

# ResultsPlus

## Examiners' Report June 2010

GCSE History 6HI02 B

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

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com). If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated History telephone line: 0844 576 0034.



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

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

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

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

To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

June 2010

Publications Code US024078

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

## Introduction

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

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

The sources were accessible and there were some very good responses to this question. Most candidates grasped the political aims identified in the sources and better candidates discerned the socio-economic aims and were able to cross reference these differing aims by reference to both content and provenance. Not all candidates were able to fully access source 3, misinterpreting parts of his comments. Many candidates, quite appropriately, used own knowledge to contextualise the provenance and were able to form a conclusion on the distinction between leaders and masses. However, it would be helpful for candidates to also fully mine the provenance to draw out its implications. It was a rare candidate, for example, who commented on the title of source 1 - "The Rotten House of Commons", which could clearly be used to comment on the political aims of Chartism. It is disappointing to note that a significant number of candidates are still working through the sources in turn, re-stating the provenance, paraphrasing the content and treating the sources as information rather than evidence. Some candidates brought in their own knowledge about the six points of the People's Charter and Chartism in general; this cannot be credited.

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

- (a) during the time of the Chartist movement there was great political unrest throughout England, the voting was corrupt and easily won through blackmail and extortion, whilst the franchise was poorly regarded and the fear's poorly distributed amongst constituents.

Source 1 is from an article published by the London working men association this tells us that the source is likely to be biased against the upper classes as the London working men's association ~~mostly~~ consisted of working class men, who at this point wanted equal representation in the franchise. In this source it is describing why would be more suitable to the the House of Commons and later describes that it is 'the people's house' this was because of the need for equal representation of the working class which would be erased because the upper class believed that the working class were inferior and not politically aware to earn the right of representation.

((a) continued)

Source 2 is an extract from a book published in 1840 by William Lovett, who was one of the leaders of Chartist and John Brown. Because it was partly written by William Lovett we can expect this extract to be critical about the Chartist Methods and aims. It describes how the people's Charter "secures their fair share of political power to all classes of society", this shows how one or the aims of the Chartist movement was political equality. But it also describes the critics within the party over how the Chartists were trying to achieve these goals. This proved to be a weakness as too many people would think that the Chartists were disorganized and therefore not consider their position taken seriously. This also gave confidence to the working classes remaining who had wanted equality with the other classes.

((a) continued)

source 3 is an extract from the Journal of General Sir Charles Napier, written in 1839 and published in 1857. It describes the amount of agitation for reform meant that men where unable to feed themselves or their family. Because the petitions written by chartists were rejected they could not really have pass any laws and as a result little changed until the Reform act's were very few if any of the chartist's ideas were considered. It is also important to consider that Charles Napier was sent to consider the unrest caused by chartists, so it isn't likely he had a high view of the chartists, and as a result this extract can be seen as biased, this extract also tries to bring's to light how the chartist movement better or worse off hidden more than it helped the cause for equality amongst the political parties.

Sources 1 and 2 do however support the claim that the Chartist movement did have aims towards political equality by suggesting representation of the working class in the franchise. Source 3 on the other hand shows how the Chartist

((a) continued) movement might have been holding the working class back instead.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This illustrates the source by source approach which is often characteristic of a level 2 response. The candidate begins with an introduction which makes some basic points that are derived from own knowledge rather than the sources. The response then works through each source in turn, sometimes attempting to make brief links to the question although there is often paraphrasing that is not linked to the question. There are also some brief and rather simplistic comments on provenance. There is a very brief attempt at cross referencing in the conclusion but this is not convincingly linked to the question focus.

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

This question was the more popular response. Some candidates misunderstood “conservative” and wrote instead about Robert Peel and the Conservative Party. Some candidates struggled to address the issues of “limited” and “conservative” separately. Most candidates comprehended the suggestion from the sources that one aim of the Reform Act was to divert revolution. Not all were able to develop this point and link it to the question focus. Indeed, some candidates used it as a springboard to discuss the reasons for the Reform Act. There were also some very effective answers. These looked at the case for the Act being limited and conservative, and then countered with the case against. The sources in these answers were well integrated with own knowledge. The best answers were detailed, analytical answers, driven forward by the sources. A minority of answers relied on substantial paraphrasing of the sources, with little evidence of own knowledge. It is important that candidates support their interpretations by reference to their own knowledge.

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

(b) i) The 1832 reform act was initially intended as a radical bill that would help to create an equal system, however this idea was taken by political leaders such as Grey, who is quoted as saying that the act should be so based on existing property franchises, so as to preserve the existing system, and was turned into a way of disowning the possibility of a revolution.

Source 4 by a whig MP is a speech made to the House of Commons in 1831, in support of the bill. However he says it is because 'I am opposed to Universal Suffrage' that he supports it. Like Sir Grey and many other Whigs, and radical Tories he sees it as the 'best security against revolution'. The idea was that by working together, the middle and working classes could cause a revolution. Similar to the one in France, ~~so~~ a few years before. So by enfranchising the respectable middle class they could split the two and prevent a revolution.

Source 5 also agrees that the purpose of the 1832 Act, as well as the 1846 repeal of the Corn Laws, were import plans by the

(b) continued) A aristocracy to preserve their power and to prevent a revolt. The Source which was published in 1953 suggests that the 'landed interest' that continued to control the Commons had no hostility towards its 'leaders in the Lords'. The Lords essentially appointed the Commons, and by using both together power could be maintained.

The two reform act and repeal of the Corn laws would appear to damage the upper classes, yet the Source says 'neither surrendered cast the Lords as a house, or the Aristocracy as a class, one particle of their real power' because by appealing the working class, they were able to avoid revolution.

Source B which is from a history textbook published in 1990 states that 'the 1832 reform act defused a major political crisis, as was its intention' and that it was 'an essentially non-democratic reform'. The Source agrees with 4 and 5 that the act was cleverly set up and disguised as a liberal bill that would create a fairer system, but in reality was watered down and very constitutive so that power could be maintained, and in reality the few working class who could

((b) continued) vote due to pot-wallop clauses etc were actually disengaged by the act and the introduction of the uniform £10 voting qualification.

Although in the long term political reform and equality was eventually achieved through subsequent acts, this first reform act was highly conservative and its effects actually were to make the system even less equal in the short term.

# the suggestion of the source is therefore that a reform of the political system, incorporating points proposed by the chartists was essential for political equality # which were later



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This candidate uses virtually no own knowledge in this response. Each source is taken in turn and the content is paraphrased with only limited links being made to the question. It is only at the very end that there is a touch of own knowledge and some limited attempt is made to engage the question's focus. This is level 2 in both assessment objectives. There is little sense of an argument here.

**Question 1(b) (ii)****ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This was the less popular alternative. The sources were accessible and gave rise to balanced arguments, although some candidates misread the provenance of source 7, believing the letters to be written by Disraeli to Derby; this clearly undermined the ability of candidates to make valid points. A minority of answers relied on substantial paraphrasing of the sources, with little evidence of own knowledge. It is important that candidates support their interpretations by reference to their own knowledge. Better responses focused on the relative significance of Disraeli compared to Derby, Gladstone and outside pressure for reform. Some responses spent a considerable part of the answer in formulaic or routine evaluation of provenance. Candidates need to be aware that it is AO2b that is tested in this section of the paper; provenance need only be assessed where it helps to weigh up the quality of the evidence in relation to the claim under investigation.

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

Most candidates were able to understand and write about the surface features of the sources. It is disappointing to note that a significant number of candidates are still working through the sources in turn, re-stating the provenance, paraphrasing the content and treating the sources as information rather than evidence. Some candidates also brought in their own knowledge both for the reasons for public health reform, and the terms of public health legislation. This cannot be credited for this assessment objective. The best responses were able to weigh the evidence and base their conclusions on the sources value and content. They developed the subtle points about opposition from vested interests in source 1 and the issue of cost in source 2 as well as demonstrating an understanding of the timescale derived from the provenance. However, many candidates had some difficulty in assessing the value of the sources. There were many general comments such as ‘source one is from a newspaper therefore it is biased.’

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

- (a) Sources 10, 11 and 12 all discuss the problems of public health in Leeds and indeed put forth different ~~oppon~~ opinions on reasons for the delay in improvement.

Source 10 certainly agrees with the statement that 'the City Council lacked the power' as the editorial from the 'Leeds Intelligencer' bluntly puts "Parliament has not yet given the Council the authority." However it could be argued here then that surely some of the blame should lie with Parliament? It is not the Council's fault they lack the power and therefore perhaps if they were to have such power improvements would have been made. Source 12 appears to support and sympathises with this view, however despite acknowledging the Council's lack of power clearly voice a perhaps obvious solution: "they can readily obtain them by a new Improvement Act, as the Corporation of Bradford has recently done." Therefore James Hole in Source 12 highlights perhaps the idleness of Leed's council and shifts some of the blame from "lack of power" to their simple inactiveness. Why don't

((a) continued) they have the authority when Bradford has achieved it readily?

Source 11 is from ~~1863~~ an Act for "clearing, sewerage and improving... Leeds." and one would therefore assume it agreed with source 12's survey results that "the sanitary state of Leeds is far from satisfactory." However despite having the 'lawfulness' to improve the situation the Act contains very vague instructions "from time to time." This does not exemplify a clear desire or chance of improvement. Despite the improvements needed being specifically noted and layed down those creating the Act appear not to realise its importance and therefore perhaps this apparent Act to incur improvements has little significance and indeed contributes to such delay of improving Leeds.

However despite Source 11's slow, seemingly non-compulsory instructions it does indeed highlight the needs of Leeds: "all or any of the streets... to be cleansed and watered and the dirt, ashes and rubbish to be removed." Perhaps this supports the idea that the Council is too idle, as in 1863 when 'The Working Classes of Leeds' is

((a) continued) published the situation is still unsatisfactory. Despite being told quite bluntly what was needed to be done perhaps they took liberties with 'from time to time' and did extremely little.

The general idea of who is to blame is not only the Council, but the ideas behind Public Health on a whole. However the Council's seeming lack of motivation or action is apparent in all 3 sources.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This is not a perfect response, but it does start to engage in a number of the skills that are required in question a. There is an attempt to cross reference some of the arguments; it picks up on some aspects of the provenance, notably the issue of dating; it makes links to the question; it is aware of other explanations offered. On the critical front, it could be said, it needs more range of cross referencing; provenance is sometimes merely stated and not developed in relation to the issues; there could be more links to the question; there are other explanations in the sources that are not mentioned. However, candidates have about half an hour to write this response, so it is not necessarily possible to include everything in an answer. This response is sufficient for level 3.

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

Answers were fairly evenly divided between the two options. The sources were mostly well handled in this response with generally good understanding of the continuation elements of the question such as the continuity of outdoor relief in the North. However, fewer candidates successfully argued about elements of change in Poor Law provision although there were some effective responses where candidates pointed out, for example, that whilst there had been workhouses before 1834, their ideological purpose had been quite different. Some answers did move to a description of workhouse conditions with little sense of period. Indeed, many candidates found it hard to engage with the chronology of this question, often starting with the Poor Law Amendment Act and not moving beyond the 1840s. Candidates should be encouraged to read the question carefully and ensure that they deal with its chronological parameters. A minority of answers relied on substantial paraphrasing of the sources, with little evidence of own knowledge. It is important that candidates support their interpretations by reference to their own knowledge. Some responses spent a considerable part of the answer in formulaic or routine evaluation of provenance. Candidates need to be aware that it is AO2b that is tested in this section of the paper; provenance need only be assessed where it helps to weigh up the quality of the evidence in relation to the claim under investigation.

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

- (b) Between 1830 and 1875, the system of poor relief appeared to change dramatically. However, throughout the multiple acts and changes put in place by government, it is obvious that there are parallels between the implementation of the poor laws before the Poor Law Amendment Act in 1834 and afterward.

Source B on the surface, would seem to suggest a strong correlation with the idea of their being little change after the Poor Law Amendment Act. The source tells of 'workhouses ~~were~~ in existence long before' in addition with the notion of 'people dying or being born in workhouses'. On the surface this would seem very similar to the 1834 act which put great emphasis onto the ~~the~~ usage of workhouses to deter the poor. However, these workhouses had a different nature, workhouses were reserved solely for the elderly and it was still very uncommon for a pauper to remain in a workhouse for their entire life. The principle of less eligibility was not in place and so also, the designs and functions of workhouses were not so regimented.

Also, 'Other parishes had no workhouse at all', there was much local variation in the administration of poor relief. This meant that while in some areas the Act of 1834 seemed relatively similar to that they

((b) continued) already had in place, in others it was characterised by a great deal of change.

This view is supported in Source 14, where the 1834 Act is said to be intended to 'radically reform the system'. However, further on in the source it becomes apparent that this is less in practice and more in focus; 'cost effective and efficient'. This source states also that 'it grouped parishes into unions', this was in order to reduce cost of building workhouses. However, the idea of creating parish unions, although not applicable everywhere, was prevalent in places with large numbers of paupers. The Gilbert Act of 1776 allowed parishes to group together to create poor-houses, this draws parallels with the ~~the~~ 1834 unions on all but one point. The driving force behind the centralisation<sup>and consolidation</sup> of the poor laws, was the rising dramatic cost of poor relief, as a result of the population increase. This centralisation was entirely new, parishes had always took charge of their paupers and the old poor laws had not changed since 1601.

The issue of the cost of poor relief as a motivation behind shows a motivation to less change and more adapt the poor laws in the Act of 1834. Source 15 states that the cost of ~~poor~~ outdoor relief is so great', changes made to the laws, such as <sup>widespread</sup> poor law unions and centralisation can be seen to be using previous methods of coping.

((b) continued) With the problem of poverty, on a wider and more efficient scale. On the other hand, Source 15 can be seen as depicting the 1834 Act as being one of change, not necessarily in method, but in attitudes, wanting to give a 'motive for saving' which is thought was lost. This source, taken from 1871, a considerable number of years after the 1834 act, does not however seem to suggest that these changes were successful in their goal. The similarities and parallels between the old poor laws and the 1834 poor laws appear to have hindered the intended changes as opposed to helping it.

To conclude, <sup>I do not agree entirely with</sup> the view that between 1830-1875 the system of poor relief in England was characterised by far more continuity than change. Change amounted from the attitudes and the shift in focus of the poor law, the principle of less eligibility and the changing attitude to the poor. However, I do believe that in a way parallels can be drawn throughout this period to show little practice change.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This candidate works through the sources one by one, but shows quite a strong understanding of the demands of the question and makes secure comments that link the material to the question. There is also some sound own knowledge integrated with the use of sources. This is a sound level 3 response that with more effective planning of the material could have developed a more distinctly analytical approach and hence have possibly accessed level 4.

**Question 2(b) (ii)****ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Answers were fairly evenly divided between the two options. Many candidates were able to produce effective answers to this question. Candidates were able to integrate sources and some impressive own knowledge to develop clear arguments. The best responses focused on the impact of democracy on public health, focusing on the information in all three sources for support and pointing out the connection between working class voters and the need to win their vote. These arguments were then juxtaposed with other factors such as outbreaks of diseases such as cholera (source 18), the role of individuals and scientific developments. Weaker candidates struggled with the concept of “the growth of democracy” and the meaning of source 17, and concentrated on other factors with which they clearly felt more confident.

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	42	37	32	27	23
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40



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

Telephone 01623 467467  
Fax 01623 450481  
[Email publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)  
Order Code US024078 June 2010

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

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

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

  
Rewarding Learning