

Examiners' Report
June 2014

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.



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.

June 2014

Publications Code US039087

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

Introduction

Centres and candidates are to be congratulated for their performance this examination 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. There was a wide range of responses seen across the mark range.

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

However, it is again disappointing to note that there was a significant minority of candidates seen in this series who performed poorly, both in terms of their skills set and their knowledge base.

In part (a), many candidates understand the language of cross referencing, but did not actually engage fully in the processes of cross referencing, merely asserting agreement or disagreement between sources without explaining its basis. There seemed to be an increase this series in this kind of approach, making it very hard for candidates to move beyond level 2 even where they clearly understand the issues raised by the sources. Also this series, there appeared to be a number of candidates who were using their own knowledge to develop points raised in the content of the sources in this question. There is no credit for this in part (a) and these 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 significant minority of candidates relied very heavily on the material in the sources, which was not always fully understood. In some cases, there was no evidence of any own knowledge being used at all. Centres are reminded that candidates are expected to have some range and depth of knowledge that can be applied to the part (b) questions. Some candidates appeared to view both parts of the examination as relating solely to the use of sources. 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. Despite comments in many previous examiners' reports regarding the focus of AO2b, this issue continues to pose a challenge for many candidates. A significant number of candidates commented to a greater or lesser extent on provenance in their responses to part (b) in this exam series. Such comments are frequently 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 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. There were a number of candidates who used the word 'infer' extensively, without actually understanding its meaning. There also appeared to be an increase in scripts where the handwriting of candidates proved difficult to read in this examination series.

Question 1

Question 1 was significantly more popular than question 2.

Question 1 (a)

On the whole this question was answered well. Most candidates were clearly aware that the focus of part (a) is on the skill of cross referencing and were able to draw out cross references for support and challenge and so access level 3. Most candidates understood that, while all three sources could be read as critical of Thatcher, the crucial point was the tone of sources 1 and 2 which were more positive towards her, whereas source 3 was wholly negative. The best candidates also cross referenced the attributes of the sources to enable themselves to reach a judgement firmly rooted in the validity of the evidence. The most common weakness, even in responses that could access level 3 for cross referencing, was the tendency to note or describe provenance without using it to reach judgements. Candidates need to move beyond stereotypical comments on provenance and work with the specific sources for the question set. For example, a number of candidates argued that source 1 was more reliable because it was produced in 2001, after the Thatcher governments. Sergeant was therefore able to be critical. Raising issues of the freedom of the press and censorship may be relevant when looking at dictatorial regimes, but they do not apply to Britain in the later twentieth century. Candidates need to work on weighing up the validity of the evidence. Therefore, they need to move beyond identifying strengths and weaknesses for each source and to decide, on balance, whether a source is more or less reliable.

(a) On a whole, sources 1 and 2 are in alliance over the assessment of Margaret Thatcher as both sources acknowledge that she was a strong and dominant leader, which were her best qualities. On the other hand, Source 3, from Denis Healey is critical of Thatcher. In some areas there are similarities between sources 1 and 2 along with 3, however on a whole the tone of source 3 is grossly different to that in both other sources.

One of the ways in which source 3 is comparable to source 1 is through the description of Thatcher's personality. Source 1 says that Thatcher ~~is~~ was "irritating, bossy, single minded and distant," which in a way summarises the negative qualities of her as an individual. This is comparable to source 3 as the source also highlights Thatcher's arrogance. However, source 1 goes on to say that these stereotypically negative qualities of Thatcher are what made her admirable as a leader, as someone with a strong personality was necessary to help improve Britain.

(a) continued) ~~Therefore, it is clear that although~~

Therefore, it is clear that both sources 1 and 3 acknowledge negative attributes of Thatcher. Source 1 uses them to praise her as a leader, whereas source 3 used Thatcher's arrogance to condemn her.

