

Examiners' Report  
June 2015

GCE History 6HI02 C

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. 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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk).

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## ResultsPlus

### Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2015

Publications Code US041772

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

## Introduction

Centres and candidates are once again to be congratulated for their performance this series as examiners reported that the majority of candidates understood the essential requirements of the Unit 2 examination with the different focus of the two parts of the question. Many scripts demonstrated an impressive knowledge base in the part B question which compared favourably with previous examination series. At the highest levels of attainment, these scripts were combined with well-developed analysis.

However, it is again disappointing to note that there remains a minority of candidates who perform poorly, both in terms of their skills set and their knowledge base.

In part A, a minority of candidates continue to work through the sources, largely in sequence, paraphrasing the content and with no attempt at cross referencing. Whilst it is the case that many candidates understand the language of cross referencing, not all actually engage fully in the processes, merely asserting that the sources either agree or disagree without explaining how they have arrived at this conclusion. Such responses are unlikely to move beyond level 2, even where they clearly understand the issues being raised by the sources. There also appeared to be a number of candidates who were using their own knowledge to develop points raised in the content of the sources in this question in this exam series. There is no credit for this in part A and thus, such candidates waste time that would be better spent developing those aspects of the answer that do gain credit – cross referencing, a consideration of provenance linked to the arguments and judgements. There seemed to be certain stock responses given to particular kinds of sources which could not be justified on the basis of the information that the provenance provided. For example, in those options where letters were used, there were a significant number of candidates who assumed that such letters were private, even where it would appear much more likely that they would be in the public domain.

In part B, there appeared to be fewer candidates this series who relied completely on the material in the sources. More candidates demonstrated some range and depth of knowledge that could be applied to the part B questions. The best answers used the sources to shape the argument and raise issues which were supported and developed with the use of detailed and specific own knowledge. It continues to be the case that despite comments in many previous examiners' reports regarding the focus of AO2b, candidates continue to comment to a greater or lesser extent on provenance in their responses to part B. Such comments are frequently very generic e.g. the historian can be trusted because they have the benefit of hindsight (or they cannot be trusted because they were not an eye witness to the event). In any event, such comments, even if well developed, generally do not contribute to AO2b, which is what is being tested in part B. Some candidates spend an excessive amount of time on this and they would do well to develop their arguments in relation to the question, rather than write whole paragraphs on provenance which can earn no credit under AO2b.

Candidates should take care that they can spell technical words and significant names correctly, especially when those words and names form part of the question or the sources. Where candidates have a few minutes left at the end of the exam, they would be well advised to check their work. Fewer candidates this series used the word 'infer' incorrectly, although there did appear to be some increase in the use of 'bias' often incorrectly spelled.

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

## Question 1

### Question 1 (a)

This question worked well and the sources presented few difficulties for candidates, although there were some phrases that were not fully understood and some misreading of aspects of the sources or their provenance e.g. seeing junior officers and commanders as the same thing and believing that Raglan wrote his own obituary. This set of sources offered candidates many opportunities for cross referencing. Despite this, there remain some candidates who do not cross reference and who treated the sources sequentially, paraphrasing their content.

There are a significant number of candidates who were aware of the need to cross reference, and were able to show, for example in an introduction or conclusion, or in transition from one section to the other, that they understood how sources differed or agreed, yet essentially were still following a simple structure from Source 1 through to Source 3, without direct supporting evidence and development.

Whilst some impressive level 4 responses were seen, there seemed to be fewer candidates in this series who engaged in fully developed judgements in their responses which would enable them to access high level 4.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in 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) In sources 1 and 2, they both agree with the view that the commanders during the Crimean war were incompetent. Source 3 disagrees with this view, however the arguments from the first two sources outweigh this.

Sources 1 and 2 do agree with the view that the commanding officers were incompetent in the Crimean war. Source 1 states "senior commanders had no training" meaning the and similarly, source 2 states "senior commanders lack experience". Both of these sources show that the ~~commanding officers~~ senior commanders were incompetent due to having a lack of military knowledge.

The attribution of source 1 come from "a superb professional officer", meaning that he knew what he was doing and could therefore identify poor incompetence. Source 2 comes from 'The Times' newspaper, meaning that it is useful as 'The Times' would not write so critically of commanders if it were not glaringly true.

