

ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report June 2010

GCE History 6HI02 E

ResultsPlus
look forward to better exam results
www.resultsplus.org.uk

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 GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com. If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated History telephone line: 0844 576 0034



ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online tool that offers teachers unrivalled insight into exam performance.

You can use this valuable service to see how your students performed according to a range of criteria - at cohort, class or individual student level.

- Question-by-question exam analysis
- Skills maps linking exam performance back to areas of the specification
- Downloadable exam papers, mark schemes and examiner reports
- Comparisons to national performance

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus.

To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

June 2010

Publications Code US024087

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2010

Introduction

Within this option, a significant number of candidates were able to achieve marks at Level 3 or above in all assessment objectives, offering a considered analysis of the given source evidence, focused towards the demands of the questions, allied to strong contextual understanding and with effective deployment of well-selected own knowledge. It was pleasing to see that many of the issues raised in previous sessions which had hampered candidate performance were reduced, with skills in handling evidence generally being demonstrated in relation to the specific issues raised. That said, certain common errors were apparent, in some cases, where candidates appeared to be attempting to apply source skills in a manner not appropriate to the questions. Therefore, this report attempts to set out certain areas in which future responses could be improved, whilst also illustrating different levels of response across the various questions.

A questions

In January it was suggested that the most common reason for low performance in the part (a) question was an inability to comprehend and interpret the source material effectively, and that, more often than not, it stemmed from rushed and careless reading. Fewer examples of this issue were found this time around, although there is still a correlation between the degree to which candidates examine the content of the sources, considering the detail within in the context of both the provenance and the issues raised by the question, and the degree to which the subtleties of the sources are explored towards a successful response. Together, the sources offer a range of views, and the majority of candidates were adept at identifying and developing from these. However, the evidence provided by individual sources often has certain ambiguities which can be developed in different ways, and some otherwise sound responses fail to consider this. The following reasons seem to account for some of these limitations:

1. Some responses took sources taken at face value, or seem to ignore the information given in the source header.
2. Whilst most candidates seek to evaluate the sources, some tend towards generic or stock responses which fail to really engage consideration of provenance with the specifics of what the sources have to say. Although many candidates are able to draw upon taught approaches to provenance, nature and the like, it is those who are able to balance this with independent thought who tend to produce the strongest analysis.
3. Most candidates were able to cross-reference successfully. However, a significant minority of candidates still conduct a sequenced trawl through the sources. Such responses thus focus too heavily describing the sources and/or drawing inferences from them, resulting in a limited summative comparison.
4. Some responses still tend to deal with reliability as a separate issue, either sequentially, or as a comparison of the reliability of the three sources.

In the main, candidates seemed well prepared concerning the issue of the application of contextual understanding for question A, an issue highlighted in January. Many candidates were able to consider evidence in the light of historical context, using this to consider discrepancies between sources or towards giving weight to the evidence. However, a small minority still seem to desire to go beyond this, offering an explanation of the issues in the question in depth, with limited reference to sources. Such responses at best became sidetracked, and in the more extreme cases failed to address the demands of the question, which is the analysis, interpretation and evaluation of evidence from the sources in order to reach a judgement.

A small minority of candidates were hampered by time management issues, in terms of devoting too long to the a) question at the expense of the subsequent question. This was often where candidates had described the content of individual sources at length.

B questions

Candidates were, on the whole, focused on the question with many at least attempting analysis. However some responses offered relevant and in many cases well detailed factual knowledge that they did not always link to arguments in the given sources. The sources provide viewpoints on issues or stated factors that candidates can utilise, offering an analysis of these drawing on contextual knowledge. A number of candidates engaged with sources with clear conceptual understanding but failed to support their answer with sufficient contextual detail. These disappointingly relied on the sources too much, without showing their ability to balance the presentation or argument, although this was not in itself a barrier to the higher levels. On the other hand, a significant minority of responses were both well detailed and with a very secure connection between own knowledge and the sources. The best candidates synthesised sources and knowledge to develop a clear line of reasoning and to test the validity of the views provided using their knowledge. Such answers were able to reach Level 4 in both assessment objectives by offering a balanced analysis, integrating contextual knowledge with source material.

There was some overall improvement in candidates' handling of evidence within the part b) question, with greater focus towards the demands of AO2b. However, there is still a minority of candidates who attempt to address issues of the provenance and reliability of secondary evidence in answers. Whilst reasoned and focused consideration of historiographical issues can obviously play a role in the analysis and evaluation of the given views at the highest levels, this at times tended towards doing so for the sake of it. Speculative comments regarding the authorship of one source being twenty years after another, or assertions based on the title of the book it is from does little to help candidates engage with the views and interpretations. At best this means candidates are wasting time and at worst it became a substitute for valid argument and analysis. Many candidates addressed the question as they might a part a), by simply analysing the sources and commenting on the provenance. Stronger responses often clearly identified the views within the given evidence as a starting point, analysing these through interrogation and corroboration using their own knowledge, exploring the relationship between and relative strengths of the different views, offering judgement on their overall strength and validity, or aspects of these.

