

Examiners' Report
June 2012

GCE History 6HI02 C

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

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

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

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

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



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 US032413

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

Introduction

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

The paper requires candidates to answer two questions in 100 minutes. Examiners commented on the fact that many candidates this series had clearly used their time to very good effect. Although some responses were quite brief, there was little evidence of candidates having insufficient time to answer both questions.

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

In part A, most candidates were very skilled in using the language of cross referencing, but a significant number often matched statements that showed a comparison for agree or disagree and did not explain or draw out the inferences that are necessary to develop a cross reference. In part B, whilst some candidates were very knowledgeable, it was disappointing to note that a significant minority of candidates relied very heavily on the material in the sources. Centres are reminded that candidates are expected to have a reasonable range and depth of knowledge that can be applied to the part B questions.

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

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

Question 1 (a)

This question attracted a wide range of responses; the vast majority of candidates had little difficulty in accessing the sources and it was pleasing to note that it appeared that fewer candidates than usual approached the question on a source by source basis. The best responses were able to make explicit, sustained and cross referenced comparisons with Sources 1 and 2 against Source 3. Such answers understood clearly that Source 2 could be used to both support and challenge the message in Source 3 and could relate this well to the focus of the question. Such answers were often able to deal with the nuances of Lloyd George's position in Source 2 and to place the evidence of Source 1 in context (i.e. at a time of greater opposition). Less effective approaches to the use of provenance tended to make generalised comments on the usefulness or not of newspapers or politicians as evidence. The best responses integrated valid comments about the significance of provenance within the argument rather than adding a bolt-on paragraph at the end of the essay. Very few candidates identified Chamberlain correctly, with a significant minority believing that he was the Prime Minister. There seemed to be an increase in the number of candidates who used their own knowledge in the answer; this tended to be used to describe events.

Question 1 Question 2

(a) Source one strongly challenges source three's suggestions ~~the~~ Britain was involved in the war due to 'principles'. Both Sources one and two ~~write~~ agree that ~~the war~~ ^{our involvement} was actually to benefit the mine owners. Source one states the war is 'waged on behalf of the capitalists'. This implies that the mine owners are influencing the involvement of the British. Source two backs this up stating that the war 'is a question of profits'. This suggests the war is all about making money.

Source one continues to challenge Source three as it states the tactics of the mining bosses: 'bribery, blackmailing and organized espionage'. This conveys the mine owners as willing to do anything to gain power. The source goes on to say there is no 'moral principle' in our involvement. This suggests the reasons behind Britain's involvement are morally and ethically wrong. This is in complete contrast to source three which implies Britain is only trying to

defend itself and 'maintain our position'. Source two further challenges source three with suggestions the war is for 'conquest and power's expansion'. This implies the British really just want to be the greatest and most powerful methods and that the Boer war is just about adding South Africa to the empire. Source one was written ~~at the~~

((a) continued) ~~from~~ during the war in a newspaper. As a result, it is likely to reflect public opinion and as most papers had war correspondents it is likely it has a high level of accuracy because the editor himself would not print lies. However, the source could ^{have} some bias based on the paper's political views. Also, it was written in 1901 when criticism of the war was at its fiercest due to the concentration camps so is likely to be based on just the worst aspects.

Source two does show some support for source one why Britain got involved in the war. Both sources agree that it was the Boers who made the offensive move. Source two states they 'invaded our territories' so Britain had to 'defend' ~~it~~ itself. This implies that Britain was forced to get involved and support source three which claims 'the policy and aim of the Boers is to create a United States of South Africa'. This portrays the Boers as the power hungry side and the British as the defenders of freedom.

However, source two also shows some strong challenge. It ~~states~~ describes the Boers as 'poor hunted Boers'. This portrays the British as treating the Boers no better than animals and almost tracking them down to achieve British aims. The source also claims Boers had 'conceded

to our demands' yet the British still sent in thousands of soldiers'. This implies the Boers tried to stop the conflict but the British clearly wanted to take

((a) continued) control so carried on.

