Examiners' Report

June 2013

GCE History 6HI02 E

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. 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 or www.btec.co.uk.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

ResultsPlus

Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson'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 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.
Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. 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 our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

Introduction

Examiners reported that the majority of candidates understood the essential requirements of the Unit 2 examination. Many were able to structure their work effectively, addressing the specific focus of both the Part A and Part B questions and writing with understanding and insight about the key themes.

At the highest levels of attainment, there was impressive work.

However, there were some candidates still showing development needs in their skills set and their knowledge base.

In Part A, many 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. There seemed to be an increase this series in the number of candidates who worked through the sources sequentially; this makes it very hard for candidates to cross reference effectively and move beyond Level 2. There also appeared to be an increase in the number of candidates who were using their own knowledge to develop points raised in the content of the sources in this question in this exam series. There is no credit for this in Part A and thus, such candidates waste time that would be better spent developing those aspects of the answer that do gain credit – cross referencing, a consideration of provenance linked to the arguments and judgements.

In Part B, it was again disappointing to note that a minority of candidates relied very heavily on the material in the sources, which was not always securely understood. In a small number of cases, there was no evidence of any own knowledge at all being used. Centres are reminded that candidates are expected to have some range and depth of knowledge that can be applied to the Part B questions. There also appeared to be an increase in the number of responses seen this year where candidates used their own knowledge to create the line of argument and made only passing reference to the sources. The best answers made use of both elements, using the sources to shape the argument and own knowledge to develop the points raised. Despite comments in previous examiners' reports, even more candidates appeared to comment on provenance in their responses to Part B in this exam series. Such comments are often very generic – 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 Part B. Candidates would do well to develop their arguments in relation to the question, rather than 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. The usage of 'bias' seems to have increased again this year and brings with it all the variant misspellings – biast and biasicity to name but two.

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

Question 1

Question 1 was significantly more popular than question 2 with 4012 entries compared to 910.

Question 1 (a)

Overall, this question was completed fairly well, with many candidates selecting evidence from the sources that supported arguments for and against the statement in the question. Many candidates were able to cross reference the sources and consider the attributes of the sources and so access Level 3. The best responses successfully cross referenced the provenance of the sources and were able to use this as a basis for reaching a supported judgement based on the validity of the evidence. Some candidates did struggle with the nuances in Source 1 and tended to regard it as more favourable to Heath than it really is, but this did not prevent successful comparisons and cross references. A significant number of candidates believed that Julian Critchley, author of Source 2, was a woman, although this did not negate the inferences they drew from the source's attributes, whereas confusion over the difference between a back bencher (Source 2) and a member of the cabinet (Source 3) did occasionally undermine arguments related to the validity of Sources 2 and 3. There is still a significant proportion of candidates who are unaware of the need to cross reference sources and instead work through them sequentially, drawing out evidence for and against the opinion in the question. Working through sequentially does not achieve above Level 2 and candidates should be discouraged from using it. Many candidates still only briefly note the provenance of the sources but do little to help weigh up the case as level four demands. As a result, there are still relatively few Level 4 answers and many in Level 3.

(a) All three sources contain mostly or wholly negative views of Heath. They all agree on his poor personality and public appearence, however differ in terms of his leadership. Whilst sources 1 and 3 imply him to be a poor and ineffective leader of the party, source 2 contrasts them in that it states he was the 'most effective'.

His personality is described in very negative ways by all 3 sources, each one reinforcing the other. Source 1 says he was "unnecessarily agressive towards the media" implying he portrayed himself very poorly towards the public, therefore decreasing the party's popularity and so being an ineffective leader. This view is also implied in source 3, saying that he would "sit glowering and saying practically nothing" in cabinet. This implies a lack of inspirational leadership skills and as well as source 1's poor public appearance, a poor appearance to

other politicians (in cabinet) as well, making the Tory party seem weaker to their opposition. All sources give an impression of a 'lack' of "human qualities" (source 1) and although source 2 gives a more positive view of Heath as a person, it too condemns him as a political leader as his lack of "warm and friendly" qualities towards politicians

((a) continued) meant he lacked support of his backbenchers. However it is no surprise that sources 1 and 3 are, although only marginally, more negative than source 2 as both have more reason to be. As the writer of source 1 was a member of the opposition party it is no surprise he portrays a former Conservative leader in a negative light as he wouldn't want to make the Conservatives look strong, and so would exaggerate any Tory leadership failings. As well as this, it was published in 1989 at a time when Thatcher, a Conservative, was becoming very unpopular and so in order to sell his publication it would have to reflect the views of the public. Source 3, although from a Tory's viewpoint, is still likely to be negative of Heath as he had just lost the General Election campaign for his party, following a very negative few months. Due to this the cabinet member's view would still be one of anger, reflecting upon a poor few months. He is hardly going to say Heath was an effective leader having just lost an election. To contrast this source 2 was published in 1994 and so further from personal, strong emotions of Heath. This probably explains his more reasoned approach towards Heath than sources 1 and 3, however as part of the liberal wing of the Tories probably disagreed with certain Heath policies.

Whilst source 3 implies Heath only ever "got us into trouble", source 2 counters this saying he ((a) continued) was, ultimately, a "highly competent" and "effective" leader. Overall sources 1 and 3 corroborate fully on his complete failings as a leader with his "aggressive" and "glowering" nature, however whilst source 2 agrees as far as his personality lackings, it shows an alternate view that he did have abilities as a Prime Minister.

Question 1 (b) (i)

This was overwhelmingly the most popular choice in Part b. Many candidates had revised the achievements of the Labour Government well and, consequently, were able to develop a range of detailed and relevant examples with which they addressed the question.

Most students were able to distinguish between the sources and use them to break down their arguments into the social advances versus the economic difficulties. This enabled many candidates to achieve Level 3 for A01.

There were many good answers in Level 4 that reached an evaluation based on, for example, how even the Conservatives maintained much of Labour's work despite what was said in Source 6, or how continued rationing and austerity set the scene for Labour's 13 years in opposition after 1951.

There were candidates who still found it hard to move beyond the content of the sources and although they were able to score highly in A02b by developing reason and argument, they were less successful in achieving in A01. There are still a significant number of candidates that discuss the provenance of the secondary sources. There are no marks available for the evaluation of source attributes in A02b and candidates should avoid using the sources for this purpose.

*(b) In a struggling post-war Britain, what the Labour government achieved from 1945-51 can be viewed as a great success, with its creation of the Welfare State, however its economic failings meant that ultimately, their failures far outweighed their achievements. Whilst source 4 is entirely positive, it only takes into account their social changes which were an achievement, but their only one. Sources 5 and 6 corroborate completely, in contrast to source 4 they say it was the wrong time to introduce the Welfare State, and share negative views on nationalisation and the economic situation. Overall sources 5 and 6 are the most accurate, that the failings were much more important than solely the positive view in source 4 of their social policies.

Source 4 focuses on the "progressive" nature of this period and in terms of changing the country from a damaged post-war state it was. It says it was "a kinder, gentler and a far better place" to live, however this is easy to achieve when being compared to a country either recovering from or entering into war. Source 4 mentions "to be born,

to grow up, to live, work and even die" implying the measures, such as the 1946 National Health Service or 1946 National Insurance Act, greatly improved the standard of living, which is true. However, when cross-referenced with sources 5 and 6 the negatives of the Welfare State become clear. Source

5 states it was "not the best time", whilst source 6 backs this up with the reference to "wild expenditure" and "irresponsible way of living" subtly implying the creation of the Welfare state, which was very costly. For example, ~~in~~ in 1949 the NHS cost £597 million of the health and social security budget, a figure which rapidly increased to become £91 billion by 1990. As a country still suffering from the repercussions of war, already in £4200 million debt when Labour took power in 1945, it is accurate to say, as does source 5, that it was the wrong time. It led to an exaggeration of the economic troubles which ultimately overpower the successes of the Welfare State to ~~help~~ the view that their failures did outweigh their successes

It is possible to say that source 4 focuses on solely social issues as it was published in 1992 at a time when, just after Thatcher, many cuts had been made to the Welfare State and so the initial policies of it seem even more positive compared to 1992. However, source ~~2~~ 5 is from a historian's perspective further after the time it concerns and so is more ~~totally~~ likely to encompass everything, including economics and nationalisation. Whereas source 6 ~~3~~ is negative due to its being biased, source 5 is probably more negative as it can take into account the bigger picture and the huge costs of the Welfare State.

