

Examiners' Report
June 2013

GCE History 6HI02 B

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk.

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



Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

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

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2013

Publications Code US036142

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

Introduction

Examiners reported that the majority of candidates understood the essential requirements of the Unit 2 examination. Many were able to structure their work effectively, addressing the specific focus of both the Part A and Part B questions and writing with understanding and insight about the key themes.

At the highest levels of attainment, there was impressive work.

However, it is disappointing to note that there were a minority of candidates seen in this exam series who performed poorly, both in terms of their skills set and their knowledge base.

In Part A, many candidates were able to use the language of cross referencing, but a significant number often matched statements that showed a comparison for agreement or disagreement and did not explain or draw out the inferences that are necessary to develop a cross reference. There seemed to be an increase this series in the number of candidates who worked through the sources sequentially; this makes it very hard for candidates to cross reference effectively and move beyond level 2. There also appeared to be an increase in the number of candidates who were using their own knowledge to develop points raised in the content of the sources in this question in this exam series. There is no credit for this in Part A and thus, such candidates waste time that would be better spent developing those aspects of the answer that do gain credit – cross referencing, a consideration of provenance linked to the arguments and judgements.

In Part B, it was again disappointing to note that a minority of candidates relied very heavily on the material in the sources, which was not always securely understood. In a small number of cases, there was no evidence of any own knowledge at all being used. Candidates are expected to have some range and depth of knowledge that can be applied to the Part B questions. There also appeared to be an increase in the number of responses seen this year where candidates used their own knowledge to create the line of argument and made only passing reference to the sources. The best answers made use of both elements, using the sources to shape the argument and own knowledge to develop the points raised. Despite comments in previous examiners' reports, even more candidates appeared to comment on provenance in their responses to Part B in this exam series. Such comments are often very generic – the historian can be trusted because they have the benefit of hindsight (or they cannot be trusted because they were not an eye witness to the event). In any event, such comments, even if well developed, generally do not contribute to AO2b, which is what is being tested in Part B. 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 that they can spell technical words correctly, especially when those words form part of the question or the sources. The usage of 'bias' seems to have increased again this year and brings with it all the variant misspellings – biast and biasicity to name but two. Where candidates have a few minutes left at the end of the exam, they would be well advised to check their work – there seemed to be an increase in misnumbering of sources and misquoting of dates (e.g. 1956 instead of 1856) which might well be identified if the script was proof read at the end.

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

Question 1

Question 1 (a)

This question worked well and the sources presented few difficulties for candidates, although few responses were seen where candidates actually engaged with what a revolution meant. Generally candidates assumed that the use of violence was revolutionary. Candidates found the sources accessible and it is pleasing to note that there were relatively fewer examples of a source by source approach seen. Many candidates attempted to engage in some level of comparison and cross referencing, even where it was not fully developed.

Some answers tended to take the sources at face value or to only pick out what a general reading revealed. This limited the development of cross referencing and so limited the level that could be awarded.

The best responses not only cross referenced effectively, but also examined the provenance of each source with confidence and insight. Candidates do need to read both the sources and the provenance carefully; for example, a number of answers were seen where candidates misattributed Source 2 as being written by the Duke of Wellington rather than sent to him.

(a) Source 3, an extract from a non-biased publication "The Annual Register" from the year 1831, is the most explicit in providing evidence suggesting that Britain was close to a revolution by stating that "permanent association" had been formed in several "different parts of the country" that aimed to "put for political change" by "any means" by perhaps "violence" and by using language of "abuse and intimidation" to show that they were prepared to exert "by force" the "possession of power" from the government's hands. At face value, therefore Source 3 is ^{suggesting} ~~clearly~~ ^{in the years 1831-1832} that Britain was indeed close to a revolution at the hands of "Political Unions" who "pretended to be supporting the government" but in actual fact were prepared to use violence to achieve their aims. Similarly, source 1, a speech made by, the

Tory MP, John Wilson Croker to the House of Commons on December 1831, seems to suggest like Source 2 that Britain was indeed close to a revolution in the years 1831-1832 by ~~very~~ explaining how various attacks on ~~other~~ authorities were being made by protesters around the country. In Derby, Croker claims

((a) continued) "an attack was made on the goal" whilst in Nottingham "a mob collected" which "proceeded" to "burn the castle" in "broad daylight" in an arrogant fashion in the "presence of magistrates" and troops who remained "motionless" to the rioting occurring. Just like with Source 3 therefore, Source 1 is also suggesting that Britain was close to a revolution in the years 1831-1832 by providing evidence of how various violent attacks were occurring around the Britain.

