

Examiners' Report
January 2013

GCE History 6HI02 B

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. 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 for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at www.edexcel.com/ask. You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service. See the ResultsPlus section below on how to get these details if you don't have them already.

ResultsPlus

Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

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

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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 raising achievement through innovation in education.

Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

January 2013

Publications Code US034630

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

Introduction

It was pleasing to see a good standard of responses from many candidates in this examination series. Indeed, many candidates wrote with understanding and insight about the key themes.

The paper requires candidates to answer two questions in 80 minutes. Examiners commented on the fact that many candidates had clearly used their time to very good effect in this series. Although some responses were quite brief, there was little evidence of candidates having insufficient time to answer both questions.

There was a wide range of responses across the mark range, but the paper appears to have worked in the sense that the most able were stretched whilst the less talented were still able to attempt answers to both parts of the examination.

In part A, most candidates were able to use the language of cross-referencing, but a significant number often matched statements that showed a comparison for agree or disagree and did not explain or draw out the inferences that are necessary to develop a cross-reference. In part B, it was again disappointing to note that a significant minority of candidates relied very heavily on the material in the sources, even when their understanding of this material was not thoroughly secure. Centres are reminded that candidates are expected to apply a reasonable range and depth of knowledge in answering the part B questions. Despite comments in previous examiners' reports, many candidates continue to comment on provenance in their responses to part B. Such comments are often 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." Such comments, even if well developed, generally do not contribute to AO2b, which is being tested in question B. Candidates 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 with the spelling of technical words, especially when those words form part of the question or are given in the sources. Some candidates over-used words such as 'inference' whilst not demonstrating clear understanding of the meaning. Overall, however, the language used by candidates seemed to contain fewer colloquialisms and abbreviations this year than in previous examinations.

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

Question 1 (a)

There were a number of effective answers to this question in which candidates demonstrated that they were able to cross-reference the arguments of the sources convincingly whilst considering aspects of the provenance in order to reach measured judgements. It was pleasing to note both that there were a number of candidates who picked up on more subtle points of challenge and support in the sources and also that fewer candidates are now taking a sequential approach in their answers.

Candidates found it very easy to select evidence to support the claim, although weaker candidates struggled with the counter-argument.

Candidates were often aware of the skills required, making reference, for example, to provenance and 'weight' and using the sources as 'a set'. Whilst these phrases were often used in responses, they were not always followed through. Weaker candidates were often still implicitly cross-referencing. They suggested that sources agree/disagree but often failed to give examples from the source to support their assertion. Few candidates explored the idea that the Chartists were waiting for reinforcements.

(a) When looking at Sources 1, 2 and 3 there is an unclear picture of the events during the Newport rising and subsequently no clear picture of any threat or lack of threat from the chartists, as Source 1 gives a divided picture of great potential threat whereas Source 2 implies there was no threat and source 3 implies there was a massive threat. So to see how far these sources agree whether there was a threat to authorities during the Newport rising each source needs to be analysed and cross examined.

Source 2, disagrees with the view that the chartist rising in Newport posed any significant threats to authorities, this is evident as it says that the numbers involved are only up to 300 men, whereas sources 1 and 3 put the number of rioters in the thousands, so this source implies the riot was not a large scale as proposed in the other sources. It says "they came peacefully and quietly" which implies that the chartists were not violent and

Therefore cannot pose any, let alone significant threat to the authorities. Also for a significant

(a) continued Threat to be caused the men would need arms, and source 2 indicates that of the 200-300 men only some had guns or sticks so even if 50 were armed it is not likely that this could pose a significant, threat to authorities. However the reliability of this source is in question due to the nature of it. The source is from the time so is a primary source of evidence, but Patten is at a trial of the chartists, inferences ~~in~~ the source led me to believe the authorities believed him to be a Chartist, which given his working class status living further north than London implies he could be. This means his account is subject to bias because if he is a Chartist then he will likely amend his account to protect his leader John Frost, and as the uprising has failed and he stands trial it is in his favour to play down the significance of the uprising and any threat it could have caused, overall although this is a firsthand account of the events there is obvious reason for bias which could explain the massive difference in the number of chartists involved compared with sources 1 and 3.