The differences in sources two and three are most likely down to their authors. Source two is by David Lloyd George who was extremely anti-war and a leading pro-Boer. Also, he is saying this in a by election so it is likely he is attacking the government to gain votes so there will clearly be some bias. On the other hand, source three is by a member of parliament. He is going to have to defend the decision to go to war so will clearly leave out anything that hurts the government.

In conclusion, sources one and two strongly challenge source three statement about why Britain got involved. While source three suggests it was for protection ^{and} to bring about what is right ~~the~~ other sources say ^{there} ~~it~~ were ~~not~~ selfish and greedy motives. However, source two does show ^{some} ~~some~~ support when it admits it was not entirely the fault of the British.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer is doing sufficient to move into level 4. There is sustained and developed cross referencing which is linked to the focus of the question. The candidate does deal with provenance, but this might have been integrated into the argument as it progressed; quite a lot of this is left to the penultimate paragraph. There is evidence of judgements being reached, but these need to be further developed for the answer to move to the top of the level.

Question 1 (b) (i)

This was the slightly less popular answer and provided a range of answers. The best responses understood the Prussian link and the time context of the sources to provide well supported responses placing McNeill-Tulloch, Prussian success and Cardwell in a valid context for the question. Such answers were able to integrate both own knowledge and the evidence of all three sources into their argument. However, in the case of many candidates own knowledge was limited and such answers relied on an argument drawn primarily from the sources, although many such answers did not recognise the timing and context implied by the sources. Cardwell was often used to show that reform did follow the war although quite a few candidates answered the question with no direct reference to Cardwell. The Prussian connection was often ignored and relatively few candidates seemed aware of McNeill-Tulloch. Candidates were generally better informed about medical reforms than those of the military or Civil Service and some candidates wrote at some length about the work of Florence Nightingale and Mary Seacole. It was disappointing to note that many candidates made generic points regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b.

* (b) i) The Crimea war highlighted many failings within the British army. Although the government attempted to respond to these problems reform and consequently success was limited.

Firstly, the severe mismanagement of supplies was a major problem during the Crimean war. A lack of communication between those in charge led to a severe shortage of warm clothes, shelter and food. The organisation of the McNeill-Tulloch report by the government is clear people had noticed this problem. The government realised there were major problems so ordered this report to bring about change. As expected the report highlighted severe failings in the army. However, the government failed to act and actually bring about change. They realised the problems were there but failed because they went no further it suggests they didn't learn. Instead of bringing about reform they were more concerned about bringing the army under government control. Some agreed that things were 'worse than ever'.

However, what the report did do was shock the public. This generated ^{much} concern for the troops. Sarge 4 states the public suddenly 'seemed anxious about the organisation of the army'. This shows the war had been successful in changing public mood and made the

((b) continued) public realise something had to change. This in turn put pressure of those in charge to actually do something. The fact Sarge 4 is a newspaper article shows it reflects public opinion and that straight away people began to want reform.

Another example to show the lessons of the Crimea had been learnt were the Cardwell army reforms of 1870. These were introduced to bring about big changes to the structure of the army. These reforms show the government not only realised there were problems but also decided to act. The disorganisation of the military departments was partially cleared up by the formation of the war office. Sarge 5 states 'the office of the secretary of war was merged with the secretary of state for war'. This conveys the government as trying to create a more efficient and effective military. Moreover, the army was brought under close control of the government with the commander-in-chief directly reporting to the war office. This ~~ens~~ helped ensure there would be no further repeats of the chaos during the Russian winter of 1854 when the British hadn't had enough accommodation. This shows the government realised it could just leave all the organisation down to the military and had to itself get involved.

Another reform in the Cardwell reforms was to improve Britain's reserves. During the Crimea the British

(b) continued) had been desperately short of troops. As a result, the government decided to introduce the Territorials to replace the reserves. This again shows they were trying to prevent the mistakes happening again.

However, the deep divisions between officers and soldiers were not dealt with. While officers had enjoyed extensive promotions many soldiers had starved during the war. The government failed to act with the upper classes continuing to occupy the top positions. It had realised of the increasing rift between officers and soldiers and as a result this continued to be a problem. However, they did try to introduce some change to the promotion system which shows they did notice the problem but reforms did not go far enough so agreeing that lessons had not been learnt.

Furthermore, the fact that these reforms didn't come until 1870 suggests that actually the government hadn't learnt from the Crimea war. Sars 4 suggests it wasn't until the 'promotions success' that change began suggesting it was this not the Crimea that was the catalyst of change. Also, Sars five states the 'reorganisation of the infantry was delayed'. If the government had realised the full extent of the problems the changes would have surely happened sooner but they were happy to go on with minimal change. As the writer of Sars 5 is a historian he is likely to have all the information so can see where change happened

((b) continued) from his data. However, it was ^{published} written in 1938 so is unlikely to have the full picture.

The drastic reforms to the health service really suggest that actually the government learnt from its mistakes. This disagrees with the view lessons were not learnt. Following the war drastic changes were made to the layout and design of hospitals to prevent a repeat of the Crimea where hospitals like the army barracks in Scutari had been full of vermin, were overcrowded and had no clean water. However, you could argue changes back in Britain were not due to the Crimean war but instead improving medical knowledge such as Pasteur's germ theory.

^{six} Nightingale's work also led to serious changes. Source 6 states following the war 'nursing was taken more seriously'. This suggests that people realized what an impact the nurses had had on the hospitals so it became a more respectable and valued profession. Source six states 'training schools' were set up and there were 'marked improvements'. This implies that the government realized that nurses could make an even greater difference and had learnt what they could achieve. It is ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ ~~con~~ It is written by quite a recent historian in 1984. As a result, we can assume it is of a high accuracy as he is likely to have the bigger picture. As it's so recent he is able to see how

((b) continued) from monumental the changes to nursing were and where those changes originated.

In conclusion, I do agree that on the whole lessons were not learnt from the Crimean war. Attempts were made to bring about reforms but they failed to go far enough. Both sources far as five show some agreement saying change was slow and had a limited impact. It seems that if they had really learnt from mistakes the changes would have been much sooner. Instead they allowed things to carry on in similar fashion. As shown in source six the biggest changes came in healthcare. However, the causes of these changes was due to other factors such as improving knowledge not from lessons learnt as the Crimea. Although source six does disagree lessons were not learnt.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This candidate clearly understands the focus of the question and has some range of own knowledge to support the arguments that are being made. The sources are used, but there is a sense of the answer mainly using them in sequence. The answer makes some generalised comments about the provenance of the secondary sources and this earns no credit, but does interrupt the flow of the response. This answer is better on AO1 (level 3/4 margins) than it is on AO2 (level 3).

Question 1 (b) (ii)

This question was slightly more popular. The most successful responses displayed a good knowledge of the developments in medical care and treatment during the war to develop a balanced argument which also factored in the different standard of care at the time of Source 7 relative to that at the end of the war.

Most who provided own knowledge were able to show knowledge of VADs and FANYs, the development of plastic surgery, prosthetics and trench sanitation/personal hygiene. A few were also able to mention French mobile X-ray units and the growing awareness of shell shock. Very few drew comparisons with the logistical problems of the Boer War. Weaker responses tended to focus their argument on the sources. Such answers often took Source 7 at face value.

Some candidates used Crimean War knowledge inappropriately, whilst a small number substituted the Crimean for World War 1.

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

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

* (b) Do you agree with the view that there were significant advances in medical care by the British Army during the First World War?

it is fair to say that the medical care in Great War was a catalyst for advancement, Source 9 shares that view, whereas Sources 7 & 8 do not.

Source 9 states that "war always stimulates medical advances", this suggestion is a fair one to make. If you look at an area such as plastic surgery, there have been some advances further down history such as Indian Rhinoplasty and the Tagliacozzi claw, but there was no real movement in the development of plastic surgery until the Great War, this was because there had been no real war of such magnitude before, there'd been the Boer War (1899-1902) but if you were titanically injured then you

would've died, the story isn't the same for the First World War, there was one doctor in particular who was responsible for this, Gillies, he'd been performing reconstructions of the mouth, but the war gave him a chance to experiment, and as the source says "Survival rates increased" this was a result of doctors experimenting and being innovative.

The advances didn't just stop injuries that were attributable to the enemy, the developments in X-Rays (Roentgen Rays) allowed radiologists to find foreign objects but it also allowed them to discover certain diseases such as Gas Gangrene and tuberculosis, as Source 9 states "in the case of sick or injured from causes not attributable to the enemy - 29% died", this shows clear advances since 3.39% of men in the Boer war ~~that~~ that were sick or injured died. This is showing complete advances in the medical ~~how~~ care within the British Army during the First World War.

However, Sources 7 & 8, juxtapose what was said in Source 9. It again is a fair suggestion to say that medical care did not significantly improve, Source 7 bluntly says "medical care is dreadful", this is a clear juxtaposition of Source 9, this source was written in 1915,

When the medical care was still advancing, we hadn't had the losses and horrors of the Somme & Passchendaele, so most doctors were still back in Britain. Source 7 also ((b) continued) states that "injections are brutal, with a regulation dose given to every man regardless of his condition", pain relief in the Great War did make advances, but it was a very slow advancement, it wasn't until around 1916, that we'd see the introduction of Nitrogen & Oxygen, until then the only types of pain relief ~~was~~ were ether & Chloroform, both dangerous, especially Chloroform as it could kill some men if the dosage was wrong, this Source (7) also offers a strong argument for ~~the~~ medical advances, albeit against the impression, as it is the first hand account of someone who had been hospitalised as a result of injuries, the only thing that reduces the accuracy of the Source is that, it doesn't focus specifically on the medicine itself, its main focus is on the state of the hospitals, "buildings are gloomy with ~~the~~ bath taps all loose and tied to the wall with string".

Source 8, on the other hand offers a view, like the one given in Source 9, but a juxtaposition of the view given in Source 9. "One can ^{only} wonder that more men did

not die" this is a critical judgement of First World War Medical Care but it is hard

((b) continued) In Conclusion, Sources 7 & 8, offer a strong argument, but it is a lesser argument than the one presented in Source 9 also the fact that Source 7 only talks about conditions, and Source 8 only really focusses on the earlier stages of the war. I agree with the view in the question, as I do believe that there was a real advancement in the medical that was received by the British Army in 1914* - 1918, although the more modern advances came towards the end of the war, it still happened during it, more men were surviving from head wounds due to advances in neurosurgery, 33% survival rate, X-Rays also helped prevent the spread of disease, before going mobile in 1917, Citrated blood was used for transfusions instead of the old tube to vein method. The war was a catalyst in the development in all these things. ~~It wasn't for advances during~~



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

It is clear that this candidate understands that the sources present contrasting interpretations of the issue and integrates these views with some well-developed own knowledge to reach sensible conclusions that focus fully on the question. It was awarded level 4 in both assessment objectives.

Question 2 (a)

Most candidates understood the sources and many were able to pick up on the main points of disagreement and support. A number of candidates were able to consider the context of the sources as well as their authors when dealing with provenance. Many candidates were successful in reaching a clear judgement as to whether physical weakness was the main reason for withholding the vote from women. There are, however, still a significant minority of candidates who work through the sources sequentially, making links to the question, but failing to cross reference. There was also some tendency to comment on the provenance of each source and state that it made the source 'less reliable'. A number of candidates did not consider the provenance of the sources.

(a)

How far do the sources suggest that the main reason for withholding the vote from women was that they were physically weaker than men?

Intro

language

provenance

conc

Firstly, Sir Almond Wright advocates the view that ~~the~~ the vote was withheld from women because of their physical weakness, ^{suggest religion as the most important reason, and} Heber Hart appears to ~~support~~ ^{add} this view ~~but~~ ^{adds} in another reason - that they were morally weaker than men. In contrast, Mrs Humphrey Ward suggests several reasons, the physical strength of women being one of them. The sources each have underlying tones and similarities and differences ~~with~~ ^{provenance} which suggest support for the reason.

Sir Wright clearly states his view by stating that a country asserts authority in the world by 'physical force alone' and that 'the main ~~or~~ argument' against female enfranchisement is that they cannot 'represent physical force'. The words 'alone' and 'main' are particularly emphatic and effective in portraying this. This is

((a) continued) supported by Mrs Ward who claims that the problems of the world can only be solved by 'the physical labours' of men, which although does not give as strong a message as Sir Wright with his use of the word 'force', indicates the same idea - that physical strength is an important point. However, she adds ~~that~~ 'special knowledge', implying that it is not only the strength of men but their brains which make them superior, and which prevents women from having the vote. This is only furthered by her description of women as 'politically inexperienced', which ^{again} presents ~~also~~ the argument that men were not only ~~able~~ more able because of strength, but because of education and experience. In a sense, this is a hypocritical - Mrs Ward is stating that women should not ~~assert the vote because they have never~~ break into the sphere of politics because they have never been in it before. Nevertheless, to an extent, she agrees with Sir Wright that strength is an important factor.

Although Heber Mart appears to suggest that religion and nature was the most important reason for women not having the vote, on closer analysis he seems to support Sir Wright and Mrs Ward, particularly Mrs Ward. He states that women's position was set out in the Bible, and uses ~~words~~ effective, short words such as 'plain', 'benefit' and 'rule' to simplify the message - 'women cannot... claim voting equality with men'. However, he states that the ~~power of men~~ male superiority over women is the result of 'their nature'. The word nature here can be ~~interpreted~~

((a) continued) split into two meanings - physical ~~strength~~ and moral. In the case of the former, Hart could be supporting the view that physical strength is a reason women should not have the vote, and this is supported by the idea that Adam ruled over Eve. ~~In contrast~~ On the other hand, if he meant in a moral sense he could share Mrs Ward's view that ~~morally~~ women were not clever enough to have the vote and this is emphasised by the fact both use the separate spheres theory - Hart to say women should 'benefit' men, and Ward to say they should not trouble themselves with politics. However, Sir Wright also uses the theory of nature - he says women voting would 'break a law of nature', which leads me to think Hart means nature in a physical way (as Wright most certainly does) and this suggests strength was an important reason.

It is also necessary to consider the provenance of the sources. As a ^{Christian} religious man supporting charities and the Salvation Army, it is inevitable that Hart would have seen a religious reason as the most important, which suggests his account is exaggerated. Similarly, Sir Wright may also have extreme views as a medical man - a profession that was incredibly closed to women, although less so in 1913. Mrs Ward, ironically, is against the vote but is an example of a confident woman stepping out of her sphere, and as an author in the Times you would expect an anti-suffrage view. ~~That~~ However, sources 11 and 12 are written ^{in the run up to} ~~for~~ World War 1, which suggests the authors may have had physical strength at the forefront of their minds.

((a) continued)

In conclusion, I think the sources do suggest that physical strength was a main reason, but that it was a combination of reasons that resulted in the withhold. For example, although Sir Wright only advocates one point of view, I think his medical position and tone of writing (pre-war) may have had an influence on his argument. Similarly, the tone of writing influenced Mrs Hand, but I think she shows another important reason against the vote - the separate spheres theory and experience. Hart presents religion as a factor, but also the separate spheres theory and experience and strength. It is because of the support between the sources that I think physical strength was a main reason, but because of the other reasons mentioned that I think the sources suggest the main reason was a combination of factors.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Successful answers often outline the key arguments of the sources in the introduction, and this approach can be seen in this answer. There is sustained cross referencing and judgements are made through the course of the response. Provenance is considered in a separate paragraph and the answer would have benefited from including this throughout the answer. Despite this, the quality of argument merits level 4.

Question 2 (b) (i)

This was the less popular question. There were however, a number of very sound responses to this question demonstrating a thorough, and often impressive, knowledge of 19th century legislation and legal cases. The best answers were able to integrate this knowledge with the views presented by the sources. Source 14 and Source 15 were used well, with many candidates realising the significant context of 1887 for Source 15. Only a few candidates were able to draw the finer distinctions between the relative impact on married women from differing backgrounds, despite the reference in Source 13. Equally the difference between theoretical and real progress was commented upon in a few cases only. Weaker candidates tended to focus on the sources and work through these in sequence. It was disappointing to note that many candidates made generic points regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b.

* (b) i) During the second half of the 19th century many acts were passed including the Married Women's Property Acts 1870 and 1882, Matrimonial Causes Act 1884, the divorce and matrimonial causes act 1857 and the Guardianship of Infants Act 1886. All of these were hoped to improve lives of married women.

To some extent passing of legislation had "little bearing on the actual lives of married women" Martin Pugh suggests that laws about custody or property had no relevance to married women. He suggests this as he says that at marriage money would have always been settled for the daughter of which the husband couldn't touch anyway so part of the 1857 Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act which states that maintenance is to be paid to a wife would have been irrelevant. He also says it was irrelevant for working class as being married to a working husband was ambitious. So having a dispute over property was unlikely.

From a judgement custody case in 1857 suggest that the legislation also had little bearing on (b) continued the social lives of married women. This is shown as the source favours the father having custody of the child showing law may actually be irrelevant. The law that would be most relevant to this would be the Guardianship of Infants Act 1886. This followed the Custody of Children Act 1839 and was an advance to it as it said women would have better chance of getting custody of children than before as the welfare of the child would be taken into account this was triggered from the case of Caroline Norton who didn't get custody of her children after the separation from her husband George Norton. This ~~was~~ they separated due to the cruelty on George's side which is the same as the custody case of 1857. Suggesting that the law hasn't made a difference from Caroline Norton's case to 1857, and the Act ~~is~~ ^{she} helped pass of Guardianship of Infants Act may be irrelevant as it was actually binding and helping married women as demonstrated in the custody case of 1857. However in 1857 women were ~~not~~ of equal status to men therefore a court case like this would have not been surprising.

However to a certain extent the legislation passed in the second half of the 19th century

((b) continued) did actually effect the lives of married women. In Rosemary Rees says that in 1874 a matrimonial cause Act denied the right of a husband to be able to lock up his wife if she refused to have sex with him. This as a result reduced wife battering and marital rape. This was demonstrated in the Jackson Case of 1891. Mr Jackson had been away in New Zealand setting up a business when he returned his wife refused to see him, so as she left Church St, with a few friends grabbed her and put her in the back of his car. Friends of Mr Jackson campaigned for her release as Mr Jackson locked her up and refused to let her go or her friends to see her. The judge ruled that this was unacceptable and she was released. This therefore went to prove what Rosemary Rees says that judges did bind by law such as the Matrimonial Cause Act 1874, as shown by the Jackson Case 1891. This also goes against what is suggested and implied by Martin Pugh and that the custody court case of a couple in 1877.

~~Rosemary~~ Rosemary Rees also suggests that the legislation did effect and beared on married women as she says they was able to

((b) continued) gain control of their personal lives, then they had done before. She mentions property, and money they brought into marriage. By this she is ~~refer~~ referring to referring to the Married Women's Property Act 1870 ~~&~~ and 1882.

The 1870 Act allowed a wife to keep up to \$200^{+ property} in earnings which was a lot of money however wasn't as significant as the Act of 1882. This allowed women to keep all money and property and allow women to stay in the Trade or business they were in before marriage. This did effect and have a bearing on married women's lives as they could now be more independent and have more financial control of their own property and money. Poffenbary has therefore disagreed that "legal inequalities had little bearings on the actual lives of married women" as said by Martin Pugh.

I think that the legislation passed in the second half of the nineteenth century did have a bearing on married women's ~~the~~ lives; ^{to a certain extent.} as demonstrated by the Divorce and matrimonial causes Act 1857.

~~The~~ This stated that a wife can claim maintenance from a husband therefore helping married women financially, can be sued or now sue their husbands, can claim their own inheritance.

