

Examiners' Report

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE
in History (6HI02) Paper E

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 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.

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

Summer 2016

Publications Code 43888

All the material in this publication is
copyright © Pearson Education Ltd 2016

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>

Introduction

Centres and candidates are once again to be congratulated for their performance this series as examiners reported that the majority of candidates understood the essential requirements of the Unit 2 examination with the different focus of the two parts of the question. In an examination in which the majority of candidates were re-taking the examination paper, there were many impressive answers to be seen and relatively fewer weaker answers than has been the norm in the past.

In part A, the majority of candidates did attempt to cross reference the sources in their answer, although this was developed with varying degrees of success and for some this amounted to merely asserting that the sources either agree or disagree without explaining how they have arrived at this conclusion. Answers of this type are unlikely to have moved beyond level 2. There were a number of candidates who did not consider the provenance of the sources and this meant that they could not advance very far in the mark scheme. There were also proportionately more candidates than in the past who spent considerable amounts of time elucidating their answer with own knowledge - this cannot be credited in this question. Indeed those candidates would have gained more credit if they had focused on cross referencing, a consideration of provenance linked to the arguments and judgements. There were certain stock phrases that were used by some candidates e.g. taken as a set; this is only appropriate if that is what the candidate is doing. In too many cases, the phrase was not accompanied by the action.

In part B, there were a number of candidates who relied primarily on the material in the sources. There were also a number of candidates who demonstrated some range and depth of knowledge that could be applied to the part B questions. The best answers used the sources to shape the argument and raise issues which were supported and developed with the use of detailed and specific own knowledge. It continues to be the case that despite comments in previous examiners' reports for all recent exam series regarding the focus of AO2b, candidates continue to comment to a greater or lesser extent on provenance in their responses to part B in this exam series. Such comments are frequently 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 part B. Some candidates spend an excessive amount of time on this and they 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 and significant names correctly, especially when those words and names form part of the question or the sources. Where candidates have a few minutes left at the end of the exam, they would be well advised to check their work.

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

The standard was definitely higher this series, as was to be expected with the majority of candidates year 13 students who were sitting the paper for the second time. In particular, candidates' reading of the sources was far better than in previous sessions, especially in Question 1a and in all the b questions. Similarly, many were able to focus their answers to Question b far more consistently, enabling many more Level 3 responses.

Question 1a

The sources provided many opportunities to cross reference and many accessed mid- Level 3 as a result. Source 2 provided some difficulties for a small minority who did not understand the meaning of the cartoon. Consideration of provenance was often generic (especially Source 2) but many candidates made perceptive comments on Bevan's letter to Cripps being indicative as his position as founder of the NHS or Attlee having to consider all perspectives as Prime Minister. Only a small minority attempted to weigh the evidence of the sources but there were some very perceptive and mature answers that did access Level 4.

Example:

This is a level 4 response with a range of cross references and an attempt to use the sources in combination.

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

Chosen question number:

Question 1

Question 2

(a) Source 1 by Bevan was written in 1950 which was the year previous to the division in the Labour Party which was occurring in 1951. This suggests that the disagreements regarding the Health Services ^(NHS) changes ~~were~~ had been brewing which is indicated by the source, "it can hardly create friendly relations." This suggests that from July 1950 when the letter was written to 1951 ~~but~~ ~~feelings~~ tensions were rising over NHS changes. Source 3 seems to affirm this idea when Attlee states "the immediate cause was a proposal in the Budget to make changes for some of the Health Services." Due to the length of the disagreement ~~the~~ over NHS changes this suggests they were in fact the primary cause of the Labour division of 1951.

~~Source 1~~ ~~was~~ The fact that Source 1



((a) continued) is a personal letter from Bevan to Cripps - the Chancellor of the Exchequer who is in charge of the countries budget - suggests that the proposed change was of a very serious note. Yet in source 3 Adlai states he felt ~~as the party~~ ~~then, there~~ there was, "no real difference in principle". Hence it is clear that their importance was different to different members of the government, but this in itself suggests a reason for a party party split.