In stark contrast to the ~~view~~ ^{evidence provided} ~~not~~ ^{presented} by Sources 1 and 3, Source 2, ~~appears to~~ ^{a letter to Duke} ~~show~~ ^{of Wellington} by Reverend B. L. Freer on the 7th May 1832, appears to show that Britain were far from close to a revolution through Freer's attempt to "assure" the Duke of Wellington that a meeting ^{of the} Political Unions at ~~the~~ Birmingham, ^{an example of} ~~the~~ ^{the} violent organisations described by Source 3, was far from 200,000 members as claimed but in actual fact were hardly more than a "quarter of that number" and that a "gentleman" present counted the assembly as "never" exceeding 30,000 members. Source 2, therefore can be seen to suggest that ~~Britain~~ ^{Britain} wasn't on the cusp of a revolution by stating that large industrial towns like Bri "Birmingham" were

((a) continued) far from "radical" and that the majority of respectable people ~~present~~ in ^{cities} like Birmingham were "decidedly against change" and would therefore have no cause to start a revolution.

By inference, source 1 and 3, when read closely, appear to provide evidence suggesting that although there were violent outbreaks or a revolution was unlikely to occur. Firstly, the mob that the House of Commons were told had collected in Nottingham (source 2) had informed the authorities "some how" before "of their intentions" and most additionally the fact that the "Political unions" were "prepared" but hadn't actually partaken in any real violence (source 3) and that they had used "language of abuse and intimidation" suggests that it is likely that the Political unions being accused of violence weren't were just making baseless threats in the hope that the government would pay heed attention to their cause. By inference, & source 1, 2 and 3 are ~~rather~~ suggesting that although there were some groups that performed middle middle acts of vandalism ^{to} ~~and~~ ^{large pressure groups} that may have shown Britain to be close to a revolution in 1831-32 they were in actual fact ~~error~~ in the majority acts of intimidation to gain attention.

(a) continued) The reason for the discrepancies between the sources is due to their authors, provenance and audience.

Source 1, is a speech made by a Tory MP who would have been opposed to any political reform whatsoever and is likely to have been attempting to convince this fellow MPs of the danger radical "mobs" faced by illustrating violent acts that ~~occurred~~ ^{occurred and} that these groups should be prevented from having any voice. ^{although} Source 1 is ~~therefore~~ biased and unreliable because it provides evidence of how many people believed a revolution was close to happening in Britain.

Source 2, a letter to the Duke of Wellington is also biased because ~~was~~ ^{was} the Duke of Wellington desired to become Prime Minister and he would have been unlikely to have done so if there was a violent revolution was to occur. One of his supporters therefore were attempting to "assure" him that the only pressure he would receive would be from small political unions of ^{off} filled with "gentlemen" and "respectable" people. It is therefore biased as it shows it likely to have been playing down the violence that may have ~~been~~ ^{been} occurring during his time period that may have suggested that a revolution could have been occurring. Lastly, source 3 must be viewed with

((a) continued) ~~been~~ suspicious because it is from an unbiased political account of 1831 and it is unlikely to have been exaggerated ~~even~~ exaggerating any facts.

In conclusion, Source 1, 2 and 3 when taken as a set to some extent don't support that Britain was close to a revolution because the "majority of respectable persons" were probably against change" and that ~~they~~ ^{groups} were "only prepared to use violence" however, the view taken by Source 2 is extremely biased ~~and~~ ~~there~~ ~~is~~ ~~no~~ despite the fact that the Britain wasn't close to a revolution it was very violent events were occurring.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The strength of this answer is that once it begins to cross reference, it sustains this through the response, making judgements about the issues as it progresses. It also engages in a clear consideration of the impact of provenance although this is dealt with in a stand-alone section of the response. Nonetheless, overall, the cross referencing and judgement evident enable this answer to achieve a sound Level 4.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Answers generally benefit from integrating the provenance with the argument rather than treating it separately.

Question 1 (b) (i)

The vast majority of candidates attempted this question.

Some candidates often tended to follow the sources in sequence and develop a line of argument which followed this route. Some candidates displayed very limited own knowledge of this mainstream topic in support of the arguments that were raised in the sources. A significant number of candidates accepted the comments made by Lovett about O'Connor in Source 4 at face value and did not consider what such comments revealed about the nature of Chartist leadership overall. Very few candidates considered any leaders beyond O'Connor or Lovett. The best answers were able to integrate the various lines of argument that were raised by the sources with relevant own knowledge, which often looked at the nature of the role of the state in the 1830s, exemplified for example, by the actions of Napier. Such answers generally considered the interaction of the different factors and offered an overall judgement.

It was disappointing to note that many candidates were still making generic points regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b.

* (b) The Chartists were a national political pressure group who emerged into British politics in the years 1837 - 1840. They rallied around the 'six points of the People's Charter' which called for a universal suffrage, an annual parliament, an MP to be given a salary, equal constituencies and a secret ballot. I disagree with the view that the main reason why the Chartists failed ^{to achieve their} was due ^{to the 6 points of the People's Charter} to solely its weak leadership because the division of the movement, the lack of support from the middle class and the strength of the state all played important roles in the overall failure of Chartism.

