

ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report June 2009

GCE

GCE History 6HI02 Option C

ResultsPlus
Helping you to raise attainment
www.resultsplus.edexcel.com

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. If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report 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: 0844 576 0034



ResultsPlus is our unique performance improvement service for you and your students.

It helps you to:

- **Raise attainment** - by providing in-depth analysis of where your class did well and not so well, enabling you to identify areas to focus on/make improvements.
- **Spot performance trends** at a glance by accessing one-click reports. You can even choose to compare your cohort's performance against other schools throughout the UK.
- **Personalise your students' learning** by reviewing how each student performed, by question and paper you can use the detailed analysis to shape future learning.
- **Meet the needs of your students on results day** by having immediate visibility of their exam performance at your fingertips to advise on results.

To find out more about ResultsPlus and for a demonstration visit <http://resultsplus.edexcel.org.uk/home>

June 2009

Publications Code US021428

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2009

Contents

History 6HI02 Option C

General Comments	2
Option C1	
Question 1a	5
Question 1bi	11
Question 1bii	16
Option C2	
Question 2a	21
Question 2bi	24
Question 2bii	31
Conclusion	31
Grade Boundaries	32

6HI02

General Comments

There were many candidates who attained high levels in this examination, having demonstrated a good range of historical knowledge, clear understanding of historical development and its related concepts. While the option-specific comments set out below offer detailed reference and examples of student work, the purpose of the comments that follow is to highlight problems experienced by students across all options, and to suggest strategies for improving performance in the future.

Some candidates continue to create difficulties for themselves because they do not plan their time and do not read the sources with sufficient concentration.

The marks awarded for (a) and (b) questions indicate the amount of time that should be spent on each. The best responses in both (a) and (b) tended to be based on **analysing the sources as a set, with a sense of context**, to establish arguments that relate to the question. This approach allows the response to be source-driven, directed towards developing a judgement, as the question requires. It is therefore likely to score highly because **it is coherent and focused**. A key point is that the analysis should be carried out **before** the response is planned and written, so that the response is **structured around points of argument**, with **selective** source reference offered in support. Candidates who base a response on the sources in isolation are rarely able to cross-reference effectively and build a developed conclusion, sometimes running out of time.

Under pressure, candidates sometimes overlook key words or connections within the source, which can cause a serious misunderstanding that undermines a whole response. This is less likely if they habitually ask themselves whether what they **think** the source is saying is logical and appropriate in the context of the period to which it relates. Confidence in reading and using historical sources is derived **from regular and ongoing use of historical texts for research**. The essential skills of reading, comprehension, analysis and making notes from a range of historical texts lay the necessary foundations for handling extracts from such texts under examination conditions.

It is pleasing that the great majority of candidates avoided these basic pitfalls, and produced responses that varied from competent to excellent. Most candidates achieved good L2 in at least one objective, thereby demonstrating some knowledge and understanding of the period that they had studied, and the ability to analyse and comprehend individual sources, at least at face value. The skills of inference and cross-referencing, however are required to reach the higher levels.

Broadly speaking, the performance descriptors related to the E/U boundary, as described in the Specification, page 233, indicate a secure L2 performance, and a candidate achieving good L2 in all three descriptors will move beyond the borderline area.

Progression towards higher levels in objective AO2 depends on the ability to make **developed inferences** from sources that have been **cross-referenced** as a set. Candidates who analyse sources into relevant points, reason from the evidence and link points taken from more than one source are likely to achieve L3. Those who also demonstrate the ability to **apply provenance and contextual understanding** to the **evaluation** of such evidence are moving into L4. It is the ability to **weigh the evidence** in order to come to an **overall judgement** that takes account of any conflicts, takes a response to the top of L4.

Progression in AO1 depends on the **contextual understanding** that is applied to the sources as a set, in order to **develop and explain their implications as relevant arguments**, and on the deployment of **contextual knowledge to support, challenge and develop such arguments towards an overall judgement**.

Examples of such progression are included in the option-specific comments below, but certain points are

applicable across all options and may usefully be summarised here to highlight the ways in which candidate performance can be improved.

Most candidates made some attempt to draw inferences from source material but weaker candidates tended not to develop them. A **developed inference** requires the point to be clearly stated and supported by some reference to the source material, and **the connections between them made explicit**. This can be described, as in the AO2b mark scheme, as 'reasoning from the evidence' and the reasoning needs to be explicit. It is the key difference between treating sources as information (L2) and treating them as sources of **evidence**, which needs to be interpreted and explained.

Many candidates appeared to believe that pointing out agreement or disagreement between sources or parts of sources meets the requirements of **cross-referencing**. There remains a widespread tendency for candidates to analyse (or too often describe) the content of each source in turn, then try to draw out points of comparison. This tends to lead either to responses that are overly long, or to comparisons that are brief and general. The purpose of cross-referencing is to develop and bring out the implications of **sources as a set**, on the basis that if they are used in combination they offer more understanding than can be developed by considering them separately or cumulatively. **Cross-referencing therefore requires sources to be broken down so that comparisons can be drawn between points, rather than between whole sources**. The candidate can then reassemble the points into an answer to the question.