Source 2 focus on the growing expenditure of both the Welfare State and Defence. However it is defence which is in the foreground of the picture, making it appear bigger. This possibly suggests it was the growing defence spending which was splitting the Labour Party, however it does not explicitly imply this as it suggests ~~that~~ that this was a problem for Britain as a whole



(a) continued) Rather than the Labour Party. Yet
in source 3 Attlee says the "differences
of opinion" ~~in~~ the stemmed from
"the level of armaments." Hence this
possibly allows us to interpret
Source 2 as not just being an
~~issue~~ ^{issue} for Britain but also an
issue for the Labour Party as well.
Hence it suggests that the NHS
changes were not the primary
cause of the division but it was
also ~~caused~~ defence spending
which caused problems.

In source 3, Attlee confirms
that "the immediate cause" of the
"differences" which occurred was due to
"budgetary changes," for some of
the Health services. ~~Due to Attlee's~~

~~position of power~~ This is reinforced by
the ~~important~~ letters of source 1. This
suggests that it was indeed the
primary ^{reason for} division of the Labour Party
in 1951. ~~Yet source~~

Yet source 3 also suggests that



(a) continued) there were "some other matters" as well as the issue of "the fuel of arguments", suggesting that "the disagreement sprang to these." Hence Source 3 suggests that the primary cause was the NHS charges but there were other problems including the rearmament which affected the labour division in 1951 as well.

~~In conclusion when taken~~ Taking all the sources into account, it seems source 3 is the most reliable as it was written by Attlee who as the Prime Minister was the central figure in the government and would therefore see with sense the sentiment and the root of many decisions. But source 1 and 2 are also useful, ~~as it gives~~ source 1 because it gives us more personal insight into the ^{origins} ~~origins~~ of the split from Beveridge ~~but ignores the importance~~ while also showing how it was viewed

(a) continued) from outside the government shown in source 2. Analyzing the sources in combination allows us to draw the conclusion that it was the NHS groups that were the most important in causing the decision in 1951 but ~~reports~~ arguments and other issues also played a significant part.



Question 1bi

This seemed to be the less popular and the less well done of the two longer answers in section 1b. While many candidates were able to construct a case to agree with the statement from Sources 5 and 6, using the (often not very extensive) evidence of wider consumer spending to back this up, relatively few were also able to provide a convincing counter-case. There were relatively few accurate references to the “Stop-Go” nature of economic policy in the 50s, the accusation of a lack of economic investment and modernisation or that much consumer spending of the period was funded by credit. There were relatively few Level 4 responses as a result.

Question 1bii

This was more popular and often, very well done. Many candidates had a very good knowledge of the issues, even of the more complicated economic arguments surrounding devaluation and the balance of payments. A good number also were able to balance the thrust of Source 7 and Source 8 with the arguments that Labour’s overall economic record was better than it is often portrayed and, more commonly, with reference to the liberal reforms introduced by Jenkins at the Home Office or the investment in public services referenced in Source 9. There were many impressive Level 4 answers.

Example:

This is a level 4 response which is strongly argued and knowledge is used effectively to further the argument. There is excellent contextual understanding. The response is driven by the sources and the claims are probed effectively.

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

(b) ii

Sources 7 and 8 depict a bleak picture of Wilson from 1966 onwards ~~however the tone of~~ Wilson promised to be a new, young, dynamic Prime Minister however, these sources differ with Wilson's own view of ~~his~~ his success in source 9, ^{could perhaps be} instead suggesting that Wilson's success ~~was~~ ^{is} divisible by his second election.

Wilson came to ~~power~~ power in 1964 as source 7 ~~notes~~ notes 'promising that Britain ~~can~~ would grow strong again'. Wilson followed the Conservatives 13 - wasted years, and 'hope' - source 9 the economy was in a poor position and society needed the changes that Wilson offered. ~~As~~ source 8 would appear to ~~agree~~ ^{be of} ~~with~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ the view that Wilson was at first successful altering society and the economy - fulfilling his promises ~~as~~ from source 7 of a stronger nation as source 8 sights the '1966 election onwards' as the ^{descent} ~~turning~~ point for Wilson's ~~fall~~ ^{fall}. Source 7 states that 'consumption showed a remarkable increase.' - a credit to Wilson given the low consumer confidence in ~~the~~ the inherited economy. However source 7 - unlike 8 and 9, identifies 'immediate problems' with the economy and unions. There was a large deficit on the balance of payments in the UK - Douglas Home, Wilson's predecessor had needed to borrow £714 million from the IMF in order to avoid devaluation. This caused a worsening of the budget deficit which was passed on to Wilson. This is an economic problem that hindered progress within Wilson's government.