Source 4, in ~~the most~~ ^{is} a letter written by William Lovett to ~~two~~ ^a member of his 'National Charter Association' is the most explicit in indeed showing the main reason for

Chartism's failure was down to its weak leadership. Lovett states that he regarded O'Connor, the main leader of the Chartist movement, as a blight of democracy from his first moment as the "spokesman" of the Chartist movement and that his "selfishness and vanity" placed a feeling

((b) continued) of "hate, intolerance and brute" into the hearts of Reformers. Source 4, D. Mervin suggesting that the main reason for the Chartist failure was its weak leadership in the form of O'Connor who Lovett believed caused "irreparable harm" to the Chartist movement. O'Connor indeed made several mistakes as leader of Chart the Chartists such as be overwhelmed with the Plug Riots ^{and} failing to take advantage of it and by accepting the Government's request to ~~del~~ deliver the Petition to Parliament alone. However, he wasn't a complete failure as a leader as he made important decisions such as calling off the "sacred month", a month of riots, which ~~may~~ would have been ineffective due to the Trade Depression Britain was facing. Additionally, ^{and} Lovett and O'Connor were ~~at~~ ^{as} ~~poor~~ ^{poor} fierce rivals due to their differing of beliefs of how to achieve Chartist aims and this ~~brood~~ ^{breed} bias and hatred of Lovett against O'Connor is evident by the tone used by Lovett in

The source: "I will have nothing to do with O'Connor" and "I regard... O'Connor" as selfish and vain" and suggests that although O'Connor did have many failings as leader of the Chartist

((b) continued) movement and may have helped it to fail. The source is extremely biased and must be viewed with caution.

In ^{sharp} contrast, with the view taken by Lovett in source 4 and the evidence it provided ^{that} O'Connor was an appalling person and leader, source 5, an extract from the historian John Charlton's book 'The Chartists' published in 1997 seems to suggest that the main reason for the Chartist movement's failure was in fact the "carefully organised state-repression in 1841" which was effective in "distracting Chartist activity" by the vast number of arrests, prosecution and ^{and} imprisonment that "took leadership out of the struggle" for reform. It is indeed the case that the power that the state possessed was crucial to the Chartist failure. The government had ^{gained} experience with hostile handling riots and knew that ^{imprison} imprisonment sentences should be kept short to prevent martyrs being created. Both O'Connor and Lovett, ^{the two most} "eminent leaders" of the Chartist movement were imprisoned for their activities and thus the threat of imprisonment was a deterrence to many Chartist leaders, which

(b) continued) perhaps ^{by inference} supports source 4 by saying that leaders were weak in the fact that they feared being imprisoned so were reluctant to act to full movement full potential thus showing how the state repression "demoralised the ~~was~~ the movement" "movement's... (weak) leadership". In addition to the risk of imprisonment, the state possessed a ^{for greater} ~~large~~ number of physical force and were able to send "Major General Charles Napier and 6000 men to northern England to repress violent ~~and~~ outbreaks and were able to "crush" ~~the~~ ^{any} Chartists activity violence. Just as for the Kensington Inn ~~placard~~ which the authorities ^{were} ~~eventually~~ successful in preventing a violent mob. ~~And~~ As can be seen, source 5, which is from ^{the} ~~an~~ non-biased ^{and reputable} historian John Charlton and is therefore an extremely reliable source, shows how the organised and well co-ordinated state power was in addition to weak leadership a reason as to why the Chartist movement failed.

In further contrast to the view put by source 4 that the failure of the Chartist movement was solely down to its weak leadership, source 6 another source from ^{a reputable and non-stated} ~~the~~ historian Edward Royle's book Chartism explains how the failure of the

((b) continued) Chartist movement to implement any political solutions and that ^{how} its support was mainly due to poor social and economic conditions ~~but~~ ^{because} once ~~social~~ improved upon ~~decreased~~ the support of Chartism decreased leading to it ultimately being failing. However, source 6, by inference also shows another reason for Chartism failure being its weak leadership by stating that the "Chartist leaders were unable to implement (any) of their political solutions" and that once they were shown to be impotent the movement began to fail.

Further reason as to why the Chartist movement failed which aren't alluded to in source 4, 5, 6 include the violence used by some members of the Chartist movement which undermined its cause by alienating the government and reducing the middle-class support and thus taking away its main source of funding. Additionally, the chartists activities were usually poorly co-ordinated and the fact that they were spread out across the country meant that any individual outbreaks could easily be picked off one-by-one by the government's forces ^{where} especially when they had access to ^{the} ~~ready~~ ^{intelligence} ~~armed~~ ^{networks}.

((b) continued) expanding railway service. ~~Lastly~~ Additionally, the movement was split between those who believed to use physical force and moral force to achieve their aims ultimately leading it to be doomed to fail.