((b) continued) therefore giving them more financial control and being able to assert independence, divorce goes through law courts as opposed to Parliament. This would have made it cheaper and easier for a married lady to divorce. However the act was not quite positively bearing completely on a married women's life as it says for divorce a man needs to prove adultery but for a woman to ~~prove~~ divorce needs to prove divorce but also something else such as rape or bigamy.

Therefore the ~~the~~ divorce and matrimonial causes Act ~~was~~ did have bearing on a married women's life. As Rosemary Pees also says however she does say divorce was easier but still not as easy compared to men.

Overall I think that legislation did effect positively the lives of married women. I do agree with Martin Pugh ~~and~~ that it had little bearing, although I agree that it may not have applied to working class, ~~it~~ also to judgement in custody case of 1877, this does show that it may not have helped all married women but with evidence such as the Jackson case of 1841 suggest that it did apply ~~to~~ and was bearing on married women's lives. Overall however I agree with

((b) continued) Rosemary Rees that legislation in the second half of the nineteenth century did make a difference as there was many Acts that are hard to ignore or say that it wasn't binding on married women's lives such as 1870 Matrimonial Causes Act, as used as an example by Rosemary Rees of Guardianship of Infants Act 1876. So I disagree that legislative reforms in the second half of the nineteenth century 'had little bearing on the actual lives of married women!'



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer uses the sources as the basis of its argument and is aware of the different opinions that are expressed. The candidate clearly knows the material and sometimes gets a little carried away in writing about the events. However, the answer does keep coming back to the question throughout. This answer received a strong level 3 mark for AO1 and level 3/4 for AO2.

Question 2 (b) (ii)

This was the more popular question. The most successful responses were those that were able to use contextual knowledge and link it with the sources to display how the war and its aftermath impacted on women's rights in general, not just on suffrage. This included using their knowledge about war work and changing political tactics to link in with post-war legislation and perceptions, but also being able to question how effective this actually was. Such answers often displayed a wide range of contextual knowledge in support of the argument, ranging from dilution, figures of post-war workforce reduction, specific examples of individual success after 1918 and organisations such as Marie Stopes' clinics in support of points made in Source 17 especially. However, not all candidates were aware of the specifics of the post-war legislation beyond the changes to the suffrage. A significant minority of candidates spent too much time describing war work and spheres of influence. Weaker responses tended to focus their argument on the sources, with limited specific own knowledge. It was disappointing to note that many candidates made generic points regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b.

* (b) ii.) Do you agree that WWI did little to advance women's rights?

→ TUs, demobilisation
3.5 return 4.5 working 115,000

Rights during war - munitions, shell shortage, WC jobs

Rights after war

↳ got franchise, 21 women's acts, infanticide, maintenance, SPRA, 27-77, banister -

intro - during/after class divide

WC top women
MC got places

politics

The scandal of the shell shortage for British troops and the introduction of conscription in 1916 made the Government realise that they needed to use women. David Lloyd George, a leading liberal MP, headed the new ministry of munitions, which employed 25,000 women by 1917, and women were able to move into job vacancies in urban transport, offices, and even the police force, which developed female branches to control prostitution. This is ~~talked~~ mentioned by Strachey, Kobb and Pugh in each of the sources.

However, after the war life was expected to revert back to normal, and so there are arguments on both sides about the effect of WWI on women's rights. In these arguments, it is necessary to consider the rights for different classes of women as one cannot make generalisations about a whole gender, as well as the different spheres in which rights were achieved.

Firstly, Martin Pugh supports the view that the war did little. ((b) continued) He agrees that during the war, women had an impact on society, but that afterwards, ~~their rights~~ it did not lead men generally to change their ideas. ~~as the war was regarded as temporary~~ This implies that women's rights were not changed. Nevertheless, Kobb and Strachey both disagree with this point by saying their contributions were 'acknowledged by... the vote' and by Strachey indicating a change in 'public opinion'. These two points imply that attitudes had changed and so the war had advanced women's rights because ~~some~~ war work had changed attitudes. I agree with the latter point - from working in the war women had shown that the world did not collapse when they left their spheres as angles of the home and entered the male world.

Pugh goes on to discuss the fact that war work was considered as temporary. This is a valid point - in 1918 and 1919 Trade Unions had come to an agreement with the government that the economy would return to its pre-war state and that the dilution of labour would be reduced. ~~Furthermore~~ This is furthered by the ~~fact that~~ ^{speed of} demobilisation - in 1918 3.5 million men were returning and 4.5 million women were employed. Thus, 113,000 women were dismissed within a fortnight of armistice. Strachey also agrees ~~with~~ indirectly by using the phrase 'post-war backlash' - implying that after the

war the situation deteriorated. This suggests that the war did little to further women's rights, ~~and it is~~ but it is necessary to note that this is only within the sphere of work, and mainly for working class women. However, Kobb indicates that in this

((b) continued) section women's rights did advance - as working class women became members of trade unions during the war, and so had a say as such.

The 'post-war backlash' Strachey mentions could also be taken in a social ~~sense~~ ^{sense}. Pugh claims that the war re-assessed women's role as an 'angel in the house' - after the war, this job was to breed as the youth of the day had been killed in the war. Indeed, a leading member of the Government said during the war: 'the mothers of today are the mothers of tomorrow!'

This implies that the war had a negative impact on women's rights. However, ~~Kobb~~ although Kobb concedes to this ~~point~~

'renewed emphasis on motherhood' he talks about contraception which was more widely available - in 1921 Marie Stopes set up the first birth control clinic. This implies that women could then be free to take as much pleasure as men, and so the desiring of Josephine Butler to defeat the double standards theory had come true. In this respect, a negative impact of the war had ~~actually helped to advance~~ little effect, although it

could be argued that this was a result of science rather than the war.

Although Strachey is positive about the war, she discusses the impact on women's confidence and mentality rather than their rights, which implies that the war had little impact on women's rights.

~~Thus~~ I think this view is to be taken lightly for two reasons.

Firstly, Strachey was a leading member of the NUWSS. This means that ~~it is~~ she is bound to consider the role of the NUWSS

((b) continued) important in advancing women's rights rather than the war, and also, as pacifists, the NUWSS did not approve of the war and were slow to back it. Furthermore, Robb points out an advance in women's rights in the sphere of law, and names them 'freedoms'. In 1918, as he points out, there was the Representation of the People's Act, which gave votes to women over thirty. This would not have happened without the war - the reason it was passed was to enfranchise the soldiers returning from the war battle. Also, this shows a significant advance because of the war. Although Robb shows that it was only a small proportion of women who were enfranchised, they made up 40% of the electorate, and 21 laws concerning women were passed in the next decade. For example, the Sex Disqualification Removal Act of 1919 stated that women should be employed on the same terms of men, although this was not always put into practice. Nevertheless, by 1927, 77 barristers were female, and many women entered high spheres. However, these were mostly wealthy women - for working class women this the law had little effect until the Equality of the Franchise in 1928. Upper class women did begin slowly to enter the political sphere, which allowed working class women to talk to them - this could show an advance as a result of the war.

In conclusion, I disagree with the statement. Although Strachey implies few rights were achieved, she may do this because of her involvement, and she does say public opinion changed. Although Pugh, a reputable historian contradicts

((b) continued) this view and says women's role was reassessed, I think the fact that he and Robb, another reputable historian disagree shows the numerous ways the past can be interpreted. I agree with Robb - the war gave women a chance to prove their worth, and ~~at the~~ change opinion, and as a result laws were passed which gave them rights. I think everyone, all women, got something as a result of the war, and we would not be where we are today if it had not happened.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The sources are used as the basis of an argument and this is integrated with a confident own knowledge about a range of issues that impacted on women's rights. This is a secure level 4 answer in both assessment objectives.

Paper Summary

A general summary of the areas for improvement in the approach to this paper which may prove of benefit to centres.

Part A

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

Part B

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

Grade Boundaries

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

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

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code US032413 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