Sources 1 and 2 also agree with the view that the officers were incompetent, as source 1 says "our commanders were totally ignorant" and source 2 says "have little sympathy for the distresses of the private soldier". This agrees with the view as both of these sources are saying that the ~~officers~~ commanders were incompetent in not only helping their soldiers, but also in terms of military tactics, meaning they did

((a) continued) not listen to help or advice. The attribution of source 1 supports this as the author was an officer during the Crimean war, and would therefore experienced this incompetence and disregard. <sup>1<sup>st</sup></sup> hand, source 2 comes from 'the times', who were very supportive of the war, and would therefore only agree with this view if they ~~are~~ know it to be true.

Sources 3 and 1 disagree with the view given, as source 3 says "He and his ~~commanders~~ commanders were ready at all times" ~~meaning~~ and source 1 says "a few brilliant exceptions". This shows that the view is not totally agreed upon, as there were some competent officers. However the attribution for both of these sources agrees with the view, as source 1 was published in 1903, meaning that hindsight can make people seem better at what they did due to the outcome, and source 3 was written after the death of a commander, which therefore meant positive things must be said about the deceased.

Overall, sources 1 and 2 agree with the view that the <sup>commanders</sup> ~~sources~~ in the Crimean war were incompetent, due to their lack of training and inability to be flexible with tactics and their officers.



**ResultsPlus**  
**Examiner Comments**

This is a level 3 response. The answer attempts to engage in both cross referencing and some consideration of provenance. Although it does not develop these very far, it is clearly trying to link the sources and comment on the ways in which they agree and disagree.



**ResultsPlus**  
**Examiner Tip**

Although there is not much time available for this question as it only carries one-third of the marks, the answer would benefit from a slightly more substantial introduction and conclusion.

## Question 1 (b) (i)

This question was attempted by fewer candidates than question 1(b)(ii). Some very mixed responses were seen. The best answers were able to link relevant own knowledge with the material offered by the sources to reach a final judgement in relation to the question. Weaker answers often revealed very limited own knowledge and hence depended heavily on the content of the sources which was paraphrased, not always with full understanding. Such candidates often discussed issues about the course of the war, rather than considering the impact of the war on social reform. Some answers were unbalanced in their analysis, focusing almost exclusively on a discussion of how the war encouraged social reform. Many candidates discussed the contents of Source 4, but struggled to link this material directly to the focus of the question.

It was disappointing to note that yet again this year many candidates were still making generic points, some at great length, regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b. This issue has been highlighted in previous reports, but the continuing practice disadvantages candidates who spend time that would be more usefully spent on focusing on the question.

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

\*(b) Sources 5 and 6 disagree with the view that the Boer war discouraged social reform in Britain, whereas Source 4 agrees with this view, due to the British war debt.

Source 4 agrees with the view that the Boer war discouraged social reforms in Britain. Source 4 says "National debt increased to... £800 million by 1904" This shows that Britain's main focus after the Boer war was repaying debts, and not social reform. This added to the conservative government which was still in power meant that social reform was not wanted at the time by the government, as the Boer war had created large amounts of debt for Britain, meaning that the war did not encourage social reform within the government.

Sources 5 also shows agreement with the view of the discouragement of social reform within Britain, as the immediate post-war years lead to "conflicting pressures to pay off national debt and cut taxation". This shows that the Boer war encouraged monetary debates, not social reform debates within British politics. The conservative government Boer war also discouraged

Social reform, as the outcome of the war meant that the general public, and the Conservative government were more focus on military and economic reform more than on social reform.

Due to malnutrition, the idea of national efficiency and better troops.

((b) continued) Sources 5 and 6 both show social reform disagree with the view that the war discouraged social reform. Source 5 says "moves for national efficiency" and source 6 says "sweeping reforms are urgently required". This is due to the poor health of the country, which was only looked at after the war due to the condition of British troops. This not only highlighted the need for better working conditions/laws, but also the need to eradicate malnutrition in children, leading to the free school meals scheme.