In conclusion, when sources 4, 5 and 6 are used as a set ^{in combination with my knowledge} I disagree that the main reason that the Chartists failed was due to its weak leadership because it was a combination of ^{other} factors as well which included the violence which undermined its cause and the state repression is heavily evidenced in source 5 did the Chartist movement fail. Sources 5 and 6 had the most utility in providing me with an answer because they were the most reliable - by being written by historians whilst source 4 had the least because it was written by a Lovett as he who hated Disraeli's leadership and who would have been looking for a scape-goat for the Chartist movement's failure to meet its political aims.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response works through the sources in sequence, elaborating on the points made in the sources and integrating the material from the sources with some detailed own knowledge to support the argument. However, this approach does make it difficult for the answer to be fully analytical. There is no need for candidates to comment on the provenance of secondary sources and no credit is given for it in this question. Despite these issues, this response is sufficient to be awarded in the top part of Level 3 for both assessment objectives.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Use the sources as the basis of an argument rather than working through them in sequence. Planning the answer in the form of a table helps to achieve this.

Question 1 (b) (ii)

This question was tackled by only a small number of candidates. Whilst it was a straightforward question, most of the responses seen relied very heavily on what was in the sources and had very limited own knowledge to support the arguments in the sources. This meant that many candidates were unable to make developed points about the reasons for legislation at the end of the period.

However, there were some responses which balanced the need for reform with political opportunism and party political manoeuvring and supported the argument with relevant development of own knowledge.

It was disappointing to note that many candidates were still making generic points regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b.

* (b) (ii) - 1872 Ballot - 1883 R1PPA - 1886 RPA - 1885 SRA
Reason - began - 1872 - 7
- 1883 - 8
- Summ - 8

This essay will argue that the main reason for political reform in the years 1872-1885 were purely due to a desire for highlighted political success, to a small extent supplemented by ~~political~~ corruption in the electoral system.

Sources 7, 8 and 9 all support the proposition of a motivation by political success, specifically in reference to the Secret Ballot Act of 1872. This act stopped the practice of voters publicly showing their vote, with the apparent aim of preventing bribery and intimidation. Source 7, a highly reliable newspaper source with the benefit of hindsight, clearly implies this, by providing evidence to the fact that the Act of 1872 achieved no such aim - with election corruption even becoming exacerbated by the 1872 Act, via

((b) continued) enabling voters to accept multiple
votes. Source 9, a reliable yet contemporary
source, which was a direct and relevant
investigation into the effect of the 1872 Secret
Ballot Act, suggests a similar theme. The
investigation concluded that the votes had
increased, or even simply been translated into
the overpayment of expenses at elections.
Source 8 delivers the final blow to the
suggestion of a motive of reform in the
Secret Ballot Act of 1872, with clear implication
that the motive ~~was~~ was a means to
gain "untapped" Liberal support. In fact,
the statement in source 8, a reliable
reputable source, can be left unchallenged
by the fact that the 1872 Secret Ballot
Act was instituted under a Liberal rule -
the Liberals having won the 1868 elections,
not being ousted from power until 1874,
after the Bill. As a result, the sources
and evidence provided clearly point
toward a motive of party advantage in
the secret ballot, a clear disagreement
with the statement that the motive was to
end corruption. This can be seen as the Act
promised no such actuality, only really

((b) continued) leaning an advantage to the Liberal establishment under which it was instituted.

However, the Corrupt and Illegal Practices Prevention Act of 1883, clearly displays motives of a genuine desire to eliminate corruption - the title already provides heavy implications. The Act simply outlined a cap on the expenditure in elections, virtually destroying most corruption of the election process. This both eliminated bribery and the use of buying up all transportation, but also allowed poorer candidates the opportunity to stand as MP's.

In fact, Sources 7 and 9 provide evidence to this effect. Source 7, reliable due to its revisionist, late and inconclusive nature, clearly states that the corruption of elections, prevalent even beyond the Secret Ballot Act of 1872⁴. The Act would certainly be of no benefit to either Party, both mostly being comprised of wealthy upper and middle class MP's. ~~Abolition of the~~
[was entirely eliminated in 1883 as a result of the Corrupt and Illegal Practices Prevention Act of 1883] - (cont)

→

((b) continued)

Despite this, source 1 by

Furthermore, source 9 offers support, via implication, for the suggestion of an introduction of the Act motivated by a need to eliminate corruption. This is conveyed as the source clearly states that corruption persisted beyond 1872, something that the source, as a government inquiry, would be just to recommend an Act to tackle. This Act would, then, be the Act of 1883 - a clear suggestion, via implication, by source 9 that the Corrupt and Illegal Practices Prevention Act of 1883 was motivated by a need to eliminate corruption.