Sources 3 and 2 are also similar in some ways as they both acknowledge Thatcher's ability to "alienate" members within her party as well as lose support from the public. Source 2 says that Thatcher was "disagreeably strident, excessively authoritarian and unbearably bossy". This is similar to the presentation of Thatcher in source 3, as source 3 highlights how Thatcher viewed "consensus as a dirty word" and therefore was stern in her views. Although this is the case, source 2 also contrasts some views presented in source 1 as it also praises Thatcher as being "one of the most dominant prime ministers" and being "admired" along with "respected". It is unusual that source 2 would speak so highly of Thatcher as it is an account from Nigel Lawson, who served Thatcher yet was forced to resign as he realised her single minded approach. Therefore the fact that this account from Lawson still

(a) continued) acknowledges the good qualities and impacts of Thatcher makes the source more reliable as he would have been expected to entirely criticise her.

In comparison to this, source 3 is likely to be critical of Thatcher as it is from the ex-Chancellor of the Labour party. As a result of this, the source becomes less reliable as Healy would be likely to speak negatively of Thatcher due to his political positioning.

To conclude, ~~source~~ on a whole, sources 1 and 2 are hugely different to the views Healy has presented of Thatcher is source 3. Although all three sources notice how Thatcher was a "bossy" and harsh prime minister, on a whole, both sources 1 and 2 ~~are~~ use this as a way to assess Thatcher ~~is~~ in a positive light, whereas source 3 uses it negatively. ~~The~~ Additionally, the fact that source 3 is from a Labour supporter ~~is~~ is also significant as it explains why it is different to the first ~~the~~ two sources. Therefore, source 3 does challenge the views of Thatcher presented in sources 1 and 2, however, arguably, it is less reliable.



This is a level 4 response. It focuses on the skill of cross referencing right from the introduction where the candidate draws out the similarities and differences in the attitudes and the tones of sources 1, 2 and 3. The candidate cross references the sources throughout the response. Opinions are contrasted and the positive and negative natures of the sources are drawn out. The candidate explores the provenance of the sources and makes insightful comments on the expectations one might have from source 2 given its authorship. The candidate uses the validity of the sources to reach its final judgement. Overall this is an effective answer that demonstrates the skills needed to achieve level 4.

Question 1 (b) (i)

This was a popular question and produced some good answers by candidates who had revised their material thoroughly and were able to answer the question fully, producing effective answers that weighed up Labour's record on providing the "basics" as opposed to the "luxuries". Many of these candidates were able to contextualise the problems of the government fulfilling its ambitions against the background of debt and war. Candidates' knowledge of the birth of the welfare state and the nationalisation programme of the government were often detailed and used cogently to test the opinions in sources 4 and 5. Some candidates displayed less control in focusing on the question and produced detailed accounts of the 1945-51 labour governments without showing an awareness of the question set. The most common error however, which was displayed by about a third of candidates, was to misunderstand the meaning of the word 'austerity'. A number of candidates interpreted it as poverty and this did undermine their responses, but even more confused it with prosperity which impaired their analysis significantly. Candidates do need to be familiar with the key terminology used in their courses. In using the sources, too many candidates treated this response as they would in part (a) and commented, often at length, on the provenance of the sources. This is not rewarded in A02b and very rarely was it used to drive the argument to reach a judgement.

* (b) From ~~both~~ ^{all} sources 4, 5 and 6 we can clearly see that in the post war years of 1945-1951 Britain did enter an age of rationing owing to the poor economic conditions of the war that the country had been left in.

Source ~~4~~ 5 suggests austerity saying that 'we can live without' certain luxuries, but 'we cannot live without imported food'. This shows that there was not a genuine age of austerity to the point that they could get no food from anywhere, but that certain things must be carefully rationed until economic conditions were back on a steady footing.

Source ~~4~~ 4 also agrees with source ~~4~~ 5 that there was 'hardship' but that the 'welfare benefits' ~~was~~ ~~the~~ did relieve the hardship, reducing poverty levels which were 'only 2.77%' again disagreeing that

((b) continued) This was a genuine age of austerity. We know that benefits such as free healthcare for all introduced in 1948 by Aneurin Bevan did give improvements to society, along with the promise to build enough housing for everyone to have their own dwelling which saw 5 million homes needing to be built by 1951. However the standards of living were not good by a long way during this period as squatting increased and the country faced crushing debts of £4198 million pounds to the USA, which became increasingly worse as a result of the dollar gap.