An area of particular weakness seems to be the **application of provenance**, using the nature and purpose of a source to evaluate the significance and reliability of the evidence within it. Very few candidates failed to mention provenance, and equally few were able to **apply** it effectively. Many candidates could identify 'bias', often quite accurately, but few were then able to make a **reasoned judgement as to how far this discredited the evidence within the source**. Many simply discounted the problem by finding a matching bias in other sources. Others assumed that the nature of a source dictated its value – newspapers were generally deemed unreliable, private letters accurate. Some candidates had difficulty accepting that opinions could be both sincere and objectively unreliable. There is also a tendency for candidates to see provenance only in negative terms, and not to take into account that testimony which is unwitting or from a 'biased' source can provide very strong evidence if it runs against expectation. The key issue is that **provenance needs to be related to particular points** within a source to **demonstrate its effects** on the **quality** of the evidence **in relation to the particular enquiry**. In (a) questions, where candidates are dealing with contemporary sources, this is often the means by which they can come to an overall judgement.

Candidates also offered some strange perceptions as to the value of historians' interpretations. Some candidates were aware of different 'schools' of historians, and often sided with one or other according to their own preference. A few engaged in polemics to the point where their response was seriously undermined. It is clear that the concept of reliability remains difficult for many candidates, but most have some idea of how to approach contemporary sources. However, historians' views do not lend themselves to explicit evaluation for 'reliability'. **The best candidates demonstrated an understanding that historians offer views that are based on reliable research, but are nevertheless interpretations using evidence and judgement**. As such, they indicate possible explanations of the past, from which we can learn by comparing the different interpretations, and evaluating them in the light of the evidence in order to develop our own. Candidates will address this more fully in A2, especially in Unit 3. It is not expected that they will routinely demonstrate a full appreciation of historical interpretation at AS level. However, those who understand that historians' views are interpretations, and that they can be both valid and varied, are likely to reach high levels at AS as well as laying good foundation for further progress. In the context of the Unit 2 examination, the historians' sources often provide a structure for the (b) response as a whole. They allow conflicting arguments to be established, evaluated against the other sources and the candidate's contextual knowledge, and used as the basis of a balanced judgement as required for L4. In doing this candidates can evaluate the historians' sources without specific consideration of 'reliability'.

In both (a) and (b) questions the best candidates offered an overall judgement drawn from their preceding arguments. However an effective judgement cannot simply ignore the existence of conflicting evidence, or describe differences before asserting a preference. The key to L4 is recognition of different or conflicting interpretations **and** an attempt to **weigh the quality of evidence** in order to judge between them or resolve apparent conflicts. In (b) questions candidates could also assess historians' judgements, such as the role and significance of particular factors, in the light of the evidence and their own knowledge. Some candidates offered these elements within the body of their response, others in a developed conclusion. The best did both, pointing to evaluation as they developed their arguments, and summarising the results in a direct comparison at the end.

Option C1

Question 1a

This question was tackled well with the vast majority achieving at least a good Level 2 and many moving into Levels 3 and 4. Most candidates supported the challenge presented by source 3 with detailed cross-referencing and it was pleasing to see that the majority were aware of the need to address the source attributions as part of the process of arriving at a judgement. However, there is still a tendency among some candidates to dismiss evidence out of hand if the author is deemed to be biased. Perhaps unsurprisingly it was Haig who was subjected most frequently to this treatment. Those performing at higher levels were able to apply the provenance to evaluate specific elements of a source rather than make sweeping generalisations. Thus, many noted that while Haig would be keen to defend his command in the immediate aftermath of the war, he was also in a better position to appreciate the overall strategic impact of the Somme campaign. Along with a precise application of provenance, another hallmark of high performing candidates was the ability to reconcile conflicting sources through close reading. Many, for example, noted that Carrington and Shaw qualified their stances and so shared some common ground, with the former admitting there was no 'decisive victory' and the latter acknowledging that something 'was gained'. Those who were able to combine the skills of close textual reading, precise cross-referencing and the directed application of provenance to weigh up the strength of the evidence contained in the source material accessed the very top marks.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The following two examples illustrate either end of the mark range. The first script is typical of responses that fell within the Level 2 mark band. The sources are taken in isolation and summarised and then surface matched, although there is one, partially developed, attempt at a comparison on the loss of life. A separate section is then dedicated to the analysis of provenance to explain the conflicting interpretations. It would have been more useful if this had been integrated with the analysis as part of the process of weighing up the strength of the sources as evidence. The response was awarded a low Level 2 (6/20) for the brief attempt to provide a developed comparison and the awareness of the need to utilise provenance, although this was undermined by confusion over military ranks.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

(a)

Source 3 greatly challenges the impression given in Sources 1 and 2 that the battle of the Somme had achieved worthwhile objectives.

Source 1 gives the impression that the battle was a great success. It describes how the British Forces had set out and achieved everything that they sought to do. For example it states 'The three main objectives with which we had commenced our offensive in July had been achieved'.

Source 2 backs up the evidence given in Source 1. It too is very positive about how successful the battle of the Somme had been and how it had been worthwhile because of the gains that had been made. 'there was a definite and growing sense of superiority over the enemy'.

