

Examiners' Report

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE
in History (6HI02) Paper C

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by 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 or 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.

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

Summer 2016

Publications Code 43886

All the material in this publication is
copyright © Pearson Education Ltd 2016

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>

6HI02 C

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. In an examination in which the majority of candidates were re-taking the examination paper, there were many impressive answers to be seen and relatively fewer weaker answers than has been the norm in the past.

In part A, the majority of candidates did attempt to cross reference the sources in their answer, although this was developed with varying degrees of success and for some this amounted to merely asserting that the sources either agree or disagree without explaining how they have arrived at this conclusion. Answers of this type are unlikely to have moved beyond level

2. There were a number of candidates who did not consider the provenance of the sources and this meant that they could not advance very far in the mark scheme. There were also proportionately more candidates than in the past who spent considerable amounts of time elucidating their answer with own knowledge - this cannot be credited in this question. Indeed those candidates would have gained more credit if they had focused on cross referencing, a consideration of provenance linked to the arguments and judgements. There were certain stock phrases that were used by some candidates e.g. taken as a set; this is only appropriate if that is what the candidate is doing. In too many cases, the phrase was not accompanied by the action.

In part B, there were a number of candidates who relied primarily on the material in the sources. There were also a number of candidates who 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 previous examiners' reports for all recent exam series regarding the focus of AO2b, candidates continue to comment to a greater or lesser extent on provenance in their responses to part B in this exam series. 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.

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

Q1a

Most candidates were able to use the sources to good effect and there were no significant issues arising with their use. There were many impressive answers on display with candidates who demonstrated an ability to engage in developed cross referencing and engage with the attribution to reach reasoned arguments about the weight that the sources could bear. It was deemed noteworthy that across the full range of answers, many candidates engaged with both parts of the quote and thus considered 'unnecessary' as well as 'hardships'. A number of candidates did not make full use of Source 1, tending to see it as only offering the counter argument, whereas there were criticisms regarding the shortcomings of army leadership that could be inferred from it. There were a minority of candidates who used extensive amounts of own knowledge to write a general essay. Such material could not be credited as it does not meet the requirements of the question.

Example script

Whilst there is some repetition in this response, it is clear that there is also a range of developed cross referencing, some consideration of provenance and some judgements reached. Therefore this answer does reach the benchmark for level 4 work.

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) The soldiers during the Crimean war suffered various hardships. Source 1 states that soldiers were not subjected to unnecessary hardship which is supported by all 3 sources to a small extent. Source~~

The soldiers during the Crimean war suffered various hardship. To a small extent all 3 sources agree that the soldiers were subjected to unnecessary hardships. Yet, source 1 disagree with sources 2 and 3 to a large extent as it claims the army leadership did everything in their power to relieve their hardships so it was not unnecessary. Meanwhile sources 2 and 3 disagree by claiming the hardships were entirely unnecessary. Ultimately, the challenge can be seen to be weakened by one bias of the source is author.

On the one hand all sources agree to a small extent that the soldiers were subjected to unnecessary hardships

4



P 4 3 8 8 6 A 0 4 2 0

((a) continued) during the Crimean War. Source 1 states, "there are many calls upon the men, especially when... the roads are so bad that wheeled carriages cannot be used" this suggests that the soldiers did experience unnecessary hardship as the army leadership had not prepared in case of bad weather. This is supported by source 2 which states, "we had to march to Inkerman without as much as a bit of bread" - this implies the ~~soldiers~~ ^{soldiers} were subjected to unnecessary hardship as ~~they were not~~ ^{their health} was not properly cared for by the leadership and they were worked too hard. Arguably, this source holds weight as he is recalling his own experiences. Yet, this could just be on the surface and in fact lack weight as he is recalling the past 5 months and may merely be complaining due to a loss of morale and being wear weary. Both of these sources are supported by source 3 which states, "had their sufferings aggravated by deficiencies of clothing, of medical supplies" this implies the Crimean soldiers were subjected to unnecessary hardships due to weakness in the army leadership as they did not prepare



P 4 3 8 8 6 A 0 5 2 0

5
Turn over ▶

((a) continued) for winter in the Crimea sooner to spare the soldiers. Yet, ~~the~~ source perhaps lacks weight as it was by the Earl of Derby who was the leader of the opposition speaking to the House of Commons. Thus he would perhaps exaggerate the negatives of the war to gain support and have the war ended. Thus it can be said that all 3 sources agree to a small extent that ~~the~~ soldiers during the Crimean war were subjected to unnecessary hardships.

