



# Mark Scheme

Summer 2017

Pearson Edexcel GCE AS  
In History (6HI02) Paper 2E

Unit 2: British History Depth Studies  
Paper 2E: Britain in the Later 20th Century:  
Responding to Change

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by 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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2017

Publications Code 6HI02\_E\_1706\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:

*i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear*

*ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter*

*iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.*

## **GCE History Marking Guidance**

### **Marking of Questions: Levels of Response**

The mark scheme provides an indication of the sorts of answer that might be found at different levels. The exemplification of content within these levels is not complete. It is intended as a guide and it will be necessary, therefore, for examiners to use their professional judgement in deciding both at which level a question has been answered and how effectively points have been sustained. Candidates should always be rewarded according to the quality of thought expressed in their answer and not solely according to the amount of knowledge conveyed. However candidates with only a superficial knowledge will be unable to develop or sustain points sufficiently to move to higher levels.

In assessing the quality of thought, consider whether the answer:

- (i) is relevant to the question and is explicitly related to the question's terms
- (ii) argues a case, when requested to do so
- (iii) is able to make the various distinctions required by the question
- (iv) has responded to all the various elements in the question
- (v) where required, explains, analyses, discusses, assesses, and deploys knowledge of the syllabus content appropriately, rather than simply narrates.

Examiners should award marks both between and within levels according to the above criteria. This should be done in conjunction with the levels of response indicated in the mark schemes for particular questions.

At the end of each answer, examiners should look back on the answer as a whole in the light of these general criteria in order to ensure that the total mark reflects their overall impression of the answer's worth.

### **Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level**

The first stage is to decide the overall level and then whether the work represents high, mid or low performance within the level. The overall level will be determined by the candidate's ability to focus on the question set, displaying the appropriate conceptual grasp. Within any one piece of work there may well be evidence of work at two, or even three levels. One stronger passage at Level 4, would not by itself merit a Level 4 award – but it would be evidence to support a high Level 3 award – unless there were also substantial weaknesses in other areas.

### **Assessing Quality of Written Communication**

QWC will have a bearing if the QWC is inconsistent with the communication descriptor for the level in which the candidate's answer falls. If, for example, a candidate's history response displays mid Level 3 criteria but fits the Level 2 QWC descriptors, it will require a move down within the level.

## 6HI02: Generic Level Descriptors

### Part (a)

Target: AO2a (8%)

(20 marks)

As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-5	<p>Comprehends the surface features of the sources and selects material relevant to the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.</p> <p><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 3-5 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	6-10	<p>Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify their similarities and/or differences in relation to the question posed. There may be one developed comparison, but most comparisons will be undeveloped or unsupported with material from the sources. Sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information. The source provenance may be noted, without application of its implications to the source content.</p> <p><b>Low Level 2: 6-7 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 8-10 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	11-15	<p>Comprehends the sources and focuses the cross-referencing on the task set. Responses will offer detailed comparisons, similarities/differences, agreements/disagreements that are supported by evidence drawn from the sources.</p> <p>Sources are used as evidence with some consideration of their attributes, such as the nature, origins, purpose or audience, with some consideration of how this can affect the weight given to the evidence. In addressing 'how far' there is a clear attempt to use the sources in combination, but this may be imbalanced in terms of the issues addressed or in terms of the use of the sources.</p> <p><b>Low Level 3: 11-12 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 13-15 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>

4	16-20	<p>Reaches a judgement in relation to the issue posed by the question supported by careful examination of the evidence of the sources. The sources are cross-referenced and the elements of challenge and corroboration are analysed. The issues raised by the process of comparison are used to address the specific enquiry. The attributes of the source are taken into account in order to establish what weight they will bear in relation to the specific enquiry. In addressing 'how far' the sources are used in combination.</p> <p><b>Low Level 4: 16-17 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 18-20 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
---	-------	---

*NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*

## Part (b)

### Target: AO1a and AO1b (10% - 24 marks)

Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

### AO2b (7% - 16 marks)

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

(40 marks)

### AO1a and AO1b (24 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-6	<p>Candidates will produce mostly simple statements. These will be supported by limited factual material, which has some accuracy and relevance, although not directed analytically (i.e. at the focus of the question). The material will be mostly generalised. There will be few, if any, links between the simple statements.</p> <p><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks</b> As per descriptor.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 5-6 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 1.</p> <p>The writing may have limited coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>

2	7-12	<p>Candidates will produce a series of simple statements supported by some accurate and relevant, factual material. The analytical focus will be mostly implicit and there are likely to be only limited links between simple statements. Material is unlikely to be developed very far or to be explicitly linked to material taken from sources.</p> <p><b>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks</b> As per descriptor.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 11-12 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2.</p> <p>The writing will have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. Some of the skills needed to produce effective writing will be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
---	------	--

