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General Marking Guidance

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

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

  iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.
GCE History Marking Guidance

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

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

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

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

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

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

Assessing Quality of Written Communication
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%)**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | 1-5  | 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.  
**Low Level 1: 1-2 marks**  
The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 1: 3-5 marks**  
The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed. |
| 2     | 6-10 | 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.  
**Low Level 2: 6-7 marks**  
The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 2: 8-10 marks**  
The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed. |
| 3     | 11-15| 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.  
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.  
**Low Level 3: 11-12 marks**  
The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 3: 13-15 marks**  
The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>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 they will bear in relation to the specific enquiry. In addressing ‘how far’ the sources are used in combination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Low Level 4: 16-17 marks**
The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.

**High Level 4: 18-20 marks**
The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.

*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)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</strong>&lt;br&gt;The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks</strong>&lt;br&gt;As per descriptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>High Level 1: 5-6 marks</strong>&lt;br&gt;The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks</strong>&lt;br&gt;The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks</strong>&lt;br&gt;As per descriptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>High Level 2: 11-12 marks</strong>&lt;br&gt;The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Marks</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3     | 13-18 | Candidates 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.  
**Low Level 3: 13-14 marks**  
The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.  
**Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks**  
As per descriptor  
**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.  
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. |
| 4     | 19-24 | Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material, which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. There will be some integration of contextual knowledge with material drawn from sources, although this may not be sustained throughout the response. The selection of material may lack balance in places.  
**Low Level 4: 19-20 marks**  
The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.  
**Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks**  
As per descriptor  
**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.  
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. |

*NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*
AO2b (16 marks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       |      | **Low Level 1: 1-2 marks**  
The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth. |
|       |      | **High Level 1: 3-4 marks**  
The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed. |
| 2     | 5-8  | 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. |
|       |      | **Low Level 2: 5-6 marks**  
The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth. |
|       |      | **High Level 2: 7-8 marks**  
The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed. |
| 3     | 9-12 | 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 the 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. |
|       |      | **Low Level 3: 9-10 marks**  
The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth. |
|       |      | **High Level 3: 11-12 marks**  
The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed. |
| 4     | 13-16| 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. |
|       |      | **Low Level 4: 13-14 marks**  
The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth. |
|       |      | **High Level 4: 15-16 marks**  
The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed. |

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

Unit 2 Assessment Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>AO1a and b Marks</th>
<th>AO2a Marks</th>
<th>AO2b Marks</th>
<th>Total marks for question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q (a)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q (b)(i) or (ii)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Marks</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% weighting</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the surface both Sources 1 and 2 would appear to provide a significant challenge to the damning appraisal of Macmillan presented by Harold Wilson in Source 3. The famous portrayal of Macmillan as ‘Supermac’ in Source 1 can be cross-referred with Kilmuir’s description of the prime minister’s self-assured demeanour and mastery of the Commons in Source 2 to present a firm challenge to the dithering politician depicted by Wilson in Source 3. Indeed, Wilson’s reference to ‘the Macwonder’ of 1959 will be picked up by many as a direct challenge to the image in Source 1. However, closer reading of both the provenance and content of the sources should enable higher performing candidates to qualify the extent of the challenge. Thus, in reconciling the apparent conflict between Sources 1 and 3, the more astute will not only be aware of the ironic tone of the Vicky cartoon but will also appreciate the importance of the disparity in dates. Despite Vicky’s intentions, the sobriquet ‘Supermac’ may well have seemed appropriate in 1958, in the light of Britain’s recovery after Suez, but it certainly didn’t in the midst of the economic downturn and political scandals of the early 1960s. Similarly, Kilmuir is focusing on the personal attributes of Macmillan in Source 2 whereas Wilson’s objective in Source 3 is to highlight the political turmoil that the Conservatives found themselves in by 1962. Although Wilson does underscore the political assault with a personal attack on Macmillan, the more able will recognise this to be part of the accepted rhetoric of a parliamentary exchange. In arriving at any judgement, those performing at higher levels will not only use detailed cross-referencing to highlight areas of agreement and disagreement, but also display an awareness of the importance of audience and timing in evaluating the strength of any challenge.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (b) (i)</td>
<td>The question is focused on the post-war construction under the Labour governments of 1945-51 and the extent to which the policies they pursued reduced social inequalities in Britain. Candidates may well start with the extract from Nick Tiratsoo in Source 6 in which support is provided for the view that a reduction in poverty was accompanied by a move towards greater social equality. This position can be cross-referred to the contrast made in the Labour manifesto of 1951 between the pre and post-war worlds. From their own knowledge candidates should be able to develop the reference to welfare to explore the gains which accrued from Labour policies in this area, with the newly established NHS likely to feature strongly. The more astute may see in the use of the word ‘want’ (Source 4) an allusion to the language of the Beveridge Report and use this as a platform to investigate the range of reforms that underpinned Labour’s construction of ‘New Jerusalem’. However, candidates should also appreciate the qualifications contained in the manifesto which, for some, will take on additional significance given the nature of the document. Thus, the admission that ‘much more remains to be done’ could act as a starting point for an examination of the limits to social reform in the period. Education is singled out, and here the more knowledgeable may argue that the continuation of the tripartite system of schooling did little to promote social equality. Andrew Marr in Source 5 presents further evidence to support this standpoint, with his depiction of a socially stratified Britain supported by Tiratsoo’s claim in Source 6 that Attlee’s government stopped short of carrying out (albeit intentionally) a ‘social revolution’. Candidates may develop this line of reasoning by examining the impact that pragmatism and austerity had on the scope of Labour’s reforms. 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 impact and limitations of Labour’s social reform programme, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The question is focused on the reasons behind the Conservative party’s triumph in the election of 1979. Source 7 fully supports the contention in the question and provides candidates with a platform to examine the factors that underpinned the declining support for Labour. The more astute will be able to pick up on the reference to the end of the ‘socialist era’ to assess the extent to which events in the mid to late 1970s had made the triumph of Thatcher’s new monetarist approach inevitable. The counterview is clearly presented by Chris Rowe in Source 9. The more knowledgeable should be able to develop the reference to the timing of the election by exploring the impact of the ‘winter of discontent’ on Labour’s fortunes. Thus, there should be an awareness shown of the reaction of other parties to the government’s difficulties, the importance of the ‘no confidence’ vote in March 1979 and how the Conservatives made political capital out of Labour’s apparent inability to deal with the crisis. Those performing at higher levels will appreciate that all three sources, either directly or indirectly, allude to the fact that the outcome was by no means considered to be a certainty by contemporary commentators. Source 7 notes that only in retrospect has such a line of argument developed, Source 9 stresses Thatcher’s lack of popularity with the electorate of the day and Source 8 gives the impression that the result was in the lap of the gods. Although the more able may suggest that Thatcher is employing the dramatic licence of the autobiographer, the reference to election preparations does allow those with wider contextual knowledge to examine both the nature and focus of the Conservatives’ campaign and the impact this had on the result. 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 importance of long and short-term factors in the defeat of Labour in 1979, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.