Despite this, source 8 offers an alternative view on the motivation for the Act of 1883, suggesting that it was a way for a struggling, under-achieving Gladstone to keep the Liberals in governing power. As source 8 is a reliable, significant and generally impartial record of history, this view can be taken into account to substantially alter the suggestion of the source as a set,

((b) continued) with regard to the motives for the Act of 1883 - heavily suggestive motives of the nature of Party interest, rather than elimination of corruption.

However, Langely ignored by the reformer in the Redistribution of Seats Act of 1885, a result of the Arlington Street Compact of October 1884, in which Lord Salisbury allowed the passing of the Representation of the People Act 1884, provided more seats were annexed to counties. The combination of these Acts clearly displays the fact that the Liberals and Conservatives were, with the Acts up to 1885, joining politically for increased support, and the political dominance with which it came. This, then, disagrees with the view that the Acts up to 1885 were motivated by a need to eliminate corruption.

In conclusion, the reformer as a set, and the evidence provided, disagrees with the statement, instead suggesting that the Acts up to 1885 were motivated by Party ambition, and the

((b) continued)

acquisition of support. Although
Sources 7 and 9 offer disagreement to
this view, regarding the 1883 Act, the
fact that source 8 does support this
statement with the 1883 Act, and that 7, 8, 9
support it with 1872^{Act}, outweighs this balance.

(Time)



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response is heavily dependent on the sources. There is evidence of reasoning from the sources which are generally well used and this response achieved Level 3/4 borderline for AO2. There is, however, no need to comment on the provenance of the secondary sources as there is no credit given for this. There is very limited specific own knowledge in this response, although there is evidence of some contextual knowledge. This, combined with the quality of the argument, enabled the response to access Level 3.

Question 2

Question 2 (a)

The sources in this question gave candidates the opportunity for developed cross referencing and it is pleasing to note that relatively fewer instances of a source by source approach were seen this year. Most candidates were quick to see the obvious references to 'character' made by Source 10 and generally saw this as the only evidence to support the view in the question, with many missing the reference to 'population growth' in Source 12. Most candidates were also able to identify and develop the issue of costs and the rising cost of poor relief to offer an alternative view. Some candidates tended to paraphrase the sources, often taking them at face value.

This limited the development of cross referencing and so limited the level that could be awarded.

The best responses to this question adopted a nuanced approach to the sources, both in terms of content and provenance.

(a) Source 10 strongly corroborates with the idea of a reason for the amendment in 1834, being to improve the character of the poor, yet disagrees to the extent that it was the main reason. Sources 11 and 12 challenge the statement, whereas as a set the sources challenge the idea, as they bring to light other factors such as fear of revolution, and costs. Source 10 corroborates in a way as it states that 'the present method' of poor relief 'has powerfully contributed to the 'carelessness and waste spending' of the poor. Here, this could suggest that the poor were taking advantage of the outdoor relief programmes such as the Speenhamland system. Source 10 ~~implies~~ implies that many indigent poor were receiving poor relief and spending it at 'the ale-houses'. This

~~the~~ clearly demonstrates a moral judgement on the poor and suggests that the poor were immoral therefore linking poverty

((a) continued) with immorality. As source 10 was written by Malthus, a respected demographer, and around the time of the debate (1798) this is used in showing the attitudes towards the poor at the time as Malthus would have been greatly influential.

However, sources 11 and 12 challenge the idea of improving the character of the poor being the main reason for reform. Source 11 references the idea of cost and the 'burden of taxes'. Cobbett states that 'the farmers' were paying so much in 'poor rates' they could not 'afford to' pay that workers. Source 12 supports this suggestion, quoting the rise in poor rates, being '£10,100s' in 1801 and '£367 in 1832'. So cost was obviously an influential factor as this had been rising for years. Similarly, source 10 could also be seen to support this suggestion as it mentions the 'rising of the price of ground' and the 'lowering of wages'. This shows that cost was a nationwide issue and it could then be argued that source

(a) continued) 10 is connecting the rising food prices to the moral condition of the poor. ~~Malthus states that~~

Source 11 also brings in the factor of fear of revolution as a driving force for reform. It states that the present 'misery' of the poor was precisely like that 'in France' leading to the 'French Revolution'. Here, the source reflects the higher classes fear of social unrest among the poor. The source was written at the time in question (1830) however Cobbett was a 'radical' who 'sympathised with the poor', therefore the source would be less reliable as he could be writing with an agenda.

Source 12 additionally mentions the 'population' increase that was an inherent factor. It states that this had 'steadily climbed' over the years, suggesting that this has not stopped, as described by source 10, 'the present method' of relief. This could link to source 10 in that Malthus references the 'raising price of

(a) continued) second^{ly} and the 'increasing wages' which would have been expected by the population increase. Therefore these 2 sources could be seen to challenge the statement.

Source 12, was written ~~to test~~ after around the time of the region so is relevant, yet has reduced weighting as it refers only to 'Cholesburg', one place therefore should not be taken as the norm.