3	13-18	<p>Candidates answers will attempt analysis and show some understanding of the focus of the question. They may, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus. Factual material will be mostly accurate, but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor. At this level candidates will begin to link contextual knowledge with points drawn from sources.</p> <p><b>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks</b> As per descriptor.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 17-18 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 3.</p> <p>The writing will be coherent in places but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. Only some of the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are likely to be present. Syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
4	19-24	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material, which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. There will be some integration of contextual knowledge with material drawn from sources, although this may not be sustained throughout the response. The selection of material may lack balance in places.</p>



	<p><b>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks</b> As per descriptor.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 23-24 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 4.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes may not be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing but there may be passages which lack clarity or coherence. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p>
--	--

*NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*

**AO2b (16 marks)**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>1-4</b>	<p>Comprehends the sources and selects material relevant to the representation contained in the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.</p> <p><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 3-4 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
<b>2</b>	<b>5-8</b>	<p>Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify points which support or differ from the representation contained in the question. When supporting the decision made in relation to the question the sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information.</p> <p><b>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 7-8 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
<b>3</b>	<b>9-12</b>	<p>The sources are analysed and points of challenge and/or support for the representation contained in the question are developed from the provided material. In addressing the specific enquiry, there is clear awareness that a representation is under discussion and there is evidence of reasoning from the evidence of both sources, although there may be some lack of balance. The response reaches a judgement in relation to the claim which is supported by the evidence of the sources.</p> <p><b>Low Level 3: 9-10 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 11-12 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
<b>4</b>	<b>13-16</b>	<p>Reaches and sustains a conclusion based on the discriminating use of the evidence. Discussion of the claim in the question proceeds from the issues raised by the process of analysing the representation in the sources. There is developed reasoning and weighing of the evidence in order to create a judgement in relation to the stated claim.</p> <p><b>Low Level 4: 13-14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 15-16 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>

*NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*

## Unit 2 Assessment Grid

Question Number	AO1a and b Marks	AO2a Marks	AO2b Marks	Total marks for question
Q (a)	-	20	-	20
Q (b)(i) or (ii)	24	-	16	40
<b>Total Marks</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>% weighting</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>25%</b>

### Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

**E1 British Political History, 1945-90: Consensus and Conflict**

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<p><b>1 (a)</b></p>	<p>The sources offer evidence both to support and challenge the stated view. Source 1 seems to offer the greatest support for the view that the Labour Party won the 1964 Election because of their appealing programme. Source 1 stresses that the Labour Party had an attractive agenda for change, and it promised to embark upon a modernising programme that the British people wanted (<i>'A New Britain – mobilising the resources of technology'</i>). The manifesto creates the impression that the Labour Party would utilize <i>'our genius for scientific invention and medical discovery'</i> to bring about a technological revolution in Britain. Both Sources 1 and 2 suggest that Labour could bring about the changes which the Conservative governments had failed to do, directly in Source 1 (<i>'reversing the decline of thirteen years'</i>) and implicitly in Source 2 (<i>'Macmillan had provided us with so much ammunition'</i>).</p> <p>The sources can be used to argue against the stated view. Sources 2 and 3 suggest that the election was lost by the Conservatives rather than won by Labour, and that the key issue was not the Labour programme but the failure of the Conservative leadership. Source 2 emphasises the inexperience of Home (<i>'an opponent with very little experience of Parliament and much ignorance of economics'</i>) whilst the shortcomings of Macmillan would have enabled the Labour party to make <i>'mincemeat of him'</i> in the election campaign had he remained in office. Both Sources 2 and 3 use the unsuitability of Home (<i>'an out of touch aristocrat'</i>) to put the case that it was the choice of leader that led to the Conservative Party losing the election. However, Source 2 focuses more on the ways in which Labour were able to capitalise on the choice of leader while Source 3 emphasises the destructive role in the press's caricature of Home. The weakness of the Conservative leaders may be cross referenced with Labour's <i>'fresh and virile leadership'</i> to argue that this factor may be more important in explaining the Labour victory than its programme.</p> <p>Candidates cross-referencing sources and exploring such issues beyond face value can reach level 3 and beyond. Inferential skills and consideration of provenance may also be developed though considering both the degree of and the reasons for the differences between the sources. Candidates may argue that Source 1 is propaganda designed to win support for the Labour Party and is prone to exaggeration. It may be difficult to apply effectively, given that the evidence cannot demonstrate what the impact of the Manifesto was in voting terms. Sources 2 and 3 may be seen as equally questionable coming from former Labour and Conservative prime ministers. On the other hand, the dates of publication suggest that the sources have nothing to gain by distorting the events, and Wilson does admit that <i>'when the election came we only just scraped through'</i> suggesting that too much emphasis should not be placed on the Manifesto to explain the Labour victory. Candidates may draw the inference from Source 3 that Mrs Thatcher felt the need to defend Home.</p> <p>Candidates who consider valid aspects of source attribution, as it relates to the question, are cross referencing the evidence and will achieve Level 3. Responses which reach a judgement developed from this will achieve Level 4.</p>	<p>20</p>