One further aspect in which candidates could develop their work is through considering the specific demands of particular questions and what higher level analysis would be for these. Where a question has essentially asked which is the most important factor in bringing about an outcome, the majority of responses are well able to identify these from the sources and own knowledge, offering a mainly focused response with some analysis. However, fewer candidates offer real explicit awareness and development recognising that factors are often interrelated. Similarly, many candidates reach Level 3 by broadly examining success and failure on such questions, without weighing up the relative merits in order to judge whether successes outweighed failures. The given evidence often gives consideration to these issues, either individually or as a set; whilst students are clearly free to reach alternative judgements, students giving careful consideration to these in the first place are more likely to achieve the highest levels in both.

Question 1

Question 1(a) and 1(b)(i)

Most candidates could access at least Level 2 by recognising and exemplifying the basic contrast between Sources 1 and 3 (supporting the contention) and Source 2 (challenging). However, at this level it was common for the sources to be tackled sequentially and for any cross-referencing to be largely implied. Better responses, through close reading of the text, attempted to reconcile apparently contradictory sources. Thus, in Source 1, the reference to ‘the wild words of Mr Churchill’ was used as evidence that the rest of his party held more moderate views, while in Source 3 it was noted that the Conservative manifesto fell short of promising an all-encompassing denationalisation programme. Although most candidates made some reference to the source attributions, many of these comments were little more than assertions along the lines of ‘Attlee is biased’. A few attempted to use their exploration of source provenance to weigh up the strength of specific pieces of evidence. For example, it was noted by a number of candidates that the purpose of Source 3 was to accentuate ideological differences and hence the acceptance that some industries would, in all likelihood, remain nationalised pointed towards a not insignificant level of consensus. At the very top, candidates used close textual reading and application of provenance to arrive at developed judgement on ‘how far’.

There was a fairly even split between the two part b questions. In question 1bi virtually all candidates could use the source material to outline the debate and appreciated that the causal focus demanded a weighing of long-term and short-term factors. Most candidates could pick-up on the references to Conservative problems outlined on the stegosaurus’ spikes in Source 6 and use their own knowledge to expand on one or two of them. Those performing at the higher levels displayed an impressive range of contextual knowledge and managed to supplement the issues raised in the sources with additional relevant material. At the very highest levels there was a recognition that Wilson’s personal popularity, as outlined in Source 5, could, at least in part, be attributed to the fact that he seemed to personify the longer-term social and cultural shifts mentioned in Source 4.

The following extract displays all the characteristics of a Level 4 response.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

(a) ~~The socialist agree~~ agree

: disagree

source 1

: source 2 - suggest a merging or

~~Source 3~~

: belief

: source 3 - some will remain separate

: source 1 - the difference between -

The sources all agree to some extent that ~~there were diff~~ the Conservative and Labour parties held different views on nationalisation in the years ~~1945-59~~ 1945-59. All three sources show the relative stances of the parties; but they also highlight the small similarities of party policy.

Source 3 immediately asserts the idea that the Conservative view of nationalisation was drastically different to that of Labour: it begins with the claim that 'Nationalisation was proved to be a failure', and goes on to state that the Conservatives 'still repudiate nationalisation'. This is clearly a radically different interpretation of nationalisation yet it is almost to be expected: this source comes from the Conservative Party Manifesto in 1951, following an election in which Labour had not gained an overall majority. The

(a) (continued) ~~the~~ Conservatives would be likely to be critical of Labour policy, in order to sway the electorate in their favour. The Conservatives would want to exploit any dissatisfaction with Labour by presenting themselves as radically different.

Nevertheless, there is suggestion of a radical difference between the two parties from an earlier time: source 1, dating from late 1945, highlights in particular Winston Churchill's firm opposition to its nationalisation: 'Mr Churchill says that our proposals in nationalisation divert the Government from the task of reconstruction', whilst Attlee asserts that nationalisation, for many industries was a necessary measure: 'something has to be done with the coal industry'. Both source 3 and source 1 speak of a desire on the Conservatives part ~~to~~ that 'things should be left as they are', whilst implicitly acknowledging that Labour was in favour of nationalisation. However, source 1 too may ~~not~~ be completely in terms of objectivity: it comes from a speech by Clement Attlee, Leader of the Labour Party and Prime Minister, speaking the year before ~~to~~ extreme nationalisation measures were introduced. Whilst it may have been in Attlee's interests, in the aftermath of World War One, to suggest a consensus between parties, it is also likely that he would want to condemn ~~the~~ Conservative opposition to what he wanted argue on the major policy.