Source 3 presents an entirely different view. It almost gives the impression that the Somme was completely pointless because no gains were made. It also highlights the loss of life, unlike Sources 1 and 2, suggesting that the gains in battle did not justify the major loss of life. Corporal W. H. Shaw describes it as 'just sheer bloody murder'.

((a) continued) It is difficult to get an idea of whether the battle of the Somme had achieved worthwhile objectives from looking at the sources. Sources 1 and 2 agree with each other however source 3 presents a completely different view. Each of the accounts given in each source are from people who were there at the time, so they would know exactly what the battle was like. Sources 1 and 3 are extracts of two people who were fairly high up in the army. This does not explain however why source 3 is so different.

Source 3 could present a different view because it was written, or the interview took place several decades after the battle. Whereas sources 1 and 2 are accounts from nearer the time of the battle.

Source 3 is so different that the accounts given in sources 1 and 2. It gives a more negative view of the battle and suggests that it did not achieve many of its objectives and those that it did achieve were not worth the major loss of life that took place.


ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

By contrast the following script, which is operating at Level 4, uses the sources as a set and integrates references to the source attributions into the analysis as part of the process of arriving at a judgement. Inferences are drawn from the tone of Source 1 and this is used in conjunction with an examination of the provenance to evaluate the evidence contained in the source. Close textual reading and a brief, focused use of contextual knowledge about the battle are employed to reconcile the differences between the sources. The response merited a secure Level 4 award (18/20), with a rather weak conclusion which fails to arrive at a judgement preventing it from gaining full marks.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

 Question 1

 Question 2

(a) Source 3 completely challenges the views of sources 1 and 2; source 3 implies that the Battle of the Somme (B.O.S) was a disaster from the word go and that nothing could be gained from it whereas sources 1 and 2 generally agree that the B.O.S was a worthwhile experience and the positives outweighed the negatives.

In Source 3, Corporal Shaw (an unknown source) declares that the 'first day of the Somme' was 'just sheer bloody murder' thus suggesting that Haig was wrong in pursuing the battle because of the mass suffering, and in essence, he didn't know what he was getting himself in for. In Source 1, Haig contradicts this and believes that 'three main objectives were achieved' and that they were able to penetrate the enemy and they had been 'worn down'. In conjunction with this Source 2, written by a junior officer says that that the B.O.S 'raised the morale' and despite the tragic losses, did not dampen the spirits and hope of the troops.

and they were adamant they had 'got the Germans beaten'. Similarly, Shaw recognises that the Germans were a force not to be reckoned with and were not as easily defeated as suggested in source 2 by Haig, however as the source states, it was written about the 1st day of the battle which is renowned for being a 'British disaster'. The other 2 sources reflect on the battle as a whole and so give more of a balanced summary of the

((a) continued) battle. However, it is clear that the first source white-washes the battle - Douglas Haig being commander in chief had a reputation to uphold and so would not criticise his decisions or highlight the negatives of the war. He states that what needed to be achieved had been and when reading between the lines, you can tell he knew of criticisms and knew the B.O.S could be deemed as a mistake, as suggested by source 3. Haig states that 'Any one of these results is sufficient to justify the ~~battle~~ Somme battle' - to me Haig is saying the gains made up for the fact that ^{many} ~~millions~~ of lives were lost and generals were slated, accused of being incompetent, and the British Army were at an all time low. For this reason, Haig and source 1 discretely agree with source 3 and suggests the battle was not so worthwhile in some aspects. Source 2 is more of a neutral source in that it generally supports source 1 in saying that the somme 'raised morale' and gave the British forces a 'growing sense of superiority', which could be deemed as successful aspects, however it also complies with source 3 and the junior officer admits that it was not a 'decisive

'victory' which is true as it was a short term disaster but a long term success in re-moulding the British troops. In addition to this source 2 also ~~states~~ implies that the Germans were 'victory' which is true as it was a short term disaster but a long term success in re-moulding the British troops. In addition to this source 2 also ~~states~~ implies that the Germans were

(a) continued) weaponry was costing British a lot of casualties and inflicted it with such a force that the men remained in the trenches and could not advance.

In conclusion, source 3 definitely challenges source 1 from an initial reading but Haig, being top of the hierarchy was adamant ~~they were~~ B.O.S was a worthwhile sacrifice - hence agreeing with source 3 slightly. Source 3 also conflicts and coincides with source 2 because it is a more neutral source and gives a more balanced view on the battle, which should carry a lot of weight because it was by an officer who unlike Haig, didn't have as big a reputation so could tell it as it was without exaggeration.

However this does not dispute Haig's source, he was there and in command and oversaw everything but the question is did he only see what he wanted to see? Source 3 is by an unknown corporal and so its reliability is in question but being a corporal means he was in the army and would know what he was talking about - plus he was British so is he just being honest? All in all, although source 3 does challenge the view of source 1 and 2 that the B.O.S achieved worthwhile objectives, it is only to a certain extent.

