

ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report
June 2011

GCE History 6HI02 C

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can contact our History Advisor directly by sending an email to Mark Battye on HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk.

You can also telephone 0844 576 0034 to speak to a member of our subject advisor team.



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 0844 576 0024

June 2011

Publications Code US028142

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2011

Introduction

This June examination session produced a good range of attainment, and some truly impressive work. The best responses to part a) questions proved able to use the sources as a set, cross-reference evidence confidently and evaluate conflicting interpretations with an awareness of context, to establish a balanced judgement. In part (b) questions candidates were able to develop their arguments more fully through the integration of contextual knowledge with the source material. It should be noted that the most successful accessed the key themes through the sources initially and then proceeded to develop these themes through deployment of their own knowledge. The very best used this analysis to arrive at judgements that drew on, and sometimes reconciled, conflicting interpretations of the evidence.

Although it was gratifying to see so many candidates handling source material with confidence and proficiency, there were, still, some recurring errors that undermined the quality of some candidates' work.

1. A significant minority of candidates chose to tackle the sources in part a) questions in sequence. Such an approach made detailed cross-referencing, the identification of similarities and differences, all but impossible and thus frequently limited the award to Level 2 at best. Candidates should always look to tackle the sources as a set.

2. Another common reason for poor performance in the (a) questions was the inability to understand and interpret the sources effectively. In some cases there was real misunderstanding but, more often than not, it was simply a case of careless reading. Although it is understandable that candidates will feel under pressure in examinations, they should, nonetheless, try to take sufficient time and care to clarify the task that they are undertaking and to equip themselves with secure understanding of the materials that they are given. Here making a plan may help to eradicate errors that stem from undue haste.

3. Most candidates are aware that, for part a) questions, it is essential to weigh up the evidence contained in a source in the light of its provenance. However, for the higher levels this should not be relegated to a discrete section of the response but should be integrated into the answer and applied directly to specific points contained within the source material.

4. In part (b) questions, candidates at the lowest levels resorted to paraphrasing the sources with any reasoning limited to simple cross-referencing. For higher levels it is essential that candidates are able to deploy accurate and focused contextual knowledge to challenge or support the representations contained in the sources.

5. A number of candidates, despite recognising the importance of both source analysis and the deployment of contextual knowledge, limited their mark by taking the sources in sequence and in isolation, with only a brief comparative reference. Alternatively, others began from a base of wider knowledge, and developed arguments on this basis, using the sources as illustration. While many of these responses achieved good marks in AO1, they tended to offer only simple or barely developed reference to the sources, at L2 or at times L1 in AO2. The best responses used the sources and their own knowledge in combination, beginning with analysis and interpretation of the sources as a set to establish the core of the debate, before presenting support, development and evaluation from wider knowledge, to offer a balanced conclusion. Again, as for part a), the foundation of such high level responses lies in the initial planning.

6. Finally, candidates should remember that the source skills required for part b) questions are focused on AO2b not AO2a. A number of candidates still routinely evaluate the utility and reliability of the sources in part b). Such evaluation should only be employed where it assists a candidate in weighing up the strength of the representation contained in the source material. Speculation and generalised observations about the objectivity or otherwise of secondary historians serve little purpose.

Question 1 (a)

Most candidates could access at least Level 2 for this question by identifying the basic challenge embedded in the sources and providing some supporting evidence. At the higher levels candidates, while recognising that the sources were not in agreement when apportioning blame for the Light Brigade's disastrous charge, could still use the sources as a set to identify similarities in the assessment of Nolan's character. Most responses included some references to the source attributions but these were occasionally rather generalised or dismissive ('Source 1 is an obituary and is biased'). Higher performing candidates evaluated the conflicting views in the sources through careful consideration of source provenance.