Source 5 does agree with Source 6, as they both show the need for compromises to be made, which are essentially what austerity means as they faced an opportunity cost ^{when} supplying things which are fundamental to our national life.

((b) continued) rather than certain luxuries. Source 6 shows a cartoon of Dalton having made many cuts to 'luxury' goods such as films, petrol and tobacco however this is from the Daily Mail Newspaper which was often very supportive of the Conservative party, so naturally would want to depict the country during Labour's term in office as 'an age of austerity'. Source 5 when saying services such as 'coal and power' must 'come first' nationalisation of 20% of industry did occur which does suggest that there was an age of austerity as the government are taking control of fundamental industry in order to restore the country's state. However some of this nationalisation was unnecessary as iron and steel were actually two industries that were not

((b) continued) declining.

Furthermore, source B5 does suggest an age of austerity as only 'fundamental' things are being focused on in this time.

However, although despite the fact that there may have been austerity in the earlier period of 1945-51, we are told by source 4 that 'in 1950' things picked up ~~and~~ although the welfare state 'did not abolish poverty altogether'. We also know that Labour did actually lose the 1951 election campaign, perhaps because of a troubled six years in office and because many of their leaders were unattractive to the electorate in terms of their image of austerity which is fully supported by source 6, illustrating Dalton making many 'cuts' on goods and looking rather unforgiving.

To my own knowledge I do know that many of the measures

((b) continued) taken by the Labour government of 1945-51 under Attlee were necessary owing to the poor economic conditions that were premeditated by the WW2.

Although the Beveridge Report attacking the five giants and setting up the welfare state did improve conditions, it is clear that in this period austerity was needed although many may have resented it.

Overall, sources 5 and 6 do present the years 1945-51 as being an age of genuine austerity, as cuts were necessary as well as state intervention and rationing, with source 4 agreeing to a ~~real~~ small extent by suggesting that poverty did exist so giving a reason for the austerity. However I do not think that the age^{it} was 'an age of austerity' as the conditions did improve, but I knew that rationing and nationalising

((b) continued) were needed, although the nationalisation of iron and steel was opposed by many of the conservatives so this suggests that it may not have been a genuine age of austerity.

For the British public, it would seem as though these years were a genuine age of austerity as they essentially were the ones ~~the~~ directly impacted by the governments policies although I believe that in many ways, they gained a lot during this period, through the welfare state 'such as family allowances'. They could also manage without certain goods so their 'national existence' was not affected as much as it had ~~been~~ been during the war as they still gained fundamental goods and 'imported food'.

Therefore I ^{agree} ~~believe~~ that, yes, to the British public these years were an age of austerity as they could not

((b) continued) have a life full of luxuries although I think that it wasn't a genuine age of austerity, supported especially by sources 4 and 5, as things did improve slightly and ^{living} ~~certain~~ standards were not awfully affected by the post war ~~polia~~ conditions and policies of austerity, as they were balanced out by the introduction of the welfare state.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a level 4 response for both assessment objectives. The candidate uses the sources to debate the question of austerity and tests this with own knowledge which has some precision and depth. The candidate engages in the debate between hardship and austerity. The strength of the answer is in its focus and sustained argument. Greater depth of knowledge could have been included and this would have pushed the answer up within the level, but the quality of the argument and maintenance of focus mean that this is a level 4 response.

Question 1 (b) (ii)

This was not quite as popular as 1(b)(i) but it was answered by a large proportion of candidates. There were some excellent answers, where the candidate debated the strengths and weaknesses of the Callaghan governments, skilfully using knowledge to interrogate the source material and reaching supported judgements. Some candidates argued convincingly that Callaghan was a victim of problems building up under many previous governments rather than a simple failure, whilst others, acknowledging his achievements, concluded that the Winter of Discontent and the vote of no confidence could lead to no other conclusion than failure. However, in some cases, it was clearly attempted by those who didn't want to do the "austerity" question yet knew little of Callaghan. Even so most were able to build an argument around the sources, but where many fell down was in being able to add to the Winter of Discontent, the IMF Loan or Callaghan's reputation as Sunny Jim from their knowledge. These candidates ended up in low level 3. Some candidates confused events from Wilson's governments in the 1960s and Heath in the 1970s, so that the supporting knowledge was not relevant to the question set, and these could not score highly in A01.

