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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>4</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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>
</tbody>
</table>
|       |      | **Low Level 1: 1-2 marks**  
The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth. |
|       |      | **Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks**  
As per descriptor |
|       |      | **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. |
|       |      | 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. |
| 2     | 7-12 | 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. |
|       |      | **Low Level 2: 7-8 marks**  
The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth. |
|       |      | **Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks**  
As per descriptor |
|       |      | **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. |
|       |      | 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. |
| 3 | 13-18 | 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.  
**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**<br>The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 1: 3-4 marks**<br>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**<br>The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 2: 7-8 marks**<br>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**<br>The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 3: 11-12 marks**<br>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**<br>The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 4: 15-16 marks**<br>The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed. |

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

### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (a)</td>
<td>Candidates may well start with Source 3 which, on the surface at least, appears to support the contention in the question, with a firm line against Labour’s commitment to nationalisation being taken by the Conservatives in the election of 1951. This line of argument can be supported by cross-referencing with Attlee’s summation of Churchill’s view in Source 1 that ‘things should be left as they are’. However, closer reading of the sources and careful consideration of both their context and provenance should enable higher performing candidates to qualify the extent to which the two parties’ positions on nationalisation did, in fact, diverge. Thus, many will be aware that the purpose of Source 3 is to accentuate ideological differences and will note that even here the manifesto falls short of condemning Labour’s nationalisation policy in totality. Indeed, those with good contextual knowledge will recognise that the Iron and Steel Act highlighted for repeal was virtually the only contentious aspect of an otherwise relatively uncontroversial, yet wide-ranging, programme of nationalisation undertaken by Labour in its first term. This point can be corroborated by Attlee’s reference to the coal industry in Source 1 and his assertion that there is an almost universal acknowledgement that ‘something has to be done with’ it. To underline just how close the two parties stood on the issue, candidates could also highlight the significance of Attlee’s observation that Churchill’s ‘wild words’ were unrepresentative of the general views of the parliamentary Conservative party. Although account here should be taken of the setting, and the inevitable hyperbole of parliamentary exchanges, it should, nonetheless, be noted that the moderate subtext of the 1951 manifesto in Source 3 does appear to confirm such an assessment. Similarly, Source 2 focuses on division between moderates and radicals over public ownership, though this time within the ranks of the Labour Party. Again the more knowledgeable may recognise that this is a reference to Clause 4 of the Labour Party Constitution and will be aware that many within the Labour party, having just experienced their third election defeat in a row, now considered the commitments which the clause enshrined as being too extreme. Indeed, even those unaware of the exact context should, nonetheless, appreciate that there must have been a groundswell in favour of moderation for the elected leader of the party to issue such a public challenge. Thus, whatever judgement is reached must be backed by appropriate evidence with the better candidates recognising the importance of differentiating between party rhetoric and actual policy.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The focus of the question is on the reasons behind the Labour victory in 1964. Candidates may well start with Source 5 which puts forward the case in favour of the contention in the question by underlining the importance of Wilson’s image as an ‘ordinary man’. This view could then be cross-referenced to the cartoon in Source 6 which neatly contrasts the images of the two Party leaders in the run up to the election. The more perceptive will note that Wilson is painting from a pot labelled ‘Very Black Ink’ and will connect this with the nature of Labour’s election campaign which ruthlessly played on Sir Alec Douglas-Hume’s somewhat feudal persona. However, candidates should also note that the cartoon raises the importance of longer-term factors in the decline of the Conservative’s popularity. These are developed further in Source 4 which switches the emphasis away from the Party leaders and provides candidates with a platform to present the counter-argument. The more knowledgeable should be able to expand on some of the themes touched on in the source regarding the impact of the social and cultural shifts which had occurred in the preceding thirteen years of Tory rule, and indeed it may be observed by some that the Wilson as described by Marr in Source 5 appears to personify many of these. There should also be an awareness shown of the nature and importance of the political difficulties and scandals which plagued the Conservatives in the early 1960s. Again here the more knowledgeable may be able to conflate the significance of these with the personalities of the Party leaders. Thus, Sir Alec Douglas-Hume’s unexpected and precarious tenure of the Conservatives stands in direct opposition to Wilson’s position as unifier and moderniser of the Labour Party. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the reasons why thirteen years of Conservative rule came to an end in 1964, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.
The question is focused on the reasons behind Margaret Thatcher’s fall from power in November 1990. Candidates may well start with Sources 7 and 9 which, at least on the surface, offer evidence in support of the contention in the question. Both sources make clear references to the unpopularity of the poll tax with the general public and the disastrous impact this had on Thatcher’s tenure as prime minister. Candidates should be able to deploy their own knowledge to develop this line of argument further by exploring the nature of the tax and the effect it had in galvanising opposition both within Tory heartlands and the parliamentary Conservative party itself. However, the more perceptive will be aware that Wainwright’s political affiliations may well make him a less than dispassionate observer and that, although his conclusions appear to be supported by Source 7, Wilson is only dealing with the ‘immediate’ causes of Thatcher’s downfall. By contrast, in presenting the counter-argument, Pugh in source 8 is adopting the longer view by exploring the ‘underlying’ economic 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 the economic recession that late 1980s’ Britain was experiencing and the effect this had on the public’s and the conservative party’s confidence in Thatcherism. The more able will recognise that it was, of course, party confidence, or rather a lack of it, that was all important in triggering the leadership contest that overthrew Mrs. Thatcher, and there is scope here for the higher performers to detail the high profile series of ministerial resignations, culminating in Geoffrey Howe’s departure over Europe, that signalled the growing disillusionment within the party. 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.