On the other hand source 1 disagrees to a large extent ~~as~~ ^{with} 2 and 3 as it claims the leadership did everything it could to ~~minimise~~ ^{so any left were necessary} the hardships, while sources 2 and 3 entirely disagree and claim the hardships were unnecessary. Source 1 states, "My whole time and all my thoughts are occupied in attempting to provide for the needs of my majesty's troops" this implies the leadership did everything it could to minimise hardships so any remaining were entirely necessary. However, ~~the~~ source lacks



(a) continued) weight as it was written by Commander-in-Chief Lord Raglan after an enquiry was made into the treatment of the troops by Queen Victoria. Thus, he is more likely to exaggerate the positives to avoid criticism and blame and he would definitely not want to upset the Queen. Yet, source 2 disagrees entirely and claims, "we never got more than 4 or 5 hours sleep" this suggests the troops were subjected to unnecessary hardship as they were overworked. This is supported by source 3 which states, "their sufferings aggravated by ... overwork, and by exhaustion". This suggests that the troops experienced unnecessary hardships as they were overworked and not allowed to rest in order to care for their wellbeing. Therefore a challenge to a large extent can be found between source 1 and sources 2 and 3 over whether the soldiers were subjected to unnecessary hardship.

Although on the surface the challenge appears to be to a large extent, this is perhaps weakened by the author of



P 4 3 8 8 6 A 0 7 2 0

7
Turn over ▶

((a) continued) source 1. This is because it was written by Lord Raglan in response to an enquiry into his leadership. Therefore he is likely to exaggerate the positives and hide the unnecessary suffering of the troops to avoid blame and heavy punishment from the Queen.

To conclude, all the sources can be seen to agree to a small extent that the soldiers did experience unnecessary hardships. Yet, source 1 disagrees to a large extent with sources 2 and 3 as it claims the leadership minimised any unnecessary suffering. However, this challenge is weakened by the bias of the author of source 1, wishing to avoid blame and punishment.



Q1bi

Both questions tended to attract similar numbers of candidates. The sources were generally well understood by candidates. Weaker candidates tended to rely heavily on the sources for information and generally did not engage with the specific focus of the question which required them to consider whether support for the war *remained* strong through the entire period, but rather just considered a narrow time frame for their answer. Stronger responses offered an argument based on the sources and supported by relevant own knowledge that showed an understanding of the chronology and the phases of the Boer War to analyse the varying levels of public support throughout the period. Despite the fact that the issue of addressing AO2b has been referred to in numerous Principal Examiners' reports, there remain a number of candidates who discuss, sometimes at great length, the provenance of the secondary sources. There is no credit to be gained for this under AO2b.

Example script

This response is heavily dependent on the sources for its material, but it does argue validly from them and supports that argument with a limited range of own knowledge. For this reason, the answer is worthy of level 3 in both assessment objectives. The response appears to have run out of time as there is no clear conclusion to the essay.

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

* (b) ~~Source 4~~ Source 4 appears to completely agree with the view that popular support for the Boer War was present between 1899-1902; however sources 5 and 6 only partly agree with the view given in source 4 and both offer an insight to opposition throughout the time period.