Source 1 offers a slightly different view. It suggests a merging

((a) continued) at party principles, in that 'We [the Labour party] have long ago come to accept some form of economy', and also suggests the importance of nationalisation: '... we propose to nationalise everything, but do we?'. It is acknowledged that nationalisation would not work for every area of industry, the crux of the Conservative argument, and hence suggests common ground between the parties. The fact that this comes from Hugh Gaitskell, former chancellor of the exchequer, and Labour leader in 1959 ~~suggested~~ credibility to his claim: he would not necessarily have been obliged to admit initiatives of nationalisation and it therefore seems more genuine.

Source 3 and 1 also, however unexpectedly suggest the mutual beliefs of Conservative and Labour: source 3 admits that some industries will be 'remaining nationalised' and in Source 1, Attlee suggests that Churchill's view does not reflect 'the opinion presented by many of his own Party'. The idea that these views are shared across opposition parties suggests that perhaps there was not such a radical difference.

While all three sources are slightly ambivalent, it appears that they all acknowledge the differences between party principle. ~~Although~~ However, what is more striking is the subtle suggestion of consensus between the parties:

((a) continued) during this period they were never so different after all.

Answer EITHER part (b)(i) OR (b)(ii) of your chosen question.

(b) i) Labour's victory:

difference between leaders: Macmillan had values, replaced

Alec Douglas-Hume

A D-H	'Wilson'	Other factors:
'old Alec'	'smart Alec'	- scandal - unemployment - EEC failure - Suez - 'scratches rev.' to Labour
'ultra-left grumpy'	a youthful image; in tune with swing 60s	
'miserly'		

When Harold Macmillan retired in 1963, at the age of 60, he was replaced, not as many expected by R.A. Butler, but instead by Alec Douglas-Hume; ~~but~~ appointed Prime Minister with Macmillan's personal support. The ~~short~~ contrast between Douglas-Hume and the opposition leader, Faber's Harold Wilson was stark, and undoubtedly played a large role, in the rise of 'social revolution' in securing Labour victory.

Alec Douglas-Hume was seen by many to characterise the old ways of the Tory Party, ~~other than~~ and has been described as 'the ultimate grumpy Tony' (Andrew Marr). ~~but~~ suggested in Source 5 to be one of 'The Old Firmies'. Harold Wilson presented a markedly different image: the 'smart Alec' to 'old Alec' Douglas-Hume. Wilson seemed his opponent, youthful and dynamic when compared with Douglas-Hume, in tune with the emerging attitudes of the 'swinging sixties'.

((b) continued) ~~as a leader of party, his policies as well as~~
 being intelligent; the only person to gain a double first
 in economics at university. Wilson adopted a new
 style of leadership, marketing 'the white heat of
 technology'. At source 5 puts it, 'a clever new man...
 better man we did let'.

~~Macmillan was right~~. While source 4 acknowledges the new
 that 'the rise in Labour's fortunes was due to personalities'
 it also suggests 'significant long-term factors working
 in Labour's favour' mentioning 'sustained prosperity' as
 a significant ~~factor~~. Indeed, there was increasing
 prosperity across Macmillan's time as leader: a growth
 in real wages at 10% across 1951-64, and a boom in
 consumer culture: sales of luxury cars nearly quadrupled,
 from £5 billion to £5.5 billion. ~~While~~ Nonetheless, these
~~developments~~ just were easily ~~not~~ benefited the
 Conservative party: clearly a dominant proponent in
 Labour's victory was the 'decline of Conservative dominance'
 (source 4).

~~The~~ ~~problems~~ Macmillan's government ~~had~~ been
 beleaguered with difficulties. The failure to gain
 access to ~~to~~ the EEC due to France's veto ~~was~~ was
 was a blow to Macmillan's pride: Britain did not
 appear strong and independent, rather 'a beggar,

((b) continued) pleading cap in hand to be allowed to join the 'beast' (Michael Lynch). Unemployment too had been a significant issue: by ~~the last year~~ Macmillan's last year in power, unemployment figures had reached the extraordinarily high figure of 875,000.

