

Examiners' Report  
January 2013

GCE History 6HI02 E

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk) for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: [www.edexcel.com/teachingservices](http://www.edexcel.com/teachingservices).

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at [www.edexcel.com/ask](http://www.edexcel.com/ask). You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service. See the ResultsPlus section below on how to get these details if you don't have them already.

## ResultsPlus

### Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and Edexcel national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for raising achievement through innovation in education.

Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

January 2013

Publications Code US034639

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

## Introduction

It was pleasing to see a good standard of responses from many candidates in this examination series. Indeed, many candidates wrote with understanding and insight about the key themes.

The paper requires candidates to answer two questions in 80 minutes. Examiners commented on the fact that many candidates this series had clearly used their time to very good effect. Although some responses were quite brief, there was little evidence of candidates having insufficient time to answer both questions.

There was a wide range of responses across the mark range, but the paper appears to have worked in the sense that the most able were stretched whilst the less talented were still able to attempt answers to both parts of the examination.

In part A, most candidates were able to use the language of cross-referencing, but a significant number often matched statements that showed a comparison for agree or disagree and did not explain or draw out the inferences that are necessary to develop a cross-reference. In part B, it was again disappointing to note that a significant minority of candidates relied very heavily on the material in the sources, which was not always securely understood. Centres are reminded that candidates are expected to have a reasonable range and depth of knowledge that can be applied to the part B questions. Despite comments in previous examiners' reports, many candidates continue to comment on provenance in their responses to part B. Such comments are often very generic e.g. "the historian can be trusted because they have the benefit of hindsight" or "they cannot be trusted because they were not an eye witness to the event". In any event, such comments, even if well developed, generally do not contribute to AO2b, which is what is being tested in question B. Candidates would do well to develop their arguments in relation to the question, rather than to write whole paragraphs on provenance which can earn no credit under AO2b.

Candidates should take care that they can spell technical words correctly, especially when those words form part of the question or the sources. Some candidates over-used words such as 'inference' and did not demonstrate a secure understanding of its meaning. However, overall, the language used by candidates seemed to contain fewer colloquialisms and abbreviations this year than in previous examinations.

The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

## Question 1 (a)

Many candidates addressed the question directly and were able to use the sources to find evidence that both supported and opposed the claim that Arthur Scargill was responsible for the failure of the miners' strike, mostly through highlighting Scargill's tactics compared to those of the police and taking into consideration the limited support from some miners. The best answers cross-referenced the sources convincingly and used the provenance skilfully to weigh the sources and reach a judgement in relation to the question. Some candidates struggled with the cartoon, completely missing the point that Scargill's sledge hammer was destroying the mines, and this did have a negative impact on their answer as a whole. Good responses used the provenance of sources to reach a weighted judgement but many candidates provided generic statements about left and right wing and the impact of hindsight which added little to the analysis.

(a) Source 1 and 2 agree with the statement that Arthur Scargill was chiefly to blame for failure of the miners strike, whilst Source 3 seems to suggest other factors were also to blame.

Firstly, sources 1 and 2 suggest that it was Scargill's fault; Mr Scargill misled his own members. This was taken from source 2. It seems to suggest that Scargill was only looking for personal enhancement and to look strong, but seemed to actually ruin his own members and the unions. The source is also written by Margaret Thatcher, Prime Minister at the time. This suggests that, as they were first at the time, she wouldn't have any sympathy for him, but, on the other hand, she could suggest if said it was her government that caused him and the miners, but she didn't, so this adds legitimacy to the source, which points out that Scargill was entirely to blame due to his misjudgement of proceedings and Source 1 also agrees that Scargill was to blame. It depicts Scargill with a giant sledge hammer, attempting to destroy Thatcher's government, represented by the Parliament, by indirectly destroying the mines, shown as the miners pits. This clearly indicates that it was Scargill's fault because he is a lone character in it, and the fact his is destroying pits is surely shown that it was his fault. The source becomes more interesting as it is from a centre-left newspaper, the observer. As the Union, and Scargill, were left wing on the political spectrum, this is a story as one would expect them to support this ideologically on similar side. And because it shows him Scargill destroying the pits accidentally, this shows that he is ~~the~~ Scargill's fault, adding more reliability to the source.