Question 1bi

This was the less popular of the two choices for part (b). This may have been a consequence of a narrow reading of the question by many candidates. However, those who attempted it produced some very good answers with an impressive range of own knowledge deployed to argue both for and against the view. Most candidates could access through the source material the debate on the role of censorship in shaping the reporting of the war and many supplemented this with a firm grasp of the nature of late Victorian and early Edwardian society. Weaker candidates tended to rely almost exclusively on information from the sources but a pleasing number built up focused and developed responses by the careful application of relevant contextual understanding. Generally, candidates were able to argue against the view in the question more effectively than they could argue for it, with many displaying an impressive knowledge of the nature and role of the press in representing the war. The relationship between the new press and the jingo crowd was explored by many, with the volunteer movement and Mafeking Night being used as evidence of the patriotic fervour that prevented the press from adopting a pro-Boer stance. Higher performing candidates used Source 4 to discuss the role and outlook of the war correspondent, with Winston Churchill often used to exemplify Stanley's point. Very few, however, could extend their knowledge of Churchill's career to explore the informal relationship that existed between commanding officer and war correspondent. Similarly, only the very best employed any sense of the chronology of the war to show that as the conflict drifted on into its guerrilla stage so enthusiasm waned and press attitudes began to shift.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The response below displayed many of the characteristics of the top level in both AO1 and AO2. A good range of accurate own knowledge is deployed in combination with the source material to offer a focused, balanced and developed analysis. The candidate interrogates the source material through cross-referencing and integration with own knowledge, and this leads on to an overall judgement which utilises both relevant factual material and information from the sources. The script was awarded a secure Level 4 in both assessment objectives.

Answer EITHER part (b)(i) OR (b)(ii) of your chosen question.

(b) (i) Plan

Yes - Military censorship Churchill
 Manchester Guardian Butler
 Ditch the main factor
 Preventing the press from publishing
 bad news was censorship
 NO - Officers as reporters Churchill!!!
 - national interest
 - General anti-boer mood
 Lloyd-George
 The Daily Mail.

Answer

The Boer war saw the first censorship of the national media. This was a response by Salisbury's government to the reporting of Russell which brought down Aberdeen's government. Certainly until Cardy Hobhouse & the Fancett commission there was very little anti-war sentiment though the reasons for this are not entirely clear.

Restrictions by the military authorities meant journalists were not allowed to print whatever they wished. S. Browning in "The Changing Nature of Warfare" remarks that journalists did try to report bad news as well as good though the army took control by restricting access. Churchill found

(b) continued) This when he visited South Africa & Buller, the military commander restricted his access to main battle sites of Mafeking, Ladysmith & various others. Commanders & politicians took notes of the revolutionary reporting of Russell & Fenton & limited the access of Journalists. Paper Reporters from the "Manchester Guardian" were rarely allowed anywhere near the battles due to the reasonably anti-war ~~sentiment~~ viewpoint they held. The restrictions certainly made it very difficult to report "bad news". ~~It~~ There clearly was anti-war feelings, especially amongst the working classes, yet these were never really noticed as Browning states, they were rarely based on reports from Correspondents in South Africa. Clearly, censorship had some part to play

However, there is a large amount of evidence to suggest other factors were involved. Many of the correspondents that were out in South Africa never expressed a desire to report against the war. Lord Stanley as the Chief Military Censor confirms this in his "Report on Press Censorship". One of the reasons for this was the vast majority of correspondents were serving officers in the British Military. They naturally, due to the nature of their profession, held fairly pro-war views and so were unlikely to report many things that would portray the army in a bad light. Further to this, they were ~~branded~~ as officers, to make the right call in situations where they could report something detrimental to the war effort & many of them didn't. As serving officers in the Military, they were held

((b) continued) to certain standards & there was an unwritten code of conduct. Many offices/correspondents voluntarily agreed to this out of respect.

Some argue that it was simply the huge wave of enthusiasm that prevented bad news from being published. Philip Taylor remarks on the establishment of the Daily Mail. As the first "mass circulation" paper, it would be expected to sell in great quantities & it was indeed priced far below any of its rivals, such as "The Times" on sale at 3d. It sold so well because it generally followed public opinion & Taylor comments that "the masses enjoyed their war". Newspapers were aimed at a readership & the readership of most papers was very pro-war. The middle classes in particular showed strong support for the war & it was displayed in 1900 when the Conservative Tories were elected once more. At the time, British people were fed a diet of jingoistic nationalism with publications such as "Union Jack". Other papers followed suit as reported pro-war material because at the time, the majority of opinion was pro-war. ~~The~~ The rejection of the views held by Boer supporters can be seen by the heckling of Lloyd George in Birmingham & the reaction to the plight of the Irish Nationalists (who were pro-boer) which was largely negative. Simply, the papers printed what reflected the mood of the nation at the time, and the mood was largely in favour of the war.

((b) continued)

What can certainly be concluded from any military scenario is that the people only know what they are told by government or the press. At the outbreak of the war, feelings genuinely were pro-war due to the nationalist upbringing of the British people but genuinely in the arrogant manner in which Kruger acted, at Bloemfontein & in general. After that, the public were shielded from the truth by a lack of independent journalists in South Africa and as Stanley remarks, "The last thought correspondents have is in any way to go against military regulations" as there is a degree of truth to this statement. The journalists that were there were pro-war & the ones that weren't were not allowed anywhere near the conflict. From this, it would have to be concluded that the main factor preventing the press from publishing "bad news" was censorship.

