

# Mark Scheme (Results) January 2011

GCE

GCE History (6HI02/B)

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

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

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com).

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Mark Scheme that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

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

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

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

January 2011

Publications Code

US026449

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2011

## General Marking Guidance

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

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

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

*iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.*

## GCE History Marking Guidance

### Marking of Questions: Levels of Response

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

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

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

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

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

### Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level

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

### Assessing Quality of Written Communication

QoWC will have a bearing if the QoWC is inconsistent with the communication descriptor for the level in which the candidate's answer falls. If, for example, a candidate's history response displays mid Level 3 criteria but fits the Level 2 QoWC descriptors, it will require a move down within the level.

## 6HI02: Generic Level Descriptors

### Part (a)

Target: AO2a (8%)

(20 marks)

As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-5	<p>Comprehends the surface features of the sources and selects material relevant to the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.</p> <p><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 3-5 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	6-10	<p>Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify their similarities and/or differences in relation to the question posed. There may be one developed comparison, but most comparisons will be undeveloped or unsupported with material from the sources. Sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information. The source provenance may be noted, without application of its implications to the source content.</p> <p><b>Low Level 2: 6-7 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 8-10 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	11-15	<p>Comprehends the sources and focuses the cross-referencing on the task set. Responses will offer detailed comparisons, similarities/differences, agreements/disagreements that are supported by evidence drawn from the sources.</p> <p>Sources are used as evidence with some consideration of their attributes, such as the nature, origins, purpose or audience, with some consideration of how this can affect the weight given to the evidence. In addressing 'how far' there is a clear attempt to use the sources in combination, but this may be imbalanced in terms of the issues addressed or in terms of the use of the sources.</p> <p><b>Low Level 3: 11-12 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 13-15 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>

4	16-20	<p>Reaches a judgement in relation to the issue posed by the question supported by careful examination of the evidence of the sources. The sources are cross-referenced and the elements of challenge and corroboration are analysed. The issues raised by the process of comparison are used to address the specific enquiry. The attributes of the source are taken into account in order to establish what weight the content they will bear in relation to the specific enquiry. In addressing 'how far' the sources are used in combination.</p> <p><b>Low Level 4: 16-17 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 18-20 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
---	-------	---

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

Part (b)

Target: AO1a & AO1b (10% - 24 marks)

Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

AO2b (7% - 16 marks)

Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.

(40 marks)

AO1a and AO1b (24 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-6	<p>Candidates will produce mostly simple statements. These will be supported by limited factual material, which has some accuracy and relevance, although not directed analytically (i.e. at the focus of the question). The material will be mostly generalised. There will be few, if any, links between the simple statements.</p> <p><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 5-6 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 1.</p> <p>The writing may have limited coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
2	7-12	<p>Candidates will produce a series of simple statements supported by some accurate and relevant, factual material. The analytical focus will be mostly implicit and there are likely to be only limited links between simple statements. Material is unlikely to be developed very far or to be explicitly linked to material taken from sources.</p> <p><b>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 11-12 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2.</p> <p>The writing will have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. Some of the skills needed to produce effective writing will be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>

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

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



AO2b (16 marks)

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

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

### Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication

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

### Unit 2 Assessment Grid

Question Number	AO1a and b Marks	AO2a Marks	AO2b Marks	Total marks for question
Q (a)	-	20	-	20
Q (b)(i) or (ii)	24	-	16	40
Total Marks	24	20	16	60
% weighting	10%	8%	7%	25%