Source 3, agrees that the chartists posed a significant threat to the authorities. source 3, like source 1 puts the number of rioters during the uprising in the thousands, and also comments how they were expecting backup in the form of more divisions, so this number would

(a) continued Smaller than what transpired if the other divisions joined them. This source is much more obvious in its agreement that there was a significant threat as it says how nearly all of the several thousand men were armed which is an obvious threat if thousands of men are armed, especially with weapons such as guns, muskets and pikes. The phrase "any and everything that they could lay their hands on" is the most evident of the threat they posed as this gives the impression of not an organised protest like showed in source 2, but it gives the impression of a real riot, a real revolt where men took up any weapon of damage and attacked, the phrase indicates as to the ferocity of the riot and seems much more definite in its idea that this revolt did have a significant threat than source 2 disagrees there was any significant threat. Source 3 ~~states~~ when cross examined with source 1 does indicate significant threat to the authorities. Both sources agree the number of rioting chartists was in the thousands and that the chartists were armed, source 1 even says how soldiers were thought to have been killed which shows there had been significant threat. However, like source 2, the reliability of source 3 can be questioned. This source is not written at the

(a) continued time of the uprising, it is written 8 years later so it is still a primary source, but Brough would be writing from memory which decreases the reliability of the source. Also this source is taken from a book, so books are written for entertainment purposes so it is possible the extent of the threat from the Chartist is embellished to make for better reading and so the source becomes less reliable.

However source 2 proves the most influential, written at the time as a primary source and by a reporter who has no obvious means for bias plus his source is high reliability and overall this source shows the potential for a significant threat as there were thousands of rioters but, like most Chartist movements the potential failed and this is included as many Chartist rioters died and only one soldier wounded and this shows no significant threat so evidence the most reliable source 2 and source 2 combined show no that there was no significant threat to authorities.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Note that this candidate references the sources in the introduction. The response goes on to engage in some very effective cross-referencing with the sources being used as a group in clear relation to the focus of the question. Provenance is considered and, although not always successful, the candidate is trying to move beyond the generic. The combination of effective cross-referencing, some development of provenance and judgements made in relation to the question's focus, mean that this response reaches level 4.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

It is a good approach to reference the sources in the introduction as it means the focus is, quite rightly, on the sources from the outset.

Question 1 (b) (i)

This was significantly the more popular of the two questions set in this option. The best candidates were able to link detailed relevant knowledge with the source material e.g. commenting on the contents of the Chandos Clause in reference to Source 5's point on the county franchise. Such answers fully utilised the sources in order to identify support/challenge for the view in the question. Weaker responses made very little use of the sources, often merely quoting directly from them. Such answers tended to make general points about the terms of the 1832 Reform Act without linking them directly to the question. It is disappointing to note that a sizeable minority of candidates continue to discuss the provenance of the secondary sources, normally in very generic terms, which earns them no credit in this question. Time spent on this aspect could be well used to develop the line of argument and incorporate more supporting own knowledge.

B) Source 6 shows us quite clearly that the First Reform Act had done little but preserve the power of the landowning classes. It says that there was a great deal of nepotism in the Commons, that "205 persons who are immediately or remotely related to the Peers of the realm" held a seat there in 1837. Indeed it is estimated by historians that in the wake of the reform Act 85% of the Commons remained landowning aristocracy; partly because MPs did not earn a wage and the expenditure involved in becoming an MP in the first place. ~~This view is supported by~~ Though we may have some reservations over the reliability of the source; it was after all written by the staunchly egalitarian London Working men's Association with the sole intent of drumming up public awareness and support to change Parliament and so might be a little inclined to exaggerate; immediately one

(b) continued wonders just how "remote" those ~~relations~~ relations with the "Peers of the Realm" really were. However this view is supported by Source 5 which says "The 1832 Act reinforced the landed interests... The social composition was not greatly altered by the Reform Act" which

is true; the lack of electoral qualifications ~~£10~~ (property qualification) and increased penalties for owners of special or multiple houses meant there was still a massive sway in the electoral power, and consequently Commons & influence, of the ~~£~~ landed classes. Many of the changes were also regarded as "hollow conciliations", for ~~example~~ ^{example} the Chartist Clause which promised ~~electoral rights~~ ^{franchise rights} to some tenants, but really amounted to another vote ~~for~~ ^{for} the landowners choosing. Source 5 goes on to confirm that "By far the largest group in the House of Commons ... was drawn from the ~~land~~ landowning classes". The ~~power~~ power of the landowning classes was also strengthened by the arrival of 60 new peers in the House of Lords as the result of Whig and Conservative bickering. These 60 new Lords gave the elected members in the Commons free reign to act as they saw fit; most often in the favour of the landowning classes - for example the 1834 Poor Law which helped factory owners get free labour.

