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General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate’s response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate’s response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:

  i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear

  ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter

  iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.
GCE History Marking Guidance

Marking of Questions: Levels of Response
The mark scheme provides an indication of the sorts of answer that might be found at different levels. The exemplification of content within these levels is not complete. It is intended as a guide and it will be necessary, therefore, for examiners to use their professional judgement in deciding both at which level a question has been answered and how effectively points have been sustained. Candidates should always be rewarded according to the quality of thought expressed in their answer and not solely according to the amount of knowledge conveyed. However candidates with only a superficial knowledge will be unable to develop or sustain points sufficiently to move to higher levels.

In assessing the quality of thought, consider whether the answer:

(i) is relevant to the question and is explicitly related to the question’s terms
(ii) argues a case, when requested to do so
(iii) is able to make the various distinctions required by the question
(iv) has responded to all the various elements in the question
(v) where required, explains, analyses, discusses, assesses, and deploys knowledge of the syllabus content appropriately, rather than simply narrates.

Examiners should award marks both between and within levels according to the above criteria. This should be done in conjunction with the levels of response indicated in the mark schemes for particular questions.

At the end of each answer, examiners should look back on the answer as a whole in the light of these general criteria in order to ensure that the total mark reflects their overall impression of the answer's worth.

Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level
The first stage is to decide the overall level and then whether the work represents high, mid or low performance within the level. The overall level will be determined by the candidate’s ability to focus on the question set, displaying the appropriate conceptual grasp. Within any one piece of work there may well be evidence of work at two, or even three levels. One stronger passage at Level 4, would not by itself merit a Level 4 award - but it would be evidence to support a high Level 3 award - unless there were also substantial weaknesses in other areas.

Assessing Quality of Written Communication
QoWC will have a bearing if the QoWC is inconsistent with the communication descriptor for the level in which the candidate’s answer falls. If, for example, a candidate’s history response displays mid Level 3 criteria but fits the Level 2 QoWC descriptors, it will require a move down within the level.
6HI02: Generic Level Descriptors

Part (a)

Target: AO2a (8%) (20 marks)
As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | 1-5  | Comprehends the surface features of the sources and selects material relevant to the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.  
**Low Level 1: 1-2 marks**
The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 1: 3-5 marks**
The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed. |
| 2     | 6-10 | Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify their similarities and/or differences in relation to the question posed. There may be one developed comparison, but most comparisons will be undeveloped or unsupported with material from the sources. Sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information. The source provenance may be noted, without application of its implications to the source content.  
**Low Level 2: 6-7 marks**
The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 2: 8-10 marks**
The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed. |
| 3     | 11-15| Comprehends the sources and focuses the cross-referencing on the task set. Responses will offer detailed comparisons, similarities/differences, agreements/disagreements that are supported by evidence drawn from the sources.  
Sources are used as evidence with some consideration of their attributes, such as the nature, origins, purpose or audience, with some consideration of how this can affect the weight given to the evidence. In addressing ‘how far’ there is a clear attempt to use the sources in combination, but this may be imbalanced in terms of the issues addressed or in terms of the use of the sources.  
**Low Level 3: 11-12 marks**
The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 3: 13-15 marks**
The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>16-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reaches a judgement in relation to the issue posed by the question supported by careful examination of the evidence of the sources. The sources are cross-referenced and the elements of challenge and corroboration are analysed. The issues raised by the process of comparison are used to address the specific enquiry. The attributes of the source are taken into account in order to establish what weight the content they will bear in relation to the specific enquiry. In addressing ‘how far’ the sources are used in combination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Low Level 4: 16-17 marks**
The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.

**High Level 4: 18-20 marks**
The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.

*NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*
Part (b)

**Target: AO1a & AO1b (10% - 24 marks)**
Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

**AO2b (7% - 16 marks)**
Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.

(40 marks)

**AO1a and AO1b (24 marks)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Candidates will produce mostly simple statements. These will be supported by limited factual material, which has some accuracy and relevance, although not directed analytically (i.e. at the focus of the question). The material will be mostly generalised. There will be few, if any, links between the simple statements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Low Level 1: 1-2 marks**
The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.

**Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks**
As per descriptor

**High Level 1: 5-6 marks**
The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 1.

The writing may have limited coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.

| 2     | 7-12 | Candidates will produce a series of simple statements supported by some accurate and relevant, factual material. The analytical focus will be mostly implicit and there are likely to be only limited links between simple statements. Material is unlikely to be developed very far or to be explicitly linked to material taken from sources. |

**Low Level 2: 7-8 marks**
The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.

**Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks**
As per descriptor

**High Level 2: 11-12 marks**
The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2.

The writing will have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. Some of the skills needed to produce effective writing will be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.
NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3 | 13-18 | Candidates answers will attempt analysis and show some understanding of the focus of the question. They may, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question’s focus, or which strays from that focus. Factual material will be mostly accurate, but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor. At this level candidates will begin to link contextual knowledge with points drawn from sources.  
**Low Level 3: 13-14 marks**  
The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.  
**Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks**  
As per descriptor  
**High Level 3: 17-18 marks**  
The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 3.  
The writing will be coherent in places but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. Only some of the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are likely to be present. Syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present. |
| 4 | 19-24 | Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material, which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. There will be some integration of contextual knowledge with material drawn from sources, although this may not be sustained throughout the response. The selection of material may lack balance in places.  
**Low Level 4: 19-20 marks**  
The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.  
**Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks**  
As per descriptor  
**High Level 4: 23-24 marks**  
The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 4.  
The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes may not be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing but there may be passages which lack clarity or coherence. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors. |
## AO2b (16 marks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>Comprehends the sources and selects material relevant to the representation contained in the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       |      | **Low Level 1: 1-2 marks**<br>The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 1: 3-4 marks**<br>The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed. |
| 2     | 5-8  | Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify points which support or differ from the representation contained in the question. When supporting the decision made in relation to the question the sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information. |
|       |      | **Low Level 2: 5-6 marks**<br>The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 2: 7-8 marks**<br>The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed. |
| 3     | 9-12 | The sources are analysed and points of challenge and/or support for the representation contained in the question are developed from the provided material. In addressing the specific enquiry, there is clear awareness that a representation is under discussion and there is evidence of reasoning from the evidence of both sources, although there may be some lack of balance. The response reaches a judgement in relation to the claim which is supported by the evidence of the sources. |
|       |      | **Low Level 3: 9-10 marks**<br>The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 3: 11-12 marks**<br>The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed. |
| 4     | 13-16| Reaches and sustains a conclusion based on the discriminating use of the evidence. Discussion of the claim in the question proceeds from the issues raised by the process of analysing the representation in the sources. There is developed reasoning and weighing of the evidence in order to create a judgement in relation to the stated claim. |
|       |      | **Low Level 4: 13-14 marks**<br>The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 4: 15-16 marks**<br>The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed. |

*NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*
### Unit 2 Assessment Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>AO1a and b Marks \AO2a Marks</th>
<th>AO2b Marks</th>
<th>Total marks for question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q (a)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q (b)(i) or (ii)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Marks</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| % weighting     | 10%                         | 8%         | 7%                       | 25%                     |

### Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.
### Indicative content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (a)</td>
<td>Candidates are likely to begin with a consideration of Source 1 from which the opinion is drawn. This is a highly critical indictment of the contribution made by Florence Nightingale. Source 1 claims that Nightingale is ambitious, mischievous and of no help to the sick. On the surface, the traditional representation of the ‘lady of the lamp’ provided by both Sources 2 and 3 would seem to strongly disagree with the view presented in Source 1 and suggest that Nightingale made significant contributions to helping the sick. Candidates may well suggest that the image published in the London Illustrated News is a visual representation of the description offered by Source 2 and develop the ways in which these two sources support each other. However, although Sources 2 and 3 offer direct opposition to Source 1 over the ways in which Nightingale’s value as a nurse was perceived, and hence her role in helping the sick, the sources can be reconciled elsewhere. Thus, Sources 2 and 3 can be seen as corroborating evidence for Hall’s references to the press. Some candidates are likely to link the claim made in Source 1 that Nightingale enjoyed great influence at home with the widespread press coverage implied by the caption accompanying the drawing from the <em>London Illustrated News</em>. Thus, the populist nature of Sources 2 and 3 may be used to question their objectivity, while it may be suggested that Hall’s critical assessment in Source 1 is no more than one would expect from a man forced to defend his actions to his superior. Any valid conclusion that is drawn by candidates should be credited. Developed responses based on these arguments can reach L2. At L3 candidates will both support and challenge the stated claim, using evidence from different sources interpreted in context. At L4 they will use the sources, interpreted in context as a set, to reach a reasoned judgement about the extent to which Florence Nightingale did ‘not help the sick’ in the Crimean War.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The question is focused on the impact of the Boer War on public attitudes in Britain towards the value of Empire. The evidence of Source 4 can be used in support of the contention in the question by highlighting mass support for the Empire in the aftermath of the relief of Mafeking. Candidates may well pick up on the final sentence of Source 4 outlining the role of the popular press in promoting imperialism to provide detail on the nature and growth of newspapers in this period. It is likely that Alfred Harmsworth and the Daily Mail may well feature here. Source 6 can be used to support further the view that enthusiasm for Empire grew in the course of the conflict, if commercial imperialism is used as an indicator. Candidates may well develop this on the basis of their contextual knowledge by referencing other ways in which popular enthusiasm for empire was being promoted in this period, such as children’s literature. However, some candidates are likely to recognise the superficiality of the public sentiment being described in Source 6 and link this with the ‘most famous display of public support’ outlined in Source 4 to question the extent to which the war saw a genuine increase in imperial enthusiasm. Source 5 clearly presents evidence for this counter-view, although some candidates will recognise the significance of the provenance in their weighing of the argument. Nonetheless, Source 5, in combination with the reference in Source 6 to ‘manipulating working-class opinion in favour of imperialist policies’, can be used as a platform for candidates to explore contemporary arguments surrounding the justness of the war. Some candidates may be able to develop the reference to Hobson and his view of imperialism further on the basis of their contextual knowledge. The split in the Liberal party and the vociferous opposition of Lloyd George may also be referenced. Candidates’ own knowledge of recruitment and volunteerism, the significance of the outcome of the Khaki election of 1900 and the domestic concerns that were brought into relief as a result of strategy and tactics used in South Africa can all be used in support of arguments for and against the view. Candidates who go on to consider whether or not the enthusiasm was maintained in the post-war period should be credited appropriately. The sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes.

Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the impact of the Boer War on public attitudes in Britain towards the value of Empire with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view. The best responses may very well consider the interaction of different factors to explain the apparent conflict and offer an overall judgement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (b)(ii)</td>
<td>The question is focused on whether or not government control of the Home Front was effective during the First World War. Candidates will probably start with Source 7 which fully supports the contention in the question. Some candidates may well supplement the information given in the source with a range of other measures introduced by the government to tackle drunkenness, such as restricting the sale of spirits and reducing licensing hours. Candidates may use this as a platform to explore state control in other aspects of everyday life, such as the gradual imposition of rationing. Both Sources 8 and 9 present evidence to counter the contention in the question. In combination, the sources paint a picture of a government unable to deal effectively with worsening labour relations despite the increased powers referred to by Source 9. It may be argued by some that the reluctance to use coercive powers on Welsh miners is evidence of a government slow to come to terms with the true nature of total war on the home front. From their own knowledge, candidates should be able to test this theory and explore further, for example, the Munitions of War Act of 1915 and how successfully it was applied to the regulation of wartime industry generally. Some candidates will extend this to an examination of increased government powers in the control of other industries, such as shipping, railways and agriculture. It may be argued that only in the last two years of the war did the government really get a grip on the situation with the appointment of a coal controller in February 1917 and the replacement of Lord Devonport with the more interventionist Lord Rhondda as Minister of Food in May of the same year. Alternatively some may contend, as noted in the memorandum in Source 8, that the country continued to be plagued by strikes throughout the war. The sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. Whatever line of argument is followed, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the effectiveness of the government’s control of the Home Front in the years 1914-18, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view. The best responses may very well consider the interaction of different factors to explain the apparent conflict and offer an overall judgement.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C2 Britain, c1860-1930: The Changing Position of Women and the Suffrage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (a)</td>
<td>All three sources can be used both to support and challenge the contention in the question. Source 10 stresses that the new colleges were not meant to challenge the existing status quo and candidates can point to the list of female roles which are identified within the source as further support for this claim. The list of subjects in Source 11 contains a large number that would traditionally have been thought of as being particularly suitable for girls, and candidates may draw parallels between these subjects and the roles identified by Source 10. Source 12 makes the point that women will be ‘none the less feminine’ as a result of improved education. Some candidates may argue from these points that the very fact that the authors of all three of the sources felt it necessary to make such reassuring noises highlights just how gradual and non-challenging change was meant to be. Alternatively, candidates may contend that the breadth of the curriculum in Source 11 and the insistence that women need not be confined wholly to ‘active domestic duty’ in Source 10 do present something of a challenge to the philosophy of separate spheres. This emphasis on wider learning can then be cross referenced with Source 12 which advances the importance of women developing ‘serious interests’ and engaging in ‘more academic interests’. Combining all three sources as a set, some candidates will note that the ineffectiveness of female schooling highlighted in Source 12 was being addressed by the new establishments outlined in Sources 10 and 11, and that, by their very nature, these represent a challenge to established attitudes. It is likely that candidates will take note of the dates in the sources and recognise that the colleges set up by Davies in Source 10 were the natural successors to schools like North London Collegiate School (Source 11) and may well argue that such progression threatened the existing order. Any valid conclusion that is drawn by candidates should be credited. Developed responses based on these arguments can reach L2. At L3 candidates will both support and challenge the stated claim, using evidence from different sources interpreted in context. At L4 they will use the sources, interpreted in context as a set, to reach a reasoned judgement about whether the changes in female education in the second half of the nineteenth century challenged the belief in separate spheres.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The question is focused on the reactions of the Labour and Liberal Parties to the issue of women’s involvement in public life. Candidates are likely to begin by referencing Source 14 from which the stated factor is drawn. It implies that the imperatives of party politics were responsible for the approach taken by both the Liberal and Labour Parties. Candidates can support this line of argument by reference to Source 15, in which the Liberal leader can be seen to be opposing extending the vote to women. From their own knowledge candidates should be able to further develop this viewpoint by examining the reactions to, and attitudes of, the Liberal and Labour Parties to the issue of women’s involvement in public life. For the Liberals, Asquith’s hostility to women’s suffrage, the Party’s failure to support the Conciliation Bills and the negative impact of militancy are all likely to feature. From the Labour perspective, candidates are likely to use Source 13 to provide an alternative view of their approach to the issue. Pugh makes clear that the Left increasingly supported women’s participation. The more knowledgeable may well try to explain and reconcile the dilemma that the Labour Party found itself in, caught, as it was, between support for the principle of female suffrage and fear that this was a middle-class, and essentially conservative, cause which could wait until seemingly more pressing injustices had been tackled. Candidates may be able to extend this line of argument by citing the support given by Keir Hardie, the pact formed between the NUWSS and the Labour Party in 1912 and the passing of the resolution, at the annual conference in 1912, that adult suffrage must include women. Equally, candidates own knowledge can be deployed to exemplify the support given by the Liberals to women’s suffrage. Thus, reference could be made to the work of the Women’s Liberal Federation and the importance of grass-roots support within the Liberal Party. Candidates should be rewarded according to the range and depth of the material they deploy. The sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes.

Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the nature and importance of the reactions to and attitudes of the Liberal and Labour parties to the issue of women’s involvement in public life, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view. The best responses may very well consider the interaction of different factors to explain the apparent conflict and offer an overall judgement.
The question is focused on the importance of the First World War in securing the vote for women. Candidates may well start with Source 16 which offers support to the view in the question by suggesting that attributing the right to vote to the war can only be deemed to be ‘something of a myth’. This view can be used as a platform for candidates to explore the nature and limitations of women’s war work. Many may argue that inequalities in pay, dilution and the fact that women were non-combatants all reinforced rather than dismantled the separate spheres philosophy. This view can then be supported by Source 17 which, although it argues against the contention, nonetheless acknowledges that the vast majority of women who had been involved in war work were not granted the vote in 1918. The counter-view is presented in Sources 17 and 18. Source 17 notes that opposition to women’s emancipation crumbled in the face of the female contribution to the national cause. Evidence to buttress this view is presented by Asquith’s declaration of support in Source 18. Some candidates will however weigh this evidence in the light of the source’s provenance and their contextual knowledge. Thus, some may argue that this shows a genuine change of heart in someone who had at best been lukewarm in his approach to female suffrage while others may see little more than empty political rhetoric. From their own knowledge, candidates can develop the argument against the contention. The cessation of WSPU militancy for the duration of the war, the replacement of Asquith by the Lloyd George as Prime Minister and the impact of coalition politics are all likely to feature. The sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. Candidates should be rewarded according to the range and depth of the material deployed. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of the sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the impact of the war on female suffrage, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the view. The best responses may very well consider the interaction of different factors to explain the apparent conflict and offer an overall judgement.