Source 4 illustrates popular support for the Boer war by illustrating how the relief of Kimberley, Ladysmith and Mafeking produced "scenes of jubilation never seen before seen of the streets of Britain." It continues to support this viewpoint and the source states that "In the summer of 1900, Britain basked in the glory of its... overwhelming victory over the 'bloody Boers'". This statement shows how there was significant support a continued and significant support for the war when British forces captured key Boer towns including Johannesburg and Pretoria. Furthermore source 4 also highlights how support for the



P 4 3 8 8 6 A 0 9 2 0

9
Turn over ▶

((b) continued) war allened the Conservative and Unionist government to cash in on the enthusiasm and support for the war by staging the "Khaki Election" which awarded the Conservatives with a landslide victory - therefore indicating that support was very popular and far outnumbered opposition from any liberals. However Source 4 only talks about high support during the 1900's when British victories in the war. The source fails to mention opposition in throughout 1899 when Ladysmith, Mafeking and Kimberley were sieged or when the disaster of Spain happened in January caused uproar that nearly cost the government. Moreover it also neglects to talk about the huge opposition after 1907 when the conditions of concentration camps were revealed by Emily Hobhouse and Millicent Fawcett whilst Campbell-Bannerman condoned the government for "methods of Barbarism".



((b) continued) Sources 5 and 6 partly agree with the view that there was popular support for the Boer War. Nevertheless both sources, again, concentrate solely on the 1900's when the sieges on Mafeking, Ladysmith and Kimberley were relieved and met with "spontaneous rejoicing" (source 6) and "unprecedented increasing jingoism at musical halls". However source 5 describes how the "outburst of patriotic enthusiasm" was "of the brief few days" and therefore illustrates how morale and support was relatively low before the small British victories. Furthermore it also source 5 also demonstrates how even at the height of all that support there was still opposition to the war as he describes how "such praise as ourselves as a nation, such satisfaction and boastfulness are painful to me". Many people believed the Boer War to be morally wrong with Britain forcing their imperialistic power on the Boers for prestige and profits. Many Irish people sympathised



P 4 3 8 8 6 A 0 1 1 2 0

((b) continued) with the Boer and their feelings of British oppression and as such there was still great opposition to the Boer war throughout 1899-1902. Source 6 concentrates on discrediting the support for the war during the 1900 election by claiming they "reflected liberal disorganisation, long-term trends in working-class voting behaviour - they offer no evidence to support a general working class vote in support of the war." The source also talks about how "jingoistic voting" etc. "seems to have been organised by representatives of the middle classes". This offers an insight into lack of support for the war with working classes, who believed it to be a capitalist war waged for gold and the profits of mine owners and politicians such as Cecil Rhodes. This opposition in this area was largely reflected by the Manchester Guardian, which



Q1bii

Both questions tended to attract similar numbers of candidates. Whilst there were impressively well-structured answers that addressed the question and were able to use a wide range of contextual knowledge in this centenary year to support their arguments, there were also a number of disappointing responses. In such answers, candidates often relied very heavily on the content of the sources. Other weaker responses frequently failed to engage with the actual focus of the question and described aspects of war that had little direct relevance for this question. Despite the fact that the issue of addressing AO2b has been referred to in numerous Principal Examiners' reports, there remain a number of candidates who discuss, sometimes at great length, the provenance of the secondary sources. There is no credit to be gained for this under AO2b.

Example script

This is a mixed response with both strengths and weaknesses. There is a clear line of argument and analysis that does engage with the question focus and has some relevant supporting own knowledge.

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

*^{Significance of the}(b) Indeed, the ~~the~~ contribution to the Somme's contribution to the German's defeat is hotly contested. Source 7 claims that although it did have a significant impact on Germany, the human losses were not worth the small gains. This is supported by Source 8 which also conveys that the large losses on merely the first day of battle with the Somme were not worth the small gains. Yet, source 9 implies that not only did the Somme have a negative impact on Germany, but also shows how the British tactics began to improve. Indeed it appears from the sources that the Somme did contribute significantly to Germany's defeat.

Arguably, the ~~Somme~~ Somme didn't contribute significantly to the defeat of Germany due to the large losses and the small gains. Source 7 states, "obviously, there had been no significant breakthrough" which implies the large death toll on just the first day was not worth it as no significant aim was achieved.



