

Examiners' Report
January 2013

GCE History 6HI02 C

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at www.edexcel.com/ask. You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service. See the ResultsPlus section below on how to get these details if you don't have them already.

ResultsPlus

Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and Edexcel national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for raising achievement through innovation in education.

Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

January 2013

Publications Code US034633

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

Introduction

It was pleasing to see a good standard of responses from many candidates in this examination series. Indeed, many candidates wrote with understanding and insight about the key themes.

The paper requires candidates to answer two questions in 80 minutes. Examiners commented on the fact that, in this series, many candidates had clearly used their time to very good effect. Although some responses were quite brief, there was little evidence of candidates having insufficient time to answer both questions.

There was a wide range of responses across the mark range, but the paper appears to have worked, in the sense that the most able were stretched whilst the the full range of candidates were able to attempt answers to both parts of the examination.

In part A, most candidates were able to use the language of cross-referencing, but a significant number often matched statements that showed a comparison for agree or disagree and did not explain or draw out the inferences that are necessary to develop a cross-reference. In part B, it was again disappointing to note that a significant minority of candidates relied very heavily on the material in the sources, which was not always securely understood. Centres are reminded that candidates are expected to have a reasonable range and depth of knowledge that can be applied to the part B questions. Despite comments in previous examiners' reports, many candidates continue to comment on provenance in their responses to part B. Such comments are often very generic e.g. "the historian can be trusted because they have the benefit of hindsight" or "they cannot be trusted because they were not an eye witness to the event". Such comments, even if well developed, generally do not contribute to AO2b, which is being tested in question B. Candidates would do well to develop their arguments in relation to the question, rather than write whole paragraphs on provenance which can earn no credit under AO2b.

Candidates should take care to spell technical words correctly, especially when those words form part of the question or the sources. Some candidates over used words such as 'inference' and did not have a secure understanding of their meaning. Overall, however, the language used by candidates seemed to contain fewer colloquialisms and abbreviations this year than in previous examinations.

The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

Question 1 (a)

Most candidates were able to access this question in a straightforward way and it was pleasing to note that examiners commented that fewer source by source approaches were seen than is usual. The key aspects of each source were largely understood, although only a few candidates were able to pick up on the use of 'some' in Sources 1 and 2, and a significant minority misread Source 1 and its reference to 'most soldiers strongly objected to going there', wrongly taking this to mean Mary Seacole's establishment. This clearly impacted on the line of argument in these responses.

Many candidates were able to comment effectively on the provenance of Source 3, although fewer picked up on Hall's role and the fact that for him to be praising, an 'alternative' practitioner, could be seen as unexpected.

(a) ~~Both sources 1 and 2~~ All of the sources, it is clear, agree to a certain extent that Mary Seacole was indeed a great help to the men in the Crimea, suggesting her kindness and remedies provided a feeling of comfort for the soldiers. Firstly, Source 2, an extract from the unpublished memoirs of an officer who served in the Crimea, states that 'in case of any illness (soldier) would seek her advice and use her herbal medicines in preference to reporting themselves to their own doctor'. This indeed corroborates with the same view in Source 1, as the extract from a letter by the Head of the Army Medical Services states that the nourishment & treatment provided by Seacole could not be obtained elsewhere 'except in hospital, but most soldiers strongly objected to going there. Thus, both sources suggest in corroboration, that Seacole provided almost a Sanctuary for the soldiers who required care and treatment, in comparison to having treatment in the Army hospitals which strongly shows how much in regard Seacole was held. Considering Source 1 is written by

((a) continued) The Head of the Army Medical Services is also significant, as praise was unlikely considering she went to the Crimea independently, subsequent to the Army being let down. Therefore, Source 1 is high praise indeed and could display the extent of Seacole's appeal, yet it is also possible that John Hall praises her in order to improve his own reputation. This is due to the fact that the letter was written in 1856, the year the war ended and indeed when Army organisation & Medical departments became under great scrutiny due to the failures, therefore the reliability of this source could be questioned.