Another way in which source 5 shows that the Boer war encouraged the need for social reform in Britain was the idea of national efficiency within Britain and the want to "sustain its empire". This meant that the government and public both realised that for Britain to be able to hold on to its empire and make the country better, the poorest must be looked after better, this meaning social reforms would have to take place. This shows that the Boer war did not discourage social reform, due to the imperialism and patriotism of the public.



Source 6 disagrees with the view that the Boer war discouraged the need for social reforms in Britain. Source 6 says "the failures in army recruitment and other areas" which therefore means that the Boer war highlighted

((b) continued) the problems of British society, which were then linked to the failures in the war. This stimulated ~~so~~ and encouraged social reform, as the British saw this as their country and empire being weak. This meant that social reform was not only wanted, but needed within Britain, so that their country <sup>and empire</sup> could be the most powerful.

In conclusion, the Boer war did not discourage, but encouraged social reform within Britain. This is due to the war highlighting everything wrong with the country, and these problems being linked to the social aspects of Britain, as well as the drive for better national efficiency. Although the conservative gov. did not want change, this cannot be blamed on the war, as conserving society how it was was the main policy of the gov. in power, meaning that the Boer war did not discourage social reform.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This answer does demonstrate some understanding of the issues and uses the sources to develop its arguments. However, the own knowledge that is offered to support these arguments is largely contextual rather than detailed and specific. This contextual knowledge enables the answer to access low level 3, but not go any higher. It is stronger in level 3 for AO2.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Make sure that detailed and specific own knowledge is used to support arguments in order to access the higher marks.

### Question 1 (b) (ii)

This question was more popular than question 1(b)(i).

Most candidates found Sources 8 and 9 accessible and were able to use them to create a clear debate about the issues. Some candidates struggled with Source 7 with regards to whether or not Sassoon was in support of the war strategy, and some candidates tried to place the poem into an inaccurate context, but most were aware that it was not an entirely positive source.

The most confident responses to this question displayed a very detailed use of own knowledge in support of their argument, which often showed a nuanced appreciation of changes in strategy over the course of the war and were clearly set against an accurate analysis of the three sources. In weaker responses, the range of contextual knowledge applied was often somewhat disappointing, with much discussion about the first day of the Somme and little specific knowledge that was directly relevant beyond this.

It was disappointing to note that once again this year many candidates were still making generic points, some at great length, regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b. This issue has been highlighted in previous reports, but the continuing practice disadvantages candidates who spend time that would be more usefully spent on focusing on the question.

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

\* (b) (ii) Sources 7 and 8 disagree with the Statement given in Source 9. Source 7 and Source 8 argue that the Strategy used during the First World War was not a Success as Britain had incompetent leaders, could not adapt to new warfare and lack of professionalism. However Source 9 argues that Britain's Strategy was successful as Britain won the war and Britain <sup>the</sup> role of the BEF in winning the war. So the sources mostly disagree with Source 9.

Firstly, ~~the~~ sources 7 and source 8 highlights the incompetence of the British army leadership - Source 8 suggests that the Strategy used by the British in the First World War was not effective because of the incompetent leaders <sup>as</sup> (the <sup>their</sup> approach to the war was unintelligent). This shows that the British

leaders were not fit to lead the army as they had no common sense. Source 7 suggests a similar thing when it says 'now the soldiers he smiled are most of them dead'. This shows the incompetent leadership as they saw the ordinary soldier as cannon fodder. In addition another example of leadership incompetence was when the plan for the battle of the Somme was issued to carry out 5 <sup>days</sup> of shooting at the enemy lines and on the 6th day (b) continued) attack the Germans, this was leadership ~~in~~ incompetence as it was a huge military ~~and~~ murder where 20,000 people died. Even source 9 agrees with their being incompetent leadership as it says 'the strategy, on occasion, was wasteful and incompetent'. This shows that the leaders were not fit to lead as they didn't know what they were doing, so sources 7, 8 and 9 all show leadership incompetence which shows the strategy was not successful.

Sources 7 and 8 also show that the strategy of the British army was not successful as Britain could not adapt nor handle the change of warfare. Source 7 shows this when it says 'as they stayed with Arras with rifle and Puck'. This is a sarcastic way of saying that Britain were still using old tactics and weapons. Source 8 shows this lack of adaptation when it says 'They were aware that firepower had increased

tremendously but did not apply their brain to methods of making progress against it. In addition to this the use of tanks in the third phase also shows ~~a lack of~~ <sup>that the</sup> British did not adapt as although it was helpful at first they were not fully prepared for it but Britain still used them. ~~It is~~ so sources 7 and 8 argue that because Britain failed to adapt to the new fighting style it would <sup>(b) continued</sup> have been wrong to describe their strategies as successful.