Similarly, Source B suggests 'the Tory Image' as a prominent cause for Conservative defeat - rather than individual personalities. It is suggested the view of the Conservatives overall played a large part in its defeat. The source makes reference to factors that drastically weakened the Tory party - 'Spy Scandals': such as the case of Kim Philby in 1963, a senior civil servant who, it emerged, had been passing secrets with the Soviet Union for decades. Such internal ~~scandals~~ scandals weakened the Conservatives significantly: it appeared they were not in control of their own party. Most infamously was the Profumo Affair, in which John Profumo, a highly significant ~~to~~ Conservative, was revealed to be having an affair with Christine Keeler, who was also involved with a Soviet military attaché in a Cold War society. This was a complete scandal, and the Conservatives ~~had~~ ~~dramatically~~ never quite recovered.

By 1964, the Conservatives had been in power for a very long time: their reputation had been somewhat hampered. Short-lived government such as that at Anthony Eden produced

((b) continued) only crises: the Suez affair proved Britain incapable of acting independently, and showed ~~more~~ the extent of America's influence. Suez, however, was not such a prominent factor in Conservative defeat: it is shown in Source 6 in the distance; slightly less important. Indeed, Macmillan turned it to his advantage, comparing it to 'the battles at Hastings and Dunkirk'; lauding the British 'mud and shall weever' from Source 6 suggest a unified set of planks; each ~~as~~ alone not too severe, but which combine to create a daunting image. Wilson, in the context seems confident that his electors could not 'pinch the Teng's image': it seems clear that Labour did ~~not~~ ~~win~~ victory was largely a result of the Conservative misadventures.

The ~~surprising~~^{The} Labour victory in 1964 was not an overwhelming one. The Conservative administration was exhausted; hampered by scandal and economic difficulties; political satire such as Source 6 and 600 weakened the party. The issue of personalities was undoubtedly highly significant in the Conservative's defeat: Alec Douglas-Hamilton was the epitome of 'the old lot' (Source 5); his antiquated antiquated system by which he became leader archetypal at the almost ~~as~~ archaic 'Teng image'. His son and the Douglas-Hamilton's time as Prime Minister was unimpressive: the main focus would have been the contrast in personalities.

((b) continued) Yet without Conservative failings, it is unlikely that Wilson would have been able to exploit the censuring unities as we did. The differences between the two leaders were immense, not just in terms of personality but in terms of what they stood for; Wilson was perfectly representative of 'inevitable... attitudes in the post-Suez generation' (Source 4) while Alec Douglas-Hamilton was reminiscent of a bygone era; ill-suited to the new age.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The sources are used as a set and, through close reading of text, there is a clear attempt to dig beneath the surface to find areas of reconciliation. Thus, the admission that some industries will remain nationalised is highlighted in Source 3 while there is a valid inference drawn about the possibility of a split in the Conservative party. This detailed cross-referencing is supplemented by valid exploration and application of the source attributions. Although the conclusion is rather brief, there is a clear attempt to address 'how far' with the difference between principle and practice noted. The response was awarded full marks

For question (b)(i)

This excerpt meets many of the requirements examiners are looking for in a Level 4 script. The candidate uses the sources to identify key areas of debate and then explores these further through careful application of relevant contextual knowledge. There is detailed reasoning from the evidence of Source 4 in the first paragraph, with a recognition that this evidence is by no means conclusive. The second paragraph follows naturally on from the earlier line of argument using some valid stand-alone own knowledge. Source 6 is then used as the launch pad for the following paragraph in which further detailed and relevant contextual knowledge is integrated with the issues raised in the Express cartoon. This candidate clearly has an excellent understanding of the topic but has avoided falling into the trap of leading with own knowledge and paying only peripheral attention to the documentary material. It is important for candidates to remember that although the mark allocation is weighted in favour of AO1, for Levels 3 and 4 own knowledge must be integrated with the source material.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

In evaluating the significance of a source's provenance try to avoid sweeping generalisations like 'the source is unreliable' or 'the author is biased' instead link your argument to a specific piece of evidence to show how the source provenance strengthens or weakens the point being presented.

There was an impressive range and depth to the contextual knowledge displayed in many of the responses to this question. However, a sizeable number chose to reinterpret the question as one focusing on the successes and failures of Thatcher's time in power rather than concentrating on the specific demands. Most candidates could access the basic debate through reference to the sources and, although many questioned the objectivity of the Wainwright's view in Source 9, the conflicting arguments were frequently supported by cross-referencing between the sources. (There was an error in the date given in the attribution for Source 9, 1990 instead of 1991, however, this question performed as well as the other questions on this paper and there is no evidence to suggest that candidates have been disadvantaged). Higher performing candidates picked up on the importance of the use of 'immediate' in Source 7 and 'focal point' in Source 9 and, as with question 1bi, explored the relative merits of long-term and short-term causal factors. At the very highest level the source material was integrated with detailed, accurate and focused contextual knowledge and used to arrive at a developed and supported judgement.