(a) To some extent the sources all agree that some people did blame Captain Nolan for the failure of the charge of the Light Brigade. ^{*} However, source 2 ~~challenges~~ states that it was Lucas's fault ~~and~~ while source 1 + 2 state ~~that~~ 1 + 2 imply that it wasn't initially his idea while source 3 challenges this that it was the fault of others for putting

~~For~~ Sources 1, 2 + 3 all agree that many people blamed Captain Nolan for the events which occurred at the charge of The Light Brigade. Source 1 for example states that "the or in "the disastrous charge of Balaclava, blame was hastily attached to Captain Nolan" implying that many people did think he was the cause of the failure. Source 2 supports this as it states that "Captain Nolan has been held up as the unwitting instrument of the Light Brigades destruction". From this again, I can infer that many people did blame Nolan for the disaster. Source 3 agrees with source 1 + 2 as it states that "^{he} Nolan was unsusited to deliver Raglan's order for the charge" thus suggesting again that the disaster of the charge of the Light Brigade was in part due to his shortcomings. Therefore, all sources agree that Nolan was blamed by some people for the disaster.

The reason these sources agree is because many people at the time did blame Nolan for the death of many and while some sources excuse him, they all admit that he made mistakes.

* However, source 1 + 2 imply that it was the fault of others while source 3 states challenges this and states that it was due to ^{Nolan's} own weakness.

((a) continued) On the other hand, the sources disagree ~~as source 1 + 2 state~~
~~that it was the failings of~~ source 1 + 2 both imply that it was the failure
of others while source 3 states that the failure was due to Nolan's weaknesses.
Source 1 states that "the charge of the Light Brigade was so opposed
to his (Nolan's) theories on tactics that he could never have suggested it".
This implies that it was the fault of the person who did suggest the such
tactics, not Nolan. This is supported in source 2 where it says captain's
Nolan's position was that of merely aide-de-camp" and that if "Lord
Lucan was influenced by the eager spirit of captain Nolan, then Lucan
was to blame" thus implying that it was Lucan's fault for listening to
an "aide-de-camp". Source 3 disagrees with source 1 + 2 about ~~whose~~
~~fault it was~~ the ^{idea} ~~fact~~ that it wasn't Nolan's fault as it states that
"he was known to have been critical of the cavalry and its commanders and
was, therefore, ill suited to deliver Raglan's order for the charge". This implies
that it was ~~the~~ Nolan's weaknesses which meant the message was wrongly received
and that therefore, the disaster occurred. Therefore, source 3 disagrees with
~~to~~ source 1 + 2 that Nolan was to blame other people were to blame for
the failure of the charge of the Light Brigade.

The reason these sources disagree is because source 1 is written part of captain
Nolan's obituary and therefore will be biased and want to show him off
to be a brave and wise captain. This is because it's after his death and
would not want to be disrespectful of him as a ~~cap~~ person but instead
honour his memory. Source 2 agrees with this because it is written by
someone who ~~survived~~ was the father of ~~the~~ a survivor. Having heard stories
of the disaster from his son, this person may be angry ~~and a Nolan died~~

((a) continued) ~~A battle, will want someone~~ and will want someone who more directly had an impact on the outcome ~~For~~ of the battle as Lucan passed on the order. source 3 disagrees because ~~as Nolan died in the war battle had died in~~ ~~6~~ this was a while after Nolan's death, he may have felt he could be more honest about the events which occurred and give a more balanced account.

The source which holds the most weight is ~~source 1 as it states~~ source 2 as it's written by somebody who ~~served~~ ^{his son} fought in the battle and therefore, ~~may have or may~~ ^{his son} as he isn't to blame he will have given an honest account of what he experienced. However, it holds less weight because his son experienced the death of his friend and will thus be bitter towards the man who gave the orders, Lucan. ^{directly} The ~~source which is~~ source 3 holds less weight as it's written by a man who served alongside the other and may therefore, be biased as he will have been close to some of the men. Finally source ~~2~~ 1 holds the least weight as it's taken from Nolan's obituary and will therefore, be biased trying to make him look like a good man to honour his memory. Therefore, source 2 holds the most weight and source 1 the least.

