

Examiners' Report
June 2013

GCE History 6HI02 C

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. 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.

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



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson'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 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

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. 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 our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

June 2013

Publications Code US036145

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

Introduction

Examiners reported that the majority of candidates understood the essential requirements of the Unit 2 examination. Many were able to structure their work effectively, addressing the specific focus of both the Part A and Part B questions and writing with understanding and insight about the key themes.

At the highest levels of attainment, there was impressive work.

However, it is disappointing to note that there were a minority of candidates seen in this exam series who did less well, both in terms of their skills set and their knowledge base.

In Part A, many candidates were able to use the language of cross referencing, but a significant number often matched statements that showed a comparison for agreement or disagreement and did not explain or draw out the inferences that are necessary to develop a cross reference. There seemed to be an increase this series in the number of candidates who worked through the sources sequentially; this makes it very hard for candidates to cross reference effectively and move beyond level 2. There also appeared to be an increase in the number of candidates who were using their own knowledge to develop points raised in the content of the sources in this question in this exam series. There is no credit for this in Part A and thus, such candidates waste time that would be better spent developing those aspects of the answer that do gain credit – cross referencing, a consideration of provenance linked to the arguments and judgements.

In Part B, it was again disappointing to note that a minority of candidates relied very heavily on the material in the sources, which was not always securely understood. In a small number of cases, there was no evidence of any own knowledge at all being used. Centres are reminded that candidates are expected to have some range and depth of knowledge that can be applied to the Part B questions. There also appeared to be an increase in the number of responses seen this year where candidates used their own knowledge to create the line of argument and made only passing reference to the sources. The best answers made use of both elements, using the sources to shape the argument and own knowledge to develop the points raised. Despite comments in previous examiners' reports, even more candidates appeared to comment on provenance in their responses to Part B in this exam series. Such comments are often very generic – 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). In any event, such comments, even if well developed, generally do not contribute to AO2b, which is what is being tested in Part 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 that they can spell technical words correctly, especially when those words form part of the question or the sources. The usage of 'bias' seems to have increased again this year and brings with it all the variant misspellings – biast and biasicity to name but two. Where candidates have a few minutes left at the end of the exam, they would be well advised to check their work – there seemed to be an increase in misnumbering of sources and misquoting of dates (e.g. 1956 instead of 1856) which might well be identified if the script was proof read at the end.

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

Question 1

Question 1(a)

This question worked well and presented few difficulties for candidates. They generally found the sources accessible and it is pleasing to note that there were relatively few examples of a source by source approach seen. Most candidates attempted to engage in comparison and cross referencing, even where it was not well developed. Some answers tended to take the sources at face value or to only pick out what a general reading revealed. As a result, for example, some candidates took Source 3's rejection of war to show a lack of support for the war effort. A number of candidates did not recognise that the attitude of Source 2 changed over time and saw his position as static – either supporting or not supporting the war. There was some confusion for some candidates with the gender of Source 3 and, to a lesser extent, Source 1. This rarely impacted on the evaluation of provenance. However, many candidates were able to identify some of the nuances of the sources. Most candidates discussed the provenance of the sources, but many did not pick up on the differing dates or used provenance rather generically e.g. Source 3 was a diary, so it must be reliable. The best responses were able to cross reference all three sources with confidence, commenting appropriately on the provenance to support the judgements that were being reached.

(a) ~~While~~ ^{the} ~~source~~ ^{three sources} A ~~largely~~ ^{seems to largely} hint that the British public ^{did not} ~~give~~ their full backing to the war effort. Sources 2 and 3 appear ~~to~~ ^{to} be in disagreement with ~~British~~ ^{British} contention.

Despite this, both sources 1 and 2 ~~do~~ ^{demonstrate} how there was definitely some public backing. Source 1 comments on how the men who have already volunteered to be on the army will receive warm welcomes when they return. This ~~validates~~ ^{validates} how ~~those who~~ there was some public backing of the war effort as men already seemed to have volunteered. Similarly, source 2 states that one's skills must be "devoted to my country". The word "devoted" holds strong

Connotations of patriotism and like those who had volunteered in source 1, there appears to be some public backing of the war effort here as

(a) continued Well.

