

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2015

Pearson Edexcel GCE in History (6HI02/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 2015

Publications Code US041780

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

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 MarkPoint 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

QoWC will have a bearing if the QoWC 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 QoWC 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>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-5 marks 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>Low Level 2: 6-7 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 8-10 marks 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>Low Level 3: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 3: 13-15 marks 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 the content will bear in relation to the specific enquiry. In addressing 'how far' the sources are used in combination.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 16-17 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 4: 18-20 marks 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 & 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>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 1: 5-6 marks 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>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 2: 11-12 marks 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>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 3: 17-18 marks 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 own 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>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 4: 23-24 marks 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)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-4	<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>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-4 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	5-8	<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>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 7-8 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	9-12	<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>Low Level 3: 9-10 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 3: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
4	13-16	<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>Low Level 4: 13-14 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 4: 15-16 marks 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
Total Marks	24	20	16	60
% weighting	10%	8%	7%	25%

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>1 (a)</p>	<p>The question is focused on the reasons for the Conservative party's defeat in the 1964 general election. All three sources can be used to support the contention in the question. Source 2 hints at a negative public persona while Source 3 pinpoints the deciding factor in defeat as a mistake Home made over timing. The more perceptive may, however, suggest that this latter point is little more than a self-serving attempt by a former colleague to avoid responsibility for political failure. Although Home, in Source 1, is trying to downplay his poor electioneering, some candidates may suggest that the very fact that he is prepared to make this admission of weakness adds to its value as evidence. Candidates may identify Home's background as a factor in the defeat by cross-referencing Home's aristocratic hauteur alluded to by Grimond in Source 2 with Home's argument in Source 1 that television viewers did not warm to him and by his description of hecklers as 'young hooligans'.</p> <p>All three sources can also be used to present the counter-argument. Home identifies long-term factors as the key, and this is also hinted at in Source 3 with the reference to breaking 'the <i>stop-go cycle</i>'. Grimond in Source 2 asserts that Home himself was not the problem ('<i>trusted by many floating voters</i>') and suggests that the outcome depended on fine-tuning in the last week of the campaign.</p> <p>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. Some candidates may consider that Home was in a good position to know what went wrong with the election campaign, whilst others may use argue that Home cannot take an impartial view of events being so closely linked and that he is, in fact, on the defensive in explaining the defeat. Candidates may use the provenance of Source 2 to argue that, as a socialist, Grimond is bound to argue that Home was '<i>too aristocratic</i>' and '<i>out of touch</i>'. On the other hand, his claim that the Tories would have won has considerable merit, coming from a political rival, and candidates may suggest that this view presents a more objective assessment of the reasons for failure. Source 3 may be considered to be offering excuses for the election failure by a key member of the Government who blames Home for the defeat rather than the longer term failures of the Conservative government.</p> <p>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. Whatever judgement is reached, it must be backed by appropriate evidence and the best will show some awareness of the subjective nature of the source material and their attitudes towards Sir Alec Douglas-Home.</p>	<p>20</p>

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (i)	<p>The question is focused on the Conservative party's defeat in the election campaign of 1945. There should be a clear awareness of the debate that surrounds this topic, in particular the relative importance that is attached to the long-term shift towards the socialist agenda as opposed to the short-term mismanagement of the election by the Conservatives generally and Churchill specifically. The significance of the election campaign in general, and the Conservatives' ineffective attempts to smear Labour in particular, are alluded to in Source 4. This can then be cross-referred with Source 5, which those with greater contextual knowledge will recognise as Attlee's response to Churchill's infamous 'Gestapo' speech. The more perceptive may well suggest that Churchill's attack must have had some effect, or at least contemporaries must have thought this was the case, if Attlee felt it necessary to make a direct reply on radio. A further weakness in the Tory election campaign is alluded to in Source 6 where Ramsden notes the lack of substance in the Tory programme; an accusation which could not be thrown at the Labour party. The more knowledgeable candidates will be able to develop the impact the campaigning had on the outcome of the election by contrasting the Conservatives' approach on personalities with the Labour Party's focus on policies, and in particular the two key issues of housing and employment. They may refer to the role played by the Daily Mirror in promoting the Labour Party as the only party that could maintain peace in post-war Britain. The counter-view is clearly presented in Source 4 with the significance of long-term social, political and economic trends being highlighted. More knowledgeable candidates should be able to develop some of the themes raised in the source regarding the growth of collectivism and the public's heightened expectations of life in post-war Britain.</p> <p>Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of the sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the reasons why Churchill and the Conservative party were rejected in 1945, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the view.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (ii)	<p>The question is focused on the reasons behind Margaret Thatcher's fall from power in November 1990. Candidates will most probably start with Source 7, the source of the quotation in the question. Source 7's assertion that Thatcher had lost cabinet support can be cross-referred with Source 8 and Clark's account of Geoffrey Howe's resignation speech and the impact it made in Parliament, although the more perceptive will be aware of the somewhat melodramatic and scurrilous nature of Clark's diaries. Candidates should be able to deploy their own knowledge to develop this line of argument further by exploring both the immediate repercussions of Howe's resignation and the impact of earlier high profile resignations by ministers, notably Michael Heseltine and Nigel Lawson. The more knowledgeable will be able to develop the significance of Meyer's 'stalking horse' challenge to Thatcher and will understand the importance of the source's concluding phrase 'credible candidate'. The case for the counter-argument is clearly presented in Source 9 presents the longer view by exploring the underlying economic and political failings which fatally weakened Thatcher's base of support. Again, candidates should be able to use their own knowledge to elaborate on the extent and nature of both the economic recession that late 1980s' Britain was experiencing and the opposition the poll tax generated. The more able will be able to make explicit links between these problems and the declining public and Party confidence in Thatcher`. It may be argued, therefore, that the leadership contest, outlined in source 7, which triggered Thatcher's resignation had more to do with long-term weaknesses than short-term ministerial defections.</p> <p>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 interaction between the long and short-term factors which resulted in the downfall 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
<p>2 (a)</p>	<p>All three sources provide some evidence to support the contention in the question that reality TV is a bad influence. Source 10 presents this argument most strongly and many candidates may choose to start here. Source 10 claims that reality TV has led to '<i>the glorification of low culture and low moral standards</i>' and argues that bad behaviour by school pupils can be directly related to programmes such as '<i>Celebrity Big Brother</i>'. Candidates may cross reference these claims with the evidence in Source 11 that Big Brother is '<i>a bit juvenile</i>' and infer from the statement in Source 12 that '<i>Reality television broke all the rules</i>' that this rule breaking can be interpreted in term of bad behaviour and low standards and thus reality TV has had a negative impact.</p> <p>The counter-argument can be found in Sources 11 and 12. Both sources offer arguments in support of reality TV; Source 11 argues that it is useful preparation for young people by enabling them to rehearse '<i>what they will be asked to do in elections</i>' while Source 12 can be used to argue that it can be regarded as a form of modern art and inferences may be drawn about the positive impact of innovative television.</p> <p>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. Some may argue that the teacher in Source 10 will have a privileged insight into youth behaviour while others may suggest that view offered could have been unfairly shaped by the focus of the inquiry, or by pressures on teaching staff to find excuses for bad behaviour that originate outside of their management of pupils' conduct. Candidates may use the provenance of Source 11 to argue that Bazalgette has a vested interest in extolling the merits of Reality TV as the creative director of the company that produced '<i>Big Brother</i>' and that he cannot be regarded as impartial. They may argue that the very fact Bazalgette feels obliged to put up such a questionable defence of <i>Big Brother</i> highlights how widespread is the view that the programme is a bad influence. They may contrast his position with that of the author of Source 1 who was also involved in the production of reality TV, in the 1970s. Some candidates may argue that he takes a more balanced view of reality TV being aware of both its merits and disadvantages; other may argue that he is merely emphasising the value of his own work whilst being more critical of the way that the genre developed subsequently.</p> <p>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. Whatever judgement is reached, it must be backed by</p>	<p>20</p>