(B) (ii)

Callaghan was ultimately a failure as prime minister during his time in government with his 'late flowering' still not enough to make him a success even though he brought Britain through economic problems with high inflation and taxation of VAT coming to a high of 83%.

As suggested by source 7 that the decision to raise for an IMF loan felt as though the country was cap in hand begging for help showing the weakness of Britain's economy to the rest of the world. The £3 billion loan consisting with £2 billion worth of cuts primarily achieved by the sales of BP shares was unnecessary with the loan quickly being paid off which was Callaghan's mistake due to his 'lack of interest in radical economic ideas' as he backed away from Keynesianism which would mean he would have to spend his way out of the economic issue, despite he opted for the IMF loan. Resulting in anger from the Labour electorate, and the

((b) continued) was ultimately being considered. In turn Callaghan was primarily a failure as he had a 'lack of interest' as suggested by source 4 to ultimately make radical economic ideas, resulting in Callaghan being support whilst not successfully solving the economic issue.

Furthermore the 'piled rubbish and unbridled greed of the 1979 winter of discontent' as indicated in source 7 was also a key reason for showing Callaghan failure as prime minister. At a time when Callaghan tried to offer a wage increase, that was ultimately rejected and mixed with the issue of high inflation. The winter of discontent shows that Callaghan was a failure who lacked any form of comeback with figures suggesting his view was 'crisis what crisis' a line then taken on by the general public. With doctors, nurses and care workers all leaving their posts it gave the strong notion that Callaghan was primarily a failure. Also with the unions 'rightened out of their wits' as suggested by source 8, Callaghan did little to combat them to effectively end the winter of discontent. Ultimately suggesting he was a failure.

((b) continued)

Although source 9 suggests that even with Britain going through 'economic paralysis' with interest ~~rate~~^{rates} at ~~the~~ 15% unemployment at 1.25 million and a balance of payments deficit of £1 billion, Callaghan was able to bring inflation ~~down~~ under 10% for the first time in a decade towards the end of his time as prime minister as suggested by source 8 who ~~says~~ that it was a 'late flowering'. This suggests he was an success as he turned inflation around, from 18% to 10% by increasing exports allowing for the economy to calm and. Although it was helped with the pumping of north sea oil which allowed for the efficient paying of the IMF loan. However creating the push for a return in the economic stability. It is then possible to consider Callaghan to be a success due to his 'late flowering' suggested by source 8 and ^{similarly} due to 'the suicide of a nation being halted' in source 9.

In conclusion it ~~was~~ Callaghan was ultimately a failure, making the country look as though they were 'dying' for an IMF loan of £3 billion even though it had the

((b) continued) government looked any real need as
Callaghan looked 'radical economic ideas' admitted
a failure, there were some positives to
Callaghan government solving huge economic issues
that brought 'economic analysis'. Though it was
ultimately a 'late planning' for Callaghan who's
was already been time as prime minister
was already a ^{clear} failure with 'himself part
of the problem due to lack of 'leadership



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response achieved level 4 for A01 and high level 3 for A02b. The introduction is used to outline the views of the candidate with support from the sources. The candidate demonstrates a good level of knowledge throughout the answer. Knowledge has depth and precision and is integrated with the sources. Focus on the question is explicit and a clear argument is constructed. The sources are used to drive the argument. The weakness in the use of the sources is in the conclusion. Here they are used as a summary rather than to reach a judgement and therefore this is level 3 for A02b rather than level 4.

Question 2

Question 2(a)

The vast majority of candidates found the sources in 2(a) accessible and more of the students sitting this paper this series understood what to do to access level 3. Thus, many were able to point out that there was information in all three sources which could be used to construct a case for and against the opinion in the question. Many noted the provenance but there were many generic or fanciful claims made in this respect and only a few were able to question Cameron's purpose in deflecting criticism of his government in source 11 or point out how in source 12's case, the writer may want to defend such forms of communication. Students who do refer to provenance often tend to do it as an afterthought, writing a distinct section on the provenance of each of the sources. In these cases, it seemed that provenance was not really considered an integral part of the overall analysis. Better answers tended to address provenance throughout the response, acknowledging the relative weight of the sources as the candidate examined the evidence presented within each of the sources.