To conclude, the sources all agree that Nolan was in part to blame and that many people did blame him. However, source 1 + 2 imply that it was also the fault of other while source 3 disagrees and states that Nolan's weaknesses ~~is~~ rendered him unfit for the job.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response clearly uses the sources as a set and presents some solid cross-referencing supported by relevant selection from the evidence. There is some valid comment on provenance but this is relegated to a separate paragraph towards the end of the response and would have been more effective if it had been integrated into, and applied to, the points raised through the source examination. Nonetheless, this is a strong answer and would be rewarded with a low Level 4.

Question 1 (b) (i)

Most candidates recognised the debate embedded in the source material, although a sizeable minority were unable to reason from the evidence of the sources by deploying any meaningful contextual knowledge. However, many had an impressive range of own knowledge and used this as well as the attributions of Sources 4 and 5 to help evaluate the weight that should be attached to representations of Passchendaele presented by Groom and Haig. Revisionist historians are clearly making gains in the war over the High command's reputation and a significant number of candidates balanced the blood and mud view of Source 4 with convincing arguments in support of Corrigan and Haig. The very best managed to weigh 'achievement' in the light of objectives.

An excellent succinct introduction was provided by the following candidate. Not only is the debate highlighted from the content of the sources but the attributions have been applied correctly to provide some sense of the weight that should be attached to the representations contained in the sources.

Groom in source 4 presents a very traditional view of the battle of Passchendaele as one of 'lingering deaths in the mud' and a 'military crime'. This is the human view of the battle as we would expect from a veteran who is recalling the event during the more anti-military 1970s. By contrast Haig, unsurprisingly as commander-in-chief, argues the opposite by concentrating on the strategic achievements of the battle and not the individual suffering. Gordon Corrigan, in source 6, while acknowledging the number of deaths and the appalling weather conditions, largely agrees with Haig that the battle was a 'genuine achievement'.

Question 1 (b) (ii)

This was the more popular of the part b) options. Most candidates appreciated the debate embedded in the source material with the more astute aware that Source 9 was slightly less fulsome in its support than Gregory in Source 7. An impressive number of candidates could deploy a wide range of accurate material to support or challenge the claims made in the sources. Many had detailed knowledge of the various regulations and edicts enforced by the government during the war (DORA and the Munitions of War Act being the most common) and could develop the source references to strike action with specific examples, with Welsh miners featuring heavily. Higher performing candidates recognised the need to examine labour relations and worker attitudes in the light of the changing fortunes of war.

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

* (b) To some extent, Britain's workers did respond patriotically to the nation's needs as workers were largely patriotic and did what was required of them. This is evident in source 7 where Gregory writes that "workers were, in fact as patriotic as everyone else" implying that they did do their jobs. Furthermore, this is evident in source 9 where Clarke writes that "the leaders (of trade unions) responded to the nation's needs", again implying that the workers did what was required of them. I can support this with my own knowledge as I know that following the Munitions of War Act, ~~some~~ people received ^{lower} ~~fewer~~ wages and the profits went into creating total war. Furthermore, women, who had not previously worked readily took up jobs in the Women's Land Army, while the men fought, and as VADs and FANYs who worked to look after the wounded. This demonstrated a willingness to meet the needs of the nation. ~~Source 7 challenges this as it states that the~~ source 8, however challenges this as it states that "The war was popular... three years ago... At present (1917)... it is not". ~~This is perhaps~~ I can challenge this source as I know that there were few strikes and people worked ~~due~~ as people were happy to work towards a total war economy due to propaganda and the prospect of working towards a greater good. This source may perhaps be incorrect as there was a mining strike in 1917 and ~~as~~ as Tawney ~~he~~ was part of an anti-war organisation, he may be largely biased and ~~be~~ at the point will be manipulating the strikes to imply that there is great civil unrest. Therefore, ~~the~~ Britain's workers

the strikes to imply that there is great civil unrest. Therefore, the Britain's workers did respond patriotically to the nation's needs as they coped with wage cuts.