{ It must be noted that here that the date in the attribution for source 9 has been incorrectly given as April 1990 rather than April 1991. Those candidates who use the anomalous dating to question the validity of the views expressed in the source should be rewarded for this line of reasoning }
Responses may well start with Source 10 which, at least on the surface, appears to present the strongest argument in support of the contention in the question, especially as the attribution intimates that Braine’s writing was rooted in personal experience. The more perceptive will be able to contextualise the source and will be aware that Braine was one of the leading lights of the ‘Angry Young Men’, a group of writers who sought to challenge prevailing social mores by presenting, in uncompromising terms, the lives and aspirations of the working-class. Similarly, they should recognise that the film Room at the Top signalled the beginning of the ‘new wave’ in British film-making, where the focus was on the authentic representation of working-class life. Lester, in source 11, also appears to be supporting the view that British cinema reflected the essence of working-class life by suggesting that films captured the zeitgeist of Britain in the mid-1960s. However, careful reading of the source, with the stress falling on ‘feeling’ and ‘sense’, may result in the more able positing that Lester was motivated more by a desire to present an impressionistic image of a new fashionable working-class than to provide a clear picture of working-class life as it really was. Although Source 12, to an extent, backs up some of the points made in Sources 10 and 11 by noting the new emphasis on ‘working-class accents and manners’ in the films of the 1960s, it, nonetheless, firmly challenges the view that these representations bore any resemblance to reality. Those performing at higher levels may seize on the reference to ‘swinging Britain’ and cross-refer this with the attribution in Source 11 to argue that many films, with their metropolitan focus, were far removed from the realities of working-class life in the industrial towns of the North and the Midlands as depicted in Source 10. It may also be recognised that Jarvie, writing at the very end of the 1960s and in a period of some social turbulence (‘time of crisis’), can, and feels bound to, provide a critical overview of the cinematic portrayal of working-class culture. Thus, the groundbreaking realism of the late 1950s (Source 10) and the challenging impressionism of the mid-1960s (Source 11) have merely become out-dated irrelevances in the more politically charged climate of the late 1960s. Whatever judgement is reached should be backed by appropriate evidence with the better candidates appreciating the importance of citing the sources in their precise context.
<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 focus of the question is on the relationship between soap operas and public opinion. Candidates will most likely access Source 13 as a starting point for the argument in favour of the contention in the question. The source presents a clear example of a mainstream soap opera not only introducing an issue from outside everyday life experience to a mass audience but also shaping its reaction to it. The view of soaps as the formers of social attitudes is supported by the case study of <em>EastEnders</em> in Source 15. Again the focus is on an aspect of sexuality which had, at the time, received little public attention and was, as a result, widely misunderstood. A similar approach to that adopted by <em>Coronation Street</em> in Source 13 is outlined with a sympathetic character being used as a vehicle to heighten public awareness and mould opinion. More perceptive candidates may note that Farthing, as both an advisor to, and beneficiary of, the storyline might be inclined to over-emphasise the impact it had had. Nonetheless, some may be aware that, despite an earlier intensive government information campaign, the peak time in requests for HIV tests coincided with Mark Fowler’s positive diagnosis in January 1991. Source 14 provides a platform from which the counter-view can be presented, with the emphasis on soaps as the mirrors rather than creators of changes, though the final clause does open up an interesting circular argument regarding cause and effect. From their own knowledge, candidates should be able to expand on the arguments both for and against the contention in the question by citing examples from specific soap operas and/or by showing a clear understanding of the aims of, and pressures on, the genre over the past half century. Thus, the social realism of <em>Coronation Street</em> and the series’ origins as a reflection of the real lives and concerns of working-class communities may be developed. Alternatively, the growth of competition and the need for ever more challenging and shocking storylines to maintain market share could be examined. 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 the impact of soap operas on collective attitudes, 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 impact of the internet on the relationship between individual citizens and government and authority. Candidates may well start with Source 16 which categorically states that the internet has made people more politically active. Candidates may pick up on the differences outlined in the source between the internet and other forms of communications media and highlight how the advent of the worldwide web has extended existing, and initiated new, ways of engaging in political activism. Thus, as well as the examples presented in the other two sources, candidates could, from their own knowledge, discuss the significance of such areas as tweeting, facebook, blogging, hacking, e-petitioning and YouTube postings. They may also include details of specific online campaigns, such as McSpotlight, and should be rewarded according to the depth and relevance of the material. The points raised in source 16 can be further supported by the content of the interview in Source 17. However, from a closer reading, the more perceptive may note that ‘Blue’ is talking about reaching ‘like-minded people’ who may well have been inclined towards some form of political activism anyway. Thus, his assertion that the people he contacted became activists flies in the face of the evidence presented in Source 18, where the Friends of the Earth organiser admits to a relatively low take-up rate from his initial contacts. Source 18 provides further support for the counter-argument by questioning the efficacy of disembodied cyberactivism which Source 16 forefronts and insisting, instead, that the internet is, at best, simply a supplement to more traditional methods of mobilising political action. In attempting to reconcile the different views held by the campaigners in Sources 17 and 18, the more perceptive may take into account the relative size of the organisations and the differing aims of their publicity campaigns. Thus, Save Lyminge Forest is targeting a localised and already sympathetic grouping while Friends of the Earth is looking to attract the attention of a wider public who may well feel no direct connection with their cause. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the impact of the internet on the nature and extent of political activism within the general public, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.