Finally, lack of professionalism is shown by sources 7 and 8 <sup>to argue</sup> ~~show~~ <sup>the</sup> statement by source 9 that the British strategy was successful. Source 7 shows a lack of professionalism as it describes the general as a 'cheery old cod' after they are talking about the ~~de~~ <sup>death</sup> toll of the soldiers, although source 7 is only a poem and is exaggerated it still highlights a lack of professionalism. Source 8 argues this some point when it ~~it~~ is talking about the generals being 'limited in their professionalism'. This is stating that the generals and the army lacked professionalism so how could their strategy be successful. In addition further evidence of the lack of professionalism of the army was the shell crisis in 1915 when Britain were ridiculously low on munitions and most of the weapons were

Quality and short studs. This only changed in ~~1916~~ 1917 which shows the lack of professionalism. However Source 9 disagrees with this as it says 'to succeed in strategy all that is required is performing well enough to beat an enemy'. Source 9 is arguing that the army did have professionalism as the ~~British~~ British defeated the Germans. Sources 7 and 8 (b) continued) oppose Source 9 <sup>about</sup> ~~view~~ its view that the British strategy was successful.

On the other hand Source 9 argues that the British strategy was successful as they won the war. Source 9 argues this when it says 'you do not have to win elegantly; you just have to win'. This argument is saying that the British strategy didn't have to be flawless it just had to be enough to win and it was. In addition to this yes the British did win the war but it was not just the British who defeated Germany, as the Allied counter-offensive was a coalition effort. So this questions British strategy as yes they did win the war but they did with help from France and America. ~~So~~ Source 9 agrees with the statement that the British ~~did~~ win the war so strategy in the war was successful as they won the war.

Finally, Source 9 argues that the work of the BEF show that the British strategy was successful. Source 9 says 'The BEF played a pivotal role in defeating the main enemy in the decisive theatre of operations'. This is saying that the BEF made British strategy successful. Further evidence (b) continued of this was in the early stages of the war like the battle of the Marne when the small but well trained BEF army held out the German advances to Paris, also the BEF helped out in the extremely successful 100 days offensive. This is the only source that carries this stance though as Source 8 disagrees with the success of the BEF as it argues 'they believed that the best way to cope with the new German way to push more and more men at it'. Source 8 here is calling the ~~the~~ British army and the BEF ineffective. So, Source 9 agrees with that the strategy was successful as the BEF was a big help.

In conclusion, Source 9 argues that the strategy used by the British was successful as the British won, and the BEF ~~was~~ helped make the strategy effective as they held the Germans back in the battle of the Marne and helped in the

100 day offensive. ~~however~~ Although, the British did win they still needed help from their allies as it was a coalition effort. However sources 8 and 7 argue that the strategy was not successful due to military incompetence like the battle of the Somme, could not adapt to new

((b) continued) style of warfare and lack of professionalism S-M shown with shell crisis in 1915. So overall sources 7 and 8 disagree that the British army ~~is~~ strategy was successful.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

The sources are used together in this answer in order to reach conclusions which are supported with specific and detailed own knowledge. This own knowledge is well integrated into the answer. The line of argument is clear throughout the response. This answer was awarded level 4 in both assessment objectives.

## Question 2

### Question 2 (a)

Generally candidates found the sources accessible and many recognised that the sources could be seen to both challenge and support the view expressed in the question. Some impressive answers were seen where the candidates wrote in some depth and commented usefully on the provenance of the sources, also noting tone and linking the extracts to the war's chronology. Such answers also generally distinguished between status and opportunities.

Some candidates treated the sources sequentially, paraphrasing their content.

There were also a significant number of candidates who were aware of the need to cross reference, and were able to show, for example in an introduction or conclusion, or in transition from one section to the other, that they understood how sources differed or agreed, yet essentially were still following a simple structure from Source 10 through to Source 12, without direct supporting evidence and development.