Question 1bii

The question focused on the impact of war on the role and status of women in society. Although all three sources clearly dealt with the impact of the Great War, the question did not specify any particular conflict and candidates could, therefore, include material relating to any of the three wars covered by the specification. Nearly all focused exclusively on the First World War, with only a very small number extending the range by making brief references to the work of Florence Nightingale and/or Mary Seacole. This was as expected. Virtually all those who opted for this question achieved at least Level 2 by accessing the debate through the source material and then extending it by reference to their own knowledge. The most common reason for failing to move into Level 3 and higher was an over-reliance on generalisations when assessing the claims made in the sources. Thus, although weaker candidates understood in general terms the demands that total war made on the domestic workforce, they were often unable to cite specific evidence to illustrate how women were affected. However, there were many responses that used Source 8 as a platform to develop extensive own knowledge detailing the nature and scale of the new employment opportunities that opened up in both the civilian and military spheres. According to the quality of evidence deployed and the extent of source integration this line of argument could take candidates to the Level 3/4 borderline. Higher performing candidates were able to move the analysis on from a narrow focus on employment by linking the reference in Source 7 to 'attitude' with Asquith's apparent volte-face in Source 8 to explore the effect of the war on women's sense of self and the public perception of women's position in society.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The following example illustrates the approach adopted by many of the good responses to this question. The candidate starts by using the sources to establish the debate and then continues to use the sources as a set to develop the different lines of argument. Reasoning from the evidence is achieved through cross-referencing the sources and integrating them with own knowledge. There is a clear structure, with both sides of the debate addressed and the focus sustained throughout. However, the response is by no means perfect. The breadth of own knowledge is a little restricted and there are some rather sweeping statements made. The conclusion is also rather too brief. As a result the response scored highly in AO2 with a high Level 4 but slightly less well in AO1 where it was awarded a borderline Level 3/4.

Answer EITHER part (b)(i) OR (b)(ii) of your chosen question.

(b) ii) I agree with the statement that ^{very little} very little changed for women from the war, but only to a certain extent.

Source 7 suggests they were still considered as second class citizens and that not many in work; Source 8 suggests women were vital in the home front, keeping the work pumping out and taking on men's roles and Source 9 suggests although there were changes, they were not that significant, thus partly agreeing with 7 and partly agreeing with 8.

Source 7 very clearly agrees with the statement because it is where the statement is from. The author is unknown but what he says has some weight. He states that there were fewer jobs for women after than before the war. During the war when the men went out to fight, job opportunities were opened to women to take on their roles, so that the economy could still function and support the war. The economy was preparing for total war and so the work force had to maintain high levels of employees to produce and distribute weapons, food, transport and medical ~~of~~ requirements. When the men returned, of course the women went back to the home, as it was deemed as being where she belongs, and the men got their jobs back or another job of some sort to rebuild the state. Source 8 kind of agrees with this too, saying that it was a momentary change.

((b) continued) and women were put where needed in the war and once it was over, went back to normal. Some women in the suffragette movement actually put a hold on their campaigns to support the war effort as it was a time of crisis and all people needed to be involved, so this could be a reason for women's rights not changing; as source 8 says "the question will be raised about women's labour and their function in the new order of things", suggesting that now that women's role has temporarily changed, will it permanently be changed. It is quite contradictory of PM Asquith as he according to the factnote, blocked attempts at giving women the vote, so being PM means he would be the one to change things, but won't. However looking at it another way, he may have changed his opinion because he was clearly impressed by the effort the women put into the war. Source 9 ~~again~~ agrees partly with source 8 ~~because~~ and 7 because he states that yes, women were moved to 'munitions industries' where they would not normally be, ~~the~~ 'the significance of the changes in women's role' should not be overstated because not all women came from the household, they were simply transferred to another department/industry and that is if they were transferred at all; the upper and middle class women would scarcely get their hands dirty. This source is reliable because it is known that women, particularly from the Women's Royal Air Force, could get trained as being mechanics, fixing aircrafts and weaponry, which was

((b) continued) quite liberating for women as it was an opportunity they didn't previously have and they could learn new skills and feel part of the war effort. Source 3 suggests this idea too as Asquith clearly says that women were 'doing work which 3 years ago we would have regarded as exclusively 'mens' work'. All in all even though the change could be deemed as temporary, it was a step in the right direction as before, women would not have had these job opportunities and in the near future women would be taken more seriously and some were given the vote, as a thanks for their contribution the war and to keep them inside.

On the other hand, women's lives could be perceived as changing drastically. As all 3 sources indicate, women took the place of the men during the war, but things branched out much further than this. For example, more women's organisations were created. These included the VAD (Voluntary Aid Detachment) who worked with nurses in the war - they would take on the roles of cook, ambulance drivers or cleaners to help keep on top of things - those over 23 and with 3 months experience were also permitted to go to the Western front to help out. They were financially self-sufficient and so came from the middle and upper classes while the working class worked in industries. The VAD grew and so did the number of nurses. By the end of the war the number

((b) continued) telephone, being a gas mask instructor for new recruits and being canteens. These would, as sources 7, 8 and 9 suggest, be previously men's jobs but it was a change for women having this much responsibility and not being stuck in the kitchen feeling helpless and useless to the war effort. Unlike other wars, there were not so many key female figures to change the way things were which may be why WWI was deemed as being a significant time of change for women. ~~How~~ Having said this women did appear to want to make a change; in source 7 Ben Walsh states that they were 'prepared to work for a lower wage' and this would obviously appeal to employers.