With regards to nationalisation, source 5 suggests Britain was "industrially exhausted" and so unable to cope with the

((b) continued) demands nationalisation placed on industry, with huge change. Source 5 makes reference to "little long term benefit", which would be hinting at the fact that, with the exception of steel, all the nationalised industries were non-profitable, and so apart from creating jobs were not of use to the government. This view is shared with a more explicit source 6, simply stating "Nationalisation has proved itself a failure", giving no room for positivity. However, it is to be expected that source 6 is the most damning of all the sources as it's not only is it from a Conservative manifesto, it also from 1951 and so a general election year. This means that as well as the usual opposition between political parties, as a manifesto it would be written to present Labour in the worst and Conservatives in the best light possible, even moreso in 1951 as it was vital to oppose Labour and make them look weak in order to win the election, which they did. The fact the Conservatives won this election alone is proof that Labour's failures outweighed their successes, orelse they would have stayed in power.

The key failure of the Labour government 1945-51 was their economic situation, a point not picked up on by source 4 but heavily focused on by the therefore obviously, more negative sources 5 and 6. Source 5 says Britain was "mortgaged to the United States" whilst ((b) continued) source 6 also makes reference to the "two thousand millions borrowed from the United States". The sources both imply that British economics were entirely dependent on the USA, and so a failure in that Labour couldn't support themselves. This is true as

initially in this period, Keynes had to negociate a loan of $6000 million from the USA and Canada, and then later Britain was relieved by a share of the "Marshall Aid", again from the USA. The initial loan led to a crisis in 1947 when Britain had to delay a term of the loan, making the GBP freely convertible, thus showing the world that Britain was virtually bankrupt. As referred to by source 6, later "devaluation" from $4.03 to $2.80 again showed the weaknesses of the British pound under Labour. Whilst source 6 refers to devaluation, source 5 refers to another economic issue, "export at all costs" due to the £750 million Balance of Payments deficit. However, the "at all costs" implies desperation, as a result of the "grave disorder" in source 6. Overall both sources cover each negative aspect both of nationalisation and economics, and of the Welfare State partially as a cause of this, whereas source 4 focuses only on the positives aspects the social changes brought with them.

In conclusion, it is not possible to say that their achievements far outweighed their successes, as they didn't

((b) continued) outweigh them at all. Source 4 shows how the creation of the Welfare state brought a "kinder, gentler" Britain, however this is completely contrasted by sources 5 and 6, which both highlight the disastrous economic situation, the failings of nationalisation and, unlike source 4, the negative consequences of their social policies. The labour governments heavy debts set up issues for all following governments, and although the Welfare State was an impressive achievement in a post-war

Britain, the overall "grave disorder", and fact Labour lost the 1951 election, show their failures outweighed their successes.

Question 1 (b) (ii)

Questions that focus on Mrs Thatcher's governments between 1979 and 1990 have been very popular on past exam papers, so it was quite surprising that only a small minority tackled this question in this series. On the whole, it was answered less successfully than 1(b)(i).

Most candidates understood the sources though a few struggled with the concept of a revolution. Knowledge was often patchy with only a few candidates being able to support their arguments with detailed examples. Some of the better answers were able to balance the evidence of the government's changes (monetarism, privatisation, a reduction in the influence of the state) with a consideration of just how much of the post-war consensus remained. Some candidates knew little beyond the poll tax and the miners' strike and on occasions seemed unduly influenced by opinions that had been expressed recently at the time of Mrs Thatcher's death and funeral.