A personal goal for Wilson ~~was~~ was to ~~avoid~~ ~~the~~ maintain the value of the British pound - this was something his predecessors narrowly managed to do. However,



((b) continued) ~~as~~ source 7 notes, 'In 1967 the pound was devalued' from \$2.80 to \$2.20. Wilson was famously quoted for saying, 'the pound in your pocket or purse has not lost its value' - a complete lie as the economic definition of devaluation, is a decrease in the value of a currency. The devaluation was both a personal and party failure for Wilson and Labour. ~~however, it is not entirely to blame~~ Economically, a devaluation of the pound increases the price of imports - in theory consumption of imports should have declined improving the UK's 'balance of payments deficit' ^{in the long run} referred to in source 8. The subsequent 'inflation' caused wages to be pressurised ~~and~~ compromising employment. "What could have caused progress caused problems."

Wilson, like others would in later years, struggled with the trade unions. The trade unions were against 'wage ~~in~~ and salary increases' needing to be 'kept in check' - (source 8) and therefore strike action occurred as is ~~refer~~ mentioned in source 7 with the 'dock strike'. ~~Wilson also attempt~~ ~~struggled with the~~ Wilson composed 'In Place of strife' in order to combat the unions however, he lacked the majority required to push this through. Here, Wilson's own government acted as a barrier to his success. This failure caused strike action to rise with strikes by the NUM in 1966 and 1967 ~~over~~ over pay.

On the other hand, Wilson himself believed firmly that by 1969, Britain had experienced 'Five years of change' as he states in source 9. However, source 9 was spoken in 1969 - before an election that he later lost to Heath, at a party conference. ~~As~~ ^{hoping for reelection} A Prime Minister ~~cannot~~ ~~protect his party~~ always starts driving messages of positive changes made ^{in the country} to ~~them~~ their own party first. If 'Everyone' knew of all the changes 'for the better' that Wilson made then surely, Wilson would have won the 1970 election.



((b) continued) Wilson did invest in infrastructure by developing 'new hospitals', 'new schools' and homes - the basic ^{consensus} areas for Labour spending. ~~the~~
~~Despite this~~ This spending may have been ^{a partial} ~~the~~ cause for the inflation the economy experienced. Source 8 would support perhaps 2 years of positive change ~~but~~ but five is too many. Wilson ~~disregards~~ refrains from mentioning the economy - a key evaluation of success for a government as it defines ~~to~~ what the government can do. The absence of this core element from his speech suggests that Wilson did attempt to focus on the positives.

Wilson was unable to fully deliver his 'white heat of a scientific revolution' to its full potential. He was unable to maintain the value of the pound and failed to make 'In place of shite' law. These personal and party problems hindered his success. ~~However,~~ ^A weak economy and a dissatisfied workforce prevented Wilson from making absolute progress. Wilson was overwhelmed by challenges as source 7 notes and though he made some change for the better as source 8 credits, - source 9 is overwhelming self propaganda, ~~and~~
Wilson's government was characterised by problems for the second half of his government as the first 2 years were underlying inherited issues. ~~Despite~~
~~this characteristics~~ that were not his fault that he sought to change. Unfortunately, change at the wrong time can often backfire as Wilson experienced.



Question 2a

This was much better done than in previous years and many accessed Level 3. There were some interesting (and wrong) interpretations of Source 10 but even if they did not identify Diana's purpose in allowing the photograph, the vast majority did identify that, for whatever reason, this was potentially evidence of her manipulating the media. A few answers were very perceptive in their reading of Source 11 and Source 12 given that both came after Diana's death and were part of the debate over the press' responsibility.

Example:

This is a level 3 response. There are a series of cross references and an attempt to discuss the attributes of the sources. However, the sources are not weighed in order to reach the judgement and this keeps the response in level 3.

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

Chosen question number:

Question 1

Question 2

(a) Source 10 shows that Diana had manipulated the media for her own purposes, using it to help her achieve fame. Source 11 also shows the same view, demonstrating that Diana wanted media attention and enjoyed the popularity she got from it. Lastly, source 12 shows that it was the newspapers themselves and the paparazzi who manipulated and used Diana's popularity to sell editions of their papers and make huge profit.