In conclusion, although now it seems that women's roles did only change temporarily and it only changed because of the outbreak of war, in the women's eyes, it was an opportunity and as a result some women did get the vote. It took time and effort and women did prove themselves as Asquith states. Something minor to us was major to them. So yes, after the war, a little changed for us, but to them it was a step in the right direction and times of change were coming.

Provenance:

- Asquith - PM - didn't give women vote
- Ben Walsh - unknown - knowledge supports + contradicts.
- Rex Pope - unknown - knowledge supports + contradicts.

Hoyd George PM in 1916 gave women vote.

useful!

Option C2

Question 2a

The majority of candidates performed well on this question with very few falling below a solid Level 2. The reason for some failing to achieve higher was a tendency to analyse the sources in sequence leaving any cross-referencing implicit rather than explicit. The conflict between Sources 10 and 11 was highlighted by virtually everyone, although the comments on provenance, especially for Source 11, were often restricted to simple and generalised assertions of bias. A number of candidates struggled to make sense of the apparent shift in tone between Sources 10 and 12 with many missing the significance of the phrase 'in their eyes at least'. A pleasing number of candidates could apply sound contextual knowledge to advance their understanding of the sources, with many aware that *The Times* was staunchly anti-suffrage. Better responses drew an important distinction between popularity and publicity and, by locating Emily Davison's actions in the Suffragettes' maxim of 'deeds not words', could reconcile Source 10 with the contention in the question by arguing that there is no such thing as bad publicity. There were many strong responses to this question with evidence of detailed cross-referencing and the careful application of provenance to weigh up the strength of the source material, and these operated within the good Level 3/low Level 4 bracket. However, only a few continued to the next stage and reached a judgement based on their analysis of the evidence. Candidates should be reminded that it is important to leave enough time to provide a developed conclusion in which a substantiated assessment of 'how far' is reached.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The example that follows displays many of the characteristics of a strong response to part (a) questions. The sources are taken as a set and cross-referencing is, therefore, sustained throughout the piece. Similarly, comments on provenance are not restricted to an isolated paragraph at the end but are integrated throughout thereby providing an on-going evaluation of the strength of evidence contained in the source material. There is close textual reading of Source 12 ('in their eyes') to reconcile it with source 10 and there is an attempt to arrive at a developed judgement. Although more could be made of source 11, the quality of the analysis and sustained focus on cross-referencing and evaluating evidence merits an award of 18/20.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

(a)

All three sources make it clear that the event drew great public interest, however they disagree on whether such publicity helped or hindered the women's suffrage movement.

Both sources 12 and 11 show a view that they felt the death of Emily Davison, drew attention to the cause & indeed so to a great extent advanced the movement. Source 12 states Emily's action as a 'heroic deed' and as a 'sacrifice' to the cause. ~~Agree~~ In agreement with this view is C. Pankhurst writing in 59 saying that 'Emily paid her life' and ~~was~~ 'so effectively brought the concentrated attention of millions to bear upon the cause?' ~~How~~ Although this suggests that her death - by attracting millions to the cause was a step forward for the movement, it is important to be aware of the provenance of the source, as a leading member of the WSPU, it would have been in her best interest to state that the death promoted the cause. Although this limits the extent to which we can put weight on the source, to a great extent sources 11 & 12

(a) continued) ~~imply~~ ~~that~~ Emily's death helped the cause by attracting public attention to it, but also by her 'gentle' nature as source 12 states.

In contrast, ~~source 1~~ to these two sources, source 10 suggests that Emily's actions were no more than 'some mad notion'. They describe her actions as 'desperate' and state they wonder 'how she imagined it could assist the cause of women's suffrage'. The Times make it clear they feel it could not help the cause 'a deed of this kind is not likely to increase the popularity of any cause with the general public'. Although, this view is clear, it ~~is made by a paper~~ is an article written by a paper 'the Times' known to be anti-suffrage for women, so would be bias in wanting to show the event in a bad light, this reduces the weight we can give to the evidence when assessing 'how far' it did not help. As an article it is limited.

On the other hand, although source 10 appears to strongly disagree, ~~they~~ all 3 sources are aware of the attention it will have brought. The fact that it is written about twice (source 10 & 12) in a

(a) continued) paper against the vote shows this & source 10 states 'will impress general public'. The strong change of tone apparent between the source 10 + 12 is because at home absence 10 - it was not known the ~~was~~ headline. In source 12, as they are reporting her funeral, they are likely to ease at their anti-women's suffrage views, & as seen earlier show respect. However, like 8-10 it indicates hostility saying 'in their eyes' showing they do not fully agree with the idea that her death promoted the movement, but are being more subtle, because of the funeral.