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (i)	<p>The question asks candidates to evaluate the reasons for the failings of the Heath Government. Taken as a set the sources offer evidence for and against the claim in the question that conflict with the miners' union played the most significant role. Source 4 offers evidence providing support for the stated view. The statement made by McGahey detailed in Source 4 that he wanted to '<i>bring down the government</i>' invites candidates to draw upon their own knowledge of the events of the miners' strike including the reaction to the 1971 Industrial Relations Act by the TUC and the impact of the three day week on the country in considering the failings of the Heath Government. Candidates may link this to attitude of voters in the 1974 election.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to use Source 6 to challenge the views provided in Sources 4 and to argue that there were a number of failings by the Heath Government that led to its downfall and may use this as the basis for an argument that these played a more significant role. Candidates may refer to the high costs of keeping '<i>lame duck</i>' companies in business ('<i>Public money was pumped into Rolls Royce</i>') and to the problems of unemployment, and as outlined in Source 5 the '<i>record trade deficit and inflation</i>'. Candidates may develop knowledge of unpopular policies such as the withdrawal of free school milk as well as the impact of events beyond Heath's control such as the international oil price rise. They may refer to Source 5's acknowledgement '<i>there was little enough success to report on any front</i>' and link this to arguments that miners' strike was the last straw rather than the main reason. In this sense, candidates will have the opportunity to explore the issues and reconcile differences in the evidence to demonstrate that the reason for the failings of the Heath Government arose from a complex web of interlinked causes.</p> <p>Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the reasons for the failings of the Heath Government with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<p><b>1 (b)</b> <b>(ii)</b></p>	<p>The question asks candidates to evaluate the reasons for the fall of Margaret Thatcher. Taken as a set the sources offer evidence for and against the claim in the question that loss of public support played the most significant role. Both Sources 7 and 8 offer evidence providing support for the stated view. Source 7 could be used to argue the case that Mrs Thatcher fell because she had lost public support (<i>'the most unpopular prime minister since opinion polls had begun'</i>). Candidates may develop knowledge of animosity towards Mrs Thatcher's policies and their consequences. They may draw on evidence from Source 8 regarding by-election defeats to argue that support for the Conservatives had declined significantly. They may use Sources 7 and 8 to lead into discussions over the opposition to the community charge (poll tax) and the economic problems which arose out of the stock market crash of 1987 as well as to the <i>'renewed confidence'</i> in the Labour Party and link these points to her loss of public support and hence her fall from power.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to use Source 9 to challenge the views provided in Sources 7 and 8 and to argue that Mrs Thatcher had lost support in her own party and particularly in her cabinet and that this was why she fell. This can be developed by the implications in Source 9 that even her most loyal supporters were in doubt (<i>'Even if' ... 'Peter Lilley – a card carrying Thatcherite ...saw no point'</i>) together with the claim in Source 8 that her party was questioning whether they could win the next election <i>'if she were still the leader'</i>. Candidates may draw upon their own knowledge to explore the loss of support for Mrs Thatcher in the party. They may refer to the differences of attitude over Europe, to Geoffrey Howe's resignation and to the role of individuals like Michael Heseltine and the leadership contest and her decision to step down after the first ballot. In this way, candidates will have the opportunity to explore the issues and reconcile differences in the evidence to demonstrate that fall of Margaret Thatcher was driven by a range of interlinking factors that require an evaluation of their relative significance to reach a judgement.</p> <p>Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the reasons for the fall of Margaret Thatcher with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

