

# Mark Scheme (Results) January 2010

GCE

## GCE History (6HI02) Paper C

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com).

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Mark Scheme that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternately, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated **History** telephone line: **020 7190 4784**

January 2010

Publications Code US022889

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

## 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%)

(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><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 3-5 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 2: 6-7 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 8-10 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 3: 11-12 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 13-15 marks</b> 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 they will bear in relation to the specific enquiry. In addressing 'how far' the sources are used in combination.</p> <p><b>Low Level 4: 16-17 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 18-20 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 5-6 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 11-12 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 17-18 marks</b> 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 contextual knowledge with material drawn from sources, although this may not be sustained throughout the response.</p>

	<p>The selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p><b>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 23-24 marks</b> 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.*

A02b (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><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 3-4 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 7-8 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 3: 9-10 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 11-12 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 4: 13-14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 15-16 marks</b> 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
<b>Total Marks</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>% weighting</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>25%</b>

### 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.

C1 The Experience of Warfare in Britain: Crimea, Boer and the First World War, 1854-1929

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (a)	<p>Candidates may well start with Source 3 which sets out a compelling case in support of the contention in the question. The content notwithstanding, the very fact that the letter was reproduced as a pamphlet for public sale may be seen by some as evidence of popular backing for the sentiments expressed, and indeed those with good contextual knowledge may be aware that sales exceeded 75,000 in the first week. However, the somewhat melodramatic tone could lead the more perceptive to question the authorship of the piece, especially as its publication came at the height of the Somme campaign when propaganda to combat public disillusionment was needed more than ever. Source 2 presents a rather more measured defence of the war, and the principled stance adopted is given extra weight in the light of Britain's own loss and her obvious abhorrence of fighting as evidenced by her pacifism in the interwar years. However, candidates may again contextualise the source and note that, as far as the British army was concerned, the worst of the fighting was yet to come. Source 1 offers a counter-view with Lansdowne not prepared to accept victory at any price. Again those with wider contextual knowledge will recognise that Lansdowne is writing not only in the aftermath of an unsuccessful German peace proposal but also at the conclusion of the Passchendaele offensive and the apparent failure of the policy of attrition to achieve any tangible results. The reference to <i>The Times</i> in the provenance may, however, lead some to conclude that his views were not shared by the wider public. Whatever judgement is reached the best responses will show an awareness of how public attitudes towards the war varied according to time and personal circumstances by exploring not only the content of the sources but also their provenance and context.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (i)	<p>The question is focused on the work of Florence Nightingale and the attempts to improve medical care for British soldiers during the Crimean War. Candidates may well start with the report from <i>The Times</i> in Source 4 which presents the traditional image of Florence Nightingale and some performing at lower levels will accept this uncritically. However, the more perceptive will qualify any argument through a closer examination of the source's content and provenance. Thus, the melodramatic style may lead some to question the writer's objectivity and those with good contextual knowledge should be able to develop this line of reasoning by referring to the paper's championing of Nightingale's work. Some of the issues raised by <i>The Times</i>, and indeed the paper's support for Nightingale, can be cross-referenced with the opinion presented in Source 5, although here the focus is on her work as an administrator rather than the more traditional 'ministering angel' referred to in Source 4. The counter-argument is clearly presented in Source 6 where the work of the Sanitary Commission and, by extension, the importance of clean water supply, is forefronted. The more astute may cross-reference the mortality rate with Source 4 and note that the 'catastrophic' starting figure corresponds with the date of <i>The Times'</i> report; although those with a good overview of the topic may be able to put this into context by observing that when Nightingale arrived in the Crimea in November 1854 the percentage was as high as 60. Candidates should, from their own knowledge, be able develop further the arguments and counter-arguments, contrasting the role of Florence Nightingale with the significance of other individuals, such as Mary Seacole, and factors, such as <i>The Times'</i> reports of Thomas Chenery and the work of the Sanitary Commission. At the higher levels, there should be a clear focus on agreement and disagreement, with evidence from the source material and the candidates' own knowledge balanced and integrated.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (ii)	<p>Although Source 8 presents the counter-argument to the contention in the question, candidates may well start with this as it encapsulates a widely held interpretation of the camps. The points made by Campbell-Bannerman can be cross-referenced with the issues raised in Source 7. Thus, not only is Campbell-Bannerman's famous phrase, 'methods of barbarism', supported by the description and death rate presented in Source 7 but also his reference to 'no war is going on' tallies with Ensor's allusion to the 'final phase' of the war. More knowledgeable candidates will be able to expand on the significance of this by noting that public criticism began to grow as, with the main objective of the re-annexation of the Transvaal having been achieved by October 1900, British tactics became increasingly ruthless in the face of an apparently defeated Boer Army's refusal to capitulate. However, candidates should use the attribution to Source 8 to provide some balance to this line of argument. Thus, the more perceptive will be aware that Campbell-Bannerman's inflammatory phrase may well owe as much to political point scoring as objective reporting. Similarly, it should be noted that Emily Hobhouse, upon whose eye-witness accounts the Liberal leader based his accusations, was hardly an impartial observer. Source 9 can then be used as a platform from which this counter-view can be developed further. Although the references to musical societies, reading rooms, games and sports sit uneasily with the death toll given in Source 7, candidates should pick up Roberts' general thesis that the appalling conditions, far from being the consequence of premeditated ruthlessness were simply the result of the British authorities being overwhelmed by the number of refugees with which they had to deal. Indeed, this point can, in part, be supported by Source 7 with its focus on 'gross mismanagement'. Candidates should, from their own knowledge, be able to develop both sides of the argument by exploring not only the nature of the camps but also the events that led to their establishment. 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 introduction of the camps, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