Source 3, on the other hand, suggests that other underlying factors played a big role; 'The Strike was a response to closure'. This indicates

man from the Socialist Workers Party, which was a far left party. Seeing as Scargill also believed such things similar to his party, they are going to give similar ~~answers~~ explanations.

To conclude, Sources 1 and 2 suggest, very far left, that it was entirely Scargill's fault and he is the one to be blamed, but source 3 seems to show that other factors, such as the <sup>new</sup> pit closures, were to blame for the failed strike. So, in all, ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> sources do suggest, with the exception of three, that it was Arthur Scargill's fault for the failed Miners Strike.



## ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a secure level 4 response. The sources are cross-referenced and the candidate considers the weight and value of the sources. There is good analysis of the provenance of source 1 with comments on the expectations and the actual views given in the source which is used to reach a judgement.

## Question 1 (b) (i)

This question drew many responses. The question was well understood and most candidates were able to consider the extent to which the British public enjoyed unprecedented prosperity in the 1950s, considering a range of positive aspects including low unemployment and indirect taxes as well as the ability to afford consumer durables which resulted a general rise in the standard of living. Many candidates also made good use of sources 4 and 5 to draw out a counter argument that pensioners and larger families saw their living standards decline. The stronger candidates used the sources with sophistication to introduce their knowledge. In many answers, however, knowledge was either insufficiently developed or lacked focus on the question, with lengthy development of the origins of the welfare state in the 1940s. At the lower end, candidates still feel the need to separate the two assessment objectives. It remains disappointing that so many candidates still spend time discussing the provenance of the secondary sources. There are no marks awarded to this type of source evaluation in A02b and candidates should avoid spending time on this aspect.

\* (b) i) Macmillan's most famous phrase 'you've never had it so good' has gone on to symbolise life in 1950s Britain. However, there is a debate over whether this was truly the case, as shown by the differing opinions in sources 4, 5 and 6.

It can be argued that the prosperity was not felt by all during the 1950s, reflected in source 4 where ~~the~~ the poster reads, "You've had it!" and is being looked at by 'old age pensioners'. Source 5 agrees with this by saying, "the number of persons living in poverty increased from 7.8% to 14.2%." Suggesting that in fact people ~~there~~ were not ~~enjoying~~ experiencing prosperity. Indeed, the 1950s and 60s began to experience the problem of the 'British disease' of low productivity and bad employer-employee relations. This led to high inflation due to poor exports and expensive imports and ~~stagflation~~ led to 'stagflation' under Macmillan - <sup>industry</sup> stagflation and inflation. This agrees with the view put forward in the sources <sup>4 and 5</sup> ~~that~~ as goods ~~that~~ were getting more and more expensive for Brits and this was ~~hard~~

especially hard<sup>d</sup> for the sections of society depicted in the poster. → The old age pensioners whose numbers were increasing, families, "at a time

((b) continued) when family allowances increased less than the average industrial earnings." (source 5) This disagrees with the ~~to~~ view that Britain 'had never had it so good' in the 1950s and industry was declining and was not as modern and efficient as other European nations. This led to high inflation and expensive goods in the shops which would have been hard to afford for some - such as pensioners, and families mentioned in the sources.

However, in other aspects the people of Britain were experiencing a time of unknown prosperity in the 1950s, & Macmillan had good reason to claim "this. (source 6). "Low unemployment...and improved real earnings gave much more spending power...". Indeed, in 1957 unemployment was only around 380,000 which is extremely low. Furthermore wages increased ~~to~~ from £8.30 in 1951 to £18.35 in 1963. This huge increase in wages and low unemployment meant that for most people they had 'never had it so good' and this was a time of ~~unprecedented~~ unrivalled wealth for them.

Furthermore, the increase in "real earnings" (source 6) was big - 4% increase by 1964. This meant money went further and you could buy more, leading to a consumer boom in 1950s Britain. "The purchase of newly affordable

((b) continued) Consumer goods such as televisions, washing machines, refrigerators and cars ... "increased massively. For example, the sales of cars increased by 4 million under Macmillan, demonstrating ~~how~~ <sup>the large</sup> ~~readers disposable~~ disposable incomes people were now enjoying. What's more, the introduction of hire purchase meant you could pay for the goods after you acquired them, making it much easier for poorer people to enjoy the new mod-cons of the 1950s. "This general rise in the standards of living" (source 6) agrees that Britain had never had it so good during the 1950s as people, even the poorer <sup>people</sup>, were enjoying improved material prosperity and this would have made life a lot easier, especially for women as they now had help in domestic tasks, such as washing.

Finally, one factor that is <sup>directly</sup> not mentioned in the sources is housing. The Conservatives had pledged to build 300,000 new homes a year under Churchill and had built 1.7 million by Macmillan's time as Prime Minister. These new houses helped Britain to become a 'property owning democracy' and along with the 1957 Rent Act, they stimulated the property market and meant that many more people now owned a home of their own, which

((b) continued) is a clear indicator that they'd 'never had it so good!'

To conclude I agree that on the whole 'Britain had never had it so good.' There were of course people who didn't share in this new prosperity as indicated in Sources 4 and 5, however, source 4 is from a left-of-centre newspaper, so may have exaggerated the truth of the matter to please their readership. However, I think it was commonly acknowledged that the prosperity did not touch everyone - in fact Macmillan had said 'Most of our people have never had it so good' and I agree. For the majority of people they had stable jobs, with wage increases of 75%. They had ~~as~~ more disposable income than ever before and with the help of hire purchase, could buy what before had been reserved ~~to~~ for the rich. These new ~~tech~~ technologies made their lives <sup>much</sup> easier and finally, more people than ever had new, modern houses to live in. So this strongly agrees that people had never had it so good and even the poorest were leading a life their predecessors had only dreamed of.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response achieved level 4 for A01. There is a good range of knowledge that is securely integrated with the source material and develops it successfully to address the question. The use of sources is effective with reasoning developed and clear awareness of the representations in the sources. There is a slight imbalance between sources and knowledge and the conclusion is driven mostly by knowledge. This was awarded level 3 for A02b.

## Question 1 (b) (ii)

This question was also popular.

The sources were used by most to structure a response concerning the success or otherwise of Wilson's government and there were some really excellent answers commenting on the economic failures of the time (including trade union reform) and contrasting this with the government's social advances. Most level 3 responses displayed strong analysis and blending of ideas/sources/own knowledge. However, many weaker candidates fell back on describing the content of the sources having little developed knowledge on the period and a number of candidates wandered from the question to describe the later Heath and Thatcher governments.

\*b)ii Source 8 and Source 9 both disagree with the claim in source 7 that Wilson's Labour government in the years 1964-70 were "years of failure". Source 8 and source 9 focus on social Britain, which was been liberalised. Source 8 and source 9 both explain the ~~so~~ changes in law which were causing social reform such as the ~~divorce~~ ending corporal punishment in 1965. However, source 9 and source 8 both describe the divorce act but even though that was put forward in 1969 it did not become law til 1972.

Source 7 takes into account the social changes in Britain but explains they

Source 8 and Source 9 are both written by labour supporters, which could explain why they both purely focus <sup>on positive changes such as</sup> on social reform and not the economy.

Source 7 infers that these were the worst years of Labour's government

((b) continued) during 1945-90. Source 7 talks about the <sup>#</sup> government being "driven ~~help~~ helplessly" this could be referring to the on going struggle with the trade union. ~~Wilson~~ Britain's economy was ruined and the seaman and docker strikes were just an ~~exp~~ ~~explains~~ ~~explains~~ explanation of the trade union reaction to the rising unemployment and ~~inflation~~ inflation.

Source 7 talks about "a more open, freer place to live", which seems to contradict the facts, as immigration was high which caused tension which lead to race riots and Powell's "river of blood" speech.

~~#~~ Although one of the social reforms had been a race relation legalisation making racism illegal, social attitude didn't seem to be changing towards immigration.

Source 9 talks about <sup>#</sup> children "get a better deal", referring to social changes making divorce legal, but surely a better argument would be the free compulsorive

((b) continued) education offered to all children?

In conclusion, I agree that the Labour government between 1964 and 1970 were years of failure. This is because ~~even~~ as living cost and housing cost ~~to~~ raised, unemployment and inflation rose causing poverty. During this period Wilson devalued the pound (in 1967) and then ~~he~~ made a speech about how the worth ~~is~~ of the pound in your pocket wouldn't change showing that he didn't think it was a big deal, which ~~may~~ suggest that the social reform (headed by Roy Jenkins) was not to be better socially but because he didn't understand socially. Source 9 talks about social reform meaning "no longer terrorise", but although the law had changed the public attitude had not, in this way you could argue Wilson did not make any good change. One of the biggest failures of Wilson's government could be

((b) continued) argued to be the failure to join Europe, this ~~could~~ infers the lack of power Britain had left, so little that the French President could say he didn't want

Britain to join Europe and no one would argue.

