

Examiners' Report
June 2012

GCSE History 5HA03 3A

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.



Get more from your exam results

...and now your mock results too!

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam and mock performance, helping you to help them more effectively.

- See your students' scores for every exam question
- Spot topics, skills and types of question where they need to improve their learning
- Understand how your students' performance compares with Edexcel national averages
- Track progress against target grades and focus revision more effectively with NEW Mock Analysis

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. To set up your ResultsPlus account, call us using the details on our contact us page at 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 raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

June 2012

Publications Code UG032450

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

Introduction

It was pleasing to see a good standard of responses from candidates in the fifth session. The paper requires candidates to answer five questions in 75 minutes and some candidates managed to write at considerable length in this time. However, it was noticeable that a number of candidates failed to complete (in some cases even start) question 5. This was due to mismanagement of time which was often a result of writing over-long answers to previous questions. Centres should note that the amount of space provided in the booklet for answers, is more than we would expect any answer to take, not a recommendation of the amount candidates should write.

There were strong answers to all questions although, in some cases, there were formulaic responses which did not directly address the question. For example, some answers referred to the reliability of the sources in questions 3 and 5 without directly relating this to either the strength of support or challenge for the cross-referencing or the hypothesis.

There was a noticeable increase in the number of candidates who wrongly labelled the source they were referring to, especially in question 4 with Source E being confused with Source D.

An example response from the examination is given for each question in the report. Please note that in some cases part answers only are given as exemplification, not full answers. However, a general summary for improvement in the approach to question types (which are common across the three options) may prove of benefit to centres and is provided at the end of the report.

Question 1

Candidates were asked to make inferences about female munitions work during the First World War. This was very well answered with the most obvious inferences being that their conditions were unpleasant and that women were still treated as second class citizens in terms of pay.

The key to answering this question is to make the inference and use the wording of the source only as *support* for the inference. An inference should not be made using the words of the source, as that is likely to produce paraphrasing.

Candidates who stated that 'the gunpowder turned our faces, hair and hands yellow' were *copying* the source, not making valid inferences and were marked at Level 1. Those who suggested that 'the working conditions were unpleasant' and then added 'I know this because the Source says 'they had no protection from the gunpowder which turned our faces, hair and hands yellow'' were making a valid inference and supporting it from the source. Such answers were rewarded at Level 3.

What can you learn from Source A about munitions work?

(6)

Source A suggests that ~~there wasn't~~ men and women were treated differently in the munitions factories when it says, 'women were paid... men tool-makers got 12p'. This shows that women were thought of as inferior and that there was inequality in the munitions factories.

Source A also suggests that munitions factories were dangerous places to work. We can tell this when the source says, 'there were minor accidents, of course'. The words 'of course' also suggest that accidents were common and to be expected in the munitions factories.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The candidate has made two supported inferences. The first about women being treated differently and the second about the dangers of working in the munitions factories. Notice how the candidate signposts their answer with 'Source A suggests' and 'Source A also suggests' and quotes from the source to support each inference.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

To access the higher marks you must make two inferences supported from the source. Why not say 'I know this because the source says...'? Do not write too much although, if you have time, include three supported inferences.

Question 2

This question asks candidates to explain the purpose of the cartoon. The majority of candidates were able to identify the message, that working in munitions factory was quite glamorous, and support it from the source. This is because the munitionette is dressed up, smiling and wearing makeup.

However, to reach Level 3 candidates had to explain the purpose of the source - what it was intended to make people think or do.

The purpose was to encourage more women to work in the munitions factories. This is because it is an example of First World War propaganda and deliberately avoids any evidence of the unpleasant, even dangerous conditions in these factories. It was publicised at a time when there were shell shortages and even less men in the workforce. Some candidates misunderstood the cartoon and saw it as anti-female.

A minority of candidates confused the *message* of the source, (the point it is trying to put across), with its *purpose*, (what the message is trying to achieve). The best candidates made effective use of discourse markers such as 'suggests', 'persuade'.

What was the purpose of this cartoon? Use details of the cartoon and your own knowledge to explain your answer.

(8)

The purpose of this cartoon was clearly to try and get more women working in the munitions factory.

To begin with the title 'Munitionette' gives the impression of a girly job and a place where groups of munitionettes meet. This would be desirable to the potential workers because it is advertising a way of life.

Also, the fact that the woman has clearly been made to look pretty would possibly make other women be inclined to join up. The way that her lips are red and her cheeks are pink is the author's way of informing the women who the poster is aimed at that being pale and skinny like the 1903 women should be has gone out of fashion.

Next, the way that the woman is so clearly unconcerned with the fact that she is leaning on explosive ammunition is the illustrator's way of implying that the weapons and the job the women do is not harmful or dangerous in any way. This idea is also shown by her looking over her shoulder away from the

weapons which is basically saying that they are not dangerous at all as they don't need watching.