**B1 Britain, 1830-85: Representation and Reform**

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (a)	<p>Taken at face value the sources offer evidence to both support and challenge the claim in the question. Lord Grey states that the government would be unable to deal with public outrage if they failed to reform. William Bowyer explains that the purpose of his demonstration was intended to create this impression. In Source 3 Charles Greville suggests that although there has not been violence, he expects it to occur 'if the Duke succeeds'. Candidates can cross-reference these sources to argue that the claim has some validity, and attain L2 if points are developed. However, if the inference that the expectation of violence in Source 3 would create pressure to pass the Bill is developed, a response can move to low/borderline L3. Similarly, reference to the provenance of Source 3 to explain the significance of Wellington's attempt to form a government could begin to move a response towards the higher levels. To secure higher levels candidates need to interpret the sources and make detailed comparisons, enabling them to support and challenge the claim in a more complex analysis. By referencing Source 2, they can infer that there was an organised radical campaign in support of the Bill, using popular pressure and the threat of violence, while Source 1 suggests that this threat did have some impact on Grey's attitudes. However, Source 2 also indicates that violence was outside the control of the radicals, and if this is cross-referenced to Source 3, it can be argued that it was this actual, uncontrolled violence that created pressure and explains why Greville refers to London as 'fearfully' quiet. Similarly, the fact that Wellington was attempting to form a government suggests that the threat of violence was not enough to ensure passage of the Bill, even as late as May 1832. Greville refers to an expectation of violence, but does not suggest that it cannot be contained. Source 2 is evidence that violence had occurred, but had not secured the passage of the Bill. Responses at L3 will both support and challenge the claim, while those at L4 will offer an overall judgement - for example that radical campaigns based on popular pressure, both organised and spontaneous, had some effect in creating the impression of imminent revolution.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (i)	<p>Source 4 is offering a general comment about the difficulties faced by radical reformers in general, and this offers candidates a starting point to consider Chartist failure. The point can be developed by wider knowledge to show the effects on Chartist support of the outbreaks of violence in 1839-42, and the constant attempts by leaders like Lovett and Place to prevent violence from occurring. Cross-referencing to Source 5 allows the point to be developed more fully, showing the extent to which local leaders like Cooper were also fearful of the impact of violence and law-breaking. Although Cooper could be trying to justify his role and defend the image of Chartism, the fact that his autobiography was not published until many years later suggests that this might not be the case. It is equally likely that his concern was to explain why, in his view, Chartism failed. Candidates can also refer to leaders like O'Connor, and the violent rhetoric adopted by many Chartists to develop points from Source 4 and show that the threat of violence was necessary to draw attention to the movement, posing precisely the difficulties that Sources 4 and 5 demonstrate.</p> <p>However, Source 6 offers other reasons for the failure of Chartism, including the opinion that it was 'doomed' and therefore had no chance of succeeding. Candidates can contextualise the source by reference to divisions among the leadership and personal rivalries as well as disputes over methods and tactics. In particular, the role of O'Connor was significant. They can consider rival causes and organisations, but they can also address the issue of access to parliament and the problem of influencing MPs whose interests lay elsewhere and who were primarily opposed to 'democratic' changes. The 'economic crisis of 1847-48' also raises the importance of distress in maintaining Chartist support, and candidates may refer to the pattern of Chartist activity across the period to demonstrate this. Candidates can therefore both support and challenge the claim in the question. However, Source 4 also offers a basis for an overall judgement, by suggesting that the need to pressurise an unsympathetic parliament, which was inevitably alienated by violence and extremism, posed a basic dilemma that led to internal divisions, variable support and, ultimately, failure.</p> <p>Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of reasons for Chartist failure, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (ii)	<p>The focus of the question is on the significance of the 1832 Reform Act in developing parliamentary government through a system of elections and political parties, as opposed to the traditional choice of prime ministers by the monarch. Source 9 explains that this had happened by 1868, but Sources 7 and 8 conflict on the pace and causes of the development. Source 7 suggests that by 1835 it was recognised that no government could function without a majority in the House of Commons. Candidates can use contextual knowledge to show that although Peel was the King's choice as Prime Minister in the traditional way, he was forced to seek a mandate through a general election. This was recognised in his decision to publish a party manifesto, and it was also recognised by the conservative Quarterly Review as a direct effect of the 1832 Reform Act. Candidates can develop this point by reference to the provisions in the Act that increased the electorate, made constituency organisation essential, and restricted the patronage of the Crown as well as the Lords by removing a number of small and 'rotten' boroughs. Peel's failure in 1835 and the return of the Melbourne Whigs despite the attitude of the King demonstrate the increased power of both the Commons and the electorate. By cross-referencing to Sources 8 and 9, candidates can show the longer-term effects of these provisions. Both refer to the reduction of royal patronage, and candidates can refer to a number of occasions when Queen Victoria tried, and failed, to influence the selection of a Prime Minister on the basis of her personal preference. In 1859 she appointed Palmerston, whom she intensely disliked and of whom she thoroughly disapproved, supporting the claim in Source 9.</p> <p>However, Source 8 challenges the view that these changes were simply the result of the 1832 Reform Act, by pointing out the continuation of traditional relationships, the lack of any need for a 'mandate' and the relative indifference of the electors. The source suggests that this was caused by the continuation of aristocratic influence and patronage, and by the lack of an overriding issue or leader to enhance the definition of parties. This claim can be supported by reference to the divisions in the Conservative party that brought about the fall of Peel, the role of the Peelites in parliament during the 1850s, the weakness of Liberal leadership and the divisions between Whigs and Radicals, the number of shifting coalitions that formed the basis of government, the limitations of party organisation and the dominance of aristocratic families, and the lack of correlation between changes in government and the holding of elections before 1859. The point can be developed further from Source 9 by the fact that it was not until 1868 that a Prime Minister resigned because of defeat in an election rather than in the Commons. Placed in context, this can be used to argue that the Reform Act of 1867, not 1832, brought about this change. Candidates can, however, resolve this by suggesting that the change came as a result of gradual development, involving structural changes and their practical consequences over a period of time.</p> <p>Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the debate, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