To conclude, although source 10 clearly holds a moral view, supports the idea that the region was improved by improvements to the character of the poor, the sources when evaluated together mainly challenge this idea, favouring the rising cost and population as driving factors. Also when assessing the sources it should be noted that source 10 is 'Matthew's' personal view so this gives it less weighting.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response at various points displays all the key skills that are required in an answer – there is cross referencing, consideration of the provenance and the beginnings of some judgement being made. However, its organisation needed to be improved. For example, the answer begins by spending quite a lot of time focusing on Source 10 alone, and although this section is linked to the focus of the question, it is not cross referencing. This answer is therefore Level 3 work.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Answers benefit from sustained cross referencing throughout the response.

Question 2 (b) (i)

This was the less popular of the two questions. There was generally a good understanding of the claims that were being made in the sources, although a minority of the responses relied too heavily on the information that was provided in the sources and had very limited specific own knowledge about the operation of the New Poor Law beyond an awareness of, for example, the events in the Andover workhouse. Some responses often worked through the sources in sequence, paraphrasing the arguments presented, rather than setting up a debate about the issues. There were, however, some very assured answers which were able to consider fully the debate that was set up in the sources and to contextualise this by the use of specific and detailed own knowledge as the basis on which to reach a considered judgement.

It was disappointing to note that many candidates were still making generic points regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b.

* (b) Do you agree that with the view that ~~the~~ under the New Poor Law, the administration of Poor Relief was centrally controlled and uniform?

~~The~~
The implementation of the Poor Law Amendment Act came in mid-nineteenth century with the intent to abolish outdoor relief and create a workhouse in every parish to discipline and control the increasing poor. It is arguable whether the administration of Poor Relief was uniform and centrally controlled with Source 14 stating vast differences across the country reinforced by the letter in Source 15. Source 13 does, however, describe the administration of Poor Relief as centrally controlled, but not entirely uniform.

With the implementation of the ~~the~~ Poor Law Amendment Act, the Poor Law Board was created in 1847 to centrally control all relief which was to be distributed around the country. The Poor Law Board saw a "central commission of three" with

previous Royal Commission (1832) leader, Chadwick, as secretary. Source 13 makes the point that the introduction of a centrally controlled Board did in fact attempt to regulate, yet its success

(b) continued) remains debatable. Source 13 also bases its argument around "two elements", the first with the second relating to a "local uniformity of practice and management" which stemmed through the "projected par law unions". The source is clarifying the idea that there was in fact strong ~~very~~ uniformity around the country. This however is not true. Par law Unions were each given their own power/control over their parishes. This made way for vast differences in the treatment of the poor. The treatment of the Poor can be seen through the workhouse treatment of the sick, elderly and the young. Some workhouses were extremely harsh and unjust in the treatment of their inhabitants. This is reinforced through the 1846 Andover Scandal which was highly publicised around the country and the unbelievably harsh conditions shown. Source 13 does however mention the fact that the guidelines of the distribution of relief are being vague:

"Little was actually said about the principles on which relief would be distributed."

This reinforces the idea that in fact, the system was not as uniform or centrally controlled as previously thought.

Although the local Poor Law Board was erected in 1847, the system of the New Poor

((b) continued) Law ~~is~~ was undubitably disorganised. This Board was dismantled ~~and~~ ^{and} replaced with the Local Government Board in 1871. This new central authority, although coming many years after the implementation of the NPL, proved to be fair and more equal in its distribution of poor law relief. The unequal distribution of relief and a standard of living is remedied through source 14. The source highlights how "few would claim" that the new system of the New Poor Law operated with "ferocious harshness everywhere". The source admits how in some ~~of~~ parishes there were "quite good conditions" yet "poor ones elsewhere". This notion of a ~~poor~~ lower standard of living can be reinforced as in Cheshire in southern England, the life ~~&~~ expectancy of a pauper was around 66 years old. In the more northern towns, where harsh workhouses lay, the life expectancy was ~~off~~ around 36~~4~~. This vast change in the age of paupers dying highlighted the areas where poor relief was not being distributed as equally.

The introduction are more commonly known use of charities spring up around the country during this time. The creation of the Charity Organisational Society (COS) proved that the ~~paupers~~ ^{poor} in one area of the country differed to ~~poor~~ ^{poor} living conditions.

((b) continued) others. By 1852, charities were funding ~~the~~ more than £4000 of poor relief than the government. This relief coming from charities generally focused on the areas where the destitute ~~origin~~ originated. Cities like London and Manchester received much more relief from charitable organizations than poorer and less well connected towns and cities. The Poor Law Board knew about the activities of charities, and where their money was going, yet did nothing to compensate or provide more relief to the paupers receiving very little charitable aid.