Finally, the poster is meant to appeal to women who want to attract a man. In 1915 the casualties of the first few battles were coming back so there was a great emphasis on finding a man before it's too late. The woman in the picture showing her bum and the clearly written 'you should see how the guys fill them' is obviously telling women that being a 'munitionette' is attractive.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The candidate begins by identifying the purpose of the source. This is then supported with evidence from the source itself - details of how the munitionette is made to look and the implication that the cartoonist has deliberately hidden the obvious dangers of the job. The last paragraph includes some interesting contextual knowledge about the shortage of men in 1915.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

The key to Level 3: why not go straight to the purpose of the source? Remember, however, that this must be explained fully by reference to the source itself and/or contextual knowledge. Try to do both to ensure top marks.

Question 3

The question is asking candidates to decide how far Sources A and B support the evidence of Source C about the work of women in munitions factories. A number of candidates achieved higher Level 2 marks by identifying agreement and disagreement between the sources. The best answers cross-referenced Source A to Source C and Source B to Source C and made reference to the content of the source to establish the extent of agreement and disagreement. Again, well prepared candidates were able to make skilful use of discourse markers ('similarly', 'on the other hand', 'by contrast', 'to some extent') to get their point across. Candidates who were able to cross-reference effectively and also comment on the extent of agreement/ disagreement were able to access Level 3 and could achieve at least 9 marks (sometimes even full marks).

Some candidates, however, gave formulaic comments on reliability and did not use these to address cross referencing and the extent of support. Others compared each source to the view given in the question and showed little or no evidence of cross referencing between the sources. Such candidates were able to access Level 2 but not Level 3. This question specifically asks candidates to cross reference and make comparisons between the sources.

Again, a minority of candidates demonstrated a tendency to make comments on the provenance of the source without focus on the question. While candidates were not penalised for doing this it often resulted in time management problems later on in the paper. Comments on the provenance of the source must compare the attitude and motives of the writers of the sources to be credited.

Quite a common issue with this question was candidates getting side tracked into assessing how far A and B disagreed rather than cross-referencing A - C and B-C.

Source A and C disagree to a great extent about the luxuries that came from working in a munitions factory. Source A states the little pay they received "2p" whilst working in such terrible conditions. Source C however implies that the ~~work~~ war work had almost made them quite wealthy "bracelets and jewellery", hence disagreeing. Source B ~~also~~ and C also disagree to a far extent about the clothing that workers wore, Source

B shows a glamorous worker in a rich purple overall whereas Source C ~~states~~ states that people ~~were~~ "rags".



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is part of a level 3 answer in which the candidate makes an explicit judgement on the extent of support between Sources A and C and B and C and then supports this with evidence from each source. Notice judgement phrases such as 'disagree to a great extent' and 'disagree to a far greater extent'.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Ensure that you cross-reference between the sources and give evidence of support and challenge. Remember to identify and explain agreement and disagreement between the sources. Make *explicit* judgements about the extent of support/challenge throughout your answer and especially in your conclusion, based on the contents and reliability of the sources. Use judgement phrases such as 'strongly agree', 'partial agreement', 'totally disagree'. Ensure that reliability is used as a criterion to judge the extent of support between the sources.

Question 4

For this question, candidates had to examine the reliability of Source D, an extract from the 'Home Front' by Sylvia Pankhurst and a photograph of a female ticket collector. Most candidates achieved Level 2 by examining the contents/information given in each source or commenting on the nature, origins or purpose of the sources. Many candidates were able to interrogate the sources effectively commenting on both their content and provenance. Candidates who were able to do this effectively with *both* sources could score Level 3 (9/10) with full marks awarded to candidates who interrogated the sources most effectively. Candidates were generally confident with the provenance of both sources. However, a number of candidates used formulaic responses in which they went through the nature, origins and purpose of each source without making direct reference to how these affected utility. Others simply described the contents of each source - what they could see or read.

In general candidates handled source D more confidently than source E and did not always make effective use of the provenance of Source E 'a photograph which was published in a national newspaper' with the link to DORA and censorship.

On the other hand, there were a number of strong and balanced evaluations. Weaker candidates paraphrased the sources or made simplistic comments or pre-learned responses about them, often referring to them as biased or as primary/secondary sources. Such responses were confined to Level 1. A number of candidates wrote at great length about the reliability of the contents of the sources and compared this to their contextual knowledge about working conditions for women during the First World War but failed to evaluate the nature, origins or purpose of either of the sources with reference to reliability.

Finally, although utility and reliability questions require the application of similar skills -evaluating the contents and nature, origins or purpose of the sources, candidates must ensure that they focus on reliability. The question is not whether the two sources are useful but whether they are reliable.

How reliable are Sources D and E as evidence of the work of women during the First World War? Explain your answer, using Sources D and E and your own knowledge.

(10)

I believe that sources D and E are reliable as evidence of ^{the} work of women during the First World War.