(b) continued The act also failed to stop corruption that was occurring in elections as Source 6 ~~is~~ says, "5 mps are returned by under 200 electors". Though there had been attempts to abolish "rotten boroughs" they were half hearted and ~~conscientious~~ ^{conscientious} and ~~an~~ ^{an} estimate of 56 of them still ~~returned~~ ^{electing} corrupt mps, often two per borough. But as Source 4 says, there were some changes for the better of the working classes that weakened the power of the landowners; "The reforms also hurt the aristocracy" ~~in this instance~~ most notably the increase

In legitimate voters from 0.5 million to over 1.5 million ~~but~~ led to an unprecedented rule of the Whig party ~~and~~ uncontested by ~~cons~~ conservatives for almost four decades. Although it was not a particularly liberal ~~&~~ party the Whigs did have radical elements ~~the~~ which the reform bill had given a voice in Parliament.

Source 5 supports this ~~also~~ attesting that "there were lawyers, merchants and manufacturers in Parliament after 1832" and Source 6 tells us that at least "331 mps" are voted by "151,492" electors somewhat legitimately. The efforts of the reform bill did succeed in closing ~~to~~ over so rotten and corrupt boroughs and did help to reduce some corruption.

I think that predominantly yes, the 1832 reform act did preserve rather than weaken the power of the land owning classes, but it did also set

(b) continued the ~~process~~ precedent for further reform that ultimately led to the Parliamentary democracy we have today, not to mention gave confidence to generations of political activists and ~~to~~ protesters against the land owning classes.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a standard level 3 response to both assessment objectives. The sources are used to construct an argument, which is valid, although perhaps not as fully developed as it could be. There is evidence of some supporting own knowledge, although it could be more extensively used. Nonetheless, the candidate does reach some reasoned conclusions.

Question 1 (b) (ii)

This question was not attempted by many candidates. Stronger responses linked arguments derived from sources to help them make their judgements. Such responses integrated the sources and own knowledge throughout, showing a good level of analysis in their treatment of the factors. Using Source 9, stronger responses were able to discuss the role of Chamberlain and were likely to note and develop the point that the Birmingham organisation was set up prior to the 1867 Reform Act. Such responses were also able to develop alternative theories for change such as the Secret Ballot Act and the Corrupt Practices Act on the basis of their own knowledge. Although a number of answers focused on parliamentary and electoral legislation rather than detailed changes to the organisation of the main parties, the motives for change were acknowledged by most candidates. Weaker responses often demonstrated insufficient relevant own knowledge to address the issues effectively and also often struggled to fully make use of Source 9. It is disappointing to note that a sizeable minority of candidates continue to discuss the provenance of the secondary sources, normally in very generic terms, which earns them no credit in this question. Time spent on this aspect could be well used to develop the line of argument and incorporate a greater range of supporting own knowledge.

*(b) (ii)

I believe that the improved organisation of political parties was not mainly due to the 1867 Reform act, as the 1872 secret ballot act, the 1883 Corruption and Illegal practices prevention act & the passing of the 3rd reform acts in 1884 & 1885 respectively helped political parties to realise that party organisation had to take principle over political force. While the 1867 reform act had a notable effect on the electorate, I believe that many parties waited until 1885 to realise the sudden change in the British parliamentary system.

In source 7 Paul Adelman described the pre 1867 party organisation as "primitive, makeshift and erratic" during his works. Source 8 similarly describes how the 1865 Birmingham Liberal association was ahead of its time, and finally source 9 states how the conservative parties view on change, was a hinderance to them. Interestingly J.A. Gorst, who wrote source 9 was a conservative party

organiser, and was one of the few conservatives to recognise the need for change.