Answer EITHER part (b)(i) OR (b)(ii) of your chosen question.

(b) PLAN // (Score 7)

Poll tax was her downfall - Undermined her colleagues

- aggressive

(Scored) - mass non-payment

- 8 months after - discontent

- in conjunction with tGS

Poll tax wasn't - ↑ unemployment

- ↑ mortgage rates

- slow economy (Re elite)

- Trade union power ↓, Labour support

Stronger

hard graft Muds - Falklands

- Trade union power ↓ (Revised elites)

Answers //

Margaret Thatcher's reign was a long and controversial reign of 11 years from 1979-90.

In her time as leader there were many controversial events and it isn't 100% clear which one greatly assisted her downfall. It could have been a mixture of both, or was it mainly the implementation of the Poll Tax?

There were many other events that could

((b) continued) have caused her downfall. Firstly it could have been due to a suffering economy. As source 8 states "Unemployment had begun to rise" and "mortgage rates rose to 15.5%". As Thatcher preferred less government intervention, such as lower unemployment benefits, it meant the newly unemployed had less money to live on so were more likely to show their support to Labour as they received higher benefits in their welfare system. Furthermore, they wanted to leave the market to run itself, therefore the interest rate wasn't controlled and homeowners suffered. The fact that one of her early policies, 'the right to buy' council housing with discounts, meant a large majority of the UK population owned homes. These people clearly weren't being helped and had to disapprove against the first female prime minister.

In addition, her tight controls on the trade unions lead a lot of people switching to Labour because they couldn't achieve wage rises or better working conditions. The riots that included violence ^{harm} under her soon ~~soon~~ harsh and un-sympathetic notice gave ~~view~~ a good view for a democratic leader.

However, source 7 does strongly agree that

((b) continued) the introduction of the poll tax did greatly affect her downfall. One reason this gives is that it was "inefficient" and "regressive". Therefore, it affected the lower class more and discriminated them even more than they already were. This Society of course agrees with it as it provoked "mass non-payment" and "topped one of the most hated prime ministers". However the public's view isn't the only view. Her party members even showed discontent as it "undermined the government's chances of staying in office". This meant that the poll tax had turned her own party members against her as they believed it would lose them power, and it did. As stated earlier, the Conservatives reduced benefits, thanks to this regressive tax in conjunction with other regressive taxes assisted in losing a lot of support. Also the timing of its introduction wasn't a great choice, it had come after bin-laden strikes, miners strikes which provoked a lot of distress and unhappiness at Thatcher. Therefore the Poll-tax tipped the views on her over the edge and was the last straw for her time in power.

However, Thatcher was successful in a

((b) continued) areas, such as the Falklands war.

This victory showed she and Britain were still a strong international power and that she is strong, 'the iron lady' and went give up on the British empire. Her extremely right control also pleased the elite along with the Poll-tax as it reduced their bills. Conservatives were right wing, they favour the rich more so so she only, is heavy, done as expected. So Margaret Thatcher's clear fall could have only been due to the fact her time was up and there was a need for change.

In my opinion the Poll-tax was the main reason for Margaret Thatcher's downfall. Although there were many other factors, such as a long reign, bad economy and discontented Cleveland. The introduction of the aggressive Poll-tax swayed middle-class people towards Labour and lost them support from her party members. With this severe lack of support and amount of public discontent it greatly affected her loss of power. Furthermore, by many people not paying it and the government having to pay for extra legal action, not only was

((b) continued) The economy had but so was the government's budget and spending pattern. It was a step too far in her highly polarised regime and just added to her other 'bad' events after her successes which concerned a few years in on her reign.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This excerpt from a response is operating at Level 3 for both assessment objectives. There is some close reading of Sources 7 and 9 in the first paragraph and this is extended by supported cross-referencing. However, the extent of the reasoning from the evidence of the sources is limited as a result of rather restricted and generalised contextual knowledge. Although some of the material deployed in the next paragraph is relevant to the topic under discussion, it is neither linked to the source material nor focused on the precise demands of the question. The conclusion does show a clear understanding of the focus of the question but would be greatly improved by the inclusion of some evidence drawn from the sources to buttress the line of reasoning adopted. Overall, Sources 7 and 9 have been analysed with points made to challenge and support the contention; (Source 8 has been dealt with in a similar fashion elsewhere in the essay) thus, the candidate received an award at mid Level 3. For AO1, there is an understanding of the focus shown, though this is not sustained, and some relevant if restricted and occasionally descriptive material is deployed; an award at the bottom end of Level 3 was given.