On the other hand, the workers did not respond patriotically to the nation's needs as in the mining industry, ~~they~~ there were many strikes in (b) continued) 1915, 1917 and 1918. This is evident in source 7 where it states the source 8 reiterates this public unrest as it states that "the war was popular at present, it is not". It goes on to say that ~~if~~ you wouldn't "get a hearing at a worker's meeting if one spoke of the principles at stake in this war. One would get laughed down" which implies that the workers stopped being supportive and patriotic. I can support this from my own knowledge as I know that in the mining sector in particular there were several strikes particularly in Bangor, South Wales. This was due in part to the low wages which plagued the mining industry ~~and~~ because of the Munitions of War Act. This Act stated that strikes would be prohibited under the protection of the Defence of the Realm Act - which ensured the government could gear the economy towards total war ~~in spite of the Munitions of War Act~~. The Munitions of War Act ~~gave~~ gave the government the ability to keep the profits of business' ~~thus~~ thus creating lower wages. Naturally, this led to strikes in spite of the ban on strikes ~~from~~. In response to these strikes, the government allowed the mines leeway, gave into demands and let them run their own industries. Therefore, it is clear that the ~~workers~~ ^{miners} were not willing to adapt to the nation's needs and instead made the government adapt to them. Source 7 challenges this as it states "the strikes were modest affairs" and that "the vast majority of strikes ~~came~~ in 1918 came in the second half of the year" suggesting that the ~~the~~ workers were loyal ~~at~~ "when defeat became a real prospect". ~~I~~ I can challenge this source as I know that miners went on strike at the beginning of the war when victory was not a prospect. Furthermore, it was not a modest affair as it managed to ~~etc~~ make the

Furthermore, it was not a modest affair as it managed to ~~err~~ make the government go back on their Munition's of War Act. ~~Therefore, the~~
~~workers~~ The reason this source may disagree is because it's an
(b) continued) overview of ~~the~~ all of the areas of industry and therefore, isn't
just focusing on one area. Therefore, the workers were not always patriotic
as ~~they often~~ ^{the miners} went on strike over wages.

To conclude, workers were largely patriotic as they did everything they could
to help the total war economy in spite of personal cost. ~~to~~ They took part
in trade unions, ~~worked~~ and accept of lower wages. Even women worked
in the war effort. While it is evident there were strikes this was only due
to low wages which the miners couldn't cope with. Overall, the workers
were highly patriotic and supportive of DORA ~~and the~~



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response was typical of those operating on the borderline of Level 4. The candidate has a reasonable range of contextual knowledge and this is used in combination with the source material to present arguments both for and against the view in the question. However, some of the finer nuances of the sources are not picked up and the structure of the piece is a little disjointed. The candidate was awarded a low Level 4 in both assessment objectives.

Question 2 (a)

Most candidates could readily access the arguments from the sources for and against the contention in the question. However, at the lower levels, a sequential approach was invariably adopted and any comment on provenance was restricted to simple generalisations. Higher performing candidates recognised that the all three sources could be used both to challenge and support the contention and provided detailed cross-referencing to illustrate this. The very best used the source attributions and carefully applied contextual knowledge to weigh up specific points. Thus, some felt that the circumstances of the interview in Source 10 added weight to Mrs Jackson's plea that she should be allowed to resume her 'quiet and happy life', while others placed the mob in Source 11 in the cultural context of late Victorian street protest.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

(a) ~~All~~ As a whole, the sources seem to suggest that Mr Jackson had 'right upon his side'. ~~Traditionally~~ However, ^{sexist} the ~~nature~~ of traditions that have been in place in ~~Engl~~ Britain for hundreds of years ~~also~~ afforded Mr Jackson a more lenient and lawful escape from what should have been ~~deemed~~ illegal. Deemed 'romantic' by ~~the~~ ^{some}, the abduction was brushed off by the sources, and by the majority of society as being a necessary evil in order to keep the status quo within society.