Firstly, I believe that source D is a reliable source as it was written by Sylvia Pankhurst herself which shows that it was therefore based on first-hand experiences and she was therefore able to give a detailed and accurate account of what work was like for women during WW1.

However, I believe that Sylvia could potentially have made her extract much more intense and ~~make the con~~ exaggerate on how poor the conditions were as she was campaigning for improved conditions for working women. This therefore ~~could~~ has the potential to make this source unreliable in content as she would have wrote this extract with very strong and biased opinions as she was trying to prove that the conditions for the women were very poor and needed to be improved.

Although, using my own knowledge, I know that women had to work longer hours in order to get the job finished but didn't necessarily get paid whilst doing so. I also know that women weren't given correct safety equipment, meaning that their health and well-being wasn't a priority. This is why I therefore believe that although Sylvia's biased opinion and her intentions may have made the source unreliable in content, the source is typical to an extent.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is part of a very good Level 3 answer. Notice how the candidate evaluates the reliability of the nature, origins, purpose as well as the contents of Source D based on Sylvia Pankhurst's motives as well as contextual knowledge about female working conditions during the First World War.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Remember to mine and interrogate each source. Make judgements on the information/contents as well as the origins, nature and/or purpose of each source.

Question 5

There were a number of well structured answers to this question which asks whether the sources support the hypothesis that working conditions for women during the First World War were poor. Some candidates were able to achieve at least Level 3 by addressing the issues inherent in the question and the extent to which the sources addressed them. At Level 4, candidates were able to select, draw inferences and use extracts from the sources to address the question set. The best candidates were able to weigh the evidence from each source, based on contents and/or reliability, and use their conclusion to make a final judgement based on the weight of evidence given in the sources for or against the hypothesis.

Use of provenance/reliability varied in quality and often was overtly mechanical making it difficult to ascertain the direction of an answer. The most effective use of provenance/reliability was woven into the wider argument of whether or not the source supported or challenged the hypothesis, with candidates making explicit judgements about whether the reliability of the source weakened or strengthened it as evidence.

In a minority of cases, time management issues undermined candidates' responses to this question. A small number of candidates failed to make sufficient use of the sources and used their own knowledge about working conditions for women during the First World War to discuss the hypothesis. Remember that this is a source enquiry question. Candidates are being asked to evaluate the strength of the evidence in the sources themselves - in their content and reliability. Candidates should not bring in additional personal knowledge to support or challenge the hypothesis but should use their *contextual* knowledge to identify the issues involved and to evaluate the provenance of the sources.

'Working conditions for women during the First World War were poor'.

How far do the **sources** in this paper support this statement? Use details from the sources and your own knowledge to explain your answer.

(16)

Source F has strong support that the working conditions were good, and it disagrees with the statement. The source states that in 'general women' were looked after by women who were supervisors and they had 'nutritious food in the canteens'. I believe that the source would be quite reliable as it was created in 2010 in a book dedicated to the first world war. This means that the authors would have had time to collect a clear view of the events and make an educated conclusion.

Source E also strongly disagrees with the statement. The picture depicts a woman looking lippy and content whilst working as a ~~randy~~ ticket collector on a London bus. This source may not be reliable however, as it was created for a newspaper during the war, so it may have the purpose of persuading women to get jobs, which is why the woman in the picture would tend to look lippy.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is the first part of a level 4 answer to the question. Notice how the candidate focuses immediately on the question and makes an explicit judgement 'Source F has strong support that the' - this is then supported with evidence from the source. Again, the second paragraph begins with an explicit judgement 'Source E strongly disagrees' followed by support from the source.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Ensure that you use the sources to make judgements on the hypothesis. Do not simply summarise each source or use own knowledge. Your overall judgement should be based on the weight of evidence given by the contents/reliability of the sources not on your own knowledge. Leave enough time to write an answer to this question. Remember it is worth 16 marks.

Paper Summary

The following notes may be of benefit to centres in preparing for future sessions of this exam:

Question 1. Candidates often wrote too much for inference. It is sufficient to make the inferences and support them from the source, often with a direct quote. The reliability of the source is not a relevant issue.

Question 2. Ensure that candidates identify the underlying purpose of the source, not just the message. This could be what the source is trying to make people think or do. This should be supported with evidence from the source itself and/or contextual knowledge. It is better to begin with the purpose and then support this with the message of the source.

Question 3. Ensure that candidates focus on the style of a cross- referencing question and actually cross-reference the sources. They should identify support and differences and make judgements on the extent of support based on the content and reliability of the sources.

Question 4. Candidates should avoid simply describing the contents of the sources. They should evaluate both the information/contents in the context of utility or reliability as well as the nature, origins and purpose.

Question 5. A small number of candidates made little or no reference to the sources and instead wrote extensively about women's work during the First World War.

Ensure that candidates focus only on using the sources to test the hypothesis. Highest marks require them to make judgements on the extent of support and challenge to the hypothesis based on the weight of evidence given in the sources and/or their reliability.

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 UG032450 June 2012

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