P 4 3 8 8 6 A 0 9 2 0

9
Turn over ▶

((b) continued) This is supported by source ~~2~~ which states, "90,000 killed, 57,000 casualties - the greatest loss in a single day ever suffered by a British Army." This implies that this a high death toll was not worth "no significant breakthrough" and instead served to weaken the British Army, thus lessening the significance of its contribution to the defeat of the German Army. I can support this with my own knowledge & as I know that overall the Battle of the Somme helped Britain gain several miles. However, this was ~~over~~ over a period of 5 months ~~over~~ where thousands of soldiers were slaughtered. For example just on the first day there were 60,000 casualties with 19,240 of them killed. This significantly weakened the British army, especially by the end of the battle when 600,000 lives were lost. Therefore this implies that the Somme did not contribute significantly to the defeat of Germany due to the fact the death toll on the first day and overall was arguably not worth several miles of land.



((b) continued) ~~H~~

However, it can be argued that tactics improved as a result of the Somme thus implying it did contribute significantly to the defeat of Germany. Source 8 states, "the barrage did not obliterate the Germans" this implies at this stage of the ~~the~~ British tactics were ineffective and lessons were learnt from this battle so they could improve. This is supported by source 9 which states, "we have proved our ability to force the enemy out of strong defensive positions" this also suggests the British tactics improved throughout this battle and they learnt from the lessons of the Battle of the Somme. Thus suggesting the Somme did contribute significantly to the defeat of Germany as it allowed the British to learn ^{how to improve their} techniques in order to win the war. I can support this with my own knowledge as I know that ~~at~~ the British bombarded the Germans for 5 days before beginning to fight. This was not used again at the ^{3rd} Battle of Ypres arguably because they had learnt



P 4 3 8 8 6 A 0 1 1 2 0

((b) continued) bombardment not only failed to destroy Germany's defences, but also warned the enemy of an attack. Source 8 also comments about the failure of a "barrage" this creeping barrage was perhaps seen to be a failure in this battle due to poor communication. Thus, when radio were invented in 1917 and improved in 1918 the creeping barrage improved in effectiveness. This implies the Somme contributed significantly to the defeat of Germany as it taught the army leadership how to improve their tactics. Moreover tanks were used in the Somme for the first time and they were partially ineffective due to a lack of experience and the terrain. However, the experience from using them in the Somme can be seen in the Battle of Cambrai in 1917 as over 100 of them were used successfully to gain a victory. Therefore this suggests that the Battle of the Somme made a significant contribution towards the defeat of Germany as it helped the Army leadership learn lessons on how to improve tactics and ~~enabled them~~ allowed them to gain experience with new equipment to improve effectiveness.



((b) continued) ...

Most importantly it can be said that the Somme made a significant contribution to the defeat of Germany through the effect that Battle had on Germany and how that impacted the rest of the war. Source 7 states, "the combined losses of Verdun and the Somme contributed significantly to the ultimate defeat of Germany" this implies that the Somme did make a significant contribution to Germany's defeat due to the large loss of life they couldn't afford to lose due to them not having an Empire to fall back on like Britain. This is supported by source 9 which states, "German soldiers are now practically beaten men... and expecting defeat" this implies that soldiers morale was low after the Somme and the German Army leadership was beginning to panic as they began to fear defeat after this battle. Thus, this suggests that the Somme did contribute significantly to Germany's defeat as the large loss of life lowered their troops morale and the Army leadership began to panic about how they could avoid defeat. I can support



P 4 3 8 8 6 A 0 1 3 2 0

((b) continued) ~~this~~ with my own knowledge as I know that during the 1st day of the Battle of the Somme Germany also experienced extensive losses. Most importantly, these losses were mainly of experienced officers whose expertise would have been vital in future battles. I also am aware that after the Battle of the Somme German Army leadership began to panic and set in motion Unrestricted Submarine Warfare. This is extremely significant as it caused USA to join the war after unrestricted submarine warfare blew up one of their ships. ~~this suggests~~ This further contributed to ~~the~~ Germany's defeat as it added numbers to Britain and France. ~~was~~ Ultimately this suggests that the Battle of the Somme contributed significantly to the defeat of Germany as without it Germany would not have begun unrestricted Submarine warfare which caused ^{the} British Army's ^{numbers} to increase with the USA entering.

