3: Wider awareness of alleged 'defects' ie answer not restricted to the 'objectivity' point alone. Answer offers a wide-ranging and penetrating discussion based securely on confident use of the sources and own knowledge.

(15-20)

SECTION B

GENERIC LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Level 1

- The answer shows adequate understanding of the focus of the question, demonstrating some conceptual awareness
- Historical knowledge related to the question is adequate and appropriately selected.
- The answer offers some development of the analytical points made.
- The candidate will be able to analyse complex historical ideas which will be communicated in logical and generally well-structured ways.

(1-6 marks)

Level 2

- The candidate offers an answer which shows a clear understanding of the analytical demands of the question and demonstrates secure conceptual awareness.
- Historical knowledge deployed in relation to the question will be well selected, secure and accurate.
- Points are adequately developed some may be convincingly thought through.
- The candidate's ability to analyse complex historical ideas will be communicated in writing which is controlled, coherent and well-directed.

(7-14 marks)

Level 3

- The answer shows a complete and clear understanding of the analytical demands of the question and its full conceptual demands are met.
- Historical knowledge will be related precisely and effectively to the questions set, demonstrating confidence in moving between generalisation and detailed discussion.
- All arguments are convincingly developed and the answer displays genuine independence of thought.
- The candidate's ability to analyse complex historical ideas and concepts will be communicated in writing which is controlled, coherent and well-directed throughout.

(15-20 marks)

2. *'Political history is inevitably just the history of elites.'* To what extent do you agree with this claim? Develop your answer by specific reference to any historical period or periods you have studied.

Straightforward endorsement of the quotation on the basis that it's elites who hold and wield power is likely to be L1 if thinly supported and perhaps L2 if more fully developed. If the additional point is made that its evidence relating to elites that survives and is most plentiful, a solid L2 is in prospect. Stronger answers, however, are likely to include elements of challenge to the quotation, arguing that non-elites influence and shape the political process. If this latter is the only point offered, it's likely to be L1 if thinly supported, L2 if developed.

NB We need to be sensitive here to the difference between (i) the candidate who offers 'argument led' work and exemplifies his or her answers by reference to a single historical period, and (ii) the candidate who recycles a standard A Level essay, describing, maybe analysing, a single historical episode and embellishing what is written with general statements or conclusions which link in only a limited way to the question. The former type of candidate can get to L3 but the latter is likely to be low-mid L2 at best. If exemplification is essentially restricted to a single historical episode or case study as opposed to a 'historical period', and the answer is very heavily 'case-study' -driven, don't go beyond L2.

3. *'Consideration of "what could have been" might be an entertaining activity, but it has no place in serious historical study.'* How far do you agree with this view of counter-factual history? Develop your answer by specific reference to your own knowledge and to historical works you have studied.

Defences of counter-factual history are likely to revolve around (i) counter-factualism draws attention to the role of chance and contingency, reminding us that outcomes could easily have been different (ii) the point that it is necessary to understand what could have happened in order to explain what did happen. Criticism of the counter-factual approach is likely to centre on the ideas that it's unhistorical, that evidence is difficult to offer and that counter-factuals are in practice offered as entertainment rather than for any more serious purpose. There might as well be criticism from a determinist (eg Marxist) perspective to the effect that chance and contingency don't have a part to play. Answers which are straightforward defences or criticisms and which consist of assertions or simple statements lightly supported will be Level 1. Answers containing reasonably well developed and supported statements but which are essentially critiques or endorsements of counter-factualism are likely to be L2. L3 work will be systematic and balanced in the sense that both sides of the argument will be explored but will as well offer a clear judgement on 'extent'.

4. *'Imaginative literature, music and the visual arts are all highly problematic sources for the social historian: they provide much less useful evidence than might be anticipated.'* How far do you agree with this assertion? Develop your answer by specific reference to any historical period or periods you have studied.

This is an attempt at a question focusing on the ability to evaluate historical evidence, an area which has perhaps been under-represented in AE essay questions thus far. Straightforward endorsement of the quotation is likely to be supported by the arguments to the effect that writers, composers and artists are to some degree unrepresentative and / or biased. If well done, with very high quality support, this line of approach could get to L3 but is more likely to be L2. At the highest levels there are likely to be elements of challenge to, as well as of support for, the quotation, with candidates offering (eg) the point that the insights of imaginative writers etc are important in the absence of opinion poll evidence and that some writers / artists saw their prime function as depicting / exploring / satirising their own

society. Note that the question asks for a focus on evidence for the *social historian* not the historian in general: those whose supporting evidence and exemplification relate to political history ought not to go beyond lower L2. On the other hand, be prepared to reward those who keep the focus tightly on exemplification relating to themes/issues central to social history (eg gender and gender relations, social stratification, ethnicity, living conditions etc). Reward fully too those whose exemplification is not restricted wholly or largely to imaginative literature (those who ignore the visual arts and music wholly should not be allowed to get beyond L2).

5. *'Wars between states create more problems than they solve.'* To what extent do you agree with this observation? Develop your answer by specific reference to any historical period or periods before the end of the twentieth century that you have studied.

The idea here is to pose a question requiring consideration of *consequences* rather than the more familiar *causes*. The phrase 'between states' is intended to close off consideration of civil wars - which, if left on-side, would advantage candidates who have studied (eg) the English or American civil wars. The reference to the end of the 20th century shuts off the second Iraq war. In the strongest (L3) work there should be consideration of the international as well as the domestic consequences of major wars: work confined to one of them might, if exceptional, be worth lower L3 but is more likely to be L2. Range of reference is important here too, with answers focusing on the impact of only one major war being unlikely to get beyond L2. Answers which are wholly focused on eg the First World War or the Vietnam war are thus likely to be good L2, and not necessarily top L2, at best. Descriptive writing which doesn't focus on consequences would be L1. The strongest work (L3) will be structured around a plausible overall judgement in relation to the quotation and will be argument-driven rather than example-driven: answers structured around descriptors of the outcomes of a series of wars followed by an attempted 'conclusion' ('so it can be seen that...') of no great perception are not going to be worth more than L2. In other words, much depends on how evidence is deployed - in support of argument or in place of argument.

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code UA 018335 Summer 2006

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications
Alternatively, you can contact Customer Services at www.edexcel.org.uk/ask or on 0870 240 9800

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH

edexcel 
advancing learning, changing lives

A PEARSON COMPANY

