



---

# A-level HISTORY

Paper 1J The British Empire, c1857–1967

---

**Mark scheme**

---

---

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)

## A-level History Paper 1 Specimen Mark Scheme

### 1J The British Empire, c1857–1967

#### Section A

- |          |          |   |                   |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|
| <b>0</b> | <b>1</b> | Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to Britain's policies in South Africa in the late nineteenth century. | <b>[30 marks]</b> |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|

*Target: AO3*

*Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.*

#### Generic Mark Scheme

- |            |  |              |
|------------|--|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | Shows a very good understanding of the interpretations put forward in all three extracts and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. Evaluation of the arguments will be well-supported and convincing. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context.   | <b>25-30</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | Shows a good understanding of the interpretations given in all three extracts and combines this with knowledge of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. The evaluation of the arguments will be mostly well-supported, and convincing, but may have minor limitations of depth and breadth. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context.   | <b>19-24</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | Provides some supported comment on the interpretations given in all three extracts and comments on the strength of these arguments in relation to their historic context. There is some analysis and evaluation but there may be an imbalance in the degree and depth of comments offered on the strength of the arguments. The response demonstrates an understanding of context.   | <b>13-18</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | Provides some accurate comment on the interpretations given in at least two of the extracts, with reference to the historical context. The answer may contain some analysis, but there is little, if any, evaluation. Some of the comments on the strength of the arguments may contain some generalisation, inaccuracy or irrelevance. The response demonstrates some understanding of context.   | <b>7-12</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | <b>Either</b> shows an accurate understanding of the interpretation given in one extract only <b>or</b> addresses two/three extracts, but in a generalist way, showing limited accurate understanding of the arguments they contain, although there may be some general awareness of the historical context. Any comments on the strength of the arguments are likely to be generalist and contain some inaccuracy and/or irrelevance. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. | <b>1-6</b>   |

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.**

In responding to this question, students may choose to respond to each extract in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach of individual arguments. Either approach could be equally valid, and what follows is indicative of the analysis and evaluation which may be relevant.

**Extract A:** In their identification of Porter's arguments students could identify the following:

- the inference that Britain had imperial designs on the Transvaal
- Cecil Rhodes promoted the extension of British control in South Africa, partly for economic but also ideological reasons
- however, most capitalists did not want British control in the region – they were happy to tolerate Afrikaner rule or take political control themselves.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students could refer to the following:

- the attitude of capitalists might be explored through, for example, reference to tensions between the mining companies and the Transvaal government (e.g. over taxation, corruption and the explosives monopoly); the levels of investment associated with the development of deep-mining in the 1890s might be seen as adding to frustration; contemporary perceptions on the role of capitalists in imperialism (e.g. J A Hobson)
- the levels of British investment in the Transvaal – over half of all investment in the gold mines – might be seen as giving British capital a particularly high stake in the future of the region
- the extent of Uitlander grievances and the organisation and failure of the Jameson Raid might be seen either as evidence of support for, or indifference to, political change in the region
- the extent of Rhodes' business interests across southern Africa might be explored – possibly referring to his interests in De Beers, Consolidated Goldfields, British South Africa Company
- Rhodes' imperial visions and their influence may be explored, e.g. through his speeches and statements (such as his Confession of Faith 1877 or Last Will and Testament), his political career in the Cape, relationship with British government and officials, the territorial acquisitions of the British South Africa Company, his plans for a railway linking Cairo the Cape.

**Extract B:** In their identification of the arguments of Saunders and Smith students could identify the following:

- British policy in South Africa in the 1890s was a reaction to the growing power of the Transvaal
- the interests of capitalists did not determine British policy, nor did British trade and financial interests

- the British government's plans to consolidate political control in the region lay behind its policy towards South Africa and ultimately the decision to go to war with the Transvaal in 1899.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students could refer to the following:

- the growing power of the Transvaal might be explored: the Transvaal had grown rich on the back of gold revenues, had begun to develop economic and commercial policy outside of British control and had established diplomatic links with Germany; significantly, it was beginning to promote Afrikaner nationalism beyond its borders, creating close links with the Orange Free State and threatening British interests in the Cape Colony
- in considering the extent to which British trade or investment did or did not play a role in shaping policy, reference might be made, for example, to the supply of gold and its implications for British finance; the scale of British investments in southern Africa; the attitude of the City of London, the eventual cost of the conflict and the damage incurred
- Chamberlain's plans to consolidate the empire might be discussed, for example, with reference to the emergence of rivals in Germany and the USA; the strategic importance of South Africa to the defence of Britain's eastern empire and trade routes and the potential value of its gold and mineral wealth to the British Empire in the future.