Many candidates did not make developed comments on the provenance of the sources.

Some candidates took the content of the sources at face value and thus, for example, did not appreciate the sarcastic tone of Source 10.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in 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) There is a varying amount of agreement and disagreement within these sources regarding whether women's status and opportunities in the workplace improved during the first world war. On the one hand, there is evidence that the Government actively wanted women to join the effort, as source 11 states that 'the Board of Trade issued a proclamation asking every woman, who was able and willing to take employment, to register at the Labour Exchange'. The fact that this 'threatened to flood the labour market with volunteers willing to take employment on any terms' is confirmed in source 10, when it states that women were 'ready and keen when the hour of need struck'. Because of the 'proclamation' mentioned in source 11, it is implied that women now had all sorts of new job opportunities, ~~echoing~~ with source 10 acknowledging that 'it is



quite impossible to keep pace with all the new roles of women, indicating that many jobs were opened to women. Furthermore, these were often traditionally masculine jobs, with source 10 including the roles of a <sup>bank clerk</sup> 'bank clerk', <sup>motor-driver</sup> 'motor-driver', 'farm-labourer', 'munition maker' and more. The fact that the employers were ready to give such important jobs to women suggests that women had quite a high status in the workplace, as they were deemed to be capable of often taxing work.

Women's status was also increased because of the gratitude, ((a) continued) with source 10 stating that 'Mr Punch is proud and delighted'. This shows that women were valued more because of their involvement.

Furthermore, there is a subtle hint in source 12 that there were greater <sup>job</sup> opportunities for women because of the war, as it mentions how women had 'left domestic service to enter the factories', showing that factory war work had progressed.

On the other hand, there is also evidence that there was little improvement in the status and opportunities of women. We can infer from source 12 that women still had an inferior status to men, as the 'factory work' would not be possible after the war.

This implies that the involvement of women was only seen as a temporary measure, and they weren't truly appreciated as otherwise these jobs would still be available to them after the war. Source 12 as a newspaper is a good reflection of popular opinion, as it would need to appeal to its readers, so its belittling view of female workers is an indication that public attitudes hadn't really changed. For example the reference to a woman's role at home as 'the pots and pans' sounds dismissive and patronising, demonstrating that women's status as workers hadn't

really been elevated, as many still thought their true place was in the home.

There is further indication that women were still far from having equal status to male workers, as in source 11 Margaret Bondfield felt the need to ask 'that men and women should receive equal pay for equal work', showing that it didn't just happen

((a) continued) automatically. Source 10 too suggests that public opinion wasn't entirely accepting of female workers, as 'even in the present' they may have been 'a little given to tease Englishwomen.' As a magazine with a large male readership, source 10 probably reflects the male opinion of the time.

Overall, it appears that sources 10 and 11 mainly support this statement, whilst source 12 is strongly against it. In conclusion, I can infer that the opportunities for women had notably increased during the war, which is shown in the earlier two sources from 1916 and 1915 marvelling at the new positions for women. However, their status did not improve so much, as source 12, which is from 1918 so is reflecting on the near-end of the war rather than women's initial involvement, indicates that women were nowhere near on a par with men in terms of status in the workplace, despite their role in the war effort.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

There is sustained cross referencing throughout this answer which is developed in relation to the focus of the question. The candidate shows an awareness that opportunities and status are not the same thing in the conclusion. This answer was awarded level 4.

## Question 2 (b) (i)

This question was attempted by about half of the candidates, most of whom found the sources accessible and many of whom were able to use the sources to both support and challenge the view in the question.

There was generally a good understanding of how responses to the legislation were determined by social class. The best answers were able to link the sources with sound own knowledge to arrive at clearly argued conclusions. Weaker answers tended to either rely heavily on the sources and paraphrase their content or treat the sources and own knowledge separately so that there was very little integration between them or to engage in description of a wide range of 19th century legislation without linking this to the precise focus of the question.

It was disappointing to note that once again this year many candidates were still making generic points, some at great length, regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b. This issue has been highlighted in previous reports, but the continuing practice disadvantages candidates who spend time that would be more usefully spent on focusing on the question.