However, source 3 ~~is~~ stands in stark contrast to the other two sources. ~~Because~~ This is because ~~from~~ the start it makes reference to the "ragging loss of life" and the "horror" of it all. The strong, emotive discourse implies how ~~the writer~~ Bilsborough is struggling to offer her full backing to the war effort. ~~the~~ Whilst her view may not necessarily reflect that of the public, she is a member of public herself and so, we can deduce that not all members of the public offered their full support. Source 2 offers some validation of this because ~~it~~ ~~contains~~ the provenance comments on how Kirkwood led a "strike of munitions workers". This suggests how not everyone fully backed the war effort. The fact that they are striking hints at a hindrance to the war effort itself. ~~It is~~ ~~it~~ can be cross referenced with the lack of support offered by Hilsborough to the war effort.

(a) continued

Adding to this, the provenance of source 1 also suggests that not everyone fully backed the war effort. This is because it is a speech being made at a recruiting rally. The fact such rallies had to be held allows us to infer that ~~not~~ ~~the~~ the ~~whole~~ public were not fully behind the war effort and so, rallies had to be held to encourage such support. Also, the source comments on how there are "able-bodied" men still on the streets makes the Mayor "ashamed of him". ~~the~~ This implies that these men have not yet volunteered, ^{perhaps} indicating their lack of support for the war effort.

However, sources 2 and 3 offer glimpses of there being confusion in whether people fully backed the war effort or not. For instance, source 2 says that ~~the~~ ~~people~~ ~~were~~ to help in the war effort and ~~the~~ ~~also~~ ~~the~~ despite knowing the horrific outcomes of war was

((a) continued) a "confusion"; this view is echoed in source 3 when Bilston says "it is hard to struggle on, putting patriotism before peace". Both sources reflect the conflict people may have felt when ~~offering their~~ ~~full~~ deciding whether to fully back the war effort or not. However, it must be noted that ~~the~~ source 2 is an extract from Kirkwood's autobiography titled "My life in revolt". The word "revolt" connotes ~~a~~ conflicting of attitudes which may explain his "confusion" ~~of~~ ~~being~~ at whether to offer his full backing. Notably, source 4 presents no signs of such confusion perhaps due ~~it~~ being a speech. We would expect it to be declarative in its message and aim to influence people to help in the war effort.

Conclusively, whilst all three sources suggest that there was some ~~backing~~ public backing of the war, sources 2 and 3 challenge the contention that there was "full" backing more. The contrasting

((a) continued) attitudes portrayed in enemy ~~sources~~ may ~~not~~ mirror how the ~~whole~~ public were struggling to offer their full backing. Conversely, source 1, despite its provenance suggesting otherwise, hints at how the public were largely ~~backing~~ the war effort.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response is clearly aware of the focus of the question and uses the sources to offer both agreement and disagreement to the position outlined in the question. The sources are clearly cross referenced and provenance is considered. There is evidence of the candidate starting to reach a judgement. This combination of skills means that this response has accessed Level 4.

Question 1 (b) (i)

Candidates were split fairly evenly across the two questions, with slightly fewer attempting this question. Most responses argued from the sources with some general comments about the constraints imposed on Fenton in terms of technology and the limitations of sources of information in the case of Russell. Candidates often tended to write more confidently about Russell than Fenton. This may be because they were able to use Source 5 to develop their ideas and link this to the debate about the Charge of the Light Brigade. Only a minority of candidates were able to bring a range of detailed own knowledge to support their argument. Indeed, there were a number of misapprehensions about the work of both men, revealing a lack of specific own knowledge about their work. Whilst some candidates tended to structure their responses on a source by source basis, more developed answers looked for the issues and the alternative views that could be presented and were able to reach an overall judgement about whether the work of the two men amounted to a 'realistic portrayal of the Crimean War'.

It was disappointing to note that many candidates were still making generic points regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b.

There is always two sides to every story and within the Crimean war the work of Roger Fenton and William Russell is a ~~3~~ clear divide. Evidence the both gave from picture and reporting were perceived in two different lights. Two themes agree that ~~#~~ Fenton and Russell coverage was realistic suggesting they were a success and they had factual correction. Whilst on the other hand they did not and evidence given was mythical. In this essay I will ~~agree~~ show that I ^{disagree} ~~agree~~ Fenton and Russell didn't given realistic coverage of the Crimean War.

In source 6 evidence suggesting how Russell and Fenton's work was all mythical is clearly displayed supporting the British public were receiving incorrect information. First off ~~#~~ the reporting of Russell "has acquired mythical status supporting the view straight off the bat. Russell "historical significance" also has no weight to it because the

((b) continued) known how Russell was absent from the majority of battles. Therefore some ~~reputable~~ ~~reputable~~ repertoire of the battles are completely made up as he set out to ruin the reputation of leader Raglan and Nolan. Russell did not like leaders and wanted to damage them. ~~Evidence~~ → The source ~~is written by~~ ^{has been wrote} by Brandon High who wrote a review of Russell book. Therefore the source has weight as he is diving into depth reading far into his book trying to tell people the real truth of Russell. Source 4 and 5 do not agree with this view suggesting Russell and Fenton were a huge success and displayed great coverage of the 'Charge of the Light Brigade'. Although Fenton is not mentioned in the source he still did not display ~~the~~ realistic coverage as his cameras could only take still pictures thus not displaying the realism of the war. As well as he was taking pictures for a British victory therefore his pictures can be seen as propaganda as he was making Britain out to be ~~the~~ better than it was. Therefore this is why I disagree with the view that Fenton and Russell's coverage was realistic as both their intentions were bias. And did not show the truth and horrible conditions of the Crimean War.

On the other hand source 4 shows

((b) continued) how Fenton and Russell's coverage was a realistic view of the war displaying their coverage was a success. The photographs Fenton took "were a huge success" and he ~~long~~ touched on "a public passion for documentary".

This was due to forward movement of photographs as Britain were used to oil paintings and were amazed with his work. The source is written by Simon Grant a historian who published his work in 2008. Due to Grant being a historian this adds weight as you can trust his view as he has looked back over time of the events. Because of the success he talks about he wants to inform all about Fenton specifically and his successful work. Fenton's work opened up a new gallery for photographs and took many photos of soldiers showing their lives. The government allowed him to attend the war to take photographs and wanted to show Britain strong soldiers and he did this with his love for photography. Source 6 strongly disagree with this so called success and fails to even mention Fenton and focuses on Russell's failure. Whilst source 5 agrees on the realistic coverage talking about how the people who Russell talked to ^{whose} "honesty cannot be questioned". This suggesting the coverage of Russell and the people he spoke to would not be about the cause of events. Therefore source 4 and 5 agree with each other how Fenton and Russell were a success in comparison to

((b) continued) source 6 who strongly disagree and say it was an unrealistic coverage of the Crimean War.

Within source 5 the theme of factual correction is deployed as Russell talks about army leaders and the Charge of Light Brigade. "I shall proceed to describe... under my own eyes". Although there is evidence stating Russell was not at many battles he may well have been at the Charge of the Brigade.

This is because it was in fact that Captain Nolan informed Lord Lucan incorrectly which led the cavalry to advance down the wrong way to be placed under heavy fire by the Russians. The miscommunication was down to the step brothers of Lucan and Nolan's unprofessionalism barely being on speaking terms. Many soldiers died and Russell had reported it well showing realistic coverage. The source has plenty of weight as it is written by Russell himself and therefore can be read with trust. Source 4 agrees with 5 and that there is factual correctness saying Fenton did "telling it how it was" showing they did realistic reporting of the war. Therefore source 4 and 5 agree that Fenton and Russell did have realistic reports of the Crimean War.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response relies heavily on the sources from which it extracts quotes which are not developed. There is some basic contextual own knowledge, but the response lacks any specific detail. The answer spends some time exploring the provenance of the secondary sources and this is not a requirement in the Part B question. Therefore, this response scores level 2 for both assessment objectives.

Question 1 (b) (ii)

Candidates were split fairly evenly across the two questions, with slightly more attempting this question. It is very pleasing to note that the majority of candidates used the sources to develop a line of argument, even where the answer was constructed on a source by source basis. However, it was more disappointing to note that too much of the supporting knowledge that was offered was often generalised or relied heavily on the sources. Relatively few candidates were aware of the need to relieve the pressure on the French at Verdun. There were, however, some effective points made on developments in tactics such as the use of tanks and the creeping barrage. Most candidates were able to discuss the casualties on the first day of the Somme, although not all were able to go far beyond this. Source 9 was generally used at face value and few candidates went beyond this in their use of this source. The best answers that were seen were able to use the sources to create a line of argument which was supported by a range of specific and detailed knowledge and some impressive writing was seen in response to this question. However, it was disappointing to note that, despite comments in previous examiners' reports, many candidates were still making generic points regarding provenance, sometimes at great length, which cannot be rewarded under AO2b.

(b) Due to the high casualties and general wastage of life, it is understandable why some would regard the 'Battle of Somme' as a "defeat" for the British. However, as source 7 clearly mentions, it is difficult for us to disregard the long term successes of the war. From the manner in which the British army learnt from their mistakes to ~~their~~ ^{its} contribution to increasing French morale, the 'Somme' was undoubtedly a long term success. Whilst ~~it~~ the large number of casualties may allude to it being a "defeat", its long term successes override this. Thus, ~~we~~ ~~we~~ we must vastly disagree that the Battle of Somme was a "defeat" for the British. Despite this, many would argue that Haig's attempt at a "breakthrough" ~~being~~ during the 'Somme' was a

"defeat" due to the large casualty figures for what some see as pointless gains. For instance, both sources 7 and 8 comment on how strategically

((b) continued) the battle was a "defeat": source 8 states this explicitly in the first line and source 7 says that the initial attempt of a breakthrough was a failure. This is validated by how on the first day of the Somme alone, the British had over 20,000 casualties. Some question ~~rather~~ whether such high casualties were necessary for the somewhat small gains made strategically. ~~for example~~ source 8 goes further to say how British attempts to wear "down the spirit of the German army" was largely a failure. Although it did weaken the opposition, it did not do this to the "point of crippling" them as a fighting machine. ~~and~~ This ensures that the large casualties are seen as a ~~the~~ waste and pointless. Hence, the 'Battle of Somme' could be viewed as a "defeat" for the British.

~~However~~ ^{Moreover}, the immediate effects of the Battle ~~may point~~ may point to it being a "defeat". However, we must take into consideration the

((b) continued) long term effects in order to decide whether it truly was a "defeat". Source 7 appears to adopt this line of argument as it explicitly comments on how the battle as it "developed" was a "success for the British army". Sheffield points out that in February and March 1917, the "Germans abandoned their positions" on the Somme. This undoubtedly signals of British victory as one of their aims of removing the Germans from the Somme had succeeded. However, the more cynical may see how considering the battle began in July 1916, ~~for~~ it took a long time for the British to force the Germans to abandon their position. They may argue that to lose so many men to only move the Germans from the Somme was pointless and ~~that~~ could be seen as a "defeat". Whilst this is a fair disposition, there were other long term effects of the Somme on the British ~~which~~ army which outweighs the cynical view.

((b) continued) One pivotal example would be how the battle had to be fought in order to relieve the French at Verdun. This is because French morale was declining as the German army prepared to "bleed the French white" in Verdun (1916). Due to this, it appears that the British had no choice but to attack on the 'Somme'. In this regard, we cannot agree completely that the battle was a "defeat" as it is clear now it was crucial in saving French morale.

In addition, the 'Somme' could be seen as a success because as source 7 ~~states~~ states, it provided valuable "experience" to the BEF. For example, they had the chance to use tanks for the first time. Although many of them broke down, the BEF were able to learn from ^{this} and improve their tanks ~~to which to make them~~ to provide the effective ones used in 1918. Also, the 'Somme' had taught them how a preliminary artillery bombardment warned the enemy

((b) continued) that an attack was imminent. They learnt from this because in ~~1918~~ the Battle of Arras ~~(1918)~~ (1917), there was no preliminary bombardment which would warn the enemy. ~~(1918)~~ Subsequently, as the British were able to learn from their mistakes at the Somme, we are simply unable to whole heartedly agree that the Somme signified a British "defeat".

Adding to this, initially after the Somme, many ~~stated~~ categorized it as a defeat. However, source 7 clearly demonstrates how it was a success. The title of the book itself validates this. "Forgotten Victory" implies how many regarded the Somme as a futile loss of life and clearly dismissed the successful elements of it. Therefore, the Somme cannot fully be seen as a "defeat" because ~~it~~ ^{what} it may have initially appeared ⁱⁿ that way, its long term effects were far too profound to ignore.

On the other hand, as well as the high casualties, the Somme could partly be seen as a British defeat as some argue that it ~~damaged~~ ^{weakened/reduced} British morale. Source

8 ~~the~~ offers some evidence of this as it directly states that "enthusiastic volunteers were enthusiastic no longer" and they had "lost faith". This hints at the morale decline ^{suffered by} ~~for~~ the British as a result of the Somme.

Even though this suggests that (b) continued) the Somme was vastly a "defeat", the evidence in source 9 prevents us from ^{fully} agreeing ~~fully~~ with such a view. This is because source 9 says how no body "here doubts as to which side will ultimately win". The implication here is that the British are confident that they will eventually win ~~and~~ which suggests that the Somme was not a complete "defeat". However, source 9 does ~~not~~ partly support source 8 because the former provides evidence which could back up the claims made in source 8 about enthusiasm declining. Source 9 states that "I have had enough" and "all we ask is to talk". We must treat such claims with caution as source 9 is the diary of only one soldier and we would not expect it to be reflective of how all the other soldiers felt. So, we cannot

agree completely that the Somme was a British "defeat" with just this evidence alone.

((b) continued)

Conclusively, ~~despite~~ ^{while} the Somme ~~seemingly~~ appeared to be an initial "defeat" to the British, ~~it~~ in ~~the~~ the long term, it was largely not a "defeat". Hence, ~~it~~ it is almost impossible to agree without hesitation to the view that it was a "defeat". On the one hand, the large number of British casualties and ~~that~~ ^{the} ~~fact~~ ^{fact} decline in British morale ~~may~~ ~~and~~ all allude to it being a "defeat". However, ~~it~~ ~~shows~~ the offensive reduced pressure from the French in Verdun and contributed greatly to the BEF's improvement of their tactics which eventually won the war. As source 7 states, it was indeed a "forgotten victory" because many would ~~only~~ typify the ~~battle~~ ^{battle} with its ^{huge} loss of life and go on to label it a "defeat". However, its long term significance

prevents this from being the case.
Thus, we can only partly agree that
the Somme was a "defeat" for
the British.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a Level 4 response in both assessment objectives. It argues the issues throughout the response, developing the points that are raised in the sources with a wide-ranging mixture of contextual and detailed own knowledge.

Question 2

Question 2(a)

It is pleasing to be able to note that most candidates did attempt to engage in comparison and cross referencing and that only a small minority took a source by source approach to this question. However, a number of responses to this question did not go beyond a surface reading of the sources. As a result, for example, Source 12's attack on militancy was taken as proof of his anti suffrage sentiments, and some candidates argued from Source 11 that the suffragette movement had been 'injured' by militancy. Better answers often recognised that the simple fact that militancy was being discussed meant that it was at least in the public eye, even if not always successful in outcome. Most candidates also considered provenance within their responses, although not all responses developed this sufficiently to support the arguments fully that they were making. The best answers showed a recognition of the differing dates of the sources and commented sensibly on this.

(a) David Lloyd George ~~press~~ part of the government and therefore in the view to protect its members against aggressive women, clearly shows negative feelings towards women's militancy. Stating that the "women's movement has gone back" I can infer from this that he thought that women had made some progression in terms of their campaigning before the arson attacks. He backs this up by stating that it was "duty of all of us who wanted... vote" He at that point categorised himself in support of the vote. It is clear however that Lloyd George is against militancy, stating its negativity is a "mood of the nation" I can infer from the word "nation" that militancy has angered many across the country. Clearly ~~portraying~~ portraying women's ^{militancy} in a negative light. Lloyd George is very definite in his words used "worst I have ever seen," This makes the

rest of the country agree, due

((a) continued) to his certainly against women's militant actions.

In comparison to this Hannah Mitchell who was a leader of ~~WSPU~~ WSPU and therefore in favour of their militant acts, Disagrees with David Lloyd George. Quoting that the now imprisoned suffragettes had become "central figures" I can infer from this that their actions were looked up to by many campaigners and proved to be inspirational. Mitchell also felt the militancy created "Sympathisers" as it proved to the public how disastrous women's situation had become. To add to this Mitchell stated that "Twenty years propaganda... not affect" here she is referencing to the NUWSS ~~even~~ peaceful campaigns. I could be argued that Mitchell is supportive of militancy due to the fact that the NUWSS had tried for so long to be noticed and only now militancy had been introduced did they have full media support. In that sense Mitchell

(a) continued) disagrees with Lloyd George's view on campaigns.