	appropriate evidence and the best responses will be aware of the importance of evaluating content in the light of context and provenance.	
--	---	--

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (i)	<p>The focus of the question is on the treatment of ethnic minorities on television and the impact this has had on race relations generally. Candidates will most likely access Source 14 as a starting point for the argument in favour of the contention in the question, with the list of presenters and newsreaders being used as a platform for candidates to explore and exemplify the positive role models that have appeared on television in the last three decades. The counter-view appears in Source 15 where Briggs and Colbey assert that negative images of 'Blackness' dominated the TV screens from the late fifties to the late seventies, with the Black and White Minstrel Show being the most egregious example of racism passing for popular entertainment. Although Source 13 would appear to be in direct opposition to this line of argument, the more able may suggest that Sylvestre's claim that her character did a tremendous amount of good is a little self-serving. Indeed, at the very highest levels, the argument might be made that the very fact that so much is being made of the beneficial impact of one character in a soap merely serves to highlight the general paucity of such positive images in TV at this time.</p> <p>Candidates should, from their own knowledge, be able to support and exemplify the counter-view, with credit being given according to the range and depth of the material deployed. The more perceptive will be aware that Sources 14 and 15 do not, in fact, conflict but simply point to a temporal shift in the depiction of racial minorities on TV. Those operating at higher levels will be able to link this shift to changing cultural attitudes, placing televisual representations of racial minorities firmly in the context of the times.</p> <p>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 debates surrounding the nature and impact of the representation of ethnic minorities on television, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<p>2 (b) (ii)</p>	<p>The question is focused on the role the media played in uncovering the political controversy surrounding the sinking of the <i>Belgrano</i>. Candidates may well start with Source 16 which presents evidence in support of the contention by making a direct link between the <i>Observer</i> expose of 19 August 1984 and the ensuing 'political controversy'. Both Sources 17 and 18, by their very nature, add weight to this line of argument. Source 18 is steeped in irony and candidates who can make reference to the need of Thatcher and Heseltine to sink the "Belgrano Affair" should be credited.</p> <p>From their own knowledge candidates should be able to provide additional detail on the role of the media in applying and maintaining pressure on the government. Here Ponting's recourse to the press as a means of publicising his case and Thatcher's interview on <i>Nationwide</i> are likely to feature. Source 17 can be used to present the counter-argument. Cook is pointing out that the press did not uncover the affair but merely reported on it, although the more perceptive may argue that his interpretation owes a lot to party political point scoring.</p> <p>Nonetheless, candidates should be able to corroborate this interpretation through their own knowledge of the genesis of the controversy. Here, the initial controversy surrounding the sinking of the cruiser, the nature of the conspiracy claims and the roles played by Clive Ponting and Tam Dalyell in publicising these claims should all feature. Candidates should be rewarded according to the range, depth and relevance of the material deployed.</p> <p>Whatever line of argument is followed, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of nature and extent of the media's involvement in developing the controversy surrounding the sinking of the <i>Belgrano</i>, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	<p>40</p>