Both source 10 and 12 describe ~~the~~ a more relaxed and 'romantic' attitude towards the abduction. Source 10, ~~written by~~ an interview of Mrs Jackson in the Manchester Times, shows a ~~the~~ seemingly apologetic and restrained Mrs Jackson denying all charges and being amazed at the importance made of the matter by the newspapers! Her husband had returned from abroad

her husband had returned from abroad after some years setting up a business, and therefore had become estranged to his wife. She supposedly refused to live with him, & so he forcibly abducted her and locked her up. Source 12, written in December 1891, reviews the case and portrays it to be a misunderstanding on the part of wife, and that ~~the~~ the husband had 'law and right upon his side', which was then confirmed by the Law Court, a decidedly male institution. However, Mrs Jackson, captive within her own home, seems to have been coerced into speaking amicably about her husband, as well as ~~with~~ obviously stating that had felt some 'ill effects' from her 'forcible abduction'. This gives that wasn't entirely standing up for herself ~~in~~ and protesting against his violent act. Moreover, source 12 also describes the appeal of Mr Jackson's friends against the law court's decision allowed Mrs Jackson to be 'set at liberty', concluding that in some instances, Mr Jackson's behaviour was seen to be too harsh.

Source 11 is the only source which truly shows that Mr Jackson had 'right upon his side'. It shows the public's reception of ~~the~~ ~~event~~; ~~as~~ ~~re~~vering of Mr Jackson's right and portrays the sexist nature of which the female population of Britain was subjugated.

((a) continued) The 'groans, hisses and yells' for Mrs Jackson further confirms this, as are do the cheers for the husband. Written shortly after the ~~reversing~~ granting of the appeal, it analyses the atmosphere of the society of Britain as it emphasises the patriarchal nature of the people's reaction, in comparison to Source D and R.
^{in regards to female 'ownership'}

Generally, the sources indicate that Mr Jackson did not have any right to abduct and capture his wife; this ~~show~~ is evidently shown in the Court of Appeal's decision to reverse his right and allow Mrs Jackson to be set at liberty, as well as the primary appeal of her friends. Moreover, Mrs Jackson's restrained reaction in her interview, as well as its location and date, allows to gauge ~~to~~ that she did not ~~g~~ like her husband's actions, ~~as per~~ ~~however~~ Plus, a law passed following this event allowed women to have the choice to live with their husband and also the case was used for case law.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response was awarded a mark of 15. There is evidence of supported cross-referencing and the candidate has displayed some close textual reading of the source material. However, the attempts to weigh up the evidence in the light of the attributions, although, for the most part, sound, lack development and application. There is a strong conclusion which pushes the award to the top of Level 3, although the inclusion of additional own knowledge in the last sentence is superfluous.

Question 2 (b) (i)

Most candidates appreciated the debate contained in Sources 13 and 14. However, at the lower levels, there was some misreading of Kenney's impressions of Arthur Balfour in source 15, with a number of candidates missing the significance of the last sentence. Those performing at the higher levels could use the sources to chart the shifting attitudes of the Conservative Party to female suffrage and use their own contextual knowledge to develop this line of argument. The very best recognised that support and self-interest often coincided.

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

(b)

| do not agree | agree |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• would benefit• Supporting enfranchisement | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• was against idea.• misogynist (sexism) |

Many would argue that the Conservative party supported women's suffrage as they would gain many benefits, such as an increased number of voters. However, this was not the case. This essay will argue that the Conservative party were against women's suffrage as they were ideologically opposed to it.

The Conservatives would indeed benefit from enfranchisement of women as they would see a vast increase in Conservative supporters. Source 13 supports this by saying that "female voters... would substantially increase Conservative electoral prospects", meaning that enfranchisement would most likely give the Conservatives complete control over the government. However, source 13, although having hindsight, lacks a lot of weight as it was written by Harold Smith,

lot of weight as it was written by Harold Smith, a supporter of women's suffrage, and could therefore be biased. This source also does not include arguments from both sides, such as with sources 14 and 15, again reducing its weight as a credible source.

Some would also argue that the Conservatives actually supported the idea of women's suffrage. Sources 14 and 15 both give information to back up this argument, saying that "Arthur Balfour pointed out the contradiction in giving a vote to a man who contributes nothing," "then denying women who contribute anything the vote." Source 15 also states that "(Arthur Balfour) was giving the appearance of listening intently to what I said." Both of these quotes show that the Conservatives were willing to understand and support women's enfranchisement. Some Conservatives did truly support the women's suffrage campaign, helping set up groups in which women could support Conservatives through other means.

On the other hand, sources 14 and 15 also show that, although the Conservatives gave the appearance of support, the Conservatives actually were opposed to women's suffrage and refused to encourage it. It is well known that the Conservatives were ideologically opposed to the suffrage

Conservatives were ideologically opposed to the Suffrage movement, meaning that they would not encourage it even if it benefited them, as Source 14 states "the Conservative party... did nothing to encourage Female Suffrage". Source 15 also supports this idea of misogyny within ^{the} Conservatives by showing how their leader, Arthur Balfour, "had not committed himself any more than I expected". Sources 14 and 15 both have decent weight with which to support this argument. Source 14 has hindsight, being published in 2008 and contains information arguing for both sides, showing that the author clearly understands the events that took place. Source 15, although lacking hindsight, also shows both sides of ^{the} argument and is written in a neutral tone, showing no support for either side of the argument. Arthur Balfour was well known to be misogynistic, alongside other prime ministers such as Herbert Asquith.

In conclusion, I ~~cannot~~ agree with the view that the Conservative party were generally opposed to Female Suffrage as their beliefs as a party would not allow them to support them, and many in their party, namely Arthur Balfour, had misogynistic tendencies. Due to Source 13 lacking weight, the sources as a set strongly support this argument, showing the Conservatives inability to show support.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response is operating at the lower levels of attainment. Although there is an attempt, in the third paragraph, to reason from the evidence of the sources through cross-referencing, the quotations are used out of context. The candidate is also mistakenly focusing on AO2a rather than AO2b with misguided and unhelpful attempts to evaluate the reliability of the secondary sources. Finally, a distinct lack of contextual knowledge severely restricts the extent to which the representations in the sources can be explored.

Question 2 (b) (ii)

This was the less popular of the part b) questions. All those who attempted the question appreciated the outline of the debate contained in the sources but a sizeable proportion relied exclusively on the source material to drive their analysis. Those performing at higher levels recognised that the advances adumbrated in Sources 17 and 18 did not necessarily translate into mass improvement, although they were also aware of the significance of shifting public perceptions. A minority, but nonetheless a significant one, could extend the themes raised in the sources with their own knowledge to present a focused and balanced analysis.

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

* (b) (ii) As source 16 suggests, 'it is questionable whether women gained any significant advantage from their wartime experience'. True the womens work put them in a different light for many men and allowed themselves to be seen as more of equals. Yet at the same time, it must be considered that many women lost their jobs when the men returned from war and their lives simply went back to how they always were. However, it would seem to be incorrect to say that women did not gain 'any significant advantage from their wartime experience'.