On the surface Sources 10 and 11 would appear to pose a considerable challenge to the impression of Diana as the seasoned, media-savvy operator given in Source 12. In Source 10, Diana is portrayed as an innocent victim of the press and Spencer’s suggestion that she was eager to avoid exposure in the media is supported by the testimony of her bodyguard in Source 11. However, closer reading of both the text and provenance of the sources should enable candidates to arrive at a more nuanced judgement. Thus, the more astute may question the impartiality of the authors of Sources 10 and 11. The devotion of a close relative and the loyalty of a former employee to the memory of Diana should hardly come as a surprise, especially when the sensitive timing of both sources is taken into consideration. In addition, the overtly defensive tone of the interview in Source 11 may lead higher performing candidates to draw the inference that the image of Diana as a ‘self-publicist’ had become firmly fixed in the public consciousness. This could then be cross-referred with the royal family’s criticisms of Diana as ‘manipulative’ alluded to in Source 12. However, here the more able will note that Source 12 is representing Diana as a pragmatist rather than a self-publicist. Thus, the impression of Diana as the victim of intrusive media attention given in Sources 10 and 11, far from challenging Source 12’s view of her as an adroit handler of the press, can be seen, instead, to be supporting it by providing the rationale for such collusion. At the highest levels, responses will explicitly address ‘how far’ the impression given in Source 12 of Diana’s relationship with the media is challenged by Sources 10 and 11 through a close examination of both the content and nature of the sources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (b) (i)</td>
<td>The question is focused on the importance of imported American film and television programmes in British cultural and social life of the 1950s and 1960s. Candidates may well start with Sources 14 and 15 which both support the contention in the question by pointing to the popularity and dominance of American productions in British cinemas and TV schedules. From their own knowledge candidates may develop this line of reasoning by exploring the emergence of Independent Television in the mid-1950s and its penchant for programmes either directly imported from America or styled on American formats. Equally, the crossover between music and film/TV output alluded to in Source 14 can be used to highlight the growing Americanisation of British popular culture in this period. The more able will pick up on the reference to 'glamour' in Source 15 and 'wealth and excitement' in Source 14 to site the process securely in context, with the affluence of America acting as a sharp counterpoint to the austerity of Britain in the 1950s. The counterview is presented in Source 13. Higher performing candidates will be aware that as a result of the concerns over Americanisation referred to in Source 13, the ITA introduced a number of guidelines to encourage domestic programming. The more astute will also appreciate the significance of the time periods covered by the three sources, pointing towards a shift in cultural outlook across the period. Thus, the cultural colonisation that made America the land of 'mystique' in the 1950s (Source 14) had been replaced by a rejuvenated 'swinging' Britain in the 1960s, and this was reflected, to an extent, on the big and small screens. Alternatively, the 'glamour' which so attracted the young woman to American films in the early 1950s (Source 15) began to be challenged by the social realism of the British 'New Wave' at the end of the decade. 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 extent and nature of the impact of American programming on British visual and popular culture, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Number</td>
<td>Indicative content</td>
<td>Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (b) (ii)</td>
<td>The question is focused on the speed with which new technologies can disseminate news and views, and the impact this has had on individual citizens. Candidates may well start with Sources 17 and 18 which clearly support the contention in the question. Source 17 stresses that increased output and accessibility by no means represents an improved service for the consumer, with production pressures undermining the professional practices of both editors and journalists. This can be cross-referenced with the points raised in Source 18 about the instantaneous and ever-present nature of news output in the world of high-speed communications. Here candidates could, from their own knowledge, examine the deleterious impact of the 24/7 news cycle and the pressure to retain audience share in an increasingly competitive market on the quality and scope of news programming. The more knowledgeable may also argue that an increasing ‘nichification’ of news has been one consequence of the new technologies highlighted in Source 18, as people take advantage of their ability to select only that information which matches their interests. This may or may not be seen as benefiting the consumer. The counterview is presented by Marsha Jones in Source 16. The focus on democratisation and accessibility in the source can, on the surface, be supported by cross-referencing with the first two sentences of the Nordensen extract in Source 18. However, the more astute will appreciate that what for Jones was a revolutionary step forward has, for Nordensen, merely resulted ‘unpackaged’ news. Higher performing candidates will be able to reconcile this apparent conflict by noting the difference in publication dates. Jones was writing at a time when internet use was still relatively new (strong candidates will be aware of the use of the future tense), before the information overload that informs Nordensen’s opinions had become a reality. From their own knowledge, candidates should be able to explore the impact that the growth of new technology has had on news output and the dissemination of views. Thus, the start date in the question allows for an exploration of the development of Sky TV (1989), the WorldWideWeb (1991) and SMS text messaging (1991). Analysis may well be supported with references to particular news stories by way of exemplification and this should be rewarded according to the relevance and range of the material deployed. 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 impact new technology had on the nature of news production and the dissemination of views, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>