Source 3 moreover, also supports both Sources 1 & 2 to an extent, as, the letter extract written by Florence Nightingale reads, 'Seacole was very kind to the men in the Crimea and no doubt did some good'. This of course adds weight to the debate as it agrees with Source 2 which states 'Seacole was a wonderful woman & a great help to the men in the Crimea. Source 1 also agrees with this, as it also states, 'she charitably provided them with proper nourishment. Thus demonstrating that Mary Seacole's work was indeed helpful, much needed & highly

((a) continued) praised. Furthermore, in this sense, all three source agree one more.

However, Source 3 on the other hand, recognises the work and kindness of Leavelle, yet Nightingale also criticises her. For example, 'she introduced... much drunkenness and improper conduct' and that she 'would not call her establishment a bad house, it was something not far from it.' Sources 1 and 2 do not even refer to what Nightingale mentions, yet as Source 2 was admittedly a soldier, Seacole's 'British Hotel' was welcomed, as it has already been insinuated she provided home comforts and a sanctuary for soldiers. Therefore, in this case, the sources do not all corroborate with this, yet this is the only criticism contained.

However, considering the author of the source, she may also have written this into order to protect her own 'angelic' reputation, as Nightingale depicted, overshadowed the work of Leavelle in the Crimea. Therefore, this source needs to be carefully considered as also, it clearly highlights the typical Victorian view on this sort of behaviour as Nightingale suggests a lack of discipline.

(a) continued Furthermore, this criticism certainly contradicts both sources 1 & 2.

Finally, the care received is also mentioned in both sources 1 & 2 and his kindness in Source 3, as Source 1 states she administered ~~some~~ 'appropriate remedies' for the ailments of some of the soldiers, suggesting so extend he provided effective care. Also, this indeed corroborates with Source 2, that 'she did cure some patients' and that it was 'beyond doubt'. Furthermore, suggesting he did indeed provide effective care & was a great help in the Crimea.

To conclude, all three sources agree to an extent that Seacole was a great help in the Crimea, despite slight criticism from Florence Nightingale. However, considering Source 2 originates from a first-hand account, it is clear she was loved by many soldiers for her kindness and compassion, in the Crimea.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a secure level 4 answer. The sources are used as a set and there is sustained cross-referencing throughout the answer which is used as the basis on which to reach a judgement. The provenance is considered; had this been developed further, the answer would have been high level 4.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Candidates could improve their answers by focusing on the 'how far' element of the question more explicitly. This helps in the construction of judgements.

Question 1 (b) (i)

This was the less popular answer of the two questions in this section, but examiners were often impressed by the answers that they saw. Stronger candidates were able to link the sources with a very wide range of contextual own knowledge which included references to the impact of Spion Kop, the concentration camps linked to the work of Emily Hobhouse; many examples of jingoism in the media and popular culture and a statistical awareness of voter turnout in both the 1900 and 1906 elections. Stronger answers explored both changes over time and the different attitudes among different classes. Some also considered whether or not the British public "firmly" supported the Boer War. Many candidates, prompted by Source 6, commented on the fact that

Birmingham was Chamberlain's stronghold and, again using own knowledge, pointed out that support was less outspoken in other parts of the country such as Bristol. Weaker answers did not show evidence of the same range of own knowledge available to support the arguments, with some responses failing to mention the role of concentration camps. Such responses relied heavily on paraphrasing the sources, which were not always fully understood or appreciated. It is disappointing to note that a sizeable minority of candidates continue to discuss the provenance of the secondary sources, normally in very generic terms, which earns them no credit in this question. Time spent on this aspect could be well used to develop the line of argument and to incorporate a greater breadth of supporting own knowledge.