(a) Sources 10, 11 and 12 suggest to ~~an~~ ^{car} ~~extent~~ extent that social media has been a "force for evil". Nevertheless, it could be argued that it is not a force for evil and is "merely a tool for communication" (S 12).

Firstly, source A does agree that it is a force for evil as it says that voters used blackberries "due to its level of piracy". Furthermore, this is supported by source 12's statement that these voters were able to make contact "quickly and securely". This suggests that social media is enabling criminals to organise crimes worse than ever, supporting the view that social media is a "force for evil". However, source 12 suggests otherwise as online blogger Veronica Puller (on the 11th of August post-vote) said that it "isn't twitter fault" and places the blame on the people organising it. Yet, this view may be unreliable as ~~the~~ the source is from an ~~online~~ social media consultant, ~~posting~~ online, suggesting that she would be bias, in the favor, towards social media as it gives her a job, therefore, feels strongly about it. Nevertheless ~~the~~ the source does have support in Maria Fats

((a) continued) statement saying social media was used for "exchanging photos to identify victims" which opposes the initial view that social media is a "force for evil".

Additionally, although source 12 states that it is "merely a tool for communication", it also states that criminals can communicate in "large numbers" and "quickly". This ~~implies~~ implies that without the use of social media, criminals may not be able to have communicated so "securely", therefore, maybe a driving "force for evil". This is supported by David Cameron's statement on August 10th 2011, on the last day of the London riots - he stated social media can be "used for ill".

Nonetheless, this statement may be unreliable as majority of the voters are elderly and aren't used to new forms of social media, therefore, he would lean toward blaming it and saying there is a need to "stop" people using it "for violence", but this could be contradicted and therefore, unless Cameron also states, in source 11, that it "can be used for good". The fact that it can be "used for good", can be seen in source 10 which states social media can be used to "resolve the problems on the streets of London". However, ^{Margaret} ~~she~~ would put this view forward as her group ("Big Brother Watch") aims to protect civil liberties, therefore, she becomes hypocritical when stating social media to be used for "further violence".

(a) continued) but subtly hints that it ~~can~~ can be "used for good" toward the end of her speech, to promote her own campaign of 'civil liberties', therefore the source may be unreliable. Contrasting to the source's unreliability, it may be extremely reliable as other quotations in another source support it as source 12 states that "it is the [like-minded] people to blame" - not social media, provoking to not seem like "the force of evil".

Lastly, the fact that the ~~police~~ police were seen to be facing "new circumstances" ^(in source 11) suggests social media may be used more and more, as the police aren't familiar with this severity of organised crime and the fact that "40% of teens" own a 'BlackBerry' could imply that it is "the force for evil". However, as David Cameron states that the public were "shocked" how the riots were organised on "social media" ^(source 11) and "limiting social networking in the public sphere will not limit violence" ^(source 12) suggests that it is not usually social media being the cause for such violence, and therefore, may not be the "force for evil".

To conclude, despite there being some opinions that social media can be "used for good", ^(source 11) throughout all sources, the fact that "rioters used BlackBerry to communicate" ^(source 10) suggests that it was the social media

(a) continued) communication that enabled the riots to occur on a large scale, therefore is the "force for evil".



This is a level 4 response. Although the conclusion is rather weak, essentially presenting a summary of the views in the sources, the answer as a whole demonstrates sustained judgement based upon the evidence in the sources used as a set. The candidate focuses upon the task of cross referencing, both the source content and the source attributes. For example, the candidate uses the evidence of Source 10 to verify the views expressed in source 12 by an online blogger who would be expected to have a positive outlook on social media. The candidate therefore demonstrates a range of skills which allows entry to level 4.