To conclude, it can be said that the Somme did not contribute significantly to Germany's defeat, as seen in sources 7 and



((b) continued) 8, due to the ^{high} death toll not being worth the land gained. Yet it can be said that the Somme's contribution was significant to Germany's defeat as it allowed Britain to gain experience and as know how to improve tactics as sources 8 and 9 suggest. This is furthered by the ~~the~~ sheer negative effect the Battle of the Somme had on Germany, ^{as shown in sources 7 and 9,} because it caused the entry of USA into the war. Therefore my own knowledge and the sources suggest that the ~~sonthe~~ Battle of the Somme did contribute significantly to the defeat of Germany.



P 4 3 8 8 6 A 0 1 5 2 0

Q 2a

The very best answers were able to link their cross referencing and discussion securely to the focus of the question, namely the effectiveness of Emmeline Pankhurst's leadership. Such answers generally explored what is meant by an 'effective leader' and how some seemingly negative traits might be desirable when in charge of an organisation. Most candidates, however, tended simply to cross reference the views held about Emmeline Pankhurst by the various sources. Most candidates discussed the provenance of the sources, although a significant number did not discuss all the sources. There were a minority of candidates who used extensive amounts of own knowledge to write a general essay. Such material could not be credited as it does not meet the requirements of the question.

Example script

This response begins with some valid cross referencing and consideration of provenance, but loses its focus and begins to engage in generalisations. It has done sufficient to achieve level 3, but would need more development of relevant points to move beyond this.

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) sources 10 and 12 argue that Emmeline Pankhurst was an effective leader of the suffragette movement as she was determined and managed to inspire ^{the public} ~~the public~~. However, source ~~10~~ and elements of 10 argued that she was not an effective leader of the WSPU as she dictated what people should do and did not care about the supporters of the movement. Overall, the sources demonstrate that Pankhurst was in fact an effective leader because her work for the suffragette movement encouraged the public to discuss it.

Sources 10 and 12 argue that Emmeline Pankhurst was an effective leader of the suffragette movement because she inspired supporters and gave outsiders something to talk about. Source 10 states that Pankhurst was a ~~was~~ "very wonderful woman" and "very persuasive". This suggests that she encouraged anti-suffrage supporters to reconsider their stance. Billington-Oreig also ~~compared her to~~ states that she was a "skilled politician" and

4



P 4 3 8 8 6 A 0 4 2 0

((a) continued) a "re-shaper of the world". This suggests that not only did Pankhurst inspire supporters but she helped change society's view on female suffrage, thus making her very effective. What's more, comparing her to a 're-shaper of the world' hugely highlights the sheer impact on an international level, making her a very effective leader. Additionally, source 12 argues that "Mrs Pankhurst was, in very truth, a hero." This indicates that people looked up to her and that her leadership had paid off in campaigning for female suffrage. What is significant about that source is that May Stokes was a member of the NUWSS, the opposing organisation to the WSPU therefore, Emmeline Pankhurst must have been an effective leader. Therefore, Emmeline Pankhurst was an effective leader of the suffrage movement as she inspired people to discuss female suffrage in a convincing manner.

However, sources 11 and elements of 10 suggest that Pankhurst was not an effective leader as ~~she was compared to a~~



P 4 3 8 8 6 A 0 5 2 0

5

Turn over ▶

((a) continued) her style of leading was controlling and she did not care about her supporters. Source 11 argues that "there was a split in the WSPU." This suggests that Pankhurst was not an effective leader as her organisation was divided, she could not unite them but an effective leader would be able to do so. Mitchell also states "I ~~was~~ did not realise that in the great battle, the individual does not count." This suggests that Pankhurst was doing whatever she could at the cost of her supporters. This also suggests that Pankhurst only saw the big picture and that she lacked attention to detail. Nonetheless, Mitchell's ~~view~~ ~~view~~ view is subjective as she is discussing the way she was treated during an illness so it might have impacted on the way she experienced the WSPU. What's more, Source 10 compared her to a "dictator without mercy." While this may imply she is strong, it also shows that she was very controlling and could imply she did not care about other people's views in the organisation. Therefore, in some ways Pankhurst might have been an ineffective leader.