*(b) (ii)

Q. Do you agree with the view that mrs thatchers domestic policies in the years 1979-90 amounted to a revolution?

thatchers revolution between the years 1979-90 can be split into 2 parts, The first revolution was her policy of monetarism, tackling inflation the Falklands victory and the miners strike victory. The second stage from 1986 is her policy of supply side economics which changed the face of britain.

source 7, by Eric Hobsbawn states "The thatcher era was the nearest thing in the twentieth century to a political, social and economic revolution – and not one for the better"

The latter 'not one for the better' can be made evident in terms of social unrest during the 1981 riots throughout the UK, due to her economic policy of monetarism in 1980. monetarism initially started by labour in 1976 was revolutionised by thatcher in terms of tackling inflation - and she succeeded. thatcher believed public expenditure should be induced to boost the economy, and indeed inflation fell from 19% when she took office in 1979, to 5% by the time of her 1983 landslide victory election.

However, this as source 7 states 'made the country unrecognisable' as riots broke out across the UK due to mass unemployment – the conseque-nce of low inflation. In 1981, in Brixton, predominantly black young
people felt discriminated against by the police and school leavers were frustrated as they could not be employed. Riots and mass violence tore the country apart, as in 1981 monetarism was followed by a deep recession too.

Thatcher believed in 'taking the government off the backs of the people' as source 9 supports by stating 'her ideological distate for a system ... encouraged a dependance culture.'

Some of the ways Thatcher gave the British people independance was in terms of deregulation, one example was for the first time council housing tenants were given the right to buy their homes at half the value, encouraged the public to invest in shares and become shareholders

Source 5, by Norman Tebbit supports the view that Thatcher revolutionised Britain as it states 'most of its (Thatcher revolution) work so far has been dedicate voted to the destruction of the restraints which had brought our economy to its knees.'

An example of Thatcher destroying these restraints was in privatising the industries formally nationalised by Attlees Labour government in 1945-51. Some of these included privatising cable and wireless, British gas and British telecom and North sea oil. Privatising the North sea oil was seen as controversial because it was an important industry however it raised billions of pounds for the UK treasury.

((b) continued) Also undoing the power of the trade unions given by labour by not giving in to the miners demands in the miners strike of 1984, stockpiling on coal and passing two Employment Acts in 1980 and 1982 which stated ballots must be held before strikes and you must be a member of a union to participate in the strikes.

source 9 states 'mrs Thatcher embraced many aspects of the post war consensus' in which she did in terms of education. The education Act of 1988 introduced league table, the key stage system and the 11+ selective school system similar to that of 1945-51 labour government tripartid educational reforms This was an aspect of her supply side economics. In conclusion although as source 9 states 'changes were made but they were not revolutionary' is true to me. Firstly she was not overthrown, although the 1984 IRA Brighton bombing attempted to, and many of her policies such as privatisation only undid what the labour government of 1945-51 nationalised. Indeed a social reform, political and economic reforms were made, but it only built on existing policies. Nothing compared to the welfare state revolution of 1945-51, that still exists to this very day.

1 such as the NHS being introduced.

Question 2

Question 2(a)

The sources were comprehended effectively by most and candidates were able to compare them appropriately. Many accessed Level 3 even though the point of the cartoon was often lost in long descriptions of its detail and the nuances of Source 10 were sometimes missed, as was its date. Good responses picked up the point that it was produced right at the beginning of the mass television age, and cross referenced this to the 1958 portion of Source 11. Some very good responses used the attributes of the sources effectively to evaluate and reach a judgement based on the validity of the evidence. However, there were many Level 2 answers largely because candidates appeared unsure of the techniques necessary and worked through the sources sequentially, devoting much time to describing the content. Some candidates provided a substantial amount of knowledge to address the question; this is not rewarded in A02a.

(a) How far do the sources suggest that TV had a negative impact on British society? (10, 11, 12)

Following the 1952 coronation, TV sales hugely increased, with programs with questionable themes becoming increasingly popular. These themes may have moulded British society, but may also have reflected it or taught good lessons about good and bad.