**E2 Mass Media, Popular Culture and Social Change in Britain since 1945**

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<b>2 (a)</b>	<p>The sources offer evidence both to support and challenge the stated view. Source 10 seems to offer the greatest support for the view that the Sex Pistols challenged authority in Britain after the Sex Pistols released their version of God Save the Queen in a deliberately provocative move in the Silver Jubilee. Both Sources 10 and 11 can be used to show how Sex Pistols challenged authority in the words of the song and their decision to perform it outside Parliament. Both sources can also be used to show that the authorities can be seen to have felt threatened directly in Source 11 with the police arrests of their manager, and implicitly in Source 10 since the song was banned by the BBC.</p> <p>The sources can be used to argue against the stated view. Source 12 offers an alternative view that media demonized the Sex Pistols who had been <i>'transformed into the devil as far as the British press were concerned.'</i> Candidates may use Source 11 to support this view, noting that the <i>'headlines... helped to fortify the band's controversial reputation.'</i> Some candidates may draw inferences that the lyrics of the song and actions by the group may not be considered so challenging to authority and that the controversy caused had more to do with promoting the group and securing record sales, evidenced by their chart position.</p> <p>Candidates cross-referencing sources and exploring such issues beyond face value can reach level 3 and beyond. Inferential skills and consideration of provenance may also be developed though considering both the degree of and the reasons for the differences between the sources. Candidates may query the validity of Source 12 and argue that the writer worked for the NME and a musical newspaper would be less likely to be hostile to punk rock. They may consider that the passage of time and the changes in the behaviour of rock stars since the 1970s means that the behaviour seemed less outrageous and hence less of a challenge by 2011. On the other hand, aspects of Source 11 clearly verify Maconie's claim that the Sex Pistols were playing up to the media for the publicity and that the challenge to authority may be overstated. Candidates may regard Source 11 as reasonably objective written so long after the event and with no obvious reasons to distort the story. Candidates considering valid aspects of source attribution as it relates to the question are cross referencing the evidence and will achieve Level 3. Responses which reach a judgement developed from this will achieve Level 4.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (i)	<p>The question asks candidates to consider portrayal of women in British films in the 1960s. Taken as a set the sources offer evidence for and against the claim in the question that films reflected the traditional roles of women. Source 13 offers evidence providing support for the stated view. Source 13 could be used to argue the case that <i>'traditional gender roles were upheld'</i>. This can be linked to comments in Sources 14 and 15 that claim that women who deviated from their traditional role found only <i>'emptiness'</i> in their lives and that hence in film women got a <i>'raw deal'</i>. Candidates may develop their knowledge here referring to films that focused on traditional roles including <i>'Look Back in Anger'</i> (1959), the <i>Carry On</i> films, the role of women in Bond movies and in the film version of <i>'Till Death Us Do part'</i> (1969).</p> <p>Candidates are likely to use Sources 14 and 15 to challenge the views provided in Source 13 and to argue that there were films from this period that challenged the traditional role of women. Candidates may refer to Diana's behaviour in the film <i>'Darling'</i> as described in Source 14, a film which focused on <i>'issues that were still considered taboo'</i> and which were <i>'embraced'</i> by the main character. They are likely to cross reference this with Liz's behaviour in <i>Billy Liar</i> that Christie describes as <i>'quite loose'</i> and so argue against the view in the question. Candidates may develop knowledge of the films that portrayed the new social attitudes for example <i>'A Taste of Honey'</i> (1961) and <i>'Saturday Night and Sunday Morning'</i> (1960). In this sense, candidates will have the opportunity to explore the issues and reconcile differences in the evidence to demonstrate that especially over the passage of time, the range of films produced in the 1960s meant the portrayal of women did vary and so the question requires discussion of complex issues.</p> <p>Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the role of women portrayed in 1960s films with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40



Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<p><b>2 (b)</b> <b>(ii)</b></p>	<p>The question asks candidates to evaluate the responsibility for the controversy surrounding the publication of the Iraq dossier. Taken as a set the sources offer evidence for and against the claim in the question that the BBC was mainly responsible for the controversy. All three sources offer some evidence providing support for the stated view. Source 16 could be used to argue that Gilligan's claims in the <i>Today</i> programme were responsible to sparking the controversy and use Sources 17 and 18 to support this view following the conclusions of the Hutton Inquiry. Candidates may draw upon their own knowledge explore the consequences including the circumstances of the death of Dr Kelly and link it to BBC revelations about the dossier.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to use Source 16 to challenge the view expressed in the question and to argue that the role of Alistair Campbell and the quality of the dossier were primarily responsible for the controversy. They may refer to Gilligan's role in writing for a newspaper to question whether the media involvement was not wider than the BBC, as well as considering the importance of Dr Kelly as the one who leaked details about the dossier. Candidates may develop knowledge of the content and alterations to the report that formed the dossier and its use by the Labour Government which would explain why the revelations were so controversial. In this way, candidates will have the opportunity to explore the issues and reconcile differences in the evidence to demonstrate that the causes for the controversy are complex.</p> <p>Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the reasons for the controversy, and the importance of the role of the BBC in creating it, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	<p>40</p>

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom