

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE in History
(6HI02) Paper C

Unit 2: British History Depth Studies

Option C: Conflict and Change in 19th
and 20th Century Britain

19th Century

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, please visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

Our website subject pages hold useful resources, support material and live feeds from our subject advisors giving you access to a portal of information. If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

www.edexcel.com/contactus

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 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

Summer 2016

Publications Code 43886

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

GCE History Marking Guidance

Marking of Questions: Levels of Response

The mark scheme provides an indication of the sorts of answer that might be found at different levels. The exemplification of content within these levels is not complete. It is intended as a guide and it will be necessary, therefore, for examiners to use their professional judgement in deciding both at which level a question has been answered and how effectively points have been sustained. Candidates should always be rewarded according to the quality of thought expressed in their answer and not solely according to the amount of knowledge conveyed. However candidates with only a superficial knowledge will be unable to develop or sustain points sufficiently to move to higher levels.

In assessing the quality of thought, consider whether the answer:

- (i) is relevant to the question and is explicitly related to the question's terms
- (ii) argues a case, when requested to do so
- (iii) is able to make the various distinctions required by the question
- (iv) has responded to all the various elements in the question
- (v) where required, explains, analyses, discusses, assesses, and deploys knowledge of the syllabus content appropriately, rather than simply narrates.

Examiners should award marks both between and within levels according to the above criteria. This should be done in conjunction with the levels of response indicated in the mark schemes for particular questions.

At the end of each answer, examiners should look back on the answer as a whole in the light of these general criteria in order to ensure that the total mark reflects their overall impression of the answer's worth.

Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level

The first stage is to decide the overall level and then whether the work represents high, mid or low performance within the level. The overall level will be determined by the candidate's ability to focus on the question set, displaying the appropriate conceptual grasp. Within any one piece of work there may well be evidence of work at two, or even three levels. One stronger passage at Level 4, would not by itself merit a Level 4 award - but it would be evidence to support a high Level 3 award - unless there were also substantial weaknesses in other areas.

Assessing Quality of Written Communication

QoWC will have a bearing if the QoWC is inconsistent with the communication descriptor for the level in which the candidate's answer falls. If, for example, a candidate's history response displays mid Level 3 criteria but fits the Level 2 QoWC descriptors, it will require a move down within the level.

6HI02: Generic Level Descriptors

Part (a)

Target: AO2a (8%)

(20 marks)

As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-5	<p>Comprehends the surface features of the sources and selects material relevant to the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-5 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	6-10	<p>Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify their similarities and/or differences in relation to the question posed. There may be one developed comparison, but most comparisons will be undeveloped or unsupported with material from the sources. Sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information. The source provenance may be noted, without application of its implications to the source content.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 6-7 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 8-10 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	11-15	<p>Comprehends the sources and focuses the cross-referencing on the task set. Responses will offer detailed comparisons, similarities/differences, agreements/disagreements that are supported by evidence drawn from the sources.</p> <p>Sources are used as evidence with some consideration of their attributes, such as the nature, origins, purpose or audience, with some consideration of how this can affect the weight given to the evidence. In addressing 'how far' there is a clear attempt to use the sources in combination, but this may be imbalanced in terms of the issues addressed or in terms of the use of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 3: 13-15 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>

4	16-20	<p>Reaches a judgement in relation to the issue posed by the question supported by careful examination of the evidence of the sources. The sources are cross-referenced and the elements of challenge and corroboration are analysed. The issues raised by the process of comparison are used to address the specific enquiry. The attributes of the source are taken into account in order to establish what weight the content they will bear in relation to the specific enquiry. In addressing 'how far' the sources are used in combination.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 16-17 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 4: 18-20 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
---	-------	---

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

Part (b)

Target: AO1a & AO1b (10% - 24 marks)

Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

AO2b (7% - 16 marks)

Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.

(40 marks)

AO1a and AO1b (24 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-6	<p>Candidates will produce mostly simple statements. These will be supported by limited factual material, which has some accuracy and relevance, although not directed analytically (i.e. at the focus of the question). The material will be mostly generalised. There will be few, if any, links between the simple statements.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks As per descriptor.</p> <p>High Level 1: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 1.</p> <p>The writing may have limited coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
2	7-12	<p>Candidates will produce a series of simple statements supported by some accurate and relevant, factual material. The analytical focus will be mostly implicit and there are likely to be only limited links between simple statements. Material is unlikely to be developed very far or to be explicitly linked to material taken from sources.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks As per descriptor.</p> <p>High Level 2: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2.</p> <p>The writing will have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. Some of the skills needed to produce effective writing will be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>

3	13-18	<p>Candidates' answers will attempt analysis and show some understanding of the focus of the question. They may, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus. Factual material will be mostly accurate, but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor. At this level candidates will begin to link contextual knowledge with points drawn from sources.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks As per descriptor.</p> <p>High Level 3: 17-18 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 3.</p> <p>The writing will be coherent in places but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. Only some of the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are likely to be present. Syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
---	-------	---

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

4	19-24	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material, which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. There will be some integration of contextual knowledge with material drawn from sources, although this may not be sustained throughout the response. The selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks As per descriptor.</p> <p>High Level 4: 23-24 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 4.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes may not be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing but there may be passages which lack clarity or coherence. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p>
---	-------	--

A02b (16 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-4	<p>Comprehends the sources and selects material relevant to the representation contained in the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-4 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	5-8	<p>Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify points which support or differ from the representation contained in the question. When supporting the decision made in relation to the question the sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 7-8 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	9-12	<p>The sources are analysed and points of challenge and/or support for the representation contained in the question are developed from the provided material. In addressing the specific enquiry, there is clear awareness that a representation is under discussion and there is evidence of reasoning from the evidence of the sources, although there may be some lack of balance. The response reaches a judgement in relation to the claim which is supported by the evidence of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 9-10 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 3: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
4	13-16	<p>Reaches and sustains a conclusion based on the discriminating use of the evidence. Discussion of the claim in the question proceeds from the issues raised by the process of analysing the representation in the sources. There is developed reasoning and weighing of the evidence in order to create a judgement in relation to the stated claim.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 13-14 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 4: 15-16 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>

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

Unit 2 Assessment Grid

Question Number	AO1a and b Marks	AO2a Marks	AO2b Marks	Total marks for question
Q (a)	-	20	-	20
Q (b)(i) or (ii)	24	-	16	40
Total Marks	24	20	16	60
% weighting	10%	8%	7%	25%

Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (a)	<p>The sources offer evidence to both support and challenge the claim in the question. Candidates may begin with an examination of Source 3 from which the quotation in the question is taken. The source suggests that there had been a ‘lack of foresight’ at governmental level and the consequence was that the men were inadequately supplied. This assessment of the circumstances experienced in the early stages of the war finds support in the detail offered by Source 2. In contrast, Source 1 clearly suggests that Raglan was very concerned to provide ‘for the needs of your Majesty’s troops’. Candidates may be aware that Raglan was commander-in-chief of the army and they may also note that the letter was addressed to the monarch, and therefore conclude that such a statement suggests commitment at the highest levels to mitigating any hardships. This however, can be seen to conflict with Derby’s statement in Source 3. Candidates may explain the disagreement between the sources on the basis of the provenance – Source 1 trying to justify the situation whilst Source 3 was in opposition in government and may be trying to score political points. On the question of provisioning, Source 2 contrasts to Source 1 – specifically with reference to coffee and adequate clothing. Candidates are likely to attach great weight to Source 2 as it is written by a soldier who is experiencing the conditions and he is not likely to exaggerate in a letter to his parents, whom he would not want to worry excessively. Although there is some disagreement on the issue of supplies, there is consensus on the extent to which the soldiers are being over-worked. Source 2 is perhaps the most overt in its criticism of this, whilst Source 3 refers to ‘overwork’ and ‘exhaustion’. Even Source 1, despite its generally positive position about the treatment of soldiers, acknowledges that ‘there are many calls upon the men’ and the impact on what the men were required to do because of the inadequacy of transport could be inferred from this source.</p> <p>Any valid conclusion that is drawn by candidates should be credited. Developed responses based on these arguments can reach L2. At L3 candidates will both support and challenge the stated claim, using evidence from different sources interpreted in context. At L4 they will use the sources, interpreted in context as a set, to reach a reasoned judgement about whether soldiers fighting in the Crimea were subject to ‘unnecessary hardships’.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (i)	<p>The focus of the question is the extent to which popular support for the Boer War remained strong whilst the war went on. Candidates may begin by discussing the popular outpouring of support for the war which was manifested by the relief of Kimberley, Ladysmith and Mafeking as all three sources begin by discussing this and all agree on this, at least at face value. Source 4 clearly agrees with the view expressed in the question and candidates are likely to discuss the positive image that is portrayed in this source. Candidates may also pick up on the reference to the role of the popular press in Source 4 and use this combined with own knowledge to discuss how the popular press contributed to the continued popularity of the war. They might also refer to the different perspective on war held by the Manchester Guardian to suggest that there was not unanimous support. This line of argument also finds support in both Sources 5 and 6. In Source 5, Bennett does not share the popular enthusiasm for the relief of Ladysmith, although, according to what he writes, he does seem to be an exception to more widely held views at the time. Source 6 argues that the support for the war was stronger among the middle class than the working class, and candidates might develop this argument. Sources 4 and 6 offer an additional argument about popular support on the basis of the result of the 1900 election. Whilst Source 4 suggests that this is clear proof of support for the war, Source 6 disagrees and suggests that it is evidence of the longer term problems assailing the Liberal Party and that attitudes to the war played little part in the results. Candidates might develop the counter argument to this question by using their contextual own knowledge to discuss the growing opposition to the war. This might include the impact of Emily Hobhouse's findings about the conditions experienced by Boer women and children in the camps and the growth of an opposition group within the Liberal Party. Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available. The sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes.</p> <p>Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the extent to which popular support for the Boer War remained strong, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view. The best responses may very well consider the interaction of different factors to explain the apparent conflict and offer an overall judgement.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (ii)	<p>The focus of the question is whether the Battle of the Somme contributed significantly to the ultimate defeat of Germany. Candidates are likely to begin by referencing Source 7 which offers support for the view in the question. In the short term, Source 7 suggests that the battle was important for relieving Verdun. In the longer term, although it argues that the ‘effects are difficult to quantify’, it implies that the battle played a key role in damaging the morale of the German army and thus contributed to ultimate British victory in the war. This view on the long term impact on German morale also finds support in the first sentence of Source 9. Candidates may comment on the provenance of this source. It can be addressed in one of two ways – either as a report to the Cabinet, it would need to be honest or alternatively, Haig may be trying to justify what has happened. As long as the argument is clearly linked to the focus of the question, either approach is legitimate and should be credited. Candidates might expand upon the longer term importance of the battle by considering other ways in which the battle of the Somme contributed to this longer term victory from their contextual own knowledge, for example the fact that it provided the BEF with more experience and led to an improvement in its tactics. Source 8 offers an alternative view to the impact of the battle of the Somme on morale; it argues that rather than German morale being negatively affected by the battle, the more severe impact was on British morale – ‘there perished also the enthusiasm with which nearly three million Englishmen had marched forth to war’ and suggest that this undermines the argument in Source 7. Candidates are likely to use Source 8 to develop the counter arguments to the thrust of the question. It sees it as a military failure in that it did not achieve its objectives. It refers directly to the loss of life on the first day of the Somme. Candidates may well cross reference the statistics provided in Source 8 to those in Source 9 as there is clear disagreement between them. Some candidates may suggest that other factors explain the ultimate defeat of Germany and such responses should be credited accordingly. Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available. The sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes.</p> <p>Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of whether the Battle of the Somme contributed significantly to the ultimate defeat of Germany, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view. The best responses may very well consider the interaction of different factors to explain the apparent conflict and offer an overall judgement.</p>	40