Similarly to Mitchell, Millicent Fawcett a leading figure in the NUWSS was writing at the beginning of the more militant campaigns, agrees with Mitchell's view, "old fashioned Suffragists" I can infer from this that she feels the NUWSS perhaps are more old fashioned and need to look at a more modern form of campaigning, this shows me that militancy was becoming the more favoured approach even by those not involved in WSPU.

This change in tone from NUWSS in supported of militancy ~~shows~~ clearly challenges the view of David Lloyd George in that it seems militancy was a ground breaking discovery in terms of campaigning.

~~with both~~ Although both Mitchell and Fawcett are campaigners for women's rights and would therefore both aim to support any campaign

((a) continued) ing style, therefore it could be questioned the extent of Millicent Fawcett's honesty.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is an example of a level 2 response. It attempts to make some links between the sources, but whilst it uses the language of cross referencing, with phrases such as 'in comparison' and 'similarly', it generally does not apply the skills required nor develop the arguments. The candidate suggests that inferences are being drawn, but often they are just paraphrasing the source.

Question 2 (b) (i)

Candidates were split fairly evenly across the two questions, with slightly fewer attempting this question. Many candidates were able to use the sources as the basis of a debate and were able to discuss with varying degrees of success the importance of the Married Women's Property Acts, the Jackson Case and the 'angel in the house' theory. The most impressive answers were those that went beyond these three areas to discuss other aspects involved in the personal status of women, such as the custody of children, divorce legislation and the campaign against the Contagious Diseases Acts. Such answers also frequently appreciated the existence of class divisions between working class and middle class women. Some candidates tended to write very generalised answers based on the content of the sources, often working through the sources in sequence, or to misinterpret the focus of the question and deal at length with issues of suffrage, employment and/or education. Many candidates had not appreciated the chronological parameters of this question and included the First World War in their answers. It was disappointing to note that many candidates were still making generic points regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b.

* (b) 1860-1914^{WW1} personal status of women improvements

- infants → 7+ → lord chancellor
- married women's acts → property
→ money
- Jackson marriage case

At the beginning and for the majority of the 19th century a woman was seen as nothing more than a man's personal property to whom he could do as he wished, she either belonged to her father or husband and would be expected to comply to his every need without objection as she needed his support to survive. ~~At~~ Towards the end of the 19th century however things seemingly began to change as new legislation was introduced to protect the rights of a woman and to give her greater independence.

Some of the new legislation passed is mentioned in sources 13 and 14, both make reference to the new married women's property laws but they disagree on their significance. The married women's property acts of 1870 and 1882 would allow women to keep some of their own property they had.

before marriage so ~~was~~ if they divorced the husband would not be able to claim ownership to everything she had brought into the marriage. But as source 14 points out this had

((b) continued) little impact as the upper and middle class women were already protected through marriage settlements and it would not have affected the working class as few actually had much money or could afford to get divorced after marriage anyway.

One act not mentioned by the sources is the custody of infants act which allowed wives custody of their children under the age of 7. Prior to this a husband could take his children away and refuse his wife access to them, the only problem with this act though is that while it did give mothers custody they had to be judged to be of morally good character by the lord high chancellor (a man) who is likely to favour the husband's right to custody. The Jackson marriage case was an example of new legislation being put into action, when Mrs Jackson refused to live with her husband for abandoning her he kidnapped her and locked her up in his home, the triumph Mrs Jackson gained in being freed was a step towards a greater personal status for women and a step away from women being seen as property. The Jackson marriage case does however

(b) continued) highlight that while women may have been gaining rights they actually faced the issue of unchanging attitudes, when Mrs Jackson was freed crowds of men gathered at her and praised Mr Jackson's actions and this is a problem highlighted in source 15. A book published after much of the aforementioned legislation took place it describes a woman's role to ~~be~~ ~~to~~ similar affect as the 'angel in the house' by Coventry Patmore. One of a dutiful wife whose 'very purpose in living is to give out pleasure to her husband' and the fact that it was the publisher's best seller up until the war in 1914 suggests that the majority of people still held very traditional roles of separate spheres, a thought that is present in source 13 as well which states that although there were improvements they only improved women's lives within the 'domestic sphere', personal freedom outside of which was non-existent.