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

\* (b) <sup>with the new mat</sup>  
Sources 14 and 15 show a strong disagree ~~that~~ <sup>the</sup> Married Women's Property Acts of 1870 and 1882 did little effect for the advancement of women's rights - calling them 'a great victory' and even 'an important milestone'. In contrast with this - Source 13 agrees with the view the Acts were simply "symbolical" as opposed to influential.

Source 14 was released in 1882, in coincidence with the second Married Women's Property Act by the Married Women's Property Committee - the date of the report suggests a period of hysteria - the passing of two <sup>Acts</sup> ~~acts~~ in 12 years signified a great achievement and explains their emotive, strong language "bloodless and beneficial revolution" implying huge change for women could be felt. This perfectly correlates with Source 15's

comment regarding its "deep psychological effect" - women had received "a sense of achievement and a confidence that they could fight and win". Although Source 15 came from a history book (Changing Role of Women 1815-1914, suggesting huge in-depth knowledge), it reflects greatly on the confidence given by women reflecting the emergence of women's rights activists groups (NUWSS and WSPU - both late 19<sup>th</sup> century/early 20<sup>th</sup> cent).

Source 15 also speaks of the Acts' presence in society, 'distribution of wealth in England (as every married woman [...])

((b) continued) "had ownership and control of her earnings, savings and inheritance". The Acts of 1870 and 1882 broadened the rights of a Married Women separate from her husband - no longer was she her property, but her own wage earner and legally recognised person (could be prosecuted by law separate from her husband). As it states "first great victory [...] over the unjust privilege given to men", the committee rightly states an advancement in Women's Rights.

Source <sup>13</sup>~~10~~, in contrast to this, strongly agrees the Acts of Married Women 18<sup>7</sup>0 and 1882 deeply limited the advancement of women's rights. Despite being better recognised by law, it hadn't changed women's social status in seeking change, "neither did it [...] affect men's attitudes to feminist claims". This can be supported by the history books (Source 15) reflection on political attitude (<sup>male</sup> dominated); "Liberal MPs <sup>supported</sup> ~~for~~ the Acts [...] believed "the demand for women's suffrage may disappear". The 'Symbolic' Acts (Source ~~10~~ 13) reflected the

political attitudes felt by politicians who feared the home owning women (as the Act only really helped upper class women - those who were wealthy) would vote Conservative. Reassuring women of their valued importance by granting wealth and Property Act was a liberal attitude of avoiding Tory power. The alternative, "feminist view in Victorian England" obviously suggests a one sided view, but can be supported by alternative objectives as shown (i.e. Political).

((b) continued)

Suggesting an "advancement in Women's Rights" suggests a broad and revolutionary change in breaking 19<sup>th</sup> Century women away from a whole range of limiting factors; i.e. their role in society ('angel in the house', domestic - 'delicate creatures') being kept separate from public and private spheres. Source 13 implies the Act has a limitation in advancing women's rights describing it as addressing 'only a narrow issue'. Source 15 supports this by talking about <sup>(liberal)</sup> MP's hoping to see the end of women's suffrage demands. By 1882, women were still unable to be franchised, limiting their advancement of rights; reflecting on Philippa Lengua's "Act importance remained <sup>more</sup> symbolic than actual".

Another huge limitation remained in the content of the Act of 1870 and 1882. Despite granting Married Women the ability to have ownership of her own earnings, savings and inheritance it was limited to females by class. Working Class women were ~~unable to~~ <sup>unlikely</sup> to own their own homes and earnings would quite frequently be a family shared wealth. Inheritance was limited to women by £200, meaning they were unable to keep any above that threshold - suggesting women were incapable of managing large amounts of money (social stereotyping).

Upper class women were unlikely to have worked, and so  
were still restricted by the confines of marriage - they still  
practically stayed their husbands property.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is an argued response which draws heavily on the sources which are quoted from somewhat excessively at times. There is some supporting own knowledge but it is not extensive. Overall, this answer is operating at level 3 in both assessment objectives.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Brief quotes often help advance an argument, but this response would have benefitted from less quoting from the sources and more use of detailed own knowledge.

## Question 2 (b) (ii)

This question was attempted by about half of the candidates, most of whom found the sources accessible. The most successful answers constructed analytical, balanced, well-integrated responses, had a good range across the period and also reached a judgement on how far such activity was 'key' in promoting later development.