Question 2

Most candidates reached a secure Level 2 by outlining and exemplifying the superficial contrast that existed between Sources 10 and 11 (for the contention) and Source 12 (against). At this level, any attempts to evaluate the significance of the source attributions were generalised and assertive - ‘Braine comes from a working-class background so is biased’. It was also common for candidates operating within Level 2 to tackle the sources sequentially and thus limit their opportunities to develop detailed and supported cross-referencing. A few candidates allowed themselves to drift away from the demands of question and presented lengthy overviews of the ‘new wave’ cinema of the 1950s without any reference to the source material. Higher performing candidates, through close textual reading and application of provenance, interrogated the sources more carefully and, thus, arrived at an overall judgement as to ‘how far’. It was, for example, noted that Lester’s focus in Source 11 on London (the hub for ‘swinging Britain’ mentioned by Jarvie in Source 12) might not fully represent working-class experience across the country. The best candidates addressed the sources as a set, showing an awareness of textual nuances and applying provenance to the evidence in order to arrive at a considered judgement.

Here is an example of a candidate answering question a and bii.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

- (a) It can be argued that to some extent films of the late 1950's and 60's presented working class life as it really was. However, it is debatable as to how far sources 10, 11 and 12 agree with this viewpoint.

It is clear that both sources 10 and 11 agree with the fact that films in the 50's and 60's portrayed the working class truthfully. Both sources mention how the working class were ambitious. Source 10 states "for the first time, a boy from the working classes" wasn't being presented as "a downtrodden victim," while source 11 says "they were filled with a sense that there were new opportunities for the working-class." Both statements indicate that films had started to portray the working class as optimistic individuals who wanted to find a way out of their situation. Both sources talk about "a new structure of life;" and being "honest about the whole business of class." While these opinions do highlight

((a) continued) The optimism of films at the time it must be noted that both sources come from people who had made films about the working class and had contributed to the film industry. This may effect the validity of the sources as ~~now~~ the producers of these films are likely to see their contribution as accurate and positive because they produced the films.

However source 12 seems to disagree with both sources 10 and 11, claiming that the films boreed "little resemblance to contemporary Britain," proving that in fact the film industry nearly glamourised the lives of the working class- Source 12 further contradicts sources 10 and 11 by claiming that the working-class accents and manners are taken for granted as being charming." Further proving that films in the 50s and 60s didn't represent the true struggles of the working class. However the validity of the source maybe affected by the fact that it comes from a media magazine or book which aims to criticise ~~the~~ some of the contributions from films, meaning that some of the statement may have been

((a) continued)

exaggerated to attract public attention.

In conclusion both sources 10 and 11 appear to agree with the opinion that Soes and Goss films presented the working class as they really were. They claim that the films were "honest about the whole business of class." However source 12 clearly disagrees with this view point claiming that there was "little resemblance of contemporary Britain." All three sources together seem to say that to some extent films did portray the working class as they really were.

Answer EITHER part (b)(i) OR (b)(ii) of your chosen question.

(b) (ii) Do you agree with the view that the internet has resulted in becoming more politically active? So mins.

Plan

yes

no.

People are able to create their own news stories.	newspapers like Time and still more popular.
People can connect across countries.	

It is clear that to some extent the internet has made an impact on people becoming more politically active - with sites such as YouTube, which was founded in 2005, helping people to post their own campaigns and news stories internationally. Furthermore socialising sites such as Facebook and Twitter have contributed to campaigning groups such as WiltF to increase supporters and donations to the charity. Even MP's such as Gordon Brown and David Cameron have Twitter and Facebook accounts to engage the public more in their political activities. To some extent all 3 sources agree with this viewpoint.

((b) continued)

It is clear that to some extent all three sources agree with the view that the internet has resulted in people becoming more politically active. Sources 16 and 17 both agree that the internet has resulted in more people becoming politically active; Source 16 says "the internet has made the individual more politically active," while Source 17 agrees saying that "it helps a lot to have a website;" from this it is evident that the use of the internet and websites has increased the ease and accessibility of political activity. This is further proved by the fact that during the 2010 elections the BNP lost substantial support as a result of a fight between a BNP member and ~~the~~ a member of the public being published on youtube. This shows that not only can the public form opinions upon material published on the internet they can also post their own material on the internet which could result in major failures for certain political parties and campaigners.

Further more source 18 also partially agrees with sources 16 and 17 say that "the

(b) continued) Internet adds to the ability of our campaigns," suggesting that the use of the internet can enhance popularity and support for political parties and local campaigns. This is further proved by the mass worldwide support for groups such as PETA and WWF who both use the internet to communicate to people across different countries ease and swiftly; furthermore the speed at which people can find news stories has increased dramatically for news stations such as Sky News people can virtually witness live news 24/7, not only does this increase the amount of public attention but it also increases the ability people have to criticise and analyse the information that is being given to them as they can compare ~~different~~ ~~several~~ the information given by different news channels.