In conclusion, to a very great extent all 3 sources agree in gained attention to the cause. Taking into consideration the timeliness and weight of each, as well as prominence, it is only to a limited extent that they show such attention progressed the movement, which is mainly indicated by Mrs Pankhurst in S. 11 & the 'new ker' it brought good change is reflected as S. 10 & 12 indicate that it was only 'in eyes of campaigners' that it helped. However taking into consideration & evaluating the sources, wanting to show it in a bad light

((a) continued) her death, clearly got attention,
~~to~~, and that any attention is good for
the movement as it increases awareness.

/

Question 2bi

This was the more popular of the two options for part (b). Most candidates had firm grasp of the context of the period and could locate any possible advances that accrued from educational reform in the prevailing ideological culture of 'separate spheres' and 'the angel in the house'. However, a number of candidates were limited in their knowledge of specific changes in educational opportunities and were, therefore, restricted to an analysis based on a combination of source material and generalised background. These rarely managed to go beyond borderline Level 2/3. Better responses used the references to the Girls' Public Day School Company and higher education in Source 14 to explore the nature and limitations of the new openings for women at schools and universities. Similarly, Source 13 led many to examine the impact of the Education Act of 1870. Those operating at the higher levels were aware of the importance of class as well as gender in educational opportunities and recognised that the report in Source 13 was focusing on working-class girls while the new schools mentioned in Sources 14 and 15 were targeting a middle and upper-middle-class market. The best responses appreciated that all three sources could be used both to challenge, by emphasising the deeply embedded nature of the separate spheres ideology in Victorian public consciousness, and support, by underlining the potential benefits of educational reforms, the contention in the question.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The example that follows highlights some of the characteristics of a high performing response. A very good grasp of context is displayed and accurate own knowledge is deployed in conjunction with the source material to advance a focused and occasionally sophisticated argument. The sources are used frequently to draw out arguments both for and against the contention in the question. The candidate develops reasoning from the evidence by cross-referencing information from the sources with their own knowledge as well as with points drawn from the other sources. Although, there could have been a greater range of material on specific reforms to the educational system, the quality of analysis, the strength of the conceptual understanding and the sustained focused are sufficient to place this script in the Level 4 bracket for both Assessment Objectives. It was awarded 21/24 for AO1 and 13/16 for AO2.

Answer EITHER part (b)(i) OR (b)(ii) of your chosen question.

(b) (i) Do you agree with the view that changes in ~~the~~ schooling in the 2nd half of the 19th significantly improved role & opportunities of Brit women?

Initially, in the ~~In the~~ second half of the 19th century, women had a very distinct ideal to aspire to, that in the eyes of middle-class society, at least, was deemed feminine perfection: as Coventry Patmore put it in his 1854 poem, 'The Angel In the House'. Women were expected to be confined to the domestic sphere, as the cornerstone of family life, dominated by & answering ^{subserviently} to the male head of the family.

Outside of this middle class ideal were the realities faced by the upper & working classes. The ideal of 'The Angel' didn't apply to the upper class women, so much on account of their wealth, social status & numerous servants, and nor did it apply to the women of the working class, who could not afford to aspire to Patmore's 'Angel': they depended on a wage, even from the most menial & brutal of jobs in which they were often exploited.

However, some may argue that changes to schooling in this period significantly improved the role & opportunities of women.

In some ways, I believe this to be true. The rea-

((b) continued) fact that women could achieve an education outside of the confines of their governess' schoolroom & make a tentative step or two towards the edge of the domestic sphere can be seen as a definite advancement. Thanks to individuals such as Josephine Baker, women could achieve higher levels of education (eg at Newnham College Cambridge) and more radical ideas were being put forward regarding the liberation of women through education (Lydia Becker, for example, proposed an educational 'role reversal' in which girls & boys would be taught each other's traditional subjects, eg cooking & carpentry).

Additionally, as Joan Paterson writes of the Girls' Public Day School Co in the 1870s, 'girls [were provided with] different role models & loosened family ties. They sent a first wave of women into Higher Edⁿ & 'broke the mould' once & for all'. I agree - it was extremely valuable to 'break the mould' of the domestic sphere & the constraints of family & social ideals, even to a limited point. Education allowed for women to become aware of the outside world (even if this awareness was limited), & to have a perception of their opportunities - and indeed their restrictions (intellectual legislative or otherwise) which could prompt them to try & further push the boundaries of expectation & acceptability.

(b) continued) Indeed, these arguments were already being ~~sketched~~—women could stand on School Boards in the 1870s & onwards, a definite victory in the moving of the domestic sphere into public life. Women were being educated, & were also playing significant roles in the governance of this education, arguments leading to other advancements (granted, initially in the social sphere which was capped by an exceptionally low 'glass ceiling')—eg being allowed to sit on Poor Law Boards 1875, or as candidates in the local elections as a result of Municipal Franchise Act 1869 & Education Act 1870. It could be argued that they would not have been capable of this or ^{have been} as informed without a beneficial education.

There is, inevitably, the other side of the coin, the argument that changes in schooling had very little or no benefit ~~to~~ as to the improvement of the role & opportunities of women in the mid-late 19th c.