There are also female divorce rights to consider, between 1860 and 1914 several acts were passed regarding divorce in Britain which set a high double standard between men and women. For a divorce a man need only prove his wife adulterous

((b) continued) which was easier since she was likely to be pregnant from it. A woman on the other had to prove her husband was adulterous and guilty of either bestiality, homosexuality, desertion, cruelty or rape ^(presumably of another person as marital rape only became illegal in 1991). What is more the one filing for divorce would most likely gain most of the wealth in the marriage.

So, it would seem that the personal status of women between 1860 and 1914 had very little effect on the lives of the majority of women. While they had a few triumphs regarding property and children they appeared to a small change in attitudes and personal freedom outside of the home and wedlock was near to non-existent, women still had few opportunities to better themselves and anything that appeared to aid them usually contained loopholes that would allow them to continue being treated as the property of man. In conclusion I would have to agree that there had been little significant improvement as the 'improvements' were few and far between and this is a few I feel is backed up by all of the sources and my own knowledge of the effects of legislation at the time, while source 13 seems to disagree the final lines about the

((b) continued) emancipation of women within the domestic sphere does suggest that the writer acknowledges this to be a small triumph ~~through~~ and that its significance is minimal.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response understands the focus of the question and contains a range of relevant own knowledge which is integrated with material from the sources. There is some argument in relation to the focus of the question, but this is not fully developed. This response therefore achieves a secure level 3 in both assessment objectives.

Question 2 (b) (ii)

Candidates were split fairly evenly across the two questions, with slightly more attempting this question. The sources were well understood and were used together with own knowledge by many candidates to create a debate that linked in class, the type of syllabus and whether this actually made any difference. Some candidates were imbalanced in the debate and weaker candidates generally used the sources for information rather than for analysis. The best responses used the sources as a springboard for a wide ranging debate in which own knowledge supported the arguments presented very impressively. Such answers often made very effective use of Source 17, which was often only used for information in other responses. They were also likely to recognise the nature of the distinction in the provision available to working class and middle class girls. It was disappointing to note that many candidates were still making generic points regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b.

Whilst there seemed to be improvements for the female education, the education was often limited. Its aim was to produce a 'woman who would grace a future husband's home' (18) not a woman who would go into a profession. However, new schools were being created and women were becoming professionals such as Anderson being placed on the British Medical records in 1874.

The curriculum at a female education was limited. The subjects taught would often be 'female' subjects such as botany or dancing. Middle classes were 'educated at home' by a governess

((b) continued) and were taught how to ~~en~~ make a 'good marriage' (18). Education did not aim to improve the social status of women or help them up the 'social ladder' as some 16 claims but, rather as a means to keep women in their separate sphere and re-enforce the Angel in the House role.

Whilst, middle class and upper class girls could afford to go to schools such as Cheltenham Ladies College or North London Collegiate School for Ladies, founded in 1850, working class girls often 'received little or no education'. This is because their parents could not afford the fees and even though scholarships were introduced the working class girls had commitments such as 'wash days' whereby they had to do the laundry. Even though they received free education from churches such as 'National Schools for the Established Church' (19) they did not receive new education that was out of their sphere. They were taught how to be 'schoolmistresses' (19) which was within the ~~an~~ acceptable sphere women could be in because it was dealing with children. Therefore, this shows that there was

((b) continued) little improvement in the schooling of girls as they were taught only how to stay in their sphere and education was even this limited education was subject to class because Beale

stated that Cheltenham Ladies College would not have a 'daughter of trade' as a pupil.

Furthermore, as highlighted by source 17 the struggle for girls to be recognised in schools was a 'long, slow process'.¹⁷ Girls were ignored in education because they were believed to be too delicate to have an education. It was not until 1963 that girls could sit public exams but, it was not made official until 1967. Girls were 'not expected to achieve' (18) in education because this was not within their sphere. Women were believed to suffer nervous exhaustion at the thought of exams. As a result, school was kept simple for women and they were only ever taught the basics of a subject as they would 'learn all they needed at home' (19). Therefore, education did not improve for girls in the second half of the nineteenth century that much as women could not learn too much at school as they would challenge their sphere and therefore, not 'grace a future husband' (20).