Question 2 (b) (i)

Only a small minority of candidates answered this question. The best responses focused on the ways in which the BBC might be seen to have mishandled the issue against the context of a very controversial war. However, there was common vagueness about the Iraq Dossier and a tendency to very literal responses, or irrelevant comments were made about other events. Few candidates knew anything about the case of Dr David Kelly beyond the sources. However, they did tend to engage well with the source material and argue convincingly from these. As seen across unit 2, too many candidates engaged in fruitless comments on the provenance of sources.

* (b) i

plan	no	yes
13	Alastair Campbell Just retire him	BBC chairman Undemanded BBC → BBC Made it worse
14	Campbell's fault - had no wish	
15	Hutton Report perfect in	Greg Dyke - head of BBC

① yes → should have stayed behind
 ② No → showed truth
 ③ No → Freedom of speech.

● The BBC's handling of the Iraq Dossier was a controversial issue which is shown through all of the sources 13, 14 and 15. On it seems that whilst sources 14 and 15 largely deny that the BBC mishandled the Iraq Dossier and death of David Kelly in 2003 source 13 claims that in fact BBC were at fault despite the self interest of the government and in particular, Alastair Campbell. Altogether it is evident that the BBC did not mishandle the controversy surrounding the Iraq Dossier but the death of David Kelly but

((b) continued) actually dealt with it in an honest & manner at the disapproval of many politicians.

Primarily, it can be argued that the BBC did mishandle the controversy surrounding the Iraq Dossier and death of David Kelly as the BBC failed to convey both sides of the argument and exacerbated the situation. Source 13 actually claims that 'BBC was at the centre of a storm that it had itself created'. Thus, Christopher Bland clearly blames the BBC for mishandling the information surrounding the Iraq Dossier and for not controlling Andrew Gilligan when he leaked the information that in fact the Iraq missiles could not ~~be used to~~ explode in 45 minutes and in fact it was for Alastair Campbell's own benefit as he could use this as a reason for why Britain could go to war. However, Bland claims that reporting this was a huge mistake as it allowed Alastair Campbell, a spin doctor, to deal effectively with the situation and clear his own name as this caused Dr David Kelly to commit suicide, which enabled The Hutton Inquiry to clear the government's name. However, as the provenance of source 13 is from an ~~a~~ previous chairman of the BBC, ~~perhaps~~ surely he is more likely to be critical of the new chairman of the BBC as he could claim that in fact he could have dealt with the problem more effectively. Therefore, the ^{evidence suggest that the} BBC did mishandle the

((b) continued) story as they continually denied they made an error by defending Gilligan, whereas if they had dealt with the claim by admitting that Gilligan did in fact make errors perhaps the BBC would not have been blamed as much as it was.

On the other hand, it can be argued that the BBC in fact did not mishandle the story but simply explained the facts of the controversy, much like what many investigative journalists were doing at the time. In fact, both sources 14 and 15 agree as they defend the BBC by claiming that the BBC was within its rights. Source 15 claims that 'I will always defend the actions I took at the BBC' and describes this as a 'vicious attack' against the BBC whereas source 14 claims it was also an 'attack'. Subsequently, this suggests that actually perhaps the government are more to blame for suggesting attacking the BBC after they uncovered the truth, especially as the 'Butler Report' had already said that the 45 minute claim might not be true. However, as source 15 is written by Greg Pyke, it is not surprising that his tone is extremely critical of Campbell and the government as undoubtedly he is trying to defend his actions against what he has the BBC dealt with the problem. On the other hand, this pro-nance can also argue that if Greg Pyke

((b) continued) really did not believe that the BBC were in the wrong, he would have not apologised and then not resign. Thus, the strength and courage exhibited by Dyle could also convey how he genuinely believes the BBC were in the right ~~As this is also support~~ and that the BBC did not mishandle the story.