Firstly it is important to remember that ^{some} women actually gained the vote in 1918, the year the war ended. Although the extension ^{of the franchise} did not include all women (only women over 30 who were rate-payers or married to someone who was could vote), it must still be seen as significant progress for the suffrage cause. It is debatable whether wartime work actually attributed to this as

machine work actually attributed to this as ~~many~~ the majority of machine workers were young, working-class ~~off~~ girls who did not own their own property, so therefore were (b) continued) excluded from the franchise. However as the timing of the extension of the franchise was so close to the war, it would be incorrect to say that the gains from women's machine work had absolutely no effect.

Another legal gain women made following war was the Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act of 1919. ~~So~~ This, in theory, should have increased women's ~~use~~ employment opportunities as it outlined 'a person should not be disqualified by sex or marriage from the exercise of any public function...'. Therefore it seems source 12 disagrees with the view that employment opportunities did not have any gains from machine work. Source 17 also seems to disagree with the suggestions as it claims, 'to some extent they had their wishes fulfilled, at least in the legal sense'. Paula Bartley's view in source 17 has outlined the arguable flaw of source 18. Indeed by law sex disqualification had been removed, yet this did not mean that it did not still exist. It is known that there was still a 'glass ceiling' in women's work meaning that if they could even get the work, their pay and opportunities

((b) continued) would still be considerably lower than a man's. It is even questionable whether a woman could retain her job, as it is known that around 600,000 women lost their jobs following the men's return ~~of~~ from the war as they had to give them back up to the men. Therefore it seems that the part of the Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act 'any person should not be disqualified by sex ... from carrying on any civil profession or vocation'. So although the view in source 18 and partly source 17 disagrees with the idea that employment opportunities did not gain 'any significant advantage from their wartime work', it seems that these views cannot be entirely trusted judging by evidence such as figures of post-war unemployment in women.

On the other hand, it is known that many jobs opened up to women that had not been previously available to women before the war, for example law. Source 17 outlines that 'After 1919 the legal profession was opened to women like Christabel Pankhurst. As were some

((b) continued) Other professions outlined in source 17. ~~The source also~~ It could be said that these gains were a result of women's wartime work as it proved they were able to hold down an ~~the~~ important job, in some cases dangerous such as munitions work, and could balance this with their roles in the family. Many previous opinions of women's incapacities were expelled and this could be the reason why, as source 17 states, 'in the '1920s there were a number of significant firsts'. However, there was also a significant first some time ago in ~~the~~ 1865 when Elizabeth Garrett Anderson became the first woman on the medical register. Although it was possible for women to enter into professions pre-war, as Garrett Anderson did, it was extremely hard, with Garrett Anderson having to travel to Paris for a degree. The view in source 17 expresses that women's wartime work made it slightly easier to enter professions that had been seriously closed to them or difficult to enter. Therefore, it seems that it may not be true that women did not gain

((b) continued) significantly in employment opportunities. However, it must be considered that source 17 could contain a hint of opinion as it was written by a historian Paula Bartley who took great interest in the history of women.

Overall it seems that women made some gains following their wartime work. They were able to enter into many professions that were not previously open to them, and to some extent opinions of them were changed. However, as source 16 points out 'wartime economic independence was short-lived'. Many women lost their jobs as the war ended and were forced to return to the home. Even though the Sex Disqualification Removal Act of 1919 got rid of some inequalities in the workplace, there was still the 'glass ceiling' in women's work. It would not be fair to say that in terms of employment opportunities, women ~~had~~ did not gain any significant advantages from their wartime work' as it gained them the vote which increased their standing in the workplace.

((b) continued) in the eyes of men, and following the war more professions were opened to them. However, it does seem that there was still some way to go until women and men were seen equally in terms of ~~the~~ employment.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

In this response, after an unfocused start dealing with suffrage not employment opportunities, the candidate presents a tightly argued and balanced analysis using source material and contextual knowledge in combination. Although the range and precision of own knowledge could be extended, there is a sophisticated examination of the claims made in the sources both in terms of practice and perception. The piece received marks of 18 for AO1 and 14 for AO2b

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 US028142 June 2011

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