((b) continued) The Education Act of 1880 (the Mundella Act) tried to make schooling compulsory. This would therefore, make girls receive more education which gave them 'varying degrees of schooling' (21). However, girls would often miss schools and even the 'voluntary institutions' (22) that aimed to educate the working classes would often have low attendance figures. This is because girls had home commitments like

Helping their mothers' (18) and so mixed school. As a result, any improvements schools were making in education for girls they were not happening as girls mixed out of them as they were at home. A woman in the late nineteenth century was only a 'accomplished woman' (18) if they had a husband and children not because of the degrees they had or climbing the social ladder (16).

However, it could be counter argued that education did improve in the late second half of the nineteenth century. Many women now entered university and by 1900, 15% of university students were women. In 1963, the 'right of sitting examinations' (19) was finally granted to women in education and in 1967

((b) continued) these exams became official. It is significant that in 1969 Cambridge and later Oxford in 1979 granted women the right to university. ~~Both~~ The exams and being able to go to a international prestigious university show how women had won the 'struggle for recognition' (17). Both of these show that education had finally improved for women as they were now able to compete on the same terms as men.

Women could enter professions previously they had been banned from. The Enabling Act of 1976 enabled women to be entered into medical colleges on the same grounds as men and so this shows support that

Women could climb the 'social ladder' (16) and compete equally in education as men. This shows how education had improved for women as they could enter male fields and that legislation was giving them the power to achieve something other than a 'good marriage' (18).

The demand for education significantly increased in the second half of the nineteenth century. The NLCSL was founded in 1850 with a sister school opening, and at the start of the year 25 girls attended the school but, 114 were on a waiting list after a year. Even though this school was free (16) (b) continued) paying scholarships were introduced and working class women could have varying degrees of schooling as a result of these scholarships. The Girls Public Day School Trust founded in the 1870s gave working class women a right to education. It aimed to stop the 'little or no education' they had received previously and give them 'alternative employment' (16) other than being a wife. With the help of the Forsters Act of 1870, elementary school was provided for all and the 30% of children who had not received education were provided with one. Therefore, education did significantly improve for women as they were ~~enabled to~~ given an opportunity especially the working classes so that they could receive an education and 'alternative

employment other than being a wife or mother.

In conclusion, the education system did slightly improve for women but they were still expected to remain in their roles and become a good wife to 'grace a future husband' and not become a professional in 'alternative employment' that was out of the women's sphere.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response has understood the sources and integrates them with wide ranging and detailed own knowledge to address the focus of the question in an analytical way. Even though the conclusion is rather short, the answer has sufficient analysis to be awarded level 4 for AO1. The sources are sometimes used as brief quotes to support the knowledge rather than being argued from. For this reason, the response was awarded high level 3 for AO2.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Where candidates have a few minutes left at the end of the exam, they should re-read their answers to check for errors.

Paper Summary

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

All Questions

- Candidates should proof read their answers at the end of the examination and correct any instances where they have incorrectly labelled a source, used the wrong names or the wrong dates.
- Candidates need to use the terms 'implies' and 'infers' correctly. Candidates should argue that a source implies something and that they, the reader, infer from it.
- Too many candidates are using certain phrases, such as 'using the sources as a set', as a substitute for actually engaging in the task that they are claiming.

Part A

- Candidates should spend sufficient time reading the sources to ensure that they understand the nuances of the arguments presented.
- Candidates should treat the sources as a package in order to facilitate cross referencing. Candidates who work through sources sequentially cannot go beyond level 2.
- Provenance should be integrated within the argument, rather than treated as a stand-alone paragraph. The attributes of the sources should be discussed, not described. This aids the use of provenance as part of the argument. Candidates should avoid making sweeping assertions from the provenance that could apply to any source.
- 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.
- There are no marks available for knowledge in Part A. Candidates should avoid arguing from their knowledge since it cannot be credited.

Part B

- Candidates need to ensure that their subject knowledge conforms to the specification. Some responses usually relied very heavily on information derived primarily from the sources.
- In order to address the question effectively, candidates need to offer an analysis driven by the arguments raised in the sources, not a descriptive or chronological account.
- 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 A02b. Many candidates still engage in generalised comments that a particular historian is or is not reliable at the expense of developing argument and analysis tested by specific own knowledge.
- Candidates need to ensure that they are aware of the focus of the question and that they maintain the focus throughout their answer, to avoid straying into irrelevant areas that cannot be rewarded.

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>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



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