Lastly, it can also be argued that the BBC did not mishandle the Iraq Dossier and death of David Kelly as actually politicians were embarrassed by the claim and therefore the only reason why the BBC were blamed in the first place is due to the self seeking attitudes of Alastair Campbell who was desperate to defend himself. All source 13, 14 and 15 agree to a certain extent that it was not solely BBC's fault. Source 13 says how 'Alastair Campbell was able to exploit this to the full' and source 14 agrees by saying 'Campbell used the BBC as a decoy'. Therefore, ~~it seems~~ ~~that~~ Campbell used the BBC's story to defend his own actions as he knew his ~~st~~ embarrassing false 45 minute statement was not completely true but managed to divert attention away from this and on to the mistakes of the BBC instead of himself by blaming and attacking Gilligan for revealing the information whilst Campbell defended his 45 minute claim. Thus, as the

((b) continued) BBC simply recorded 'Dr Kelly's concerns' (source 15) really they did not report anything wrong. It can be viewed that the government repeatedly blame others for their own mistakes; this is exemplified once again in the sinking of the Belgrano in 1982 where Thatcher defended the ship being outside the total exclusion zone and sailing away from Argentina despite knowing in reality it was. Thus, the evidence suggests that it is ~~not completely~~ the BBC did not mishandle the information but simply recorded the concerns and truth of the Iraq Dossier.

Altogether, it is not possible to only use the sources to arrive at a conclusion as to whether the BBC did mishandle the Iraq Dossier and death of David Kelly in 2003 as it is important to consider similar incidents that the BBC had uncovered information to the public. Whilst source 13 argues that the BBC made the situation worse by denying any charges sources 14 and 15 disagree and blame the government for their attacks on BBC and not being truthful. Therefore, altogether it appears that the BBC did not mishandle the Iraq Dossier and death of David Kelly but simply exposed the facts, which in a period of investigative journalism is fairly standard.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a level 4 response for both assessment objectives. The conflicting claims in the sources are clearly outlined in the introduction. Source 13 is used effectively to establish the view that the BBC mishandled the controversy, and the opinion is tested with some precise knowledge and sound reasoning, enabling the candidate to establish the validity of the argument. The counter claim, that the BBC was not at fault, is explored through an examination of the evidence in sources 14 and 15. The candidate assesses the role of Alistair Campbell in some detail. The references to the Belgrano affair do not add anything to this answer. Overall, this is strongly argued from the sources with sufficient skilful deployment of knowledge to achieve level 4.

Question 2 (b) (ii)

This was a very popular question. The best responses were well focused, using both sources and own knowledge to construct an argument. These responses really engaged with the phrase 'throughout the 1960s'. Understanding and interpretation of the source material was good. Candidates brought in detailed knowledge about record sales, merchandising, the change in musical style in the later 1960s and the demographics of the audience to test the sources and to reach a supported judgement. However, many candidates knew little about the Beatles, and used the question to develop knowledge about the social changes in the 1960s in general or to consider the impact on One Direction and other 'boy bands'. These approaches depressed candidates' achievement within the levels.

- * (b) ii
- Source and Disagree
- 16 "increasingly turning to those people as guides" "want faces" "fearful of borrowing out of taste"
- 17 "monopolised attention of the press" "never universally popular"
- 18 "many people identified with them" "now more intellectual audience"

The sources all have differing views on elements of each source as they all both agree and disagree with the fact that the Beatles were massively popular throughout the 60s. As they outline the Beatles were not loved by all and possibly only loved by a certain age group or at a certain time in the 60s.

Elements of all the sources agree that the Beatles were mainly popular throughout the 60s. However it is primarily source 18 who supports this claim as it identifies that "many people identified with them" implying that they were seen as the people's band or working class band due to their background in Liverpool and how they had worked up through the ranks in Germany and had not been handed fame. Source 17 agrees with source 18 as it

((b) continued) suggests that the Beatles "monopolised the attention of the press" and it has been shown that the press primarily cover what the people want in order to sell the most copies suggesting that the Beatles is what the people wanted. This point is emphasised by the fact that Paul McCartney appeared on the cover of *Jackie* a number of times and in 1970 the Beatles had sold over £100 million pounds worth of merchandise suggesting that everyone wanted a piece of the Beatles. Source 16 also partly agrees with source 17 and 18 in that it claims* that the government "were increasingly turning to these young people as guides" suggesting that due to their mass popularity the governments had to be seen to be keeping up with the times and be in touch with the people. Furthermore the figure that over 65% of people of people were working class at this time means that if the working classes liked something governments had to be seen to be taking their interests seriously. Overall, ~~it can~~ the sources suggest that due to their mass press coverage and popularity with working classes the Beatles did achieve mass popularity through being in touch with the majority group.