Increases in lifestyle programs in the 1980s has contributed to the lifestyle depicted in Source 11. According to this source, TV appears to have made us lazy, dirty, overweight and hugely unhealthy as we dully absorb reality TV. Britain in the 1950s however shows an austere, normal family watching the news, or similar. In this sense the source does suggest a 'dumbing down' or increased laziness of society, although it is still presented as family bonding experience to some extent, as in both images families are pictured. This view of TV bringing family together is contested in Source 12, as it argues 'tensions' arose because of TV, creating 'psychological conflicts' within the family. Source 11 doesn't particularly show conflict or

((a) continued) obvious love in either cartoon, showing a perspective of unchanging family bonds, possibly even arguing that TV brings us all together, therefore making society more positive.

A main cause of concern about negative impacts seems to be about the effect on children. Source 12 argues that 'exposure to violence can breed violence', blaming TV for childrens potential preoccupation with war and fighting. Contrastingly, Source 11 states that the very existence of a 'baddy' and fighting for what is right teaches positive models and behaviours to the young, instilling a sense of justice. Violent TV may adversely effect children, but Source 11 depicts this child as being only lazy, not showing any particular violent tendencies. It could therefore be argued that juvenile deliquency is due to TV's content, creating a negative impact on society, but this is not supported to any great extent by Sources 11 or 10.

In terms of validity and provenance, Source 10 is based on one man's opinion. The date (1962) means that TV was a fairly new consept (ITV only began in 1955) and therefore his view may not be fully valid, whereas both Sources 11 and 12 have the advantage of hindsight. It may also come from a biased source

((a) continued) Lord Derby is chairman of a TV company and has invested interest in promoting Independent TV. As a satirical magazine, Private Eye may have a tendancy to exaggerate, and it's representation of 2008

is 4 years ahead of its publication time, meaning may not be realistic as it is an assumption. Source 12 however, used controlled studies to support its argument and may therefore be far more valid, although its religious background and stated aims remove its objectivity.

Undoubtedly, TV changed the world, but the extent of its negative influence can be questioned. As Source 10 states, it can be educational, bring families together (just good and cigarettes simply being part of modern culture) according to Source 11 and keep us up-to-date. Although arguments of violence, divisions in families and condoning an unhealthy lifestyle, the extent TV has impacted this seems small, despite Source 12's controlled studies. After all, young boys were playing with war themed toys for years before TV became commonplace, and then later had no problem joining the army, to be violent.

Question 2 (b) (i)

This was the most popular question in 2b. The sources were accessible and the candidates were able to pick out the key elements in them. This led to some thoughtful comparison of the different points. The best responses developed a range of examples from their knowledge which were used to test the representations in the sources. These responses considered Diana's "secret" charity visits, kissing AIDs patients, the "revenge dress" and "Squidgygate". However, many answers relied very heavily on the content of the sources with relatively little own knowledge to add. Some made long, inappropriate comparisons with Kate Middleton or fell back on the debate about deference that was featured on the January 2013 paper.

*(b) Do you agree with the view that Diana was a victim of mass media? (13, 14, 15)

Diana's time in the limelight following her 1980s marriage was, undoubtedly, full on. The rise of sensationalist stories, tabloids and human interest meant that she could be argued to have been hounded, by press, TV and papparozzi. But could she have been using it to her advantage?

The infamous 1995 Panorama interview, where she said the famous '3 people in our marriage' line created huge publicity. As the "peoples princess", she could be seen to have done this interview simply to allow her fans to understand her perspective, but as Sources 14 and 15 argue, she may have been manipulating the media to her advantage. Both of these sources detail her use of tabloids to maintain a public image, and may therefore be seen not as a victim, but as a wily user of media to keep popularity and possibly get a sort of revenge on the monarchy who she claimed to have been excluded by.

Diana's 'rapport' with the media is not derived by any of the Sources, but 13 clearly depicts her as a

victim, arguing that there was no control over the press, and tabloids especially. She was 'doorstepped', and unequipped to deal with it. Although this may be true, the source mentions nothing of Diana having any concern with certain photographs, but of the 'Queen's displeasure'. This interpretation may agree with Sources 14 and 15, showing Diana not really caring, or even desiring such attention. Despite this, monarchy had held an increasingly open nature with media throughout the 80s, such as in 'It's a Royal Knockout' and documentaries about royal life. The monarchy were losing their austerity, and perhaps Diana was a victim of this, not media interest that she personally created.

Diana's use of the media is clearly detailed in Source 14, as her 'confessions and revelations' with a tabloid editor may show a deliberate manipulation ~~with the~~ of the media, although they claim it was all understood that the stories would not be published. Consent may sometimes have been given, or even validation, and such claims in this source may account for her tendency to be photographed wherever she went, especially in her iconic Mini. The idea that she wasn't a greedy, nor an enemy does not imply that she was a victim, but it is never claimed that ~~she~~ her lack of consent to have stories published was always adhered

((b) continued) to. Supported by Source 15, perhaps consent or validation was always given. 'The tabloids had been one of her greatest weapons', and in talking to them at will, she could guarantee and maintain interest, removing any possibility of being victimised.

Despite claims of 'canonisation', both claims of Diana's media manipulation were published after her death. Source 15 is particularly damning about her media manipulation, potentially continuing victimisation after her demise, showing that in claims that she wanted media attention, she was being victimised. Regardless, this source argues unwaveringly that she set up media attention, but it omits to mention Charles' equal use of the media to discuss his divorce, adding to potential of a personal victimisation of Diana. Source 14 is less harsh about her behaviour, and it's lack of accusatory tone may lead readers to trust it further.

Naturally, after Diana's untimely, media linked death and the consequent public outcry and grief, Sources 14 and 15, both coming from journalists at around the same time may show that these writers are attempting to shift blame, meaning the sources may not be reliable. Additionally, Source 14's claims of ((b) continued) 'off the record' conversations means there is little proof that this was not simply further bias or victimisation. Source 13 however may appear far more valid due to Pimlott's objectivity and lack of involvement with tabloids, although a personal bias may

be evident, his use of example creates a more valid source.

Whether Diana originally manipulated media or not, eventually it appears undeniable that she was a victim. She was a victim of a society hungry for sensationalism. A victim of a unwelcoming royal family and scandalous affair. She was a victim of mass media because it killed her in trying to escape from papparazi. It could strongly be argued that intentional or not, Diana's media identity got increasingly out of her own control, and made her, subsequently, a victim.

Question 2 (b) (ii)

This question was much less popular than 2(b)(i) and did not on the whole elicit responses of a similar good quality. There were some good answers which were able to show change rather than survey existing services. The sources were accessible and candidates were able to show an understanding of the main arguments, al

though the nuances of source seventeen were often entirely missed. The better answers cited the prevalence of dating sites or the dangers of "cyber-bullying" to support their views.

However, in many cases the arguments were not fully developed nor their implications considered.

There were few level answers and many Level 2 or low Level 3. The key issue for weak responses was the lack of history used to support the issues raised. Many candidates wrote from their personal experiences and prejudices and in these cases very few marks could be awarded for AO1.

killing people of Consumerism and desire a
always want new phones. For example one,
18 seems to all agree that the invention of

Mobiles have not benefitted as
people have begun to exclude themselves
from society and physical ~~contact~~ and ~~interaction~~
interaction as they are always either "texting"
or using "blackberry"! showing how the
invention of ~~gun~~ and Mobiles are depriving
~~people~~ society of basic communication skills and
effectively harming society Not benefitting from
it. One ~~one~~ could also say that
since 17 ~~say~~ also agrees as it ~~mention~~
mentions how the new technologies has led to
people becoming ~~too~~ "uncommunicative in public" -
meaning people are so fixated on 'text language'
or 'internet' slang that it has affected ~~speech~~
speech negatively e.g unable to speak in proper
manner ~~and~~

The invention and huge rise in ~~the~~ popularity of
internet could be said to have a negative
impact on Brit society not ~~ever~~ having benefits.
One could say that the term Britain 2.0 could
be mentioned as since the rise of internet from
1998's - current time has led to various changes
in Brit attitudes - One could say that people
have started to become addicted to ~~the~~ ~~to~~
Social networking sites. For example

the invention of facebook in 2003 — where now internet use has been dominated by visits on and active use of social networking sites and blogging - e.g Twitter. One could say that this trend lead to physical interaction becoming deprived in society and an excuse for becoming less socially active. One could say that source 18 agree with this point as it clearly mentions how people of ALL AGES in UK are "physically and socially removed" from people around them clearly as mentioned the gradually coming to a process where online interaction has become a must and a first before any face to face interaction. One could also say social networking sites and rapid progress of internet has created a divide where those who do not have access are limited to information and is socially neglected for example again on facebook — common example is events - meaning people are invited online to certain events meaning others who do not have access cannot partake - leading to a growing divide in society which could be seen as not benefitting society.

However one could also say that internet - as a symbol of development of communication

technologies has becoming become a benefit to society as the invention of blogging online news feeds and internet journalism - had lead to quicker and instantaneously information

posting news whereas old media such as newspapers and press/magazines etc are outdated and takes normally a day or two to inform and publish news stories. This can be seen as a benefit as people have very cheap costing almost nothing information that are recent being led to them. Source 16 also agrees with this point as it highlights how the use of news site and other sources of news have given advantages where "citizens can gain easier access to important information" - affecting various aspects of society and aly those who [...] - such as those affected by "education" and "employment opportunities" - whereas the e-g invention of UCAS website granting or easier easier for students to access university information. and websites such as Gumtree - where people, anyone with an internet can gain early access to possible job opportunities. One could also say that the internets access to blogging have given a voice to people of society as it has let anyone blog and express

opinions. Source 17 also agrees with this in some ways as it mentions how although previously in starting from 1950's forms of communication was very limited and it was only those with authority and money that can be effectively 'heard' by people. For example the fact that Radio had a monopoly by BBC until 1973 - and newspaper dominated by various political parties

e.g. in [illegible] 1980's 70% of all news paper for a period of time had supported and backed Conservative party [illegible] such as the sun (who switched sides later on) and the express. [illegible] same 17 claims it has given opportunities to those [illegible] "never had a chance to speak publicly" — overall highlighting benefit to society.

[illegible] ultimately one could conclude that society [illegible] in Britain had benefitted hugely from development of technology as it [illegible] epitamised what Britain's [illegible] represented — Democracy — giving people a [illegible] chance to speak, be heard and to a chance to make judgements open themselves [illegible].

Paper Summary

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

All Questions

- Candidates should proof read their answers at the end of the examination and correct any instances where they have incorrectly labelled a source, used the wrong names or the wrong dates.

- Candidates need to use the terms 'implies' and 'infers' correctly. Candidates should argue that a source implies something and that they, the reader, infer from it.

- Too many candidates are using certain phrases, such as 'using the sources as a set', as a substitute for actually engaging in the task that they are claiming.

Part A

- Candidates should spend sufficient time reading the sources to ensure that they understand the nuances of the arguments presented.

- Candidates should treat the sources as a package in order to facilitate cross referencing. Candidates working through sources sequentially cannot go beyond level 2.

- Provenance should be integrated within the argument, rather than treated as a stand-alone paragraph. The attributes of the sources should be discussed, not described. This aids the use of provenance as part of the argument. Candidates should avoid making sweeping assertions from the provenance that could apply to any source.

- 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.

- There are no marks available for knowledge in Part a. Candidates should avoid arguing from their knowledge since it cannot be credited.

Part B

- Candidates need to ensure that their subject knowledge conforms to the specification. Some responses relied very heavily on information derived primarily from the sources.

- In order to address the question effectively, candidates need to offer an analysis driven by the arguments raised in the sources, not a descriptive or chronological account.

- 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 A02b. Many candidates still engage in generalised comments that a particular historian is or is not reliable at the expense of developing argument and analysis tested by specific own knowledge.

- Candidates need to ensure that they are aware of the focus of the question and that they maintain the focus throughout their answer to avoid straying into irrelevant areas that cannot be rewarded.

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