** (b) i) The Boer war, a war surrounded by the 'importance of Imperialism', did indeed, despite some opposition from radicals, evoke vast patriotism and pride within the British public to the extent that the majority, at least at the beginning of the war were firmly in support of it. Indeed, all three sources to an extent highlight this also. Firstly, Source 6, refers to the 'khaki election' in which the Conservative party under Lord Salisbury, as premier, won the election 'with a majority of 134 seats'. Further going on to read that 'this was a remarkable result & can be taken as clear-cut evidence of popular enthusiasm for the war'. Thus, this corroborates with the view in Source 6 that members of the public were so outraged by pro-boers' in particular Lloyd-George, that when speaking to an audience in Birmingham, the majority were*

hostile... I were enraged by his pro-boer utterances. Furthermore, these sources agree that the majority of the British public were in support of the war, and that those who were not known as 'pro-boers' were arguably received.

However, the origin of Source 6 must be taken

((b) continued) into consideration when evaluating the reliability of this evidence, as it is an extract from the 'Birmingham Post' newspaper, published on 19 December 1901, therefore it is likely to be bias. This is due to the fact that most newspapers were pro-war, therefore it may be possible that the newspaper dramatised the event in order to sell papers, and also, anti-war newspapers found their circulation drop significantly. Thus, this source may not necessarily be reliable and display a broad view for this reason.

On the other hand, the liberal, future prime-minister Lloyd-George did indeed receive a hostile and violent reception at this incident in Birmingham as he was perceived as a campaigner against the great empire of Britain. However, it is also known that Lloyd-George received the best reception at most of his talks in Britain, therefore highlighting that there always a minority in which agreed with his anti-war views and that some in Britain were not thoroughly supportive of the Boer

most. Yet, the fact that "Some newspapers changed editor, for example 'The Daily Chronicle' in order to become pro-war for

((b) continued) circulation rates to improve. Contrastingly demonstrates that anti-war views predominantly were not well received, and thus the majority were firmly in support of the war, which is highlighted from both sources 4 and 6.

In contrast, source 5, despite highlighting there was support for the war, displays a different view, which is not in agreement with sources 4 and 6. Source 5, an extract of a book written by a historian Stephen Miller, suggests 'the working-classes were notably absent from discussions in support of the Boer War'. Therefore, suggesting the working classes were in fact less supportive of the war as the sources continues on to read that crowds of support 'were led by, and consisted of, mostly middle-class young men'. Furthermore, this certainly does not corroborate with the stance of source 6 that men of all classes were pro-war as it states the mob which Lloyd-George faced was of 'many thousand people'. Moreover, it has been suggested by some historians that in comparison to the working classes, the middle-upper classes were in fact more supportive of the war as they had more to gain from the empire and some even

((b) continued) argued at the time, that the war was fought for the interests of wealthy businessmen, like that of Cecil Rhodes who wanted to invest in the gold found in the Transvaal region. Furthermore, source 5 and this further evidence suggests that not all members of society within Britain were pro-war, and that the lower classes were less supportive, which would be contradictory evidence.

Following on from this, source 5 even contradicts source 6, another extract written by a historian, as it states 'the khaki election of 1900 was not the indicator of patriotism and that 'the overwhelming feature of the election was voter apathy'. Thus, this directly contradicts source 6, as the source states that patriotism was not the cause which contrasts that the khaki election can be taken as 'clear-cut evidence of popular enthusiasm for the war'. Furthermore, all three sources in this sense are certainly not all in agreement, fueling the debate as to whether the majority of Britain were firmly in support of Britain's war in South Africa. However, it must be recognised that the khaki election took place in the early stages of the

((b) continued)

war. Therefore, this does not necessarily mean that the such strong enthusiasm within Britain was felt throughout the war's entirety. In fact, the Liberal party, ran by David Lloyd-George won the British election subsequent to the war and as a result it can be added, that the majority of the British public were not necessarily pro-war in the late years. This may be due to the fact that British defeats such as Spion Kop may have resulted in changing news in Britain. The reports from Emily Hobhouse also, and the Fawcett Commission's investigations into the concentration camps, where it is estimated 20,000 Boer civilians were killed, may also have contributed to less of a pro-war feeling within Britain, as such atrocities caused outrage. In fact, considering source 6 is dated 1901, earlier on in the war, prior to such information arising, this may display only a view which did not exist throughout the war.

Moreover, the origin of both sources 4 & 5 must be taken into consideration, as they were written in a retrospective view, by

((b) continued) historians. For this reason, it is possible to consider these sources as accurate, as they have been written by a supposed expert. However, considering they appear to be based on the opinions of the writer, they may not be fully reliable as evidence, yet have been written from expert opinion and information, which does indeed add weight to the debate.

To conclude, all three sources to an extent agree in that the Boer war received vast support within the British public. This may also be highlighted through the success of patriotic periodicals such as 'Union Jack' and the production of patriotic songs, for example 'Land of hope and glory', which even at present, is well known. However, when all of the evidence is taken into consideration, it is clear that in conclusion, such firm support shown did indeed wane towards the end of the war, as patriotism and pride became overshadowed by the exposure of British atrocities for example, therefore, it must be recognised that indeed, the majority of the British public, particularly during the early stages

((b) continued)

of the war, were indeed firmly supporters of it, yet were not during the later stages, as for example, Lloyd-George who faced such hostility for his views, later became elected as the Prime Minister of Great Britain, at the end of the war.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer uses the sources very well, in combination with each other and with an extensive range of specific and detailed own knowledge, to drive the argument forward. It achieves a strong level 4 in AO2 and secure level 4 for AO1.

Question 1 (b) (ii)

This was the more popular answer of the two questions in this section. Candidates answered this question with varying success. The weaker responses paraphrased the sources around the theme of the horror of the trenches, with no real development of argument and counter argument. These answers often worked through the sources in sequence, with no attempt to draw on more than one source at a time. Any own knowledge that was brought in to support this approach was very generic.

Some candidates took the arguments of Source 8 at face value. However, stronger answers could demonstrate specific and detailed knowledge of the material and the response was placed in the context of the challenge of trench warfare; the response was likely to include statistics on how the British army successfully managed to supply the men and provide entertainment, rotation and rations.

The very best responses understood that there were different experiences in different stages and areas of war. It is disappointing to note that a sizeable minority of candidates continue to discuss the provenance of the secondary sources, normally in very generic terms, which earns them no credit in this question. Time spent on this issue could be well used to develop the line of argument and incorporate a greater breadth of supporting own knowledge.

** (b) I disagree with the statement that British soldiers life in the trenches was an unwritten horror. Although they lived a life far from comfort, modern day depictions have overseen the occasional relief the soldiers were blessed with an have overemphasised the same as the poor conditions.*

Firstly, as supported by Corporal Coppard in Source 8, the men were not kept for long in one place. "we were not stepping in the trenches for too long". It was common place for soldiers to spend not more than 3 days in the trenches and only 2 at the front line. Back from the trenches there was reported to be regular entertainment such as band concerts, cinema and football matches between regiments. This is a clear 'break from the horror' of the front trenches and allowed soldiers to relax as well as keeping morals high within the army.

Morals were also kept high through pay and preserves for the soldiers. No fighting wage was less than a shilling a day and the majority of the British army were paid more than the French officers. They were supplied with food and clean clothes as well as a regular measure of rum. Tobacco was also

((b) continued) widely and cheaply available. Some men were far better off with regards to food, money and clothing during the war than they were at home.

~~However~~ There were undoubtedly many aspects of the trench warfare that were terrible to have to withstand, and a never to live with. Disease, as in many of the past wars ^{Britain had brought in} was a big problem, in particular Typhoid ^{and dysentery}. These ^{diseases} were carried freely by the "disease-ridden rats" that source 7 refers to, that were attracted to the muddy, dirty conditions of the trenches. ★

This takes me on to my next point, the conditions of the trenches. Source 7 describes the "wet, muddy conditions" of the trenches and the trench-foot that it consequently caused. We know that conditions in the trenches were poor and that trench-foot was common but as source 8 confirms, the soldiers weren't in the trenches for long and spent more time in "lousy scratch holes". Although these holes do not ~~ever~~ boast good living conditions, they would not be there for long ~~as they would be~~ during battle. Additionally, source 9 challenges claims of poor conditions made in source 7 and suggests that only parts of the trenches were particularly poor; "higher

ground meant the trenches held their shape better, the sand tended to drain properly." This suggests a
(b) continued break from the 'horror' of the poor conditions.

Source 9 also challenges source 7's suggestion of constant danger of death, "men constantly feared the danger of death or wounds." Although there were definite risks of death or injury at times, as source 9 agrees "full-scale battle was never continuous." Men were also relieved from this risk when they were removed from the trenches or the front line.

The Cardwell army reforms also helped to relieve the men from some of the horrors of warfare, for example men were allowed to stay at no longer than 6 months at war without a trip home, whereas before this had been 12 months.

As confirmed earlier, the ^{soldiers} ~~officers~~ ^{were} ~~lives~~ ^{lives} ~~were~~ ^{not} ~~one~~ ^a luxury and rightly so, when they had 'misbehaved' they were to be punished. ~~However capital punishment had become far less of a common punishment, as had field punishment, and~~ being confined to barracks was probably the most common form of punishment and some may argue that punishing the ^{soldiers} added to the horror of warfare, however, capital punishment and field punishment ~~algebra~~ were ~~in~~ used far less freely than in previous wars.

((b) continued) Another significant example of relief from the horrors of war for the trenches was the an incredibly efficient parcel system. Soldiers received regular parcels and letters from their loved ones which undoubtedly allowed them to escape the horror of the trenches even if only very ~~briefly~~ briefly.

In conclusion, although the life of the soldiers was unarguably hard it's horrors it would be unfair to argue that their life was of unbroken horrors. Disease was lesser than in previous wars and treatment was advancing. They were recruited and paid well, were well fed and had frequent breaks from battle as well as hearing or receiving parcels from home.

* However, in comparison to previous wars Britain had fought in, for example the Boer, disease was a far lesser problem. The first world war was indeed the first war in which more casualties were killed in combat than by disease.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer achieves a secure level 3 in both Assessment Objectives, despite some literal reading of the message of Source 8. The candidate is aware that there is a debate going on in the sources and brings some specific own knowledge to support this debate. The candidate uses the debate in the sources as the basis of the response, although the sources and own knowledge are not always fully integrated.

Question 2 (a)

There were a number of effective answers to this question in which candidates demonstrated that they were able to cross-reference convincingly the arguments of the sources whilst also considering aspects of the provenance in order to reach measured judgements. It was pleasing to note that there were a number of candidates who picked up on some of the more subtle points that were raised in the sources, particularly in Source 12.

A surprising number of candidates did not tackle the significance of obituaries effectively and there were some responses that did not demonstrate understanding of what an obituary was. Many answers also failed to pick up on the contrasting evidence provided by Sources 11 and 12 regarding Becker's political involvement in her later years.

Some candidates tended to compare and contrast the sources, but did not relate their answers directly to the question.

Both Source 10 and 11 disagree with Source 12. Source 12 portrays a light-hearted mockery of Lydia Becker's work, while Source 11 acknowledges she 'knew what it was to be laughed at', it still portrays Becker as a successful suffrage campaigner. Source 10 meanwhile ~~does~~ directly disagrees with Source 12's view of Becker by describing her as 'respected.' Source 11 does share a small part of Source 12 assessment of Lydia Becker's opposition, while Source 10 does not mention this, only the good work Becker did.

Source 12 is ~~written~~ published in a mens section of a newspaper, so is highly likely to mock the views and status of women. In source 10 they refuse to acknowledge Becker's achievements, even claiming the Liberal supporters 'withdrew their support' for Becker, source 10 however does not agree with this, shown when it says Becker 'served Manchester well'. This source disagrees

((a) continued)

with Source 12's view that Becker lost support.

Source 12 describes Becker as being the subject of 'good-natured jests' inferring she was mocked and not widely listened to, this is also disagreed with in Source 10 who describe her as a 'respected' and 'knowledgeable' speaker in her obituary. Being an obituary published in Becker's home town, it is likely Becker's positives will be greatly focused on and many of her flaws put to one side.

Lydia Becker is portrayed as a person who was 'not willing to surrender' to other people's views. This portrayal is strengthened in Source 11 when it says Becker 'never diverted from her path'. Both these quotes suggest Lydia Becker was strong willed, further agreed with in Source 10 when she is described as an 'unyielding leader'. Source 11 is another obituary, but from a journal Becker founded herself. This would infer an increased focus on Becker's achievements but it would also be knowledgeable about Becker's experiences.

Lydia Becker was seen to be a likeable woman. Even Source 12 concedes they will 'regret her going'. This recognition of Becker gives the closest similarity to the

(a) continued

after two sources. Source 10 focuses highly on Becher's successes, while Source 11 does recognise some difficulties she faced.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is an example of a response that improves as it goes on. In the second paragraph of the answer, there is some matching of the sources rather than genuine cross-referencing. The candidate also makes an error in the same paragraph – saying Source 12 when they mean Source 10. However, the meaning is so clear that there would be no penalty for this. As the answer progresses, there is, however, evidence of cross-referencing in relation to the question and some sensible commentary about the provenance of the sources. All of this means that the answer eventually scores a sound level 3 mark.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

It can be useful to open the answer with an introductory paragraph (as this answer does) which outlines the key approaches of the sources and begins to make judgements about their relationship to each other.

Question 2 (b) (i)

This was the more popular answer of the two questions in this section. Candidates were aware of the meaning of the term 'angel in the house' and the question was generally well answered. The strongest candidates were able to integrate arguments that were derived from the sources with detailed own knowledge that included later 19th century legislation, changes in education and the Jackson case, linking these to their impact on the position of women. Such answers often realised that legislation did not necessarily equate to real progress, even for middle class women. Weaker answers struggled to understand the message of Source 14 and tended to paraphrase each source in turn. Where such answers had supporting own knowledge, it often amounted to little more than a description of the Jackson case.

It is disappointing to note that a sizeable minority of candidates continue to discuss the provenance of the secondary sources, normally in very generic terms, which earns them no credit in this question. Such time could be well used to develop the line of argument and incorporate a greater breadth of supporting own knowledge.

(b) By the end of the second half of the nineteenth century the concept of ~~the~~ 'angel in the house' had not lost its relevance. Although many laws were in place to protect women legally, socially women were still inferior to men and the ideology of the separate spheres was still the ideal way for a Victorian man and woman to act. 'Angels' were ~~still~~ still greatly desirable and was expected by society from middle class women. Courts ~~was~~ still favoured men socially, an example of this would be the Jackson case. Mr Jackson ~~kidnapped~~ locked his wife up in their marital ~~house~~ house for refusing to have sex with him in 1891. This was breaking the law ~~according~~ according to the Matrimonial Causes Act 1884, which was put into place

to prevent this. However, at first the courts ~~also~~ took Mr Jackson's ~~opinion~~ side as socially it was acceptable and although abuse in

((b) continued) a Victorian home was a taboo, Mr Jackson did it in his own home so at first the courts did not ~~challenge~~ challenge him for it until much protest from Mrs Jackson's friends.

Source 14, which was written by John Stuart Mill a Labour MP who had greatly supported female suffrage, states that a woman "is not independent" and "her destiny is to receive everything from others". This shows that despite the changes in law, women were still classed as second class citizens and that women would have to live their lives by receiving everything from others such as their father^s or brother up until they get married, where the responsibility would be handed over to their husband. This showed that "women could not appreciate the value of independence" and were not encouraged to seek jobs or be active in public lives.

((b) continued) or politics but to be a 'Angel in the house' and to be domestic like their husbands want them too be. The perfect 'Angel' was suppose to ~~perpetuate~~ "perpetuate the race" and the attitude that women were still 'ruled by their wombs' and were 'irrational' supported that the 'Angel in the house' ideology was still relevant.

However, there is also much evidence too suggest that during the second half of the nineteenth century the concept of 'Angel in the house' had lost its relevance. Source 15 states that few women "challenged" the 'Angel in the house' before the late nineteenth century. This shows that increasingly large amounts of women were begin to not wish too follow the 'Angel in the house' philosophy and out of that bore the Suffrage movement as women were finally beginning to desire more freedom from the household and politics. Women were by the second half of the

(b) continued) nineteenth Century getting more jobs and were finally active outside the household. "If you were middle-class there was much to celebrate" (Source 13). New legislations were being passed, most of which had no benefits for men and meant that women now had "control over their own property", "unlawful for husband to lock up his wife" and "women could vote in some local elections". This meant that the second half of the nineteenth century was the start of women gained some type of legal support, ~~so~~ they were also made legal beings and could be prosecuted on the same grounds as men. The results of the Jackson Case also supports this argument as eventually Mrs Jackson was favoured over Mr Jackson, something which most likely would not have happened at the beginning of the 19th Century.

In conclusion, there is more evidence to suggest that during the second half of the nineteenth century

((b) continued) The concept of the 'angel in the house' had not lost its relevance. Women were still 'legal slaves' to their husbands and "women made to their husbands were objects of pity".



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response to Q2(b)(i) does take a descriptive approach at times – note the section on the Jackson case. However, the candidate is aware that there is an argument and counter argument to be addressed. There is sufficient argument for this to move into lower level 3 for AO1, although the answer does not develop the analysis very far nor reference extensive own knowledge. The response quotes periodically from the sources in order to illustrate points, but does not use this to drive the argument – thus AO2 is a strong level 2.

Question 2 (b) (ii)

This was the less popular answer of the two questions in this section.

Weaker answers tended to paraphrase the sources in sequence without developing the argument beyond the fact that key party leaders, such as Asquith, tended to be against the idea of reform. A significant minority drew on evidence from events that fell during and after the First World War; this could not be credited. Candidates do need to pay close attention to the wording of the question and ensure that they confine their remarks to the chronological parameters of the question.

There were some very strong answers to this question, which showed that candidates recognised the debate that they were being asked to consider. Such responses made full and effective use of the sources to develop an argument and counter argument, which was not confined to the 20th century, but picked up the prompts in Sources 16 and 17 to discuss issues pertaining to the late 19th century. Stronger responses displayed a clear grasp of the politics of the pre-war period and the conflicting pressures on the Liberals at the time. It is disappointing to note that a sizeable minority of candidates continue to discuss the provenance of the secondary sources, normally in very generic terms, which earns them no credit in this question. Such time could be well used to develop the line of argument and incorporate a greater breadth of supporting own knowledge.

Paper Summary

Based on performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

Part A

1. Candidates should spend sufficient time reading the sources to ensure that they understand the nuances of the arguments presented.
2. Candidates should treat the sources as a package in order to facilitate cross-referencing. Weaker candidates often resorted to a brief summary of each source in turn. Such responses cannot go beyond level 2.
3. Provenance should be integrated within the argument, rather than treated as a stand-alone paragraph. This aids its use as part of the argument. Candidates should avoid making sweeping assertions from the provenance that could apply to any source.
4. The best responses cross-reference not only the content of the sources but also their provenance. This enables candidates to weigh the sources and reach supported judgements.

Part B

1. Candidates need to ensure that their subject knowledge conforms to the specification. Weaker responses usually relied very heavily on information derived primarily from the sources.
2. In order to address the question effectively, candidates need to offer an analysis driven by the arguments raised in the sources, rather than give a descriptive or chronological account.
3. Whilst it may be relevant to use the provenance of the contemporary source(s) to judge the weight that can be assigned to the argument, there is no such requirement for the secondary sources and it is not rewarded in this assessment objective. Some candidates engaged in generalised comments relating to the reliability of a particular historian at the expense of developing argument and analysis supported by specific own knowledge.
4. Candidates need to ensure that where the question asks them to deal with a specific time period they do not stray beyond those parameters.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code US034633 January 2013

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