((b) continued) However both sources 16 and 17 agree that the Beatles did not achieve mass popularity in the sixties and their popularity was limited to generations or short time periods. Firstly source 16 suggests that many of the government and many other people led them out of fear "of becoming out of date" implying that they only liked the Beatles to satisfy others and would not listen to their music. However, source 16 is from the New Statesman ~~was~~ is a left wing magazine and therefore they may not like the Beatles relationship with the establishments through their OBE's and it is written before many of their liberalist views on Vietnam and nuclear disarmament appeared.

Source 17 supports source 16 in that the Beatles were never "universally popular" implying that it was groups of people who fell in love with the Beatles and not the country as a whole. This is emphasised by the fact that around 95% of the Beatles shows were teenage girls and this is why they stopped playing live as they couldn't hear the music over the screams.

Overall, both sources 16 and 17 show the Beatles to be only for the young and this mass popularity is misrepresented by the young generation as they are nostalgic about their youth.

(b) continued) Finally it could also be argued that the Beatles mass popularity was limited to certain generations and certain periods during the sixties. Source 16 suggests that people who flock round the Beatles are the "least fortunate of their generation" implying that it is a specific generation that the Beatles had an effect on not the whole of society. Source 17 agrees with source 16 showing that "as the Beatles departed from their conservative image of 1963, the more people disliked them" implying that due to their controversial views, John Lennon once saying that they "were bigger than Jesus now" they polarised certain groups. Such as this comment which is arrogant and may have affected religious groups who in 1965 70% of people still believed in God and 17% went to church showing this comments would turn off a lot of society. Furthermore source 18 supports both source 16 and 17 claiming that due to their drugs use "they lost many of their former fans" implying that the Beatles were not majority popular for the whole of the sixties but for short periods shown by their 12 number 1 albums the majority of which coming in the period 1964-68. Overall, it can be seen that all the sources agree that while there was mass hysteria and popularity for the Beatles when they first arrived

((b) continued) this did not last for the whole decade as when the Beatles move more into psychedelic music - 'Lucy in the Sky with Diamonds' they lost many loyal fans.

Conclusively, the sources seem to disagree on the Beatles' mass popularity source 16 and 17 stating they were never universally popular due to their controversial views and often their often perceived arrogance. However source 18 suggests the Beatles shared society and decisions which needed mass support and were a very popular band with a number of number 1 suggestions their music have been some form of mass popularity. Overall, it is clear that the Beatles were incredibly popular due to their style, music and looks which gripped the country. However, this intense hold on the country lasted was only apparent in the mid-60s when they were at their peak and statistics shows the vast majority of their audiences were teenagers so they cannot have had mass popularity throughout the 1960s.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a level 4 response for both assessment objectives. The introduction is not the strongest feature of the answer, as it lacks specific reference to the source, but it does outline the conflicting arguments with regard to the popularity of the Beatles throughout the 1960s. The candidate begins by examining the case for 'massive popularity'. Sources 17 and 18 are used to establish the claim and are tested with some detailed own knowledge about record sales, merchandise and social class. The response then turns to consider the case against 'massive popularity'. Statistics are used effectively to argue that popularity was based mainly in teenage audiences. Finally the candidate addresses the question of 'throughout the 1960s' and uses the sources and knowledge to consider changing and diminishing popularity by the end of the 1960s. This is a strength in the answer. The conclusion is well focused and brings the response to a supported judgement.

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', without actually engaging in that task.

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. Weaker candidates work through sources sequentially. Such responses cannot go beyond level 2.
- 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 sweeping assertions from the provenance that could apply to any source and avoid labelling a source as both reliable and unreliable without coming to any judgement on its worth.
- 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. Weaker responses usually 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. Sources should be used to develop lines of argument and reasoning rather than used for information to develop a descriptive answer.
- 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 the time period specified. They should maintain the focus throughout their answer and 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>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



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