Such answers clearly debated the contrasting views expressed in Sources 16 and 17 and then supported these views by referencing their own knowledge. Source 18 caused some candidates some difficulty; it was not always clearly recognised as the view of one American tourist, but often taken literally at face value. However, some candidates had an impressive knowledge of Victorian legislation and political organisation and, even more impressively, were able to mobilise this in a precise way alongside evidence from the sources and in support of a careful analysis.

Weaker candidates tended to paraphrase the sources and had rather generalised own knowledge to support their answers.

It was disappointing to note that once again this year many candidates were still making generic points, some at great length, regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b. This issue has been highlighted in previous reports, but the continuing practice disadvantages candidates who spend time that would be more usefully spent on focusing on the question.

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

\* (b) (ii) During the second half of the nineteenth century, women played an increasingly important part in public life, mainly through involvement on School Boards, as Poor Law Guardians, in party politics and as local councillors. However, it is debatable whether this involvement actually advanced their political role.

On the one hand, source 16 describes these new roles as 'important innovations for women', which is echoed in source 17, which calls them 'an experience valuable in itself.' Through these roles, women could learn important skills, which would be useful later in the suffrage campaign, showing that they were helpful in advancing their political roles. For example, through being local councillors, after 'local government' was made 'representative of all sections of society', according to source 16, women gained experience of debating and knowledge of how politics worked. This is why source 16 states that 'local government reforms created fresh opportunities for women', following the 1894 local franchise Act which allowed women, whether single or married, to serve on local governments.

Another political role for women was in party politics, with the Primrose League founded in 1883 and the Women's Liberal Association founded in 1886 in Bristol. From source 18 we can infer that many women were involved, as the 'presence of hundreds of women' is mentioned. <sup>and it was a vital role as they had an active political influence.</sup> Furthermore, women had a prestigious status as 'women officers and delegates' were 'equal in authority to men'. By working with men, women showed that they were

((b) continued) Capable of political roles, implying that they would also be capable of voting in a rational manner. Also, <sup>through</sup> a fundamental role in grassroots politics, women realised how politics worked and what the various parties would respond well to or not. When it came to trying to persuade these same parties to enfranchise women several years later, women would understand the best tactics to use. \*<sup>(after conclusion)</sup>

Women also had public roles by belonging to 'school boards'; as we are told in source 16, following the Forster's Education Act of 1870. ~~In 1870 there were 100 women on it~~ Because education was a political and topical matter, this placed women in an important ~~decisive~~ <sup>decisive</sup> position. Also, they could <sup>encourage</sup> ~~ensure~~ ~~that~~ school reforms favourable to girls were to be introduced. For example, Lydia Becker in her role on a school Board ensured that boys as well as girls were taught some domestic training, which helped to reduce the prevalence of the separate spheres philosophy.

Similarly, women often chose to be Poor Law Guardians, with Louisa Twinning opening the Workhouse Visiting Society in 1859. <sup>For 1800 there were 100 women Poor Law Guardians.</sup> Because welfare and social reforms were linked to political decisions, this made women aware of topical current issues. As a result of women's increased involvement in the public sphere, a key advantage was that <sup>many</sup> men realised that women shouldn't



simply be confined to the role as angel in the house, with source 17 calling it 'an assertion of women's rights' and source 18 mentioning that 'liberal and Conservative alike recognised and respected'. <sup>This</sup> This meant that, because of a feeling of gratitude,

(b) continued) They certainly wouldn't be willing to extend it to a national level. Moreover, because women were mainly seen in a supportive capacity, helping male candidates to be elected, showing that they were still very much inferior to men. Also, their roles often didn't centre on actual politics so much, for example organising garden parties and fundraisers. The extent of success implied by source 18 should probably be underplayed, as the author Mary Kroul, an American tourist, probably overplayed the 'equality' of women when comparing it to her own situation back in America.

Furthermore, even if many women did gain from these roles in the public sphere, they were all unpaid. This meant that they were essentially only open to middle- and upper-class women as working-class women were obliged to go out to paid work. This meant that any progress made was confined to only a small section of women.

Ultimately, these roles were only a way to placate women by giving them some political involvement and hoping that this would satisfy them. ~~What~~ Source 18 mentions that women still couldn't vote in 'the parliamentary elections', and the national Westminster vote is what would have really given women a political voice. <sup>The fact that</sup> This type of work was predominant in the nineteenth century, yet no women were enfranchised at a national level until the 1918 Representation of the People Act suggests that this involvement did little to influence the decision to enfranchise women.

((b) continued) In conclusion, therefore, I believe that it is rather over-optimistic to state that 'female emancipation' arose from this early involvement in public life, as is suggested in source 1b, as women were still taking roles safely confined to their separate sphere. However, the very fact that they were taken out of the home and given a role not just related to their own family and household was a key sign of progress, and was above all responsible for advancing women's political role because it taught them valuable skills which would be useful in the later suffrage campaign.

\* Another aspect of <sup>early</sup> political involvement which taught women invaluable skills was the campaign against the Contagious Diseases Acts of the 1860s. Josephine Butler set up the Ladies National Association in 1869, and this gave many women experience of meeting MPs, protesting and petitioning. Women had similar involvement in campaigning for the Property Acts and Matrimonial Causes Acts, and successes made them more confident and convinced them ~~that~~ that they would also be capable of campaigning for the vote in the future.

((b) continued) In conclusion, therefore, I believe that it is rather over-optimistic to state that 'female emancipation' arose from this early involvement in public life, as is suggested in source 1b, as women were still taking roles safely confined to their separate sphere. However, the very fact that they were taken out of the home and given a role not just related to their own family and household was a key sign of progress, and was above all

responsible for advancing women's political role because it taught them valuable skills which would be useful in the later suffrage campaign.

\* Another aspect of <sup>early</sup> political involvement which taught women invaluable skills was the campaign against the Contagious Diseases Acts of the 1860s. Josephine Butler set up the Ladies National Association in 1869, and this gave many women experience of meeting MPs, protesting and petitioning. Women had similar involvement in campaigning for the Property Acts and Matrimonial Causes Acts, and successes made them more confident and convinced them ~~that~~ that they would also be capable of campaigning for the vote in the future.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is a strong level 4 response in both assessment objectives. The candidate integrates quite sophisticated use of the sources with detailed own knowledge to consider a range of issues that arise from both the sources and the question.

## Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

### All Questions

- Candidates should proof read their answers at the end of the examination, and correct any instances where they have incorrectly labelled a source, used the wrong names or the wrong dates.
- Too many candidates are using certain phrases, such as 'using the sources as a set', as a substitute for actually engaging in the task that they are claiming.
- Engaging with the sources needs to go beyond accepting the content at face value and to test it for validity considering provenance in part a and by testing the opinions in part b with knowledge set in the context of the period.

### Part A

- Candidates should spend sufficient time reading the sources to ensure that they understand the nuances of the arguments presented.
- Candidates should treat the sources as a package in order to facilitate cross referencing. Weaker candidates work through sources sequentially. Such responses cannot go beyond level 2.
- Provenance should be integrated within the argument and decisions need to be made on the relative strengths and weaknesses of the sources.
- The attributes of the sources should be discussed, not described. This aids the use of provenance as part of the argument. Candidates should avoid making stereotypical comments about the provenance that could apply to any source and avoid labelling a source as both reliable and unreliable and thus negating any conclusions drawn.
- The key to a successful response is the ability to weigh the sources to reach a final judgement.
- The best responses cross reference not only the content of the sources, but also their provenance.
- This enables candidates to weigh the sources and reach supported judgements.
- There are no marks available for knowledge in part a.
- Candidates should avoid arguing from their knowledge since it cannot be credited and often impacts on the amount of time they have available to complete part b.

### Part B

- 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.
- In order to address the question effectively, candidates need to offer an analysis driven by the arguments raised in the sources.
- Sources should be used to develop lines of argument and reasoning rather than used for information to develop a descriptive answer.
- 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 and it is not rewarded in A02b. Many candidates still engage in generalised comments that a particular historian is or is not reliable at the expense of developing argument and analysis tested by specific own knowledge.

- Candidates need to ensure that they are aware of the focus of the question and the time period specified and that they maintain the focus throughout their answer, to avoid straying into irrelevant areas that cannot be rewarded.

## **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>





Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.