And in part, I believe that this argument is a very valid one—while I do believe that there were advances & opportunities, improvement of role etc, I believe that these advances were limited, as was the education of the women.

The limitation was ultimately provided by the

((b) continued) domestic sphere, the ideal of 'The Angel In the House' — though the angel may be in the schoolroom now, many wished to bring her back to the home once the lesson was over, or better still, ~~allow~~ never allow her to leave it — if not physically then metaphorically & practically.

'It is hoped,' said the National Society (which voluntarily educated working class girls in church schools), illustrating the above point 'that Educating girls academically I will not keep from our sight the importance of teaching them to make & mend shirts... dresses... stockings & socks.'

This is to some extent backed up by the claim made by Joan Petch in 1993 in 'Victorian Women' — that 'girl's secondary school[s] had to conform to what parents wanted'. This with reference to the Girls' Public Day School ~~in~~ C^o — which would have (unlike the schools of the National Society) been for the upper classes, the parents ~~of~~ of which who would almost certainly have been deeply rooted in the conservative belief of a woman's role — if not the 'Angel' then the upper-class equivalent. A similar sentiment is expressed by Oxford High School (as given in A History of Women, Ed. 7 is Edited by Jane Briss, pub. 1991) — that female

((b) continued) students who wore no glasses were at risk of causing the school to be branded 'rough & unrefined'. The constraints of appearances, of enforced 'femininity' & indeed of the 'Angel' ~~or~~, or even of the practicalities of being a working wife/mother were firmly apparent.

Even the jobs & opportunities provided by this education were initially governed by the domestic sphere - Poor Law Boards, School Boards, philanthropic work - all seemed to be male-dependent / dominated & ultimately limited within each field.

It is arguable, however, that a decade or so on, such as in the 1880s, this education was able to allow women to engage in roles & opportunities that society found acceptable (vol. eg as part of a political group (Women's Liberal Foundation/ ~~the~~ Association, with the Liberal Party), or that the education had given them the knowledge & means to be able to campaign & form organisations independently.

So ultimately, I do believe that changes in schooling & education in the latter half of the 19th ~~did~~ ~~lead~~ led to the improvement & opportunities & roles of women - however I believe that this was a long-term process, ~~that~~ & that

((b) continued) along the way there were many limitations & constraints from both inside & outside the educational system: the cloud of the domestic sphere & 'the Angel in the House' took a long time to shift.

Question 2bii

Many candidates who attempted this question based their responses largely around the source material. Although nearly all identified the opposing standpoints adopted by Sources 16 and 18, lack of precise contextual knowledge led some to treat the material as a summary of information rather than evidence to be interrogated. There was some confusion over the term 'Press boycott' in Source 18 with a significant number mistakenly assuming that the press was on the receiving end of the boycott. Good responses moved beyond viewing Sources 16 and 18 as being in absolute disagreement and were able to point to some areas of reconciliation. Thus, Strachey's grudging acknowledgement of the expansion of the women's movement is reflected in much of Source 16. Similarly, those with good contextual knowledge showed an appreciation of the ambivalent nature of the evidence presented in source 17, by noting that the growth of female representation on local government was taking place in the specifically gendered field of School and Poor Law Boards. Many candidates found it difficult to provide detailed evidence linked to Rubinstein's focus in Source 16 on the 1890s and so, instead, presented a potted history of the progress of the women's movement since the mid-century. The material in this approach was of implicit relevance and could, therefore, be awarded at level 3 for AO1 depending on depth and quality, but to move into the top of the level and progress on into Level 4 more precisely focused evidence relating to the fortunes of the women's movement in the last decade or so of the nineteenth century was required. Here, for example, the very best could use Rubinstein's references to 'party political activity' to explore the activities and limitations of such organisations as the Primrose League and the Women's Liberal Federation and, thus, locate their judgement firmly in the period defined by the question.

Conclusion

There were many good responses offered in all options. A few lacked sound knowledge of the periods that they had studied, and there were a number whose understanding was simplistic. Some had difficulty in expressing their points clearly because they lacked confidence in using the terminology of the period. However, most candidates had some range of knowledge and some understanding of how to approach the questions. Most attempted to focus on the question and there were relatively few who wrote purely narrative or descriptive responses. A significant weakness in part (b) was the tendency to rely mainly on the information taken from sources, but most candidates offered some contextual knowledge or showed contextual understanding. Most candidates were capable of reaching L3, although poor planning and timing sometimes prevented them from doing so.

Points for improvement are:

In both (a) and (b) questions, sources should be analysed as a set to draw out points for and against the claim in the question, before planning a response. This allows conflicting interpretations to be established to structure the response.

Both (a) and (b) questions require a developed conclusion that addresses the conflicting arguments and judges between them or shows how they can be combined.

Any judgement must be based on both quality and quantity of evidence – i.e. the content and provenance of the sources, interpreted and evaluated in context. In (a) questions contextual knowledge informs interpretation; in (b) questions it is deployed to develop it.

Grade Boundaries

6HI02 C

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
6HI02 C grade boundaries	60	45	40	35	30	26
UMS	100	80	70	60	50	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
Order Code US021428 June 2009

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

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

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