((a) continued) Overall, although Pankhurst controlled the WSPU, she inspired many supporters and ~~kept~~ kept a strong stance. Emmeline Pankhurst was an effective leader as she brought the discussion of female suffrage to the forefront.



Q2bi

This was significantly less popular than the other question in this option. Responses to this question were often either weaker by virtue of a reliance on the content of the sources and limited supporting own knowledge, or excellent because of their effective use of the sources to create an argument that was supported by impressive own knowledge. Despite the fact that the issue of addressing AO2b has been referred to in numerous Principal Examiners' reports, there remain a number of candidates who discuss, sometimes at great length, the provenance of the secondary sources. There is no credit to be gained for this under AO2b.

Example script

This response clearly sets up an argument that is derived from the material in the sources and is able to support this argument with precise own knowledge. For this reason, this answer scores level 4 in both assessment objectives.

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

*(b)i) Agree: More job opportunities-13,14,15, Challenges ideology 13,15
Disagree - Ideology 14,15, Wage gap-13,14,15, ~~and~~ Didn't help W/class 14,15

With technological advances came more jobs. Jobs that arose from new technology were given to women. Sources 13, 14 & 15 all show how this improved the status of women by bringing about more job opportunities. Sources 13 & 15 also imply how these jobs challenged normal gender roles. However, these new jobs were also driven by Victorian ideology as shown in source 14 and 15. Source 14 and 15 also show how these new jobs didn't help the working class and all 3 sources highlight how there was still a wage gap. Overall, the sources show that, while there was some improvement, new technology did not substantially improve the status of women's employment.

Many of the new jobs women got due to new technology just reinforced Victorian ideology. Source 14 highlights this as it claims that "women have the quickness of eye and ear, the delicacy of touch, which are essential qualifications of a good operator." This clearly demonstrates Victorian stereotypes and how women were pigeon-holed into suitable jobs. Source 15 also follows this line of argument as



P 4 3 8 8 6 A 0 9 2 0

((b) continued) it argues that "With the invention of the typewriter, which was considered to be suited to women's ~~not~~ manual dexterity." This again reinforces how ideology played a role in the jobs women got. Jobs such as that of a governess or teacher were also deemed fit for women as it played into their maternal role. However, source 13 argues that the new technology and new jobs "represented an improvement in status and conditions for young women, whose mothers had been restricted to agriculture and domestic service." Indeed, these new jobs broke away from traditional work for women but in 1900 over 2,177,000 women worked in domestic service. This was over half of all employed women. ~~White women were~~ ^{women also had a marriage bar} in place so when they married they couldn't work which supported Victorian ideology and it was only removed from some professions after the 1930s. Therefore, sources 14 and 15 show how prevalent Victorian ideology was meaning there was no substantial improvement in the status of women's employment.

However, this new technology did lead to more job opportunities. Source 13 talks about the "expansion of white collar employment, as shop assistants, typists, civil servants in the Post Office and as elementary school teachers." This outlines the new opportunities.



((b) continued) Women had. There was even a Trade Union formed by Emma Paterson in 1875 called the Women's Protection & Providence League which looked after women in these professions. By 1906 there were around 211,000 members. Source 15 also highlights how "the number of women clerks increased dramatically". This again shows how women had more job opportunities. But it can't be ignored that these job opportunities existed as still over half of all employed women worked in domestic service. Around 23% still worked in textiles. Source 14 also demonstrates how these jobs were in line with Victorian ideology as "women take more kindly than men or boys do to sedentary employment". This shows that despite the new job opportunities they were still jobs deemed suitable for women. Despite the new job opportunities from technology shown in sources 3 & 14, source 15 highlights how these new jobs meant that there was little improvement in the status of women's employment.

Women's status in employment still lagged behind men as there was a wage gap. Source 13 points out how none of these new jobs "offered high-paid employment". This suggests that men still earned more than women. In teaching, women only earned 1/5 of that of a man and in other professions the figure is at



P 4 3 8 8 6 A 0 1 1 2 0

((b) continued) So ¹. Source 14 goes on to say how the wages for these new jobs "would draw male operators from an inferior class of the community." This also highlights how there must be a gap in pay between men and women. Source 15 also claims how this new technology meant that jobs "became less skilled and less well paid." Since these jobs were suitable for women ^{the new technology} it ensured that there was a wage gap. However, source 13 goes on to say that these jobs "represented an improvement in status and conditions" ~~which~~ but women were still inferior to men in the workplace. Despite these new jobs, many women were not in a trade union with notable members such as John Burns being against women joining unions. This ensured that women could not be represented and so the wage gap remained and their status improved little. Therefore, all 3 sources show how that the advancement in technology ensured that there was a wage gap meaning that there was little improvement in the status of women's work.

However, it could be argued that these new roles in employment challenged existing ideology. Source 13 mentions how these new roles meant they were not "restricted to agriculture and domestic



((b) continued) Service". These jobs were considered to be within a woman's 'private sphere' and so ideologically acceptable. These new roles challenged that. Source 15 also goes on to say how "the Post Office employed 90% of civil servants". This work in the public sphere challenged the existing ideology. However, source 13 goes on to say how the Post Office employed "the largest number of middle class" and this shows how working class women were not helped. They still worked in domestic service and sweated industries and these women account for around 3/4 of all working women. Also these jobs as typists and clerics were also ideologically acceptable as it did not interfere with their pure nature which working in politics would. While sources 13 & 15 argue that these new jobs challenged Victorian ideology all & source 15 shows how that was limited to middle class women and also the new opportunities were only an extension of ideology. This shows that technology did not substantially improve ^{the} women's status of women's employment from 1868-1914.

In conclusion, while sources 13 & 15 do show how there was some improvement as women had more opportunities and previous ideology and roles were partially challenged there was not a substantial improvement.



P 4 3 8 8 6 A 0 1 3 2 0

(b) continued) All 3 sources show how there was a wage gap which was massive in teaching as women only earned 1/3 of a males salary. Sources 14 & 15 also show how these new jobs were an extension of ideology and these ~~were~~ ^{jobs} did little to help the working class. Despite the improvements, it was not substantial and the sources show how technology did ~~there was~~ ^{lead to} not substantial improvement in the status of women's work from 1860-1914.



Q2bii

This was the more popular question. Most candidates acknowledged that the question required a consideration of the 1928 legislation and were able to reference this in their response. Whilst the sources were generally well understood and used, there were a minority of candidates who did not appreciate that Source 18 was setting up an argument in order to challenge it and took the comments in the first part of the source at face value as the beliefs of the author. Despite the fact that the issue of addressing AO2b has been referred to in numerous Principal Examiners' reports, there remain a number of candidates who discuss, sometimes at great length, the provenance of the secondary sources. There is no credit to be gained for this under AO2b.

Example script

Although this answer largely deals with the years up to 1918, there is some acknowledgment of the fact that the question asks candidates to go up to 1928, so combined with its attempts at analysis and its supporting knowledge,, this answer scores level 3/4 margins for AO1. For AO2, the answer makes use of the sources, but does not fully develop arguments from this and is therefore level 3.

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

* (b) ~~It can be both largely suggested and supported that the achievement of votes for women in 1928 was mainly brought about mainly due to the impact of WW1~~

Women suffrage in 1928 was largely the result of the impact of World War One. This is heavily supported in sources 16 and 17. The most significant reason why ~~more~~ this is the case is because through their war efforts women did in actuality fact defend the ~~republic~~ realm / the country as suggested in source 17 by Herbert H Asquith. And ~~secondly~~ secondly, because through the war women were able to disprove and positively outshine the ~~modern~~ prominent Victorian sexist and belittling ideologies towards women. ~~Moreover,~~ ^{Alternatively} it can be argued to a smaller extent that it wasn't the war that helped endorse the 1928 universal suffrage as they received their reward with the 1918 representation of the peoples Act. However, this gave limited suffrage to women.

The most significantly importance reason why war did help endorse this 1928 universal suffrage



P 4 3 8 8 6 A 0 9 2 0

9
Turn over ▶

((b) continued) is because through a women broke the commonly weighted argument against them having the vote. - which was women could not defend the realm / the UK. So why give them the vote. Herbert Asquith a pro female suffrage supporter highlighted to the house of commons exactly how women did this ~~through~~ as ~~"they are the backbone of the nation"~~ "they have aided in the most effective way". Further reinforced by the claim historian Eric Hopkins made by saying "women made a massive contribution". Both show just how essential and necessary women's impact was. This was strong enough ^{evidence} to break the commonly used argument against female suffrage. with this broken it made it easier that after the war and Britain had found some sense of post war stability in 1928 they ~~then~~ endorsed the universal suffrage to thank women. As he believed after women showed they can defend the realm / UK he could "not deny" women the vote (source 17.)

The second significantly important reason as to why it was war that brought about this universal suffrage is that women had



((b) continued) managed to "radically changed male ideas about their role in society" (source 15). Due to ~~was~~ prominently instilled Victorian ideologies such as the angle in the house concept and the idea of separate spheres: both constricting women to the belief that they were inferior and inadequate enough to deal with the vote. Through the war, women proved they were not inferior to men through their war efforts. "male prejudice ... was now greatly lessened" (source 16). And as their war efforts were being conducted it allowed women to be seen a different more widened light. And it was with this lessening of prejudice towards women which allowed Parliament to be more ~~super~~ actively responsive to female enfranchisement. (* turn over!

However, it can be argued to a valid but lesser extent that war did not contribute towards the 1928 universal act. It can be said that ^{they} received their "special claim" (source 17) through the endorsement of the representation of the people's act which came at a closer date of 1918 to ~~be~~ the time of war end. This allowed women over the age of 30 yrs to be allowed to vote. Thus, allowing female suffrage.



P 4 3 8 8 6 A 0 1 1 2 0

((b) continued) to be made law. Additionally, it must be noted that the Speakers Conference of 1916 suggested to Parliament the emancipation of females aged 30-35 yrs. This was more closely linked to the age range of the act than the age range of the majority of female war effort workers were (20-25). ~~Furthermore, this was not the~~ The Speaker's Conference report was one that Parliament took very seriously and therefore it can be weightedly suggest that war did not even help towards the limited female emancipation under the Representation of People's act. However, this is not the case to a large extent as war did combat alot of issues that suffrage campaigners could not have done without the war. As war significantly broke down & discredited the main arguments used to prevent female suffrage. And with the main argument of women not being able to defend the realm/ the UK ~~in~~ so blatantly ~~was~~ during the war. It is more evident to suggest to a large extent that war did ~~eff~~ in fact result in the 1928 universal suffrage for women & men of



((b) continued) age 21 and above.

Overall, it is clear from the sources that war did in actual fact bring about the ~~enlargement~~ universal suffrage as the "recognition for their war services" (source 16) was given in 1928 when the Great Britain was stable after the war. Although there is a time difference, it is evident that due to change in views towards women as a result of their efforts, they get the vote on the basis of their war effort.

Ⓢ however, it was mainly due to ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~women~~ claim that women did not defend the realm that actually brought about the enfranchisement of women. As the opponents had lost their strongest argument against women's suffrage had ended peacefully in 1914.



P 4 3 8 8 6 A 0 1 3 2 0

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

All Questions

1. 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.
2. Too many candidates use certain phrases, such as 'using the sources as a set', as a substitute for actually engaging in the task that they are claiming.
3. 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

1. Candidates should spend sufficient time reading the sources to ensure that they understand the nuances of the arguments presented.
2. Candidates should treat the sources as a package in order to facilitate cross referencing. Weaker candidates work through sources sequentially. Such responses cannot go beyond level 2
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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

1. Candidates need to ensure that their subject knowledge conforms to the specification. Weaker responses usually relied very heavily on information derived primarily from the sources.
2. In order to address the question effectively, candidates need to offer an analysis driven by the arguments raised in the sources. Sources should be used to develop lines of argument and reasoning rather than used for information to develop a descriptive answer
3. Whilst it may be relevant to use the provenance of the contemporary source(s) to judge the weight that can be assigned to the argument, there is no such requirement for the secondary sources 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.
4. 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.