C2 Britain, c1860-1930: The Changing Position of Women and the Suffrage Question

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (a)	<p>Candidates may well start with Source 12 which would appear to challenge the assertion in Source 10 that 'the police kept their tempers very well'. This stance could then be supported by the tone and content of Source 11 which certainly points towards a negligent, and more likely, overtly brutal, approach by the police. Both these sources, therefore, on the surface present a considerable challenge to the rather dismissive and droll tone adopted by <i>The Times</i> in Source 10. However, closer reading of both the content and provenance of the sources, along with careful contextualising, should result in candidates presenting a more nuanced evaluation of 'how far'. All three sources point towards a high level of violence and even Source 10, which is clearly sympathetic to the police cause, is prepared to admit that their actions 'lacked nothing in vigour'. Candidates may also note that the instruction to avoid making arrests raised in Source 11 would have certainly exacerbated both the intensity of the confrontation and, hence, the difficulties the police were facing; though whether this would then tally with tempers being kept is a moot point. Reference should also be made to the provenance of the three sources. Both Sources 11 and 12 clearly have a vested interest in presenting the demonstrators as victims of police brutality, although those with some wider contextual knowledge will know that the Conciliation Committee would certainly have nothing to gain from outright fabrication and that the statement in Source 12 is consistent with the numerous other accounts given by protestors and the seriousness of the injuries many women sustained. Similarly, those operating at higher levels should be able to set <i>The Times'</i> report in Source 10 in the wider context of the news media's generally hostile coverage of militant action, and should, therefore, be aware that the admission that both sides acted with unusual force is something of a retreat. Thus, for better candidates, any judgement as to the extent of the challenge posed by the sources will be qualified by an understanding that any points of agreement, no matter how oblique, carry significant weight.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (i)	<p>The question is focused on the role of Josephine Butler in the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts. Sources 13 and 15 provide firm evidence in support of the contention and candidates may well start with these. Both sources highlight Butler's leadership of the campaign to repeal the Acts and give some sense of the difficulties that she had to overcome. The more knowledgeable will be able to develop this line of argument by placing the campaign in context and providing supporting detail on the tactics and impact of both Josephine Butler herself and the Ladies National Association that she headed. However, candidates should also take into account the provenance of both sources and be aware that they may well be privileging the work of Butler over other contributory factors. Thus, Lansbury in Source 13, as a lifelong supporter of the women's movement, may have been inclined to forefront the work of someone from within that movement at the expense of other agencies. Similarly, the <i>Guardian</i> in Source 15, in reviewing an exhibition dedicated to the work of Josephine Butler on the centenary of her death, has, unsurprisingly, focused on the individual rather than the wider campaign. A platform from which the counter-argument can be explored is presented by Source 14. The source offers candidates a chance to expand on the role of other individuals and groups who opposed the CDAs, and here candidates should be rewarded according to the range and depth of evidence they deploy. More perceptive candidates may, however, make note of the fact that Paula Bartley's revision of Butler's significance is measured and that the source does conclude by stating that she is still 'seen as being of equal importance'. 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 progress of the repeal campaign and the extent of Josephine Butler's contribution, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (ii)	<p>The question is focussed on the impact of new technologies on the position of women in the workplace. The sources concentrate on the typewriter and the telegraph but candidates need not restrict themselves to these two areas and can examine the significance of other technological innovations, such as the telephone. Candidates may well start with Source 16 which emphasises the 'unprecedented new opportunities' available to women as a result of technological advance. They should be able to contextualise the reference to the Post Office and be aware that it was, at this time, one of the largest business organisations in the country. They should also, from their own knowledge, be able to expand on both the nature of the new opportunities presented to women and their significance in the context of female domesticity. Although Source 17 supports this line of argument with the reference to the 'entry of women into the office', those performing at higher levels should be aware of Davies' concluding comment about the differentiation between 'new professions' and 'routine office chores' and be able to develop this counter-view by examining the extent to which separate spheres were established in the workplace both in terms of space and function. This stance can be cross-referenced to both Sources 16 and 18. The comparison between the typewriter and the piano in Source 16 emphasises the feminisation of certain aspects of office work, while Source 18 raises the issue of status and the extent to which the male workforce felt threatened by the arrival of female clerical workers (although the more able may note that the report comes less than a decade after the Telegraph Act, when male operatives in the Post Office would still be coming to terms with competition from female workers). 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 nature and limitations of the opportunities provided by technological innovation in the workplace, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

Further copies of this publication are available from  
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467  
Fax 01623 450481

Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code US022889 January 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit [www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750  
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH