

# ResultsPlus

## Examiners' Report June 2010

### GCSE History 6HI02 C

**ResultsPlus**  
look forward to better exam results  
[www.resultsplus.org.uk](http://www.resultsplus.org.uk)

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](http://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 speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated History telephone line: 0844 576 0034



ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online tool that offers teachers unrivalled insight into exam performance.

You can use this valuable service to see how your students performed according to a range of criteria - at cohort, class or individual student level.

- Question-by-question exam analysis
- Skills maps linking exam performance back to areas of the specification
- Downloadable exam papers, mark schemes and examiner reports
- Comparisons to national performance

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus).

To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

June 2010

Publications Code US024081

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Edexcel Ltd 2010

## Introduction

### General comments

A significant number of candidates were able to achieve marks at Level 3 or above in all assessment objectives, offering a considered analysis of the given source evidence, focused towards the demands of the questions, allied to strong contextual understanding and with effective deployment of well-selected own knowledge. It was pleasing to see that many of the issues raised in previous sessions which had hampered candidate performance were reduced, with skills in handling evidence generally being demonstrated in relation to the specific issues raised. That said, certain common errors were apparent, in some cases, where candidates appeared to be attempting to apply source skills in a manner not appropriate to the questions. Therefore, this report attempts to set out certain areas in which future responses could be improved, whilst also illustrating different levels of response across the various questions.

### A questions

In January it was suggested that the most common reason for low performance in the part (a) question was an inability to comprehend and interpret the source material effectively, and that, more often than not, it stemmed from rushed and careless reading. Fewer examples of this issue were found this time around, although there is still a correlation between the degree to which candidates examine the content of the sources, considering the detail within in the context of both the provenance and the issues raised by the question, and the degree to which the subtleties of the sources are explored towards a successful response. Together, the sources offer a range of views, and the majority of candidates were adept at identifying and developing from these. However, the evidence provided by individual sources often has certain ambiguities which can be developed in different ways, and some otherwise sound responses fail to consider this. The following reasons seem to account for some of these limitations:

1. Some responses took sources taken at face value, or seem to ignore the information given in the source header.
2. Whilst most candidates seek to evaluate the sources, some tend towards generic or stock responses which fail to really engage consideration of provenance with the specifics of what the sources have to say. Although many candidates are able to draw upon taught approaches to provenance, nature and the like, it is those who are able to balance this with independent thought who tend to produce the strongest analysis.
3. Most candidates were able to cross-reference successfully. However, a significant minority of candidates still conduct a sequenced trawl through the sources. Such responses thus focus too heavily describing the sources and/or drawing inferences from them, resulting in a limited summative comparison.
4. Some responses still tend to deal with reliability as a separate issue, either sequentially, or as a comparison of the reliability of the three sources.

In the main, candidates seemed well prepared concerning the issue of the application of contextual understanding for question A, an issue highlighted in January. Many candidates were able to consider evidence in the light of historical context, using this to consider discrepancies between sources or towards giving weight to the evidence. However, a small minority still seem to desire to go beyond this, offering an explanation of the issues in the question in

depth, with limited reference to sources. Such responses at best became sidetracked, and in the more extreme cases failed to address the demands of the question, which is the analysis, interpretation and evaluation of evidence from the sources in order to reach a judgement.

A small minority of candidates were hampered by time management issues, in terms of devoting too long to the a) question at the expense of the subsequent question. This was often where candidates had described the content of individual sources at length.

## B questions

Candidates were, on the whole, focused on the question with many at least attempting analysis. However some responses offered relevant and in many cases well detailed factual knowledge that they did not always link to arguments in the given sources. The sources provide viewpoints on issues or stated factors that candidates can utilise, offering an analysis of these drawing on contextual knowledge. A number of candidates engaged with sources with clear conceptual understanding but failed to support their answer with sufficient contextual detail. These disappointingly relied on the sources too much, without showing their ability to balance the presentation or argument, although this was not in itself a barrier to the higher levels. On the other hand, a significant minority of responses were both well detailed and with a very secure connection between own knowledge and the sources. The best candidates synthesised sources and knowledge to develop a clear line of reasoning and to test the validity of the views provided using their knowledge. Such answers were able to reach Level 4 in both assessment objectives by offering a balanced analysis, integrating contextual knowledge with source material.

There was some overall improvement in candidates' handling of evidence within the part b) question, with greater focus towards the demands of AO2b. However, there is still a minority of candidates who attempt to address issues of the provenance and reliability of secondary evidence in answers. Whilst reasoned and focused consideration of historiographical issues can obviously play a role in the analysis and evaluation of the given views at the highest levels, this at times tended towards doing so for the sake of it. Speculative comments regarding the authorship of one source being twenty years after another, or assertions based on the title of the book it is from does little to help candidates engage with the views and interpretations. At best this means candidates are wasting time and at worst it became a substitute for valid argument and analysis. Many candidates addressed the question as they might a part a), by simply analysing the sources and commenting on the provenance. Stronger responses often clearly identified the views within the given evidence as a starting point, analysing these through interrogation and corroboration using their own knowledge, exploring the relationship between and relative strengths of the different views, offering judgement on their overall strength and validity, or aspects of these.

One further aspect in which candidates could develop their work is through considering the specific demands of particular questions and what higher level analysis would be for these. Where a question has essentially asked which is the most important factor in bringing about an outcome, the majority of responses are well able to identify these from the sources and own knowledge, offering a mainly focused response with some analysis. However, fewer candidates offer real explicit awareness and development recognising that factors are often interrelated. Similarly, many candidates reach Level 3 by broadly examining success and failure on such questions, without weighing up the relative merits in order to judge whether successes outweighed failures. The given evidence often gives consideration to these issues, either individually or as a set; whilst students are clearly free to reach alternative judgements, students giving careful consideration to these in the first place are more likely to achieve the highest levels in both

### **Question 1(a)**

Virtually all candidates could access Level 2 by highlighting the basic challenge between the sources and supporting this with cross-referencing of surface detail. Thus, the depiction of Raglan as uncaring and incompetent in Source 1 was contrasted with the positive attributes outlined in sources 2 and 3. Higher performing candidates picked up on some of the finer nuances of the sources and recognised that the challenge posed by Sources 2 and 3 was, to an extent, mitigated by their focus on personal qualities rather than professional competence. There was also evidence of careful application of provenance by many candidates. It was, for example, noted that Panmure's observations were made shortly after Raglan's death and this was used to evaluate the weight that should be applied to his rather insipid compliments. At the lower levels, comments on source attribution were rather less secure. Many dismissed The Times as biased or became bogged down in speculation about the combat experience of the two authors of Sources 1 and 2. The very best took account of differences in timing and focus to qualify the extent of any challenge posed.

The following response, though lacking clarity on occasions, is conceptually operating at Level 4 although part b is borderline level 3/4.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box  and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

- (a) Source 1 declares that Lord Raglan generally an incompetent military leader and lays the blame for soldiers deaths and people being un-supplied onto him. Sources 2 and 3 give nothing but praise towards Raglan so initially you have to say that they challenge the view in source 1 quite monumentally. Source 2 is written by an ~~other~~ officer serving in the ~~best~~ Crimean war whereas source 3 is by the Secretary of War so you have two different backgrounds and positions agreeing that Raglan was not a bad man. Source 2 says that he was "a soldier's friend" which challenges the view given in source 1 that he does not care, the ~~source~~ author of the source has made two mentions to the fact that he did not care which furthermore reinstates this fact. It is interesting to compare sources 1 and 2 as they were both written by officers which generally would mean they would have a similar view. Sources 2 & 3 agree greatly on the fact that he is a good man where source 1 condemns him with a bad name. However if you delve deeper into these sources you can see that they are not directly challenging the view that source 1 portrays. There are several

((a) continued) factors that one must consider when analysing source 2, firstly the account is from an officer who would not have felt the incompetence of Raglan so harshly, but furthermore the author states that he not only speaks from his heart but "from my long service under the glorious soldier and man" this says one of two things. The first being that he has served a long time under Raglan meaning this view would have been influenced by previous events and he may have some kind of loyalty to Raglan, source 1 directly talks about the Crimean war and not past wars. Secondly that he is older than some men suggesting he may be traditionalistic and not want to insult the ones above him. Following on from the theme of loyalty and emotions you have source 3 which was written after his address to his HQ this would suggest that the letter contains a theme of consideration towards him and this would not be the time or place to insult him. Sources 1 and 2 also talk about Raglan as a "man" and as a "soldier" but not as a leader, source 1 is criticising his leadership (or lack of it) and not his personality. So from this you can say in fact it is not criticising source 1's view.

To consider the question of how far sources 2 and 3 challenge 1 you have to consider the fact that ~~source~~ they may be bias.

((a) continued) in the way of loyalty and compassion, you also have to consider that they are talking about Roglon as a man, not as a commander so they are not challenging the view but rather providing another. So to conclude I would say that on the surface they appear to challenge the view of source one giving praise where source one condemned but if you look further they are in fact discussing different themes.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The basic challenge between the sources is highlighted and supported in the first paragraph. There then follows a lengthy examination of the provenance of the sources. Although not all the points are fully directed and developed, there is valid comment on the constraints that may have affected the opinions of the authors of sources 2 and 3. The candidate briefly alludes to the difference in focus between Source 1 (professional) and Sources 2 and 3 (personal). Finally, there is a supported conclusion in which a judgement is reached. Throughout this answer, the candidate has used the sources as a set and displayed sophisticated source-handling skills. The response would, therefore, receive a secure level 4 mark.



**Question 1 (b) (i)**

This was the slightly less popular of the options for part b. Most candidates could access the debate through the conflicting interpretations presented in the sources but, at the lower levels, only very limited contextual knowledge was deployed to exemplify and develop the issues raised in the source material. Indeed, for some the very fact that social welfare reform followed on from the Second South African War was proof enough of a direct causal link. Higher performing candidates picked up and expanded on the references to the recruitment crisis and linked this to some of the Liberal reforms after 1906, although here some drifted into lengthy accounts of military rather than social reform. Many candidates displayed an impressive range of relevant contextual knowledge about national efficiency debates and the state of the nation and could use this to develop the counter-argument presented in Source 6. The very best could present a balanced and supported analysis, in which detailed and secure own knowledge was used evaluate the representations in the sources and arrive at an overall judgement.

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

(b)(i) When looking at the effects of the Boer War you cannot deny that the social reforms were the biggest result. You have to question to what extent though it was the war that led to the realisation or that the realisation was already there.

Looking at the three sources supplied there is a strong theme of poverty and the physical health that recruits to the army were in. This strongly suggests that the welfare reforms that followed the war were directly due to the war. The committee on Physical Deterioration was set up after the war and they are quoted in source 5, it is identified that poverty was one of the main causes of bad health but also defective housing, overcrowding and insanitary conditions, source 6 agrees with the poverty view.

Despite this you have to question was it really due to this committee that they knew the working class were not fit, the middle and upper classes would have known or heard about the conditions that they were in, if this is true then it can be said such reforms as the ~~new~~ and free children's school meals were put in place as the working class now knew that the upper classes knew, this is also a time where working class people are starting to be enfranchised.

((b) continued) suggesting that the political parties would have wanted to keep them happy so that they would vote for them again.

Source 4 which is a secondary source published nearly 100 years after the end of the war has the advantage of hindsight and suggests that after the war minds would be directed elsewhere and those of the population would be thinking about issues raised in the 1890's such as pensions and subsidised housing, to divert attention away from these ideas ~~and~~ <sup>was the</sup> government's initial thought after they the war but due to the ~~revelled~~ <sup>revealed</sup> bad conditions some welfare reforms had to be made. This agrees with my earlier point that the <sup>social</sup> ~~welfare~~ reforms were only made as the public now knew the government was aware of them. You also have the idea that the issues of 1890's were avoided in this way. So you can say the war was not responsible if you view it in this light.

There is also the view that as a result of the war there was social reforms and they were a direct response to the war but for a different reason. Source 6 picks up on the fact that if the fighting force of Britain is weak then this is a threat to the empire, so the reforms may have been

((b) continued) instated for the wellbeing of the Empire which is more in the riches gain than the poor.

Looking at the wording of sources 5 and 6 when talking about the fitness of the men there is two phrases that raise attention "gradual deterioration" from 5 and "draw attention" from 6. Both of these support the claim that the government already knew poverty was an issue 'gradual' suggest it was bad before but is getting worse and to "draw attention" means the problem was already there to draw attention towards. Although this suggests it was not the war that brought about these problems it does show the war was the catalyst for change and that it showed the government this issue could no longer be ignored.

You can argue that these were changing times for all classes, as the country was becoming fully enfranchised representation of the common man was becoming greater and the government would have to tend to the needs of this common man so looking at it is this way you can agree with the question but say it was also changing times that meant issues such as the ones mentioned in the source could no longer be ignored.

To conclude I would say that I generally agree with the question that the Second Boer

((b) continued) war advanced social reforms. Shortly after the war you have things such as the boy scouts and free schools made set up to look after the future and take stress of the families. As all of the sources agree the war outlined the terrible condition that the working class were in and called for these changes. If the war wasn't the main reason for advancing social reforms it surely was the biggest catalyst for a lot of them. Despite this there is factors to ~~consider~~ consider such as changing political, social and economic times which was leading to improved representation and greater democracy throughout the country, the needs of every man had to be met not only from a moral standpoint but from a political manoeuvring standpoint. Existing issues was another strong factor which could mean that it was not only the war that advanced the country socially but then again it was war that helped divert against these problems and offer the working class other solutions as source 4 agrees. Source 5 mentions the Physical Deterioration Committee which supports source 4 as it is a place for the government to spend money. There is also the threat to the empire but this again leads back to the war.

I firmly agree with the question as

((a) continued) in the way of loyalty and compassion, you also have to consider that they are talking about Raglan as a man, not as a commander so they are not challenging the view but rather providing another. So to conclude I would say that on the surface they appear to challenge the view of source one giving praise where source one condemned but if you look further they are in fact discussing different themes.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

For part bi the response displays a clear understanding of the key issues involved in the question but lacks the contextual knowledge required to achieve a top mark. In the first paragraph the candidate leads with Source 6 and cross-references this with source 5. Close textual reading allows a sophisticated argument about the extent to which the second South African War was the catalyst for rather than initiator of social reform. This is then supported in the following paragraph by some relevant but rather vague contextual knowledge. The conclusion is focused, integrates the sources into the overall judgement and attempts balance. However, again a lack of depth to the candidate's own knowledge makes it less convincing than it might have been. The extract typifies the approach adopted by the candidate throughout the piece and, as a result, an award on the borderline of Level 3/4 was made for AO2b but this was offset by an AO1 award at the bottom end of Level 3.

### **Question 1 (b) (ii)**

Virtually all candidates recognised the basic contrast between the views in Sources 7 and 8 (for the contention) and those in Source 9 (against). For those who failed to go beyond Level 2 the main reason was a lack of detailed contextual knowledge; responses in this bracket tended to be restricted to generalisations about life in the trenches or assertions about Haig's incompetence. At the higher levels there was an appreciation of the different themes raised Sources 7 and 8, with Kelly addressing tactical advancement and Corrigan focusing on technological innovation, and this was combined with sufficient own knowledge to extend and evaluate the key issues raised. It was encouraging to see that a sizeable number of candidates were not prepared to accept without some discussion Laffin's view that senior commanders were 'inflexible', and, when assessing the extent to which warfare was revolutionised, were keen to take into consideration the problems posed by trench warfare. A few candidates, rather than looking for evidence of tactical and technological development between 1914 and 1918, instead chose to treat the Great War as a constant and compare it to the preceding conflicts in South Africa and the Crimea. This had some validity and was rewarded accordingly. However, such an approach missed the significance of the source material, which focused on progress or otherwise in the course of the Great War.

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

(b)(ii) The Great War did result in a 'Revolution in the art of warfare' as emphasised by Corigan due to advances in technology providing ~~new~~ <sup>new</sup> ways of fighting and how the war was fought. However the advances were not completely successful due to some incompetence of the leaders as stressed by Lippin. Also some of the technology used ~~it~~ was not completely successful which limited the potential of some mechanisms in the art of warfare.

New technology greatly advanced the art of war. 'Machine-guns' like the Vickers machine gun and the Lewis gun were highly effective at ~~new~~ mowing down the advancing troops due to their high rate of fire which could be up to 1000 rounds a minute. This new weapon meant that the troops could sit in the trenches and allow the enemy to come forward and then to be mown down with very few or no casualties because they could sit in the cover of block houses or trenches and kill the exposed enemy. This shows a revolution in warfare as the emphasis has been changed from one of attack to one of defence. The creation of the Royal Artillery Corps



((b) continued) due to a lack of heavy calibre guns and howitzers at the start of the war meant that the troops were supported effectively.

The artillery could use techniques like a creeping barrage to clear the way for the troops so that they could advance and hopefully meet little resistance as they advanced which would minimise casualties. This was key in a war of attrition which required tactics like the creeping barrage to minimise casualties to ensure that you had more men to send into battle in upcoming assaults.

The mass use of Tanks like at the Battle of Cambrai where 476 tanks were used in a surprise attack, was a new and effective way to gain ground because the tanks couldn't be destroyed by bullets meaning it was hard to stop them advancing. This shows development in the way war was fought as it was showing new ways of attack compared to 'mindless frontal assaults by massed infantry'.

There was also a greater reliance on reconnaissance which was carried out by the Royal Flying Corps who took part in aerial ~~for~~ photography missions to ~~attain~~ obtain information.

((b) continued) like the position of enemy artillery. This was used to great effect at the battle of Arras where photographs taken from the sky were used to pre-calibrate the gun artillery so that they were more likely to hit their target, destroy the enemy ~~artillery~~ artillery and allow the Tanks to advance without being blown up by enemy Artillery. This shows a revolution <sup>in</sup> ~~in~~ the art of war as lots of different services are being used together to achieve better results and more efficiently. As stated by Captain D. Kelly ~~However there wasn't a total~~ who tells us that the attack at Amiens and the heavy use of artillery to destroy the enemy ~~before~~ they got there meant the 'whole affair being a complete surprise' as the tactics are more efficient and is a reliable source of information as Kelly was there during the battle.

However there wasn't a total revolution in warfare. 'Duel, ~~and~~ inflexible senior officers stood firmly in the way of real change' because they ~~presented~~ presented common sense orders being given with the resources they had. For example Haig used for an artillery bombardment at the start of the Somme offensive. There were 1.5 million shells fired but 1 million of these were fragmentation.

**ResultsPlus**

## Examiner Comments

This excerpt from a script presents the case in support of the view in the contention. Although the candidate has outlined the debate from the sources in the introduction, the source material is then sidelined in favour of a detailed exposition using own knowledge. The range of material used is impressive but opportunities to integrate this detailed understanding of the topic with the source material have, for the most part, been ignored. As it stands, this response would, unsurprisingly, receive a low mark for AO2b yet this would not be fully compensated by a high award in AO1. For Level 3 in AO1, responses should begin to link contextual knowledge with points drawn from the sources. To avoid falling into this trap, this candidate could, instead of using quotations from the sources as an afterthought at the end of paragraphs, have started each fresh argument with evidence from the sources, thus underlining the fact that it is the representation in the source material that is being evaluated through the deployment of contextual knowledge.

**ResultsPlus**

## Examiner Tip

Ensure you read the attributions carefully. All the information included in the attribution is there to help you weigh up the evidence contained in the source.

## Question 2

This was the slightly less popular of the options for part b. Nearly all candidates could utilise the sources as a starting point for the arguments for and against the contention in the question. For those operating at the lower levels contextual knowledge was limited and although there was a general appreciation of the dominant 'separate spheres' ideology this was not directed specifically on the world of work. It was also noticeable that a number of candidates exemplified their responses with material that went well beyond the scope of the question, with an exploration of women's contribution to the wartime economy being a common feature. Higher performing candidates not only recognised the conflicting viewpoints presented in Source 14 (against) and Source 15 (for) but also appreciated the subtleties contained in Delves' stance in Source 13. This evidence was then used as a platform to deploy some detailed and focused own knowledge, with an awareness shown that experience might vary according to class, occupation or location.

Ross Davies supports this view in "Women and Work" where he recognises some equality over pay in the cotton industry. This suggests that although some unions remained 'hostile', some Trade Unions and industries were making advances in equality for men and women. He also suggests some towards the end of the century showed "great willingness" to admit women to their membership. This contrasts with the other two sources as none of this willingness was shown elsewhere. However, as a book published later than the movement, it is expected the content should be revised and neutral, which adds some credibility to this source. The 1880s examples of Dock, Wharf, Rivers and General Labourers Union also prove to back up Ross Davies statement that some equality was being gained.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This excerpt is operating at high Level 3 for both assessment objectives. The conflict between Sources 14 and 15 is explored in detail and used as a platform to examine some of the key issues relating the question. There is an appreciation of that the attitude of trade unions to female workers was not uniform across the occupations and there is some specific exemplification drawn from one case-study. However, although there is some relevant observation on the wider context of 'separate spheres', contextual knowledge would require greater range and depth to reach Level 4. Similarly, although there is some judicious selection from Sources 14 and 15 to establish some of the key issues, opportunities to integrate Source 13 are missed and the reasoning from the evidence of the sources is restricted by a lack of specificity in contextual knowledge. Nonetheless, this is a response that displays a clear understanding of some of the main issues involved in the debate and a sound, if generalised, grasp of the topic. It received good Level 3 marks for both assessment objectives

### **Question 2(a)**

There were some very good responses to this question with an encouraging number of candidates able to, at least partially, evaluate the extent of the challenge posed by identifying areas of reconciliation between the sources. Thus, a sizeable number noted that both Sources 11 and 12 made reference to Mrs. Pankhurst's autocratic nature, with those performing at higher levels appreciating that for *The Times* this was evidence of her selfless commitment to the cause whereas Billington-Greig viewed it as little more than self-aggrandisement. Similarly, many noted that both Sources 10 and 11 referred to the 'emotion' that was at the heart of Mrs. Pankhurst's approach and appreciated that, in contrast to the positive reading in Source 10, Billington-Greig in Source 12 regarded this as an exploitative tool. Most candidates made some attempt to evaluate the significance of the source attributions and this frequently went beyond simple claims of bias. The very best directed any examination of provenance towards the strength of the evidence contained in the sources - for example Brailsford's personal and ideological connection with the women's movement was used to evaluate the worth that should be attached to his positive assessment of Mrs. Pankhurst.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box  and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

(a) How far does evidence change opinion of Mrs Pankhurst given in source 12.

Teresa Billington-Greig in source 12 would argue that the autocratic role of Mrs Pankhurst in the WSPU was "without mercy." This view is challenged directly by Brailsford, who in source 10 claims that far from "enslaving" her suffragettes as Billington-Greig would claim, she worked to achieve a "better world" for them all. This thought is mirrored by source 11 which labels Mrs Pankhurst a "martyr", far from the ruthless dictator painted in source 12. Brailsford does however recognise the "torrential emotions" of Mrs Pankhurst in source 10, an <sup>asset</sup> ~~observation~~ which Billington-Greig in source 11 would argue Mrs Pankhurst used to further her own cause. The opinion expressed in source 11, that Mrs Pankhurst was an "unselfish woman" is mirrored in source 10 where Brailsford claims that she was an "advocate" for others. This view is directly contradicted by Billington-Greig.

((a) continued) in source 11 labels her as "without mercy" and "ruthless." This would indicate that ~~she~~ in Billington-Craig eyes, Mrs Pankhurst far from working for others, ~~worked~~ used men to achieve her ends.

In source 12 Billington-Craig labels Mrs Pankhurst "a force", an image which is mirrored in both source 10 and source 11. Brailsford speaks of Pankhurst's "strength" whilst the Times labels her "autocratic". All three sources appear to share the opinion that Mrs. Pankhurst, whatever her nature, was an impassioned and strong woman.

Having <sup>studied</sup> ~~studied~~ the sources, I would argue that sources 10 and 11 go a great way to challenge the view of Mrs Pankhurst given by Billington-Craig in source 12. As the husband of a devoted suffragette Brailsford had cause to speak highly of Mrs Pankhurst, likely mirroring his wife's views, his allegiance would be to the suffragette movement ~~rather than~~ ~~rather~~ ~~rather~~ However the weight of his evidence is stronger than that of Billington-Craig who, at odds with the autocracy of the WSPU split to form the Womens Freedom League in 1907. Billington-Craig personal feud with



((a) continued) Mrs Pankhurst means that the weight of her evidence is less compelling than that of Bradford in source 10. In addition to this the obituary of Pankhurst by the Times in source 11 seems well-balanced, noting both her "grivous mistakes" and "large heart" yet it would indicate that Mrs Pankhurst was "ready to face" any superiority felt by her suffragettes, a stark contrast to the image of a "ruthless" woman who exploited her own self and others to achieve her goals. I would therefore argue that sources 10 and 11 go a great way to challenging the impressions of Pankhurst given by Billington-Lewis in source 12.



## ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

For part a, this response was awarded a secure Level 4 mark. The first two paragraphs contain detailed and supported cross-referencing in which similarities as well as differences between the sources are highlighted. The remainder of the response attempts to weigh up the evidence contained in the sources by exploring the source attributions. Although this might have been more effective had it been integrated with the section on cross-referencing and, hence, directly applied to specific evidence, it does nonetheless go well beyond generalised assertions about bias or reliability and is focused on the task.

### **Question 2(b)**

The more popular of the two b options was bii. This was a question in which many candidates displayed an impressive command of the subject matter. Higher performing responses recognised that the key word in the question was ‘formidable’ and, as such, appreciated that Perkin (Source 17) was challenging Pugh (Source 18) by noting the halting nature of progress in this period. There was also an awareness shown by many that the view espoused by Robins (Source 16) may well have been driven by her political agenda. Some contextual knowledge based around the ‘angel in the house’ philosophy was shown by most candidates with those performing at higher levels able to use a detailed understanding of the topic to expand on the themes raised in the sources and seize on some of the legislative reforms adumbrated in Source 18 to argue both for and against the contention. The very best offered a balanced analysis in which the source material and contextual knowledge was used in combination to arrive at a considered and focused judgement.

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

(b) BII do you agree with the view that by 1914 the changes to the laws governing married women life represented a "formidable record of improvement"?

It can be argued that in the years leading to 1914 there were distinct improvements in the laws pertaining to marriage, some aiding male spouses and others female.

Elizabeth Robins in Source 16 however, would contradict this statement. As an active member of the WSPU Robins was ~~B~~ writing on a highly charged political line. By declaring that a woman has no "legal right to a voice" she implies heavily the connection between ~~giving~~ <sup>and receiving the vote</sup> equality through legal means, a thought agreed with by Perkin in source 17 which argues that to ~~solve~~ <sup>solve</sup> inequality in marriage men and women must be placed on an equal footing legally. Robins in source 16 is writing to a suffrage sympathetic crowd as the readers of Votes for Women would be likely to agree with her sentiments. Her arguments would disregard the legislation presented by Pugh in source 18 arguing that marital inequality was still present

((b) continued) and therefore there was no tangible improvement by 1914 to the laws governing marriage.

→ Joan Perkin in source 17 would argue that whilst women were no longer "slaves" to ~~their~~ their husbands there was still a great deal of social expectations of marriage, especially when it came to women. She speaks of the "natural order" which politicians would not want to upset by giving women an equal standing in marriage. Indeed the Jackson marriage case of 1891 gives weight to this argument. Despite proving long-term desertion and being granted a divorce under the 1857 divorce act Mrs Jackson still faced social isolation for daring to divorce her husband. This case highlights the sexual double-standards in place until the Matrimonial Causes Act of 1923 ~~is~~ under which women could achieve divorce on the same grounds as men. Whilst Pugh may name the "catalogue of advances for married women" a "formidable ... improvement" Perkin <sup>recognises</sup> ~~assess~~ that the husband was both socially and "legally dominant", an injustice raised by Robins in source 16 when