Overall In summary, Britain during 1964 to 1970 had little political power, a ruined economy but were making positive social changes. Although you could argue ~~society~~ social changes weren't given our children "a better deal" as source 9 argues, better of high unemployment, ~~low~~ poverty and inflation. Source 8 argues that Wilson's government was not a failure because "no longer persecuted for their personal behaviour", yet there were race riots and Powell's "river of blood" speech.\* Now the 1960s Labour government is seen as a time of free expansion and social

((b) continued) changes which form today's society, but in fact I think it was "years of failure."

Wilson failed to control the trade union, source 7 talks about "Wilson failed to secure the passage of the Industrial Relations Bill", his refers to Barbara Castles "In place of strife"; which was a legalisation trying to control

union strikes. The fact that the government felt they needed to control ~~to~~ the trade union infers how out of control strikes had got.

Labour ~~even managed~~ even managed to lose support from the union during this period (this was a huge failure on their part), as unemployment rose, support lowered.

So as well as political and economical failure, they also lost support from their financial backers, the trade union.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is a secure level 3 response for both assessment objectives. The candidate is clearly aware of the different representations in the sources and uses them to develop lines of reasoning. There is an imbalance in the development of own knowledge with some detail on economic failures but much less development of social successes. The organisation is weak with an extended conclusion as the candidate introduces new ideas but there is a real attempt to answer the question.

## Question 2 (a)

Most candidates addressed the question directly and were able to use the sources to find evidence to support the view that the mass media were responsible for changing attitudes to the monarchy, and to counter the claim by exploring the role played by the royals themselves in using the media for their own purpose; such responses drew sensible inferences that this impacted on attitudes to royalty. Some responses show that candidates had struggled to understand the sources and fell back on *describing* their content. The best responses developed effective cross-references from the sources and their provenance to reach considered judgments.

(a) Sources 10, 11 and 12 <sup>Suggest</sup> ~~show~~ that ~~the~~ the mass media have been responsible for changing attitudes to the monarchy as it shows they were ~~not~~ able to become a popular medium for the British person to see into the life of the royal. This also meant that opinions on the monarchy could be easily influenced by the mass media on those who could not truly understand their purpose.

Source 10 from Piers Morgan, "by Andy Beckett on 12 Jan Max Hastings" suggests that the mass media have been responsible for changing attitudes to the monarchy. Morgan shows the popularity that an interview with Diana after her divorce was an unimaginable one. "There isn't enough wood in the Amazon rainforest for the number of papers you could sell with this". This shows the number of people that read and could therefore be influenced by the mass media showing the sheer power they have over the monarchy. Morgan finishes this in 2005 and so he has hindsight over the real impact of the mass media as well as having been the editor for a once very popular newspaper 'The News of the World' showing he would have had an accurate idea at the time of the scale of interest into this interview with Diana. This use of hindsight can also be seen when Beckett states the

(a) continued) royal version of 'it a knockout' was a "public relations disaster". This can ~~be~~ <sup>suggest</sup> it was the cause of the Man media as Beckett states that "Edwards described it as "the event of the year." "The BBC", he writes, had "enthusiastically accepted the idea." This shows that the BBC would have acknowledged the entertainment factor and so its popularity. The outcome of the event would prove unimportant to them, so long as they had viewers. This suggests the media had an impact on the monarchy as they probably knew it would be a 'disaster' but went ahead with it anyway as it would increase their ratings as it would not be ~~disrupted~~ <sup>ruined</sup> by many. A lack of deference can be seen by the Man Media as the Hastings writes "the Murdoch paper can hardly do the Royal Family ~~an~~ and after the lack of response by the Prince of Wales regarding the Diogenes book, "the Telegraph would never again withhold news or comment on royal issues that were in the public domain." This shows how the Man media influence would have grown from this moment onwards as they no longer had a filter of when they would and would say regarding the royal family meaning they could manipulate people's opinions to agree with them. Hastings also had hindsight as well as being the editor of the Daily Telegraph meaning he himself changed the approach the newspaper had to the Royals.