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (a)	<p>The sources offer evidence both to support and challenge the claim in the question. Candidates are likely to begin by examining the evidence in Sources 10 and 12 which support the view in the question. They both agree that she is a charismatic leader with many qualities that enable her to be an effective leader. A key quality identified by both is her ability to convince people of her views; whilst Source 10 points to the fact that she was ‘very persuasive’, Source 12 demonstrates this by referring to her as ‘a spellbinder’ who can persuade both large and small gatherings. It is clear from the language of both these sources that both the women are admirers of Pankhurst. Candidates might well refer to the provenance of the sources in this context; although Source 10 is a member of the WSPU, Source 12 is not, but is reflecting on events many years later. Another quality that candidates might suggest is key for an effective leadership is to unite their organisation. Source 11 makes it clear that the WSPU was divided and candidates might use this to suggest that Pankhurst was not an effective leader. There is some suggestion of the potential for this aspect of Pankhurst’s leadership in Source 10 when she refers to the fact that ‘she was ruthless in using the followers she gathered around her’. Candidates are likely to point out, however, that the author of Source 11 is one of those who split from the WSPU in 1907 and may comment on her objectivity. They may also point out that the author of Source 10 left the WSPU at the same time; credit should be given to those candidates who pick up on the chronology (i.e. that Source 10 was written whilst Billington-Greig was a member of the WSPU and before the split) and comment validly on it. Sources 10 and 11 both identify negative aspects to Pankhurst’s character. Source 10 refers to her as ‘ruthless’ and ‘a dictator without mercy’ whilst Source 11 accuses her of a lack of compassion – ‘in the great battle, the individual does not count’. This is unsurprising in Source 11 because of the split, but perhaps more surprising in Source 10 who was a supporter at this point. Candidates could argue validly in several different directions as to whether these qualities amount to effective leadership or not. It is unlikely that candidates will consider all of these issues and due credit should be awarded for the development of valid arguments.</p> <p>Developed responses based on these arguments can reach L2. At L3 candidates will both support and challenge the stated claim, using evidence from different sources interpreted in context. At L4 they will use the sources, interpreted in context as a set, to reach a reasoned judgement about the effectiveness of Emmeline Pankhurst as leader of the suffragettes.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (i)	<p>The focus of the question is the impact of technological advances on the status of women's employment in the period 1860-1914. Candidates may begin by considering Source 13, which offers explicit support to the question in arguing that women did see an improvement in their status. It argues that the status of women in employment at the end of the 19th century was better than that of their mothers who 'had been restricted to agriculture and domestic service'. However, Source 13 does consider a range of occupations, which more perceptive candidates will appreciate were not exclusively the result of technological advances - teachers, nurses and shop assistants, for example. Candidates might develop a line of argument through the use of their contextual own knowledge to discuss the range of white collar clerical jobs that were becoming available to women through technological advances. They may also make use of Source 15 to support this argument as it clearly refers to the mechanisation of clerical work and to the jobs that arose from the development of technological developments such as the telephone, the telegraph and the typewriter. However, by contrast to Source 13, Source 15 sees women's employment becoming 'de-professionalised' and 'less skilled', thus suggesting the counter argument to the view in the question. Source 15 points out that technological advances were 'considered to be suited to women's manual dexterity', a view that finds support in the first point raised in the contemporary opinion presented in Source 14. Some candidates may argue that greater employment opportunities did not necessarily mean better employment opportunities – all three sources make reference to the low pay of women. This point could be supported by reference to the third point raised in Source 14 which suggests that women employed in the Telegraph Office were likely to come from 'a superior class'. Some candidates may use contextual own knowledge to discuss other employment opportunities that opened up to women, such as medicine or teaching. Such arguments should be credited if they are made relevant to the focus of the question. Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available. The sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes.</p> <p>Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the impact of technological advances on the status of women's employment in the period 1860-1914, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view. The best responses may very well consider the interaction of different factors to explain the apparent conflict and offer an overall judgement.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (ii)	<p>The focus of the question is the impact of the First World War on the achievement of votes for women by 1928. It is very clear that there is a sharp disagreement between Sources 16 and 18. Source 16 will be used to support the view in the question. It suggests the very direct link between women's war work and the vote. Candidates are likely to use their contextual own knowledge to discuss the detail of the role played by women in the war and how this impacted on perceptions of their right to vote. This can be supported by the comments made by Asquith in Source 17 and candidates will probably comment on the conversion of this leading pre-war anti to this position by 1916. Candidates might also note that Source 16 picks up on issues that make a more indirect link between the war and the right to vote – the calling off of the militant campaign at the start of the war and the need to extend the vote to all men. Candidates may very well develop these arguments by reference to a range of contextual own knowledge about the issues. This may include the importance of coalition wartime politics. Source 18 clearly offers a counter view – indeed it is highly critical of the view outlined in Source 16, referring to it as 'simplistic and even erroneous'. Candidates are likely to expand on this by reference to their contextual own knowledge which may include reference to the fact that after the war only women over the age of 30 were given the right to vote and that women had to wait until 1928 to receive the vote on equal terms with men. Some candidates may wish to offer alternative explanations to those which are outlined in the sources – for example, the role of the suffragettes and/or suffragists in the pre-war period. This is legitimate and should be credited according to the way in which it is argued. All valid arguments should be credited appropriately. The question requires candidates to consider the issue through to 1928 and where this is clearly addressed by candidates on the basis of their contextual own knowledge, they should be given credit for doing so. Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available. The sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes.</p> <p>Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the impact of the First World War on the achievement of votes for women, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view. The best responses may very well consider the interaction of different factors to explain the apparent conflict and offer an overall judgement.</p>	40