Source 10 is a photograph taken of Princess Diana whilst she was on a visit to India with her husband Prince Charles. It displays her sitting in front of the Taj Mahal, scenes a scene which she set up herself. This shows that she manipulated the media for her own agenda, to try and gain attention from the public regarding her tour. The source's caption says that the photograph was printed in most British newspapers, something which Diana would have been aware of at the time. However this source is limited because it was taken in 1992, years before her death, therefore we cannot have the power of hindsight to decide whether it displays Diana manipulating the media for her own purposes. However, the purpose, which is to draw attention to Diana's visit to India, may indicate that she did have



((a) continued) Some control over the media and what was published about her.

Source 11 is from an interview with a TV presenter on Channel Five from 2001. It explains that Diana had full control over the media, shown in "She made sure for six days that she was on page one of all the newspapers". This links with source 10 and how the photograph was printed ^{in most} on all British newspapers. Diana, in source 11 also had the power to make herself seem more important than other people publicised in the press. For example she "cut the ground from under Camilla's feet" and made sure if Camilla was written about, it was on "about page fifteen". Diana was clearly extremely popular, shown in source 12 which states "a big Diana story could add 150,000 sales", this supports the idea that she could manipulate the media for her own ends ^{and fame}. This source appears to be reliable as it was published in 2001, years after her death, meaning the content would not have been swayed by public sympathy for her surrounding her death. However, it was created by a TV presenter which is called a "loyal admirer of Diana," meaning the views presented are biased towards his love for Diana.

Source 12 is from an article published in The Daily Telegraph in 2007 and makes the point that it was the press and the paparazzi who manipulated Diana and not the other



(a) continued) way around. It talks of the "out of control" behaviour of the paparazzi "who were chasing her" and caused the car crash in 1997 and subsequently causing Diana's death. This contrasts to source 11 and "the wonderful game" that Diana played against the press in order to boost her popularity. Additionally, the press manipulated Diana for money, shown in "a big Diana story could add 150,000 in sales". This contrasts with the view of source 11 which demonstrates Diana "presenting herself daily" to make herself famous and attended to by the press. This source was written in 2007 which also means it has hindsight to make a more balanced judgement about the relationship between Diana and the press, however because it was written by a journalist, he may have wanted to blame all "the editors of The Sun, Daily Mirror..." ^{for Diana's death} "in order to make the public view these ^{news} papers badly and thus not buy them. Therefore this source may appear to be biased and unreliable.

Whilst ~~the~~ sources 10 and 11 demonstrate the role that Diana had with controlling what was published about her, source 12 takes a different view. The fact that the paparazzi were chasing her on the night of her death, shown in source 12, would demonstrate that even though Diana used the media to gain popularity, the media manipulated her even more to boost their sales.



Question 2bi

This was the most popular of the questions in part b. Even though it was better done than in previous years and there were many more Level 3 responses, there were still relatively few that got to the heart of whether the media influenced social change or simply reflected it. A lot of students knew some contextual knowledge (the liberalising legislation of the 60s, the names of television programmes or films) but few built this into a convincing analysis. Some films quoted, such as the Carry on films were not well-selected examples of permissiveness and others such as dating to the 1970s were not focused on the period under discussion.

Example:

This is a level three response for both Ao1 and A02b. There is an attempt at analysis and some integration of source and knowledge. Some of the knowledge offered is out of period. There is sufficient evidence of reasoning from the sources to enter level 3 for A02b. The discussion of the provenance of the secondary sources is unnecessary and adds nothing to the analysis.

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

(b) I agree with the view to a certain extent that mass media was responsible for changing social attitudes in the 1960's.

The 1960's became a much more permissive society, due to rationing ending in 1954 austerity had declined and bands such as the Beatles and Jimi Hendrix were becoming mainstream pop culture through Americanisation. Source B suggests that permissiveness emerged in the latter years of MacMillan's government 1957 to 1961, which saw the restriction of the death penalty to specific types of murder, however it was not until the late 1960's when permissiveness took its toll with the introduction of many controversial laws in 1969, such as the 1969 Abortion Act which first came across as a private members bill but due to rates of deaths due to backstreet abortions being so high, which is shown in the 1960's film 'Up the Junction' the government felt it necessary, whereas along with this came the contraceptive pill in which you had to be over 30 years old and married in order to buy it because sex before marriage was taboo in the 1960's. Henceforth, in 1969 the Divorce Reform Act was also introduced which allowed women to seek a divorce from a man as well as vice versa. All of these acts were led by ideas and conflicts brought up within mass media, through films such as Saturday Night Sunday Morning, Up the Junction and Clockwork Orange. ✱



((b) continued) The Sun Newspaper owned by Rupert Murdoch also led to a more permissive society because in 1969 the first page 3 model was put into the newspaper. This was a big deal due to women being considered as liberal and conservatives throughout the war and the early 50's now they were being permissive.²² The page 3 model in the sun implies that because the newspapers were extremely influential a page 3 model would have extremely had an influence on women and permissiveness. Source 16 is from Robert Pearce, Contemporary Britain 1944-79, published in 1996. The source implies that the idea of sex was becoming less taboo to talk about in fact 'some said sex was being made into the new religion. Source 14 mentions the Profumo Affair in 1963; much may have led to a higher permissiveness within women and prostitution becoming less ~~taboo~~ of a taboo subject due to scenes as Jimi Hendrix having naked women on his album cover. In effect source 14 is useful because it shows how sex was portrayed through music and politicians however it may not be seen as reliable as it was published in 1996 when England was a lot more permissive than it was in the 1960's.

Source 15 is from the manifesto, Clean Up TV, by Mary Whitehouse and Norah Buerland, 1964. This source is biased because Mary Whitehouse disagreed with the idea of permissiveness therefore in 1964 launched a clean up TV



((b) continued) campaign which run alongside John Major's back to basics campaign as they believed mass media and society had become too permissive. Source 15 outlines the BBC, the BBC was set up in order to educate people by Lord Keth who had very similar views to that of Mary Whitehouse therefore he would agree with her 'the BBC employs peoples whose ideas and advice indulge and encourage the lowest in human nature' in which she is referring to the introduction of shows such as Eastenders and the split of the BBC into BBC 1, 2, 3, 4 + 5.

In conclusion I agree to a fair extent that mass media was responsible for changes in social attitudes in the 1960's, however I believe that it was a good change because although it seemed like a lot more people were speaking of taboo subjects - it was because it wasn't so heavily frowned upon whereas before it was.



Question 2bii

This appeared to be the less popular. Most were able to construct an argument using the content of the sources and there were some who were able to add developed (and relevant historical) knowledge on the advantages of new technology in improving leisure time but many strayed from the “leisure” focus and there was a definite sense of them trying to adapt information from previous exam papers. There were also candidates who wrote from personal and current experience rather than drawing upon examples from history.

Example:

This is a high level 3 response for both A01 and A02b. A range of points are introduced and analysis is attempted. Occasionally the response loses focus on ‘leisure’. The sources are used effectively with a clear appreciation of the different representations. The comments on the provenance of the secondary sources are unnecessary and add nothing to the discussion.

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

(b)ii The development of new technologies has had a range of impacts on the individual and their leisure time. On a positive note, ~~the~~ new technologies have allowed people to communicate with people they cannot see every ~~one~~ ^{day}, for example the use of Skype to produce live stream chats ~~between people and perhaps~~ ^{with} family members living half way across the world. However a range of negative impacts can be observed, technology has been blamed for causing a decline in normal communication, with some ^{critics} predicting the end of a 'face to face society.'

Source 16 agrees with the statement, claiming the public has "embraced the new digital technology." People today have an "increasing number" of channels and services available" and this links with the idea that internet shopping has become "a major pastime" (source 18). The internet has made every day things such as shopping much easier and convenient, as today we do not even need to leave our houses to purchase our groceries, we can do this all online and have our goods delivered straight to our doors. This supports the idea from source 17 that the internet is changing "how we think and behave" as leisure time becomes much more convenient for us with the development of new technologies. A further positive



((b) continued) impact that the internet has had on our leisure time is allowing for democratisation through the use of blogging and social media. For example, the use of ~~web~~ e-petitions has encouraged more widespread participation in politics, which is a huge success for ~~web~~ encouraging democracy and free speech. This supports the idea that "the British public has embraced the new digital technology" presented in source 16, along with the "hype" surrounding its development. Therefore it can be argued that new technologies have had a positive impact on our leisure time.

However source 16 shows the negative impacts of new technology ^{developed} after the 90's on ^{leisure time and} the society. It speaks of the "growing suspicions" surrounding those who "stalk the information highway". These ideas are valid in an age where it is becoming increasingly easier for people to use the internet for ill, such as cyber-bullying or internet piracy, ~~and~~ which is on the rise. In 2009, it was estimated that over 7 million people had illegally downloaded music and films to their computers. These activities would be accounted for by source 16 which speaks of new technologies and "the dangers they pose to young impressionable minds", and how they spend their leisure time.

Furthermore, source 17 makes the argument that the internet should be blamed for "killing life experiences" and also causing a "decline of free time". This can be



((b) continued) explained by source 18 and the idea of "internet shopping as a ^{major} past time" ~~perhaps~~ causing ~~peo~~ people to spend far too much time online. This idea is true, as we now live in an age where children are spending more and more time in front of computer and television screens. Such changes have had impacts on child-parent relationships, whilst for adults it has changed the way they receive information. Whilst we live in a "multi channel world" (source 6) people have ~~beg~~ lost interest in the traditional ways of keeping up to date with the news. The ^{rise of} internet has meant that newspapers have struggled for sales - for example, Rupert Murdoch's 'The London Paper' was forced to close in 2009 after having losses of £13 million that year. This shows a negative impact on leisure time as more and more people are turning to the internet and digital technology, whilst older industries suffer because of "the increasing number of channels and services available." (Source 6). This is supported by source 17 which explains that new technology is responsible for "killing life experiences and habits that have emerged over centuries," such as reading newspapers. However this contrasts to a view expressed in source 16 about "fabulous claims about the changes that will follow."

The first source is from a history book published in 2010,



((b) continued) and it is designed with the purpose of educating people, therefore we can trust that the views expressed will be well informed. The source makes a balanced judgement, comparing the positives and negatives of the new technologies on society. Thus, I judge the source can be judged as reliable. Source 17 is from an article published online from the Telegraph. Because the purpose of the article is probably to spark a debate, the views presented may be seen as subjective. Additionally and perhaps the content may not be as reliable as source 16 which gives an objective view. Lastly, source 18 is from a history book dedicated to describing modern Britain, thus the information will be well researched and considered. Andrew Marr, the author, is a well known historian and an expert in his field which means that his content is highly likely to be accurate ^{and} informative. Indeed it must be noted that the internet is a relatively new technology and is still developing today, which means that in a few centuries time, history books such as Williams' (source 16) and Marr's (source 18) will need to be updated in relation to the impacts that new technology has had on British leisure habits.

In conclusion, the new technologies have had both positive and negative impacts on the leisure habits



((b) continued) of individuals in Britain today. Whilst technologies such as the internet provide convenient ways to communicate, shop and discover ways to express freedom of speech, the negative impacts should not be ignored. ~~The~~ The internet and television now take up increasing amounts of leisure time with people spending more time in front of screens. Because of this, in a few decades time we may see what critics are calling the end of a 'face to face' society.



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

All Questions

1. 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.
2. Too many candidates use certain phrases, such as 'using the sources as a set', as a substitute for actually engaging in the task that they are claiming.
3. Engaging with the sources needs to go beyond accepting the content at face value and to test it for validity considering provenance in part a and by testing the opinions in part b with knowledge set in the context of the period.

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 work through sources sequentially. Such responses cannot go beyond level 2.
3. Provenance should be integrated within the argument and decisions need to be made on the relative strengths and weaknesses of the sources. 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 stereotypical comments about the provenance that could apply to any source and avoid labelling a source as both reliable and unreliable and thus negating any conclusions drawn. The key to a successful response is the ability to weigh the sources to reach a final judgement.
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.
5. There are no marks available for knowledge in part a. Candidates should avoid arguing from their knowledge since it cannot be credited and often impacts on the amount of time they have available to complete part b.

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 driven by the arguments raised in the sources. Sources should be used to develop lines of argument and reasoning rather than used for information to develop a descriptive answer.
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 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.
4. Candidates need to ensure that they are aware of the focus of the question and the time period specified and that they maintain the focus throughout their answer, to avoid straying into irrelevant areas that cannot be rewarded.