Morgan, Beckett and Hastings also do not suggest

(a) continued) That the man medic have been responsible for changing attitudes of the monarchy. Morgan writes "Princess Diana went on Panorama" this shows that Diana knew what she was doing and so she was influencing her own image rather than the media. Diana "opened her heart" which shows she knew she would gain sympathy for the many views boosting her popularity further. This can be seen when Bedcott wrote "Princess Edward announces a plan" showing it was not the media input ~~but~~ but the Royals themselves, showing they had an understanding of the impact of the man medic upon their own image. This idea of boosting popularity can also be viewed by when Harting says "The Prince of Wales appears vulnerable by allowing it to be 'sided' regarding the B. D. D. boat. This could possibly show that he believed it could boost his popularity ~~as it~~ or he didn't want to interfere with the biography as this would surely have gained him more publicity as it was <sup>serialised by</sup> Sunday Times. This shows that either the Prince didn't see it as a threat or that he didn't care enough to do anything about it. ~~The~~ could show naivety as the ~~for~~ <sup>idea</sup> the man medic didn't have as much of an effect on attitude towards the monarchy.

In conclusion ~~to~~ Morgan, Bedcott and Harting suggest that the man medic have been responsible for changing attitudes to the monarchy. Some of

(a) continued) it may have been bought or by the Roman  
therefore however the main media was the media  
in which it was portrayed. Therefore in reality, it could  
only have been the main media that changed the  
attitude to the Monarchs as it was the only way  
the people of Britain would be able to access an  
understand the Roman.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response is a borderline level 3/level 4. The candidate has developed some useful cross-references and drawn good inferences as well as making some sensible comments on provenance. However, there is limited weighing of the sources and this prevents it from moving securely into the higher level.

## Question 2 (a) (i)

This was the more popular option in part b. Candidates clearly understood the question and were able to use sources and own knowledge to explore the extent to which the mass media either challenged or promoted the traditional roles of women in society. The best responses skilfully integrated sources with well selected own knowledge to examine the issue. There were, in many answers, sound examples of change and continuity cited. The best answers were able to make distinctions between portrayals of women in the media from the 50's up to the present and others argued convincingly that social and legislative change was just as important as the media. Weaker responses had little to add beyond the content of the sources and some were unsure of the ambiguities in source 14.

\* (b) i) Do you agree with the view that the mass media have challenged the traditional role of women in society?

Women used to have the <sup>traditional</sup> main role of being housewives and mothers. ~~the~~ Sources 14 and 15 both support the contention of the question, whereas all of the sources ~~rather~~ contain some ~~the~~ evidence to challenge the contention of the question.

In Source 14, ~~from~~ a scene from Coronation Street, the quote 'we all change' supports the fact that mass media have challenged the traditional role of women in society, by suggesting that women are allowed to change within themselves and also within society. Soap operas have been a helpful way to analyse ~~a~~ certain beliefs at the time due to views of ~~the~~ society being reflected within them. ~~to~~ The source can be supported by the fact that in the early 2000s, ~~was~~ there were many more single mothers in Eastenders than there were in real life, which would suggest that the traditional role of a woman being obedient, <sup>and</sup> staying at home with the children while her husband goes out and works, is being very much so challenged. Although, in Eastenders,

the women ~~was~~ always coped well with the situation and were strong with the support of the community,

((b) continued) which reflects how women's traditional sense of being involved with the community was maybe not so being challenged.

Source 15 states that women are now fulfilling 'roles on television and radio that were once the preserve of men,' which would suggest that in ~~the~~ the 'twenty-first century' the traditional role of women was not so much men in existence anymore, with ~~the~~ women taking ~~men~~ what would be thought a man's job, and even having a job at all would challenge the contention of the question. In 1951  $\frac{1}{4}$  of women who had children went ~~to~~ back to work, which then rose to a  $\frac{1}{3}$  of women in 1961, thus showing ~~how~~ a change over time - the traditional roles of women being abolished, ~~to~~ to speak. In Source 15, ~~the~~ Clayton states that 'Barbara Mandell and Nan Winton' were early television newscasters, and 'exceptional women'. Even having a job ~~challenges~~ supports the contention of the question. Other female newscasters include Maura Stewart, and Angela Ripon became the first female full-time newscaster in the late 70s. Today nearly every ~~show~~ <sup>television</sup> programme has a male and a female presenter which supports the contention of the question. Clayton