**B2 Poverty, Public Health and the Growth of Government in Britain, 1830-75**

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (a)	<p>The sources offer evidence to both support and challenge the claim in the question. Sources 10 and 12 both argue that help should not be given to the poor because it is better for them to help themselves. Source 11, taken at face value is focused on the lack of awareness of the poor among the middle classes, but the provenance clarifies that Thackeray is responding to Mayhew's account of poverty in London, suggesting sympathy in both his account and Thackeray's response. Responses based on this evidence can reach L2, and if the implications of Source 11 are developed, can reach the borderline of L3. However, if the sources are cross-referenced and interpreted in context, a more developed response can be offered. Sources 10 and 12 suggest continuity, and can be compared in depth to support the point. Both emphasise the need for 'self-help' and both place most importance on the benefits to the poor themselves. Smiles does not condemn either charity or the Poor Laws, as Ricardo does, but he does refer to 'over-guidance or over-government', which can be interpreted to mean something similar. At first sight Source 11 suggests a different attitude, and Thackeray's reference to 'complicated misery' suggests both shock and sympathy. In addition the view that 'until now' the causes of their poverty had not been considered could indicate that such consideration is now taking place. However, the extent of surprise suggests that, at least until 1850, most people's attitude had been unsympathetic. The upper classes only needed to go 100 yards, but never did, suggesting that they chose to keep away. While Thackeray's tone is sympathetic, he is only stating that the upper classes now have something to think about, not what their conclusions will be. It can therefore be argued that the sources do suggest some change of attitude from people like Mayhew and Thackeray, but in the light of Source 12, Source 11 could be seen as only the limited beginnings of change. Responses at L3 will both support and challenge the claim, while those at L4 will offer an overall judgement of "how far".</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (i)	<p>The sources offer evidence to both support and challenge the view presented in the question. Source 15 directly challenges the view, and dismisses the Poor Law as a 'terrible error, a ghastly mistake', also claiming that this view is widespread among historians. However, it does also admit that contemporary opinion was different. Source 13 offers evidence to support the claim that there was a serious problem. It shows that the mounting cost of relief was brought under control (as implied in Source 15). Candidates can develop this point by reference to contextual knowledge. The most surprising point, and one of great concern to contemporaries, was that costs remained as high in the years of peace (1819-33) as they had been during the Napoleonic wars, and that some of this period had been years of general prosperity and growing trade. Using knowledge of the Old Poor Law, candidates can explain how the systems of outdoor relief helped to subsidise, and therefore depress, wages, and encourage the reliance of the poor as well as the unemployed and 'indigent' on external help. This can be further developed by cross-referencing to Source 14, to argue that the Royal Commission did highlight a serious problem. It can also be used to suggest that their analysis was thoughtful and their remedies, as enshrined in the 1834 Act, did attempt a sensible solution. There was no question of abolishing relief, but of providing it on 'sound principles' that would distinguish between the poor and the indigent and deter the idle and vagrant. Using knowledge of the Act candidates can explain how this was to work, and using knowledge of the Law in practice, they can establish a balanced judgement as to how far it constituted a 'praiseworthy' attempt.</p> <p>Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the nature of the Poor Law Amendment Act, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (ii)	<p>The question is focused on the obstacles that delayed the development of public health in Britain, and the extent to which ignorance, especially on the part of local councils and corporations, was the biggest problem in the way of improvement. Source 16 supports the claim, showing that many local councillors not only knew little of the reasons for insanitary conditions, but were also barely aware that they existed at all. Candidates can develop this by reference to the growth of cities and industrialisation, the physical separation of different classes, and the growing lack of contact of the upper and middle classes with any of the lower orders except as servants. Source 18 highlights costs and difficulties faced by local corporations and the need for scientific knowledge and technical expertise in order to understand both the problem and the remedies. Reference to the nature and spread of disease, the work of medical men like John Snow, the technological problems involved in building effective drainage and sewage arrangements, and some of the mistakes made in places like Leeds, Darlington and parts of London can develop the argument that ignorance was a major problem, especially in the local corporations responsible for implementing changes.</p> <p>However, Source 18 also highlights other obstacles, in particular costs and the extension of government power. This can be supported by cross-referencing to Source 17 and developed by wider knowledge. Contemporary attitudes and belief in 'laissez-faire', the strength of local and vested interests, including the role of the press, and the unavoidable expense involved in major improvements can be cited. More significantly, Source 18 directly challenges the claim by highlighting the extent to which local initiatives led the way in developing improvements, both before and after the 1848 Act. It can therefore be argued that local corporations varied greatly, and that national efforts drew on the best local examples to stimulate and to justify central intervention. Candidates may have detailed knowledge of some specific and local examples to support their claims. However, the best responses may well bring out the links between factors, such as the relationship between local and central changes, or how lack of understanding made rate-payers and corporations unwilling to incur such great expense, to offer a balanced judgement as to how far ignorance was the main obstacle to progress.</p> <p>Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the main obstacles to improvements in public health, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40



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

Telephone 01623 467467  
Fax 01623 450481

Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code US026449 January 2011

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

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