**Extract C:** In their identification of Worden's arguments students could identify the following:

- the British policy of unifying South Africa under British control can be traced back to the 1870s
- many factors contributed to this process, including nationalist and imperial rivalry and the roles of individuals
- however, economic factors were key – with first the discovery of diamonds and then gold making the region too important for Britain to ignore
- at the heart of British policy was industrial and imperial rivalry.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students could refer to the following:

- the circumstances surrounding the annexation of the Transvaal in 1877, including reference to Carnarvon's and Shepstone's federalist plans and the issues which thwarted their fulfilment at the time
- the extent to which key individuals shaped British policy might be explored – for example, Chamberlain's imperial vision as Colonial Secretary or Milner's role in engineering war with the Transvaal in the late 1890s might be seen as critical to the ultimate direction of British policy
- the wealth and strategic importance of South Africa at a time when Britain was facing industrial and imperial competition might be explored: the growth of Germany in particular might be seen to be a threat to British on both counts.

Students might extend their evaluation of interpretations through comparisons, links and connections in order to reach a judgement using their own knowledge.

---

Such a judgement might conclude:

- all three extracts recognise that economic factors played a major part in Britain's policy towards South Africa – hence, this can be seen as the key driver of the British government's policy, whether as a cipher for 'capitalists' or in pursuit of the government's own agenda
- alternatively, international rivalries, Britain's strategic interests and the wider defence of the empire are raised in both Extracts B and C – it is possible to see imperial policy in an international relations context
- Extract B introduces a reactive dimension. This might be seen as a significant refinement. Although Britain was an imperialist power it went about its affairs in different ways. British colonial policy sometimes was shaped by the actions of others – in this instance Kruger's Transvaal. However, Extract B still seems to see this in the context of an imperial vision
- an imperial vision at the heart of government can also be seen to be pivotal – in the 1870s under Carnarvon and again in the 1890s under Chamberlain, key individuals gave British policy a very specific direction.

**Section B**

<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	'In the first half of the twentieth century, for most British people the Empire was a source of national pride.'
----------	----------	--

Assess the validity of 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**

- |            |   |              |
|------------|---|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement.  | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated.   | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist.   | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | The answer is 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. | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | 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.  | <b>1-5</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.   | <b>0</b>     |

---

## 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.**

In support of the view that the Empire was a source of pride for most British people:

Pride may be explored through its manifestation in, for example:

- popular literature
- press
- broadcasting
- cinema
- education
- sport
- political groups
- organisations
- exhibitions etc.

Pride may also be examined through reference to particular groups in British society, for example:

- occupation
- class
- gender
- age

Alternative viewpoints may consider:

- the extent to which ‘most’ sections of British society embraced imperialism with ‘pride’
- variations over time may be explored
- alternative explanations for pro-imperial sentiment (e.g. career opportunities/employment, security etc.)
- apathy/disinterest of many
- opposition to imperialism and criticism of empire may be explored through reference to:
  - radical/liberal critiques
  - humanitarian campaigners
  - socialists



**0 3** 'British reforms in India between the two World Wars were designed to avoid fundamental change in India's status.'

Assess the validity of 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

- |            |   |              |
|------------|---|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement.  | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated.   | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist.   | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | The answer is 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. | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | 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.  | <b>1-5</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.   | <b>0</b>     |

---

## 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.**

In support of the view that reforms were designed to prevent fundamental change:

- perception of Indian nationalists that British reforms were limited
- India's economic and military importance to Britain
- the role of the Viceroy
- assumptions of Indians' fitness to participate in government
- the limitations of the 1919 Government of India Act
- responses to Indian nationalism/protest revealed resolve
- the failure of the Round Table conferences
- the limitations of the 1935 Government of India Act.

Alternative viewpoints may consider:

- the reaction of some Conservatives (e.g. Churchill) to reform and their perception of far-reaching change
- commitment to self-rule/Dominion status was a fundamental change
- changes as a result of 1919 and 1935 Acts
- engagement with nationalist leaders
- the effect of repression (e.g. Amritsar) and nationalist protest (e.g. Gandhi) on British perception
- effects of 'Indianisation' of administration
- changing defence priorities
- declining importance of India to British economy.

**0 4** 'British withdrawal from Africa in the years following the Second World War owed little to the strength of nationalist movements.'

Assess the validity of 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

- |            |   |              |
|------------|---|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement.  | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated.   | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist.   | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | The answer is 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. | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | 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.  | <b>1-5</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.   | <b>0</b>     |

---

## 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.**

In support of the view that British withdrawal from Africa owed little to the strength of nationalist movements, for example:

- the limited mass support for nationalist movements in Africa/tribal identities
- failure of federation policies
- the largely peaceful and ordered process of decolonisation
- British decolonisation policies in Africa owed more to:
  - effects of Second World War on imperial identity
  - British experience of decolonisation elsewhere (e.g. in India, Middle East)
  - the effects of the Suez Crisis
  - Britain's dependency on the USA
  - the Cold War and Britain's position in the world
  - the cost/benefit analysis of African colonies
  - belief that formal empire was unnecessary
  - the tide of history had changed.

Alternative viewpoints may consider, for example:

- the effects of Mau Mau on British opinion
- contemporary perceptions of, for example, Nkrumah
- the emergence of politicised elites
- fear of Algeria or Congo style disorder.