((b) continued) also states that 'Katie Adie led the entry of women into dangerous reporting' and 'Hazel Irvine and Gabby Logan hosting snooker and football respectively'. Football is usually thought of as a male dominated sport, alike to most sports, and to have female ~~news~~ hosts suggests that fields that were once dominated by men are now being delved into by women who are, most definitely, challenging the ~~role of~~ <sup>traditional</sup> role of women in society. This source can be supported by the fact that there is a lot more ~~sexual~~ <sup>sexualised</sup> imagery involving women in more modern times (post 2000) which would suggest that the ~~demand~~ ~~to~~ traditional ~~demand~~ women is long gone, and that she now ~~uses~~ <sup>uses</sup> her ~~and~~ sensual side to gain what she wants.

All of the sources, however, have evidence to challenge the contention of the question. Source 13 states that women 'take on the burden of being the moral and practical support ~~of~~ to the family' ~~and~~ suggesting that the more traditional roles of women being "supportive roles" is still very alive today, that the "selfless support" that women show towards others is expected even from "intelligent women".

((b) continued) which ~~it~~ suggests that no matter how tough times became women were always expected to put on a brave face and be the supportive role which challenges the contention of the question. The fact that during 1951  $\frac{1}{4}$  of women who had children went back to work suggests that it challenged the traditional role of women in society, however the polar opposite could also be suggested by this <sup>statistic</sup>, due to other factors affecting it, such as wages and such. Source 14 states that "I'm still me" which would suggest that the role of women had not changed in society. Even now, 20 years later, Decline is very much so the supporting character to Ken in Coronation Street. This source can be challenged by the film Saturday Night Sunday Morning, (late 60s) which openly showed the sexual struggles of a provocative woman and very graphic abortion scenes - suggesting that the traditional role of women was fast disappearing.

Source 15 states that the process of women ~~to~~ receiving ~~the~~ roles that are higher up and deemed 'once the preserve of men' was a "slow process", which challenges the contention of the question by suggesting that,

((b) continued) although a small change may be happening, it is happening very slowly and that the traditional role of women is still very much in place.

~~Source 14 also~~

The weight of all of the sources has to be taken into account. All of the sources are from different time periods (1987, 1991 and 2010) which gives us lots of evidence from different time periods, thus raising the ~~relevance~~ relevance of the sources to the question.

Sources 13 and 15 are both by historians and thus can be given a high amount of weight due to the fact that they have researched the topic a lot, thus increasing the reliability. Source 14 can be given moderate weight due to it being objective and checked by many people to make sure the views of society are being accurately reflected.

In conclusion, to a large extent, it can be said that the ~~the~~ mass media have not challenged the traditional role of women in society, due to the fact that every source contained some evidence ~~to~~ in

((b) continued) ~~step~~ challenging the contention of the question, and also the high amount of weight that can be given to the sources.



**ResultsPlus**  
**Examiner Comments**

This response achieves level 4 for both assessment objectives. The candidate has skilfully integrated sources and knowledge to discuss the view in the question. The knowledge is precise and wide ranging, and is used to develop ideas presented in the sources. There is sustained analysis throughout. The discussion of the provenance of the sources on page 10 adds nothing to the answer and the time spent on this could have been used more effectively; however, it does not detract from the overall quality of the response.

## Question 2 (a) (ii)

This was much less popular than 2(b)(i). Whilst there were some effective answers which engaged with both sources and own knowledge, many responses struggled to move beyond the sources and, where they did offer knowledge, it frequently focused on American examples or characters in television programmes and films rather than on celebrities. Present day knowledge was often provided.

\* (b) The Celebrity culture has had both positive & negative consequences. While I wouldn't agree that it is a 'positive force for good', it is not entirely a bad thing. However, the effects of peer pressure, and a lack of motivation has undermined British society.

Celebrity culture's impact for <sup>the</sup> youth of Britain as 'role models' is a bad thing, & the most important effect it has on the youth. As <sup>in source 12,</sup> Will Hutton says, it has 'undermined motivation' as 11% of 16-19 old boys are waiting to be 'discovered'. In addition, the easy rise to fame of 'wag wives' such as Coleen Rooney have not only undermined female motivation to be independently successful, but presented them with how they they should look, leading a unnatural view that it is 'size 8 or bust' in terms of beauty. Clearly, this not only psychologically undermines ~~some~~ the teenagers girls of today in terms of self-confidence, but it <sup>also</sup> reduces ambition, leading to a greater less educated unemployed people, which damages society.