By the evidence given so far it is apparent that the internet has resulted in people becoming more politically active.

However while sources 16 and 17 appear to entirely agree with this viewpoint source 18 seems to partially disagree with this

((b) continued) Viewpoint H claims that "the fundamental way that we are going to carry on campaigning is by engaging people on the street," this proves that while the internet does help produce more public support, some groups still prefer to talk to people face to face. The fact that the source comes from one of Britain's largest environmental pressure groups may further validate the evidence as it proves that even large campaigning groups still find other methods more useful than using the internet to increase political activity. This is further proved by the fact that newspapers such as the Times and The Independent still prefers to put a heavy influence on their printed material. Moreover it has been evident that the majority of the public would rather read printed copies of newspapers rather than the internet version.

furthermore the comment made in source 16 that only "2,000 of these have become participants active participants," and from 50,000 emails being sent calls into question the validity of source 16. The comments made in sources 17 and 18. Source 16 is from a

((b) continued) book "cyberactivism," indicating that its main aim is to pick up on and expand upon recent internet trends. This affects the validity of the source as its aim may have been to exaggerate the truth so as to attract more people to buy the book. Furthermore, since the start of the internet in the mid 1990's political parties and campaigners have all preferred to communicate to the public orally for instance through live TV debates and political adverts.

From this evidence it is evident that the internet may not have resulted in increased political activity.

In conclusion it can be argued that the internet has resulted in ~~more~~ people becoming more politically active as campaigners and MP's have shown an increased interest in Twitter and YouTube which is proved by sources 16 and 17 claiming that these people are becoming activists themselves. However it can be argued that the internet has hasn't impacted as much as printed newspapers are still favoured and before

((b) continued) The internet was funded people still shared an active interest in politics through the voting system. Slawee 16 further proves this by saying that the like to "engaging people on the streets"



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response for part A is typical of a solid Level 3 script for an a question. The candidate focuses on the demands of the question throughout and provides directed and detailed cross referencing to highlight areas of support and challenge. There is an attempt to consider the provenance of the sources in weighing up the evidence. However, this is rather restricted and, in the case of Source 12, somewhat speculative. An awareness is shown in the final paragraph that a judgement should be reached and the sources used as a set but the conclusion lacks development and support. The response was awarded a mid-Level 3 mark.

This response displays many of the characteristics of high performing responses for question bii. The sources are used throughout, and although they are not interrogated as fully as they might be, there is developed reasoning through cross-referencing between sources and by linking evidence drawn from the source material with a solid range of accurate and relevant contextual knowledge. The piece is carefully structured with a balanced analysis and focused conclusion. The counter-argument is slightly less convincing than the beginning of the essay and the speculation about the reliability of Source 16 based on the title of the book is unhelpful. However, overall the candidate displays a good grasp of the key issues raised by the sources and a clear awareness of the skills demanded by the two assessment objectives being tested in part b. It, therefore, received a mark within the top level.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Remember you are not being tested on your own knowledge in a part a question. Only use your own knowledge to help weigh up the strength of the evidence contained in the sources. This means you will never have long passages in which there is no reference to the source material.

There was a fairly even divide between the two part b questions. At the lower levels, candidates who opted for this question focused their responses largely, if not exclusively, on the source material. The debate contained within the sources was noted but any reasoning from the evidence was limited to generalisations. Some candidates attempted to mask a lack of familiarity with soap operas by citing supporting evidence from other genres, film and sit-coms being the most common. Those performing at higher levels were able to exemplify their arguments by use of case-studies drawn from a variety of different soaps - and here some flexibility was given in the precise definition of soap opera with credit being given for evidence taken from long running drama series. At this level candidates were also aware that both Sources 13 and 15 were talking about educating the viewing public about issues outside their normal experience and that this could be used to argue both for and against the representation in the question. The very best deployed a wide range of relevant contextual knowledge to develop the issues raised in the source material and arrive at a considered judgement.

The following excerpt from a script exemplifies a typical response to this question.

Answer EITHER part (b)(i) OR (b)(ii) of your chosen question.

(b) Soap operas are based on real life events. It can be argued to how far they reflect, rather than shape public opinion;

Firstly, it a variety of ways this statement could be seen as accurate. Source 14, for an extract from 'The Soap Opera Mirror or Shaper' agrees with this to a large extent. The fact that the book is completely about the argument makes it more useful and well-researched. This source states that, "Television has amplified what has gone on society" this is in relation to "The Bill." This shows that the soap only attempted to reflect what was going on society, but may be argued that it is exaggerated it. Race riots, for example Brixton and Notting Hill caused the public to get a new idea of police using violence or not intervening and soap operas attempted to follow this up or balance it. Similarly, source 14 claims that the Bill has 'not made bad policemen or is it responsible for changing the views of them.' This shows how the programme was intending to change opinion, just reflect the opinion that some people chose to have, it simply just reflected what is seen in

((b) continued) reality. Satire programmes such as 'Drop the Dead Donkey',^{and 'Harry Hill's TV burp'} sometimes focused on issues raised in soap operas, as means of mockery of how over-exaggerated these were, and to the huge extent that they did not reflect true life. This shows that it could possibly be argued that soap operas attempt to do reflect public opinion facts as the shows are too exaggerated in order to provide more entertainment. ~~(X)~~

many would argue that public opinion has actually been shaped by ~~TV shows~~
On the other hand,⁹ many serious but more unknown or overly-stereotyped issues that have been shown in ~~TV shows~~^{Soap operas} have shaped or completely changed public opinion. For example, source 15 an interview with the director of an AIDS charity, talking of Mark Fowler's HIV positive storyline in ~~Eastenders~~ states, "how the storyline, "achieved more public awareness than any of our campaigns". This suggests that soap operas were showing the public the issue and true facts" in a new light which shaped the public opinion. Comedies of the 60s and 70s would depict HIV and AIDS as a 'gay disease' e.g. 'Till Death us do part' which also contained racist

((b) continued) stereotypes. Soap operas began to educate prejudice and cruel stereotypical opinion. As this source is from someone from the charity, it is clear his aim was to shape opinion, as the opinion of the time was false and prejelice. Moreover, source 13 continues this idea as it talks of Coronation Street^{now} examined the situation of transsexuals. This was an unknown topic that many people did not have an opinion on, or disgraced more traditional viewers. Soap operas attempted to shape opinion as it was an example of an experience of life which is completely unknown to many people. This shows that public opinion needed to be shaped as there was not one formed to be reflected from.

Overall, source 13 and 14 both suggest that soap operas were able to educate us' audience, even in present day e.g. Eastenders gay muslim stories.

Moreover, in 1950 only 4% of people owned a television set, but by 1960, 80% owned one. The most popular TV shows were soaps, especially Coronation street immediately after the Queen's coronation. Therefore, it was impossible for soaps not to shape people's opinions as they were so vastly watched and people began to follow all ideas put

((b) continued) forward by them, as people got comfort and social awareness from watching them.

Firstly, many would argue that many ideas

In conclusion, historians would argue that TV did shape rather than reflect public opinion at the time as many 'contentious storylines' were not reflective. Source 1c states how soaps manage to shape brand new ideas on certain issues. Also, as soaps were so popular, it was difficult for people not to believe all that was said in them, particularly housewives of the 60s/70s/80s that watched this shows everyday. Although some would argue to a small extent that soaps did just reflect opinion, as they were meant to a depiction of normal life. Overall, it could be argued to a higher extent that soap operas did shape and form public opinion, even American soaps like Dallas gave the public the new idea of the America dream and Americanisation began, something that was rarely seen before, and could not be reflected on.

((b) continued) ~~(A)~~ Lastly, many would argue that ideas from music, youth subcultures and a growing permissive society was what soap operas reflected. Everyday life ^{and other factors.} shaped these opinions, e.g. Beatles music and rebellion of youth and soaps just reflected this, as they were not as influential.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The candidate shows a clear awareness of the representation in the question and attempts to present a balanced analysis. However, restricted contextual knowledge means that much of the exemplification is drawn from evidence which has, at best, only tangential relevance to the focus of the question. The source material is interrogated closely and there is an interesting attempt to support the contention by referencing programmes which lampoon soap operas. Similarly, some valid knowledge of the cultural context is used to develop the argument that soaps shape opinion. Overall, the candidate has used the source material well and made a valiant attempt to reason from the evidence but restricted contextual knowledge has prevented this from reaching Level 4; for AO2b the award was, therefore, at the top end of Level 3. The response is less secure in AO1 and lack of breadth and depth limits the mark to the bottom end of Level 3.

Spend 10 or 15 minutes carefully planning your response. Draw out the themes contained in the sources that agree and disagree with the view in the question. Then, think how you could extend these themes with your own knowledge.

Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	44	39	34	29	25
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

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](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)
Order Code US024087 June 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit
www.edexcel.com/quals

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

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government


Rewarding Learning