The 1867 reform act, posed many changes, but most notably to the electorate, where the male

(b) continued vote changed from $\frac{1}{5}$ males to $\frac{1}{3}$. This meant that for the first time, the working class dominated the borough electorate. This would mean that the conservative party would have trouble gaining seats in boroughs, however Disraeli, who passed the 1867 Bill, was a conservative by nature and so his policy of minimal distribution was a factor. This meant that although the working class dominated in the boroughs, they would have little effect in the national elections. Source 7 however, disagrees with this and states that the reform bill was "decisive" due to parties having to win votes of a working class electorate, however in hindsight we can see that minimal distribution eliminated the new found dilemma.

~~After~~ The problem of minimal distribution was finally solved when the 3rd reform acts were passed, split into the 1884 Franchise act & the 1885 redistribution of seats act. The 1885 act freed 142 seats across the U.K, to be spread evenly. This reduced the power of the aristocracy ~~as~~ in government, as the conservatives in particular could not rely on the landed interests ~~which~~ as they had

(b) continued done for previous elections. Instead, party organisation would have to take principle over political force. ~~The~~ Source 9, written by former conservative, John Gorst agrees with this view in his publication during 1882.

We notice from the description that Gorst resigned from the conservatives in ~~1877~~ 1877, maybe because he was frustrated that his political tactics were being ignored. ~~But~~ The 1880 general election is highlighted as a ~~key~~ ~~use~~ turning point for the conservatives, maybe Gorst wanted to form a conservative political union, much like the Liberal association in Birmingham which is described in source 8. Source 8 was however published in 1992, and therefore with hindsight. ~~It~~ does not shy from the fact that both Gorst & ~~the~~ ~~Joseph~~ ~~Chamberlain~~ the Birmingham Liberal association were both ahead of their time, and how the 1867 ~~the~~ reform act had a profound effect, however it was not realised or highlighted until the passing of other acts right up until 1885.

The 1883 Corruption and illegal practices prevention act opened up party politics to the electorate, mainly reducing electoral expenses.

(b) continued This act, which followed the 1872 Secret Ballot Act had undoubtedly long term effect on the British parliamentary system. A secret ballot had been one of the Chartists demands, and indeed been at the centre of government debate for years. The exact effects of the ballot cannot be known, as it remains secret, however it is known that the agricultural workers still had their fears about their landowners. Previously, landowners used the public poll book to pinpoint their tenants, and manipulate, intimidate or bribe them accordingly. This fear still remained and electoral expenses due to the increase in bribery, rocketed. People could vote in secret, however were still fearful & open to bribery as often vast banquets, transport and lodging were often paid in the faith that the voter would pick the candidate of choice. The 1883 Corruption & Illegal Practices Prevention Act combated this problem. Electoral expenses fell by $\frac{3}{4}$ in the forthcoming 1885 election as there was now a limit on the amount of money that could be spent. This meant that relatively poorer men could afford to become MPs, as they did not rely on bribery as a

(b) continued necessity. A negative of this 1883 act is that it was only active during elections, meaning that bribery still occurred outside of election dates.

~~It is a~~ notice

We notice that in source 9, John Gorst resigns in 1877, this could imply that the 1872 ballot act had a profound effect on party organisation, and indeed Gorst's decision to resign. In source 8 we notice that the 1865 Birmingham Liberal association was deemed "remarkably successful" as it was founded before the 1872 ballot act. In conclusion the 1867 Reform act's effect should not be underestimated however the main reason why political parties realised the need to change their policies after 1885, was mainly due to the 1872 ballot act. Even with other acts in place, the feeling of being free from intimidation ~~and the fact that~~ proved profound ~~that~~ as it had long term effects on the organisation of parties.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Although this response is sometimes too descriptive, there are some attempts to make links to the question. These links are sufficient in AO1 to lift the answer to a low level 3. However, the sources are not being used to drive the argument; they are occasionally quoted, but there follows very little development. For this reason, AO2 is rewarded at level 2.

Question 2 (a)

There were a number of effective answers to this question in which candidates demonstrated their ability to cross-reference the arguments of the sources convincingly whilst considering aspects of the provenance in order to reach measured judgements. It was pleasing to note that there were fewer candidates taking a sequential approach in their answers. In stronger responses, candidates were able to see the original concern in source 11 about the Poor Law and link that to Source 12's criticism. This distinguished such answers as many candidates tended to combine Sources 10 and 11 in opposition to Source 12 and not to go beyond this comparison. Strong answers also often made effective references to the provenance of the sources which was integrated within the body of the argument, although weaker answers often only referenced the dates of the sources and frequently presented this information as a stand-alone paragraph at the end. There were some responses which took this as an opportunity to display their own knowledge of the Poor Law, but this cannot be credited in this question.

(a) Sources 10, 11 and 12 all agree, to some extent, that the new Poor Law benefited the poor. Source 12 however mainly believes that the new Poor Law was too harsh "upon the deserving poor". Whereas, sources 10 and 11 both agree that the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act had "great benefits".

All 3 sources discuss elements of the new Poor Law that have been successful. Sources 10 and 11 discuss how many paupers have "changed" from idleness and waste, as source 10 states. They both talk about the better provision for the poor. Source 12 differs from these two sources in that it talks of the workhouse as the "dreaded Bastille". Even though the purpose of this source is to show the unjust nature of the new Poor Law and the workhouse, it still shows success of the new Poor Law. As the aim of the workhouse was to act as a deterrent to the idle, under the 'principle of less eligibility', in which the conditions inside would be worse than that of a person outside the workhouse on a lower wage.

This leniently encouraged ~~poor~~ able-bodied paupers to go and find work; reducing the amount of paupers,

(a) continued thus reducing the poor rates. Therefore source 12 agrees with source 10 in that the New Poor Law was a "great benefit" to the "rate payers". However, the fact that Richard Costler was described the workhouse as a 'Bastille' shows that the workhouse criminalised poverty, ~~also~~ therefore was not a benefit to the poor. A Bastille is a French prison full of people who did not necessarily deserve to be there. So source ~~12~~¹² disagrees here with sources 10 and 11.

It is difficult to compare source ~~12~~¹² with sources 10 and 11, since the purpose of them are so different, however the fact that they are primary sources (all written around the time of the New Poor Law) helps.

Source ~~12~~¹² is written by Richard Costler, the leader of the anti-Poor Law association, therefore this source aims to show the New Poor Law in a negative light. It also isn't very typical, since workhouses such as Kent and Chelsea were very lenient and they most definitely didn't treat the paupers as inmates. Whereas, sources 10 and 11 ~~are~~ are taken from Poor Law Guardians so they would want to look as if they were doing a good job, especially source 10 as that is a letter to the Poor Law Commission. Sources 10 and 11 work together to create a sense of typicality of the New Poor Law benefiting the poor, making them more reliable. Source 12 is the only source that is unlike source

(a) continued 12 which is unreliable as it aims to show the New Poor Law as a detriment.

Sources 10 and 11 strongly agree that there is better provision for "the aged and infirm" (source 10) "than they were under the old system" (source 11). So they both agree that the relief is more ~~beneficial~~ beneficial to the pauper, as it is generally in the form of indoor relief, since outdoor relief was strongly discouraged. Outdoor relief was seen as increasing poverty and immorality, therefore the New Poor Law tried to prohibit it. This is why all 3 sources focus upon the workhouse and indoor relief. Source 10 backs this up by talking of a "great moral improvement." It is a benefit to the pauper that the aged and infirm have better provision since they it was not their fault that they were poor, therefore shouldn't be punished. Source 12 agrees with the view that it is unfair for such moral people to be punished. However, source 12 exemplified the way in which moral people were treated, the system "trampled upon the deserving poor." So the honest poor were punished through being in the workhouse, this was no benefit to them. Oastler gives an example of this through William Dodd, who "had not been idle, dissolute or disorderly", yet is being punished in the workhouse. The harshness of indoor relief described by source

(a) continued 12 contrast with sources 10 and 11.

To conclude, after looking at all 3 sources collectively, sources 10 and 11 both agree that the New Poor Law benefited the poor, whereas source 12 mainly disagrees on this point. However, source 10 talks of a benefit for the ratepayers; the lowering of rates doesn't benefit the poor. However, both sources discuss how ~~but~~^{there} is more relief available and it is more moral. Source 12 agrees with these 2 sources on the relative success of the New Poor Law (being a detriment), however source 12 is in complete disagreement on the 1834 New Poor Law's benefit to the poor.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This answer just reaches level 4. There is sustained cross-referencing in relation to the question's focus all the way through. There is some reference to provenance and some evidence of judgements being made, but more would be needed to move this response to the higher end of the range.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Note the introduction: it is a useful strategy for candidates to survey the way in which the sources work together as it demonstrates understanding of the sources as a group.

Question 2 (b) (i)

This was the slightly more popular of the two questions in this section. Many candidates showed a very sound knowledge of the impact of cholera and showed evidence for this with support from all three sources. However, some candidates were less successful at providing knowledge to support a counter-argument. The best answers referenced reports, medical knowledge and the work of Chadwick. They made links to both Sources 14 and 15. Weaker responses tended to engage in description and to stray from the focus of the question. Such answers often used the sources for information as opposed to arguing from them. It is very important that candidates read the question carefully. Many candidates who attempted this question wrote extensively and in a well-informed way about developments after 1848 but could not be credited for this. It is disappointing to note that a sizeable minority of candidates continue to discuss the provenance of the secondary sources, normally in very generic terms, which earns no credit in this question. Time spent on this aspect could be well used to develop the line of argument and incorporate a greater breadth of supporting own knowledge.

(b) There were several factors pushing the ^{public} government towards health ~~reform~~ reform in 1830-48. A very important factor is the cholera epidemics which occurred in 1831-2 and 1848-9. These epidemics undoubtedly shocked the nation as source 14 agrees it was a 'frightening intrusion'. Without this outbreak of such a nasty disease then the public would most probably remained unconcerned as their focus would have been primarily on the financial issues of the poor at that time. However not only was it cholera which drove public health reform, but also the work of individuals which source 14 briefly considers as it says 'what was needed was a 'clear demonstration between dirt and disease'. However on the other hand the fear of cholera seems slightly over-estimated as a factor, as after the first epidemic, killing 31,000 people, the 'public mind once more sank into apathy on the public health issue'.
To begin I shall illustrate how the outbreaks of cholera did drive the country to reform. Firstly in early 1832 there were 'cholera phobias' riots through towns, this forced the government to send two commissioners

to assess the situation. Source 13 recognises this as it says it 'created a crisis atmosphere in the country', showing how ~~without~~ without cholera these uprisings would not have occurred. As a result of these cholera riots, the ~~par~~ ^{(b) continued} parary board of public health was set up which created the foundations for public health reform in later years. Another factor which shocked the nation was the rate in which cholera spread. Other diseases such as tuberculosis, whooping cough and typhus did not have this effect. Sources 13 and 14 demonstrate how cholera 'struck down thousands' and was a 'shock disease'. Without a disease which 'killed fifty million people' then surely the public would have overlooked issues such as illness as it would be a norm. However the mere fact that cholera was not like any other disease spurred on reform, and like Source 13 says, it 'got attention from everyone' ~~these~~ sources 13 and 14 provide a sound argument in favour of the impact of cholera as they are modern sources. This means that they will have been carefully analysed by experts in the field showing the reality of the situation. However within Source 14 a counter-argument may arise to the importance of cholera. It says the 'public mind'... 'sank into apathy', this is very true as after the ~~the~~ 1831-2 epidemic subsided, many of the local boards of health disbanded and lost interest, despite the powers the ~~the~~ reforms such as the 1832 'Cholera Acts' gave them so rather than shocking the nation to reform, it was only an immediate response which is ~~is~~ not a substantial factor when considering what drove

(b) continued public health reforms. Furthermore we may question the actual impact cholera had upon the people. It was known that the causes of cholera was through 'miasmas' or 'contagionist theory', so rather than cholera pushing them into reform, it drove them away from it as the public already had preconceptions of what to do to avoid the disease. Source 14 acknowledges this as it says 'something' was needed to concentrate the evidence' so to make people want to reform, their focus must be turned away from white washing and leaches, but towards public health.

So rather than cholera pushing forward the drive for reform, we should look to individuals such as Chadwick. Chadwick clearly showed the link between dirt and disease. Source 14 recognises how the 'medical profession' identified the problem and generated interest. Chadwick largely generated interest through his 1844 health of towns association which was a strong form of propaganda in favour of public health. Furthermore he did a report in 1839 which was published in 1842 by himself showing his pioneering tactics. Source 15 agrees with the work of medics in pushing forward reform as the source comes from a district surgeon who recognises the link between the 'disease has

(b) continued prevailed in those parts of town' referring to those of close confinement. It was also the government themselves who pushed forward reform in the form of the Royal Commission as their results matched what Chadwick found.

Arguably rather than cholera being the ~~impetus~~ motivation for reform, it was typhus which actually drove Chadwick into demonstrating the link between dirt and disease in 1837.

As a conclusion I believe that rather than cholera driving public reform, it was that of individuals and a collection of medical reports and diseases. Yet cholera did have an impact, the ~~at~~ medical knowledge was simply not advanced enough to prove anything.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response contains an argument and counter-argument which are clearly developed from the sources and supported by some relevant own knowledge which comes from within the period. This answer is high in level 3 for AO1 and AO2. No credit has been given the AO2 for the discussion of the provenance of the secondary sources – this question tests AO2b, not AO2a.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

It is very important that candidates read the question carefully and address the focus of the question in their response.

Question 2 (b) (ii)

This was the slightly less popular of the two questions in this section.

It gave candidates the opportunity to discuss the role of government, from permissive to compulsory, based on their own knowledge of the details of legislation in this period. Stronger candidates were able to demonstrate a more secure understanding of this in their answers. The role of central government was frequently weighed against the influence and relative merits of key individuals such as Snow, Simon, Bazalgette and even Chadwick at the start of the period and most candidates developed this point; weaker responses tended to be more descriptive. Stronger answers were often able to identify that Source 18 implied that local government had a more important role in improvement than did central government. This was often linked to a discussion of the development of democracy (such as the 1867 Reform Act) as a pressure for reform. It is disappointing to note that a sizeable minority of candidates continue to discuss the provenance of the secondary sources, normally in very generic terms, which earns no credit in this question. Time spent on this aspect could be well used to develop the line of argument and incorporate a greater breadth of supporting own knowledge.

* (b) Sources 16, 17 and 18 all agree, to some extent, that it was the intervention of the central government that was the main reason for improvements in public health between 1848 and 1875. Source 16 and 17 mainly agree that "without effective powers" and intervention public health provision was hopeless, whereas source 18 believes "a strong and able Town Council" was as good as Parliament in enforcing public health measures. However, through my own knowledge I know that other factors seriously contributed to a vast improvement in public health, such as: the change in vested interests of the government, the breakthrough in medical knowledge, the Reform Act of 1867 and the cholera epidemics. All these factors are inextricably linked and they all accumulated to create the right conditions for the 1875 Public Health Act. All 3 sources agree that intervention of the government and town councils was necessary. Sources 16 and 17 mainly agree that without an element of "compulsion" nothing really could be done. Source 16 talks about

fighting "through the tangle of local ~~and~~ legislation."
The example of London in 1848 having 250
administrative bodies with 300 acts dictating near
public health, such administrative nightmares made
it impossible for a universal public health act.

(b) continued source 18 disagrees with sources 16 and 17
in that it discusses the success of a "strong and
able town council". This suggests that government
intervention wasn't needed and that it was our
faults. ~~How~~ My own knowledge can solidify
source 18's argument through the example of the
1795 Manchester Board of Health, founded by John
Ferriar and Thomas Ferriar. Also Leeds City
Council led the way in local boards of health and
medical advice.

It was the lack of medical knowledge not saw the
failure of such acts as the 1848 Public Health Act
and the 1858 Local Government Act. ~~At source 16~~

At source 16 says, however, the 1858 Public Health
Act demonstrated that "the government was prepared
to do something." This could be due to the ^{cholera}
epidemics of that century, the worst being in 1868-9
where 62,000 people died. Cholera affected all classes,
therefore the middle class had an interest in public
health provision. This meant that the government had
to have an interest, since the Great Reform Act of
1832 had given the middle class the vote. However,
after these epidemics the middle class lost interest in
public health and it didn't concern them anymore.

So the vested interests of the central government meant that no measure would be put in place since this

(b) continued would seriously increase the risk, upsetting the rate payer (the middle class) voting their votes. The fact that no one knew what caused disease until 1861 meant that many laid little faith in public health. Pasteur's Germ Theory led in a way to the 1866 Sanitary Act in which was the first element of compulsion. As source 17 discusses John Simon was seen as a hero of public health, he was a popular man who compared to Edwin Chadwick was loved by the nation.

Source 17 talks about how Simon had to do Parliament's job for them in terms of public health and it says "without effective power" the task had very hard indeed. Simon's annual report in 1865 stated that without government intervention he feared cholera epidemics would carry on. Many became desperate to stop cholera, it created an unstable society, so Parliament had to act, to an extent. The example of John Simon gives proof that a popular, educated man was necessary and he later shows how the unpopularity of Edwin Chadwick led to the failure of the General Board of Health from 1865-1868. The 60's was a lucky time for Simon however. It was the time of the last cholera epidemic; 1866-7 in which 16,000 people died. This was seen as the last straw, and the population was now very willing for public health

(b) continued provision. Louis Pasteur's Germ Theory was published in 1861, so now that it was known that germs caused disease (not miasma), there was a greater willingness for reform.

As well as all these things the 1867 Reform Act which gave working class men in towns above a certain age the vote, seriously changed the vested interests of the central government. In order to stay in power they now need to improve the welfare of the working class. Source 16 agrees by saying now; "the state was, from this point on, directing public health reform." This was crucial and it led to the end of "miscellaneous Acts", as ~~source~~ Spoke about in source 17. The 1871 Local Government Board was set up which brought poverty and public health provision under one roof. This led to the mandatory, compulsory 1872 and 1875 public health Act, which ensured that every part of the country had a board of health and a medical officer.

Another event that led Parliament to Act was the Great Stink of 1858, this showed the MP's how bad public health really was. ~~As~~ Source 18 can be disagreed with since it says not what the Town Councils were doing was enough, but it is proven to not be true ~~of~~. So here source 16 and 17 are right in that the central government was needed to step in

(b) continued and end the series of permissive, optional acts. The Great Stink led the government to give Joseph Bazalgette the chief sanitary engineer £30,000 to create a London sewer system. Source 18 alludes to the vested interests of the water companies such as the East London Waterworks Company in that they ~~wanted~~ ^{needed} at the "lowest possible rates" to make a profit. This was why the government was so reluctant to give Bazalgette the money up until then since the waterworks company was a big political supporter, so they didn't want to lose their backing.

Source 17 agrees with source 18 to a extent in that source 17 says; "by 1869 the extension of authorities was suspicious", so even with government intervention (and it's moving away from laissez-faire), the state of public health still wasn't good enough. Source 18 delivers maybe the ideas of the Town Councils were enough, since no domestic needs would be ignored. This can be solidified by the report of the Royal Commission in 1869 which said the condition of Britain was still very bad. Reports such as these in writing facts and figures were now more believed due to the work of the leading statistician William Farr.

After looking at all 3 sources collectively and

(b) continued through using my own knowledge, I have come to the conclusion that yes the intervention of the central government between 1848 and 1878 in public health matters was crucial, however an accumulation of all factors led for the right conditions for this to happen. Sources 16 and 17 definitely agree that the end of laissez-faire was needed and through my own knowledge I agree with this view and disagreed with the view of source 18 that the work of Town Councils was sufficient enough. It was ultimately the Reform Act of 1867 that led to the change in the government's vested interests, thus leading to the Compulsory Public Health Act of 1872 (Gladstone) and 1875 (Disraeli). This ~~was~~ ^{led to} the success of public health, showing that compulsion was necessary, as John Simon had said all along.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a high scoring level 4 script in both assessment objectives. It uses the sources to drive an argument in which judgements are developed and sustained throughout and supporting own knowledge is detailed and specific.

Paper Summary

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

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 often resorted to a brief summary of each source in turn. Such responses cannot go beyond level 2.
3. Provenance should be integrated within the argument, rather than treated as a stand-alone paragraph. This aids its use as part of the argument. Candidates should avoid making sweeping assertions from the provenance that could apply to any source.
4. The best responses cross-reference not only the content of the sources but also their provenance. This enables candidates to evaluate the sources and make supported judgements.

Part B

1. Candidates need to ensure that their subject knowledge conforms to the specification. Some weaker responses relied too 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, not a descriptive or chronological account.
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 required in meeting this assessment objective. Some candidates made generalised comments relating to the reliability of a particular historian at the expense of developing argument and analysis supported by specific own knowledge.
4. Candidates need to ensure that where the question asks them to deal with a specific time period they do not stray beyond those parameters.

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>

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code US034630 January 2013

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