However, <sup>\*</sup>celebrity culture has given inspiration to many young people. Wayne Rooney has shown that no matter where you are born (he grew up in a poor council estate), you can aim higher. A <sup>→</sup> source's 17's 'teacher' says that these kind of examples 'gave me <sup>ambition</sup> ~~ambition~~'. However, as Hutton says, it is this 'motivation' that leads to young people waiting for 'some & wealth' rather than working hard to <sup>\*2</sup> earn it, & so

((b) continued) celebrity culture's aspect as a 'positive' role model is a negative thing.

Mr Evans & Hammond-Halgh says that celebrity represents 'equality & ~~encourages~~ social levelling.' This true in many regards: any actor or actress, such as Angelina Jolie or the upcoming Jennifer Lawrence have risen to extraordinary fame, with power influence & followers to rival that of the Queen. This is a 'source of good' as it 'motivates' people onward, as they act as role-models for success, & it better fulfils the idea of a democratic society where everyone is equal. So, in making real, some human ideals, ~~the~~ celebrity culture is a good thing.

However does celebrity culture really 'encourage social levelling'. Anyone who is a role model is seen as a higher authority, to be looked up to. Clearly, this is not an example of equality. In addition, celebrities such as Kate Middleton, married to Prince William in 20~~th~~ 20~~th~~ 2011, are praised for climbing the social ~~ladder~~ <sup>ladder</sup> so quickly, which goes against the very idea of 'encouraging social levelling'. So, in reality, although it may appear that celebrities represent ~~some~~ social 'equality' in fact their positions as 'role models' demonstrates that they are not equal, & so celebrity culture has in fact widened the class system of Britain, & the world.

((b) continued)

In conclusion, celebrity culture is not a 'force for good', rather it is a negative thing. It's place acting as 'role models' to teenagers & young people creates an unachievable demands on you the youth, in the form of body size, skills in certain areas, such as football while, as Hulton adds that it creates low motivation in young people 'wanting to be discovered.' (seen in source 18). Source 17's teacher talks about how celebrities 'gave me ambition', but the 1950's celebrity culture is very different from today in terms of expectations. In addition, 'social equality' has in fact be damaged as celebrities form a powerful class of rich, prestigious people, & contrary to the news expressed in source 16.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This response just accesses level 4 in both assessment objectives. It is well structured with a clear focus on the representations in the sources and clearly analyses the importance of inspiration and social levelling. The knowledge is a little thin but there are relevant examples of footballers such as Wayne Rooney and the royal 'celebrity' Kate Middleton and they are used effectively in the argument. The references to Angelina Jolie and Jennifer Lawrence however are American examples and add nothing to the response.

## Paper Summary

Based on performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

### Part A

1. Candidates should spend sufficient time reading the sources to ensure that they understand the nuances of the arguments presented.
2. Candidates should treat the sources as a package in order to facilitate cross-referencing. Weaker candidates often resorted to a brief summary of each source in turn. Such responses cannot go beyond level 2.
3. Provenance should be integrated within the argument, rather than treated as a stand-alone paragraph. This aids its use as part of the argument. Candidates should avoid making sweeping assertions from the provenance that could apply to any source.
4. The best responses cross reference not only the content of the sources but also their provenance. This enables candidates to weigh the sources and reach supported judgements.

### Part B

1. Candidates need to ensure that their subject knowledge conforms to the specification. Weaker responses usually relied very heavily on information derived primarily from the sources.
2. In order to address the question effectively, candidates need to offer an analysis which is driven by the arguments raised in the sources, not a descriptive or chronological account.
3. Whilst it may be relevant to use the provenance of the contemporary source(s) to judge the weight that can be assigned to the argument, there is no such requirement for the secondary sources and it is not rewarded in this assessment objective. Indeed, some candidates engaged in generalised comments about the reliability of a particular historian at the expense of developing argument and analysis supported by specific own knowledge.
4. Candidates need to ensure that where the question asks them to deal with a specific time period they do not stray beyond those parameters.

## **Grade Boundaries**

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publication.orders@edexcel.com](mailto:publication.orders@edexcel.com)

Order Code US034639 January 2013

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

[www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual  
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government



Rewarding Learning