Source 15 is perfect evidence of some of the poorest treatment of paupers by their Unions. Stories and scenarios exactly like Source 15 were happening all over the country. In this particular extract, the Board of Guardians would not give any money to ~~see~~ see the eyesight of the woman. And the Poor Law Board stated that they had no power over the Clitheroe Union and no money could be given. A case like this came to light in the Westborough Union, with an individual seeking medical aid for his family who were severely ill. The Union fully paid for the treatment of the family with no extra cost to the

((b) continued) individual. It is therefore unjust to say that the system of poor relief was centrally controlled and uniform, with some PL unions able to distribute relief, whereas others could not.

In conclusion, it is clear that the administration of Poor Relief under the New Poor Law was not centrally controlled and uniform, yet there was definitely some progress made. Evidence from all three sources suggest that, as a set, there is no reason to believe that the system of poor relief distribution was perfectly uniform. Different unions treated their poor in various ways through the workhouse. In addition, the Poor Law Board was replaced and refused to make these decisions about poor relief. This shows a poor and ill-equipped attempt at central control. However, the Local Government Board was implemented as the attempt to solve the issues and make decisions for itself regarding poor relief, and therefore some progress was made, yet the administration of poor law relief cannot be seen as fully uniform and centrally controlled.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response begins with an introduction that shows that the candidate appreciates there is a debate in the sources about the question. However, despite this awareness, the sources are not used fully to drive the line of argument and hence the response is awarded Level 3 for AO2. The answer does however argue a very clear case and links the argument to both central control and uniformity. There is secure contextual knowledge demonstrated, but the response lacks a strong range of specific detail; hence in AO1 the response is awarded Level 3/4 borderline.

Question 2 (b) (ii)

This was the more popular of the two questions.

The sources were well understood and were used together with own knowledge by many candidates to create a debate that identified individuals, central government and local government. The best answers often demonstrated the interplay between all three of these factors, whilst some responses often saw them as mutually exclusive. Some candidates tended to take a sequential approach to the sources, often paraphrasing the content and then frequently adding some basic own knowledge about the issues. This type of approach does undermine the ability to develop an argument, for example, such an approach could not easily link Source 16's comments about the role of John Simon to what he himself wrote in Source 18. A number of candidates read the sources at face value, for example, very few candidates picked up the reference in Source 17 to 'doctors, clergymen, novelists and politicians' as being examples of individuals. It was disappointing to note that many candidates were still making generic points regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b.

* (b) ii) By 1875, the state of public health had ~~been~~ evolved a great deal: whereas previously ~~there~~ to 1830 there was little legislation regarding public health. However, between 1830 and 1875, this changed dramatically. It can be argued that this was ~~due~~ due to the work of exceptional individuals. However, there are other factors, such as ^{the spread of cities due to} the impact of progress in ^{urbanisation} medicine, ~~the conditions of cities~~ due to urbanisation, and the impact of cholera and improvements in administration and technology. It is evident that certain individuals did play a large role in the improvement of the provision of public health. This argument is supported by Source 16, which refers to Edwin Chadwick and his "brilliant" "Report on the Sanitary

Condition of the Poisoning Population'
The fact he is referred to as "brilliant"
and it is claimed his report
"inspired" the 1848 Public Health

((b) continued) Act demonstrates how influential
his work is. The 1848 Public Health
Act was the first major legislation
~~that~~ that the government had
made regarding public health.
The central government had
previously followed a laissez-faire
policy, interfering in citizens'
lives as little as possible, so
the fact Chadwick's as implied
in Source 17 as it claims
administration was made difficult
due to the argument over "property
rights". ~~Thus~~ Therefore, the fact
Chadwick's ~~took~~ a step towards
report inspired the government to
act can be argued caused
the improvements in public health.
~~Source~~ Source 17 also refers to
the General Board of Health, ~~and~~
~~the~~ ~~fall~~ which was ~~used~~ set up
in ~~due~~ under the Public Health
Act of 1848, and states that
it "fell" in 1854. The Board did
not dissolve until 1858 but
1854 was the year in which

(b) continued) Chadwick resigned, but informing that it was his work that had been influential. ~~Also the fact that it is stated "improvements were~~ Another influential person referred to ^{in source 16} is John Simon, who was the first Medical Officer of Health in London. The fact that he co-operated with the local authorities meant that more work and improvements could be made. As Medical Officer for the Privy Council, he produced several reports, one of which inspired the 1875 Sanitary Act, ~~which~~ meant the Home Secretary. This act, ~~is~~ although it was badly drafted, was the first attempt to create a uniform ~~was~~ system and "centralisation". Therefore, it can be claimed that the work of such dedicated individuals caused improvements in Public Health.