((b) continued) she speaks of women having no legal voice to their own children. The statement made by Pugh in source 18, that married women did achieve much reform which ~~prove~~ proved a ~~formid~~ "formidable record of improvement" is backed by several law reforms. However, as Perkin in source 17, argued men were legally dominant, this is highlighted by Pugh in ~~the~~ source 18 when he references the ~~the~~ Divorce Law of 1857. Whilst this may have challenged the ~~existing~~ difficulty of obtaining divorce before his time the law merely highlighted the legal differences between men and women spoken of in both source 16 and 17. Whilst the act gave men who accused their wives of adultery grounds for divorce women had to prove long term desertion, bigamy, sodomy or bestiality to gain a divorce, thus proving the existence of double standards within marriage. Pugh's evidence however does show some improvement for women within marriage. The Married Women's Property Acts of 1870, which entitled women to keep assets left to them in wills and in 1882 which entitled women to keep money earned before

\* also the Matrimonial Causes Act of 1857 made it illegal for a husband to ~~lose~~ <sup>lose</sup> up his wife for refusing sex.

((b) continued) or ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> marriage did mean that <sup>Thus addressing the sexual control of a man to his wife's body</sup> women who had feared filing for divorce ~~or~~ could support themselves if deserted or divorced from their husbands. Indeed whilst Pugh would argue that ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> legal reforms pertaining to children were a long way to improving marital life equal custody was not granted until the mid ~~18~~ 1920's, giving weight to Robins' argument that women had no legal right to their children in 1909, or, at the outbreak of war in August 1914.

Having ~~the~~ studied the sources I would argue that the weight of Pugh's argument in source 18 shows the clear improvement in marital laws up to 1914. As a historian that can use hindsight the weight of his opinions is more valuable than the evidence given by Robins in source 16. Despite writing at ~~the~~ the time, as a politically motivated writer, the severe bias of Robins could affect her ability to weigh up the legal achievements up to 1914. However, whilst I recognise the advances made in marital law

((b) continued) I would argue that such inequality remained in marriage, ~~right~~ even up until 1994 marital rape was legal, that whatever improvements were made ~~in~~ to marital law by 1914 it cannot be labelled a "formidable record of improvement." The sheer nature of ~~marriage~~ marriage, recognised as a "union of two consenting adults" by the Age of Marriage Act in 1929, ~~which~~ (which raised the age of marriage ~~from~~ from 12 to 16) means that whilst inequality between the spouses exists any improvement cannot be "formidable." I would argue that only when husbands and ~~wives~~ wives were placed "on an equal footing" ~~called~~ by law, could improvements to marital life be formidable. This was not achieved before the outbreak of the First World War and so I disagree with the statement, arguing that there was ~~no~~ no "formidable record of improvement" by 1914 despite the undeniable record of lesser achievements in this period.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

For part bii, this script exemplifies many of the characteristics of a Level 4 response. In the opening paragraphs the debate is outlined through a detailed examination of the source material and this is then developed by some accurate and focused contextual knowledge. The sources (first Perkin and then Pugh) are used as a starting point for the analysis and, consequently, there is a clear recognition that it is the validity of contrasting interpretations of the past that needs to be tested. By adopting this approach, the candidate ensures that their detailed contextual knowledge will be rewarded at both AO1 and AO2b. The conclusion (another key requirement of a top performing script) is developed and uses the source material and own knowledge in combination to evaluate the extent to which progress in this period can be considered 'formidable'. This is by no means a perfect answer but it is conceptually very sound, addressing all the key skills involved in a part b question, and, hence, was fully deserving of the secure Level 4 award it received for both assessment objectives.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Tip

For part b questions use the sources in the introduction to give an overview of the debate, and remember to refer to them again to support your judgement in the conclusion.

## Grade Boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	46	41	36	31	26
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40





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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code US024081 June 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit  
[www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750  
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH

Ofqual  




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