On the other hand, it is also ~~claimed~~ ^{in source 16} evident that there were other factors that

((b) continued) caused public health reform. As source 17 states, public health "could not be regulated by individual or group action", implying it was not the work of individuals which caused reform. The problem with Chadwick's work was that it was "permissive", therefore local authorities did not have to set up local health Boards as he advised, seen as only 182 had been set up by 1854. The fact source 18 still refers to terrible public health conditions in 1865 suggests that any work, for example, Chadwick's had not been effective. The fact that this source is written by John S. Simon adds a great deal of weight to the argument as he was a professional in his field and wanted to make drastic changes to public health. The source refers to places being "kept filthy". This filth was caused due to urbanisation. The deaths from Britain being on a

((b) continued)

country reliant on agriculture to a country reliant on industry caused many people to flood to the cities in search of work, for example, the population of Glasgow in 1801 was 77,000 and in 1861 it was 420,000. This meant that often ^{whole} families had to resort to living in damp cellars with no sunlight. The conditions for these families were poor as they most commonly had to use a shared outside toilet, slops were dumped in the street and where streets weren't paved, meaning water would gather and stagnate. This crowding and poor conditions meant that diseases could spread more easily. This was recorded from 1836 as all births and deaths had to be recorded at the Office of the Registrar General. This meant that data on the cause of death built up and it became evident

((b) continued) what was causing deaths. Therefore, it can be claimed forcing the government to act. However, there was no law. Therefore, it can be claimed that urbanisation and the recording of deaths caused improvements in public health.

Another factor which can be argued caused improvement in public health is the progress in medicine. It is claimed in Source 17 that reform was supported by "doctors". This was due to the improvement in microscopes in the 1830s, which meant doctors could see and review micro-organisms. For many years before this people had believed in the theory of miasma, which meant that disease was spread through bad smells in the air. It was not until 1860 that Louis Pasteur was able to prove this theory wrong and prove the germ

((b) continued) theory. This gradual improvement in medicine caused people to realise what the true cause of disease was and can, therefore, be argued, was the reason for improvements in public health, ~~as~~ and the only reason that there was no ^{major} reform until 1875 was because of the "unknown problems", meaning that reform had to be "culminative rather than dramatic". Therefore, it is evident progress in medicine impacted hugely on public health reform.

Cholera also had a major impact. The outbreaks caused panic due to the high number of deaths, as 40 to 60% of sufferers died. Also, the speed ~~compa~~ of death compared to other diseases caused shock that triggered riots roughly thirty ~~riots~~ in places such as Liverpool. These riots included the ~~middle~~ middle and upper classes also as, unlike other

((b) continued) diseases cholera affected them too as they were most likely to have running water. This put pressure on the government as these people had just received the vote in the Great Reform Act. However the fact that no compulsory act was introduced suggests this had little impact. In conclusion, it is evident



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This answer begins with an introduction that focuses on some of the factors that can be considered in response to this question. The candidate develops points that are made in the sources on the basis of their own knowledge, which does on occasion move towards description. This means that the factors are identified but not always fully evaluated. The answer develops the two individuals named in the sources, but does not consider any others. The candidate clearly runs out of time as there is no conclusion to this answer. This response is Level 3 in both assessment objectives, being high in the level for AO1 and secure in the level for AO2.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

It is really important that answers incorporate a conclusion – this might have enabled this candidate to have improved the analytical focus of the answer.

Paper Summary

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

All Questions

- Candidates should proof read their answers at the end of the examination and correct any instances where they have incorrectly labelled a source, used the wrong names or the wrong dates.
- Candidates need to use the terms 'implies' and 'infers' correctly. Candidates should argue that a source implies something and that they, the reader, infer from it.
- Too many candidates are using certain phrases, such as 'using the sources as a set', as a substitute for actually engaging in the task that they are claiming.

Part A

- Candidates should spend sufficient time reading the sources to ensure that they understand the nuances of the arguments presented
- Candidates should treat the sources as a package in order to facilitate cross referencing. Candidates who work through sources sequentially cannot go beyond Level 2.
- Provenance should be integrated within the argument, rather than treated as a stand-alone paragraph. The attributes of the sources should be discussed, not described. This aids the use of provenance as part of the argument. Candidates should avoid making sweeping assertions from the provenance that could apply to any source.
- The best responses cross reference not only the content of the sources, but also their provenance. This enables candidates to weigh the sources and reach supported judgements.
- There are no marks available for knowledge in Part A. Candidates should avoid arguing from their knowledge since it cannot be credited.

Part B

- Candidates need to ensure that their subject knowledge conforms to the specification. Weaker responses usually relied very heavily on information derived primarily from the sources.
- In order to address the question effectively, candidates need to offer an analysis driven by the arguments raised in the sources, not a descriptive or chronological account.
- Whilst it may be relevant to use the provenance of the contemporary source(s) to judge the weight that can be assigned to the argument, there is no such requirement for the secondary sources and it is not rewarded in AO2b. Many candidates still engage in generalised comments that a particular historian is or is not reliable at the expense of developing argument and analysis tested by specific own knowledge.
- Candidates need to ensure that they are aware of the focus of the question and that they maintain the focus throughout their answer to avoid straying into irrelevant areas that cannot be rewarded.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



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