

Mark Scheme (Results) Summer 2011

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.

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 contact our History Advisor directly by sending an email to Mark Battye on HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk

You can also telephone 0844 576 0034 to speak to a member of our subject advisor team.

June 2011

Publications Code US028141

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>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-5 marks 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>Low Level 2: 6-7 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 8-10 marks 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>Low Level 3: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 3: 13-15 marks 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>Low Level 4: 16-17 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 4: 18-20 marks 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>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 1: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 1.</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>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 2: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2.</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 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>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 3: 17-18 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 3.</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>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 4: 23-24 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 4.</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>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-4 marks 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>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 7-8 marks 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 the 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>Low Level 3: 9-10 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 3: 11-12 marks 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>Low Level 4: 13-14 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 4: 15-16 marks 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>The sources address a familiar debate about the nature of Chartism and the aims of its supporters. Sources 1 and 2 are directly in conflict, with Source 1 focused on political changes to achieve 'just government' while Source 2 states that 'universal suffrage' is really about living standards and that Chartism is 'not a political movement'. Source 3 can be cross-referenced to support both views. Laws and taxation are political matters, as is the legal system, while 'justice to the poor' and education can be viewed as practical issues. Taken at face value, therefore, the sources can both support and challenge the claim in the question, and developed responses of this kind can reach L2. Candidates may also consider the provenance of the sources and suggest that the different views are coloured by the role and relationships of the authors to the movement. They can also rightly argue that Chartist attitudes and priorities varied in different times and places. Responses that attempt an overall judgement by these means will reach borderline L2/3. However, if the sources are interpreted in context, a more complex argument can be developed.</p> <p>Source 1 refers to the aim of 'just government', which is to be achieved by the political method of establishing 'fair and Equal Representation'. This is supported by the concern for rights shown in Source 3, especially in fair treatment under the law and the right to education 'without reference to religious creed'. Source 2 denies that universal suffrage is the main purpose of the movement, but strongly suggests that it is a key method of achieving other aims. This can be backed up from Sources 1 and 3 where equal representation is portrayed as a means of achieving 'just government' through control of those who make the laws, and 'the repeal of bad laws and the making of good'. It can therefore be argued that the main aim of the Chartist movement was the achievement of social justice by means of political equality. Responses at L3 will both support and challenge the claim, while those at L4 will offer an overall judgement.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (i)	<p>The question is focused on the pace of party development and the relative importance of the 1832 and 1867 Reform Acts in bringing about the two-party structure of Liberal and Conservative competition. Source 6 is likely to be the starting point for many candidates as it can be used to support the claim in the question that the 1867 Reform Act was of greater importance. They may point to the more “efficient local party organisation” and the emergence of Gladstone and Disraeli to lead the rival parties. They are likely to note that the two party system only re-emerged after the death of Palmerston and the ‘fresh stimulus’ of Parliamentary Reform in 1867 had created a new party struggle. It can also be argued that the terms Liberal and Conservative relate rather to the age of Gladstone and Disraeli than to Grey, Russell and Peel. These points are amplified in Source 6, to support a claim that the two-party system was not established until after 1867, and was not created by the 1832 Reform Act. Source 4 also offers the basis for some agreement in suggesting that the 1832 Act laid ‘foundations’ which were not secure until after 1867. The main thrust of Source 4 however is to support the claim of the 1832 Reform Act as being more significant. Candidates can draw on wider knowledge to support its arguments. The ‘struggle for constitutional reform’ that defined the parties may include reference to events before 1830, but this cannot be a requirement. Candidates are likely to consider the political attitudes and alliances developed by the Reform struggle, the triumph of the Whigs, Peel and the Tamworth Manifesto, the Lichfield House compact and the election of 1841 to show how Conservative and Liberal philosophies were developed and established across the decade. Reference to the impact of these events can be developed by explaining the momentous issues involved in parliamentary reform as well as the vested interests that were threatened, and the impact of further reforms such as the Municipal Corporations Act. They can also consider how the impact of the Reform Act encouraged ‘a rapid growth of central and constituency organisation’. The development of local associations, election campaigns, the Carlton and Reform clubs, and other aspects of party organisation began in the 1830s and continued thereafter. Candidates can also address the social, economic and regional characteristics that emerged, both as a result of particular situations such as Irish immigration to Lancashire, and of wider tendencies such as the growth of large urban centres in the northern boroughs and continuing landlord influence in the counties. However, Source 5 challenges the claim in Source 4. Bagehot suggests that there was widespread acceptance of moderate progress that cut across party lines, and that party lines and differences were not clear and distinct. This might suggest that the developments of the 1830s had been reversed, and this claim can be cross-referenced to Source 4 and supported from contextual knowledge. The impact of Peel’s repeal of the Corn Laws split the Tory party and initiated a period of shifting alliances and coalitions, both within and outside parliament. The importance of aristocratic influence, the role of protectionism to 1852, the personal rivalries and weak leadership in both Liberal and Conservative camps, the</p>	40

difficulty of obtaining a secure majority, and in particular the impact of Peelites like Gladstone in realigning the parties can be used to argue that the parties of the earlier period had largely disappeared.

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 relative significance of both the Reform Acts in bringing about the two-party system, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (ii)	<p>Source 8 suggests that the Ballot Act might be deemed to be of significance in ending the 'brawling and corruption of the hustings'. The claim in the question can therefore be supported, and the argument developed by reference to contextual knowledge. However, Source 8 also points out that the Ballot Act is merely one part of a number of reforms that extended beyond the period set in the question (1883 Corrupt Practices Act, 1884 Franchise Act and 1885 Redistribution Act) and candidates can therefore challenge the claim in the question by referring to other possible reforms as the key step. Source 7 offers a further alternative – the 1867 Reform Act- as making a significant contribution in the path to political democracy. Candidates can develop and explain these various acts from contextual knowledge to show the nature of change and the democratisation of the political system achieved between 1867 and 1885. They could comment on which piece(s) of reform they view as the key step, explaining their reasoning. The claim of the 1884 Franchise Act to be a key step can be reinforced by reference to Chamberlain's comments in Source 9. It should, however, be treated with an element of caution, since it is a political speech by one of those who had achieved the changes, and who may have wished to emphasise or exaggerate their significance. Source 7 reveals the limits of change in and after 1867, while Source 8 demonstrates the strength of resistance to further changes in both parliament and country. These arguments can be supported by reference to the strength of the Conservative recovery in 1874-80, the power of the aristocracy and gentry in rural areas, and the growing identification of Liberal suburbia with the new Conservatives in the face of growing working-class influence. Sources 8 and 9 can be used to suggest that once the vote had been extended in urban areas it was difficult to justify the limitations in the counties, and that therefore the 1867 Act led logically, if not rapidly, to 1885. On this basis it could be argued that no one single action marked the key step to political democracy. Candidates can therefore weigh the various effects of the 1867 Act and the pace of the change that followed to construct an overall judgement on the basis of sources and wider knowledge.</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 steps towards political democracy, 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. All three sources demonstrate lack of understanding of the causes of cholera. Source 10 blames items that have been in contact with those suffering from the disease, which may be considered to suggest contagion, while Chadwick in Source 11 refers to 'atmospheric impurities' which candidates may contextualise as a belief in Miasmatic Theory. Source 12 also refers to 'pestilential vapour', and clearly considers improvements to be unnecessary. Responses that develop these points to support the claim can reach L2. However, candidates may also infer that such misunderstandings did not hold back developments. Both Robert Baker and Chadwick misunderstood the causes of the disease, but nevertheless recognised the link with dirt and proposed sensible improvements that would have helped the situation. Responses that develop this point can move into L3. Emphasis on drainage, sewage, refuse disposal and clean water supplies formed the basis of their recommendations and were implemented by those who supported improvements, at both local level and in the 1848 Health Act that is being ridiculed in Source 12. Candidates may also point out that the campaign against improvements mounted in <i>Punch</i> and other parts of the press failed. However, Source 12 highlights the ability of opponents to undermine the work of Chadwick and others, and to make their arguments sound ridiculous, thereby holding back developments because the explanation of the cause of disease could not be proven. Direct cross-referencing between Sources 11 and 12 can make the point explicit. However sensible the connections made by reformers, the lack of scientific proof of a connection between dirt and disease allowed opposition to continue and held back improvements in public health, preventing the 1848 Act from including compulsion. Responses at L3 will both support and challenge the claim, while those at L4 will offer an overall judgement as to 'how far' lack of scientific understanding held back developments.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (i)	<p>The question is focused on how far the Poor Law succeeded in its objectives, and candidates can cross-reference the sources to help define what these objectives were. Langham Rokesby declares that the measure is working, and cites popular acceptance, fear of the workhouse, a willingness to seek employment and a reduction in illegitimate births as evidence. Placed in context this indicates that supporters were seeking a reduction in claims for relief, a deterrent effect and improved independence and morality among the 'labouring poor'. Source 14 refers to similar objectives, relating to outdoor relief for the able-bodied and payment of relief to paupers outside their place of settlement, and shows that neither had ceased by 1846. There is also reference to the extent of implementation on a national scale, as well as 'deterrence', uniformity and 'cost-effectiveness'. Those who begin by analysing these sources in context to define the objectives can find a clear route to high levels. In terms of success and failure, the sources offer conflicting evidence. Rokesby's claims are explicit, but can be challenged by reference to provenance and wider knowledge. Even if accurate for Market Harborough, this kind of acceptance and effectiveness were not necessarily replicated elsewhere. Source 14 demonstrates variation and the length of time taken for Unions to be accepted in many areas. Candidates can refer to the varying situations in rural and urban areas, the difference between north and south, the continuing opposition to the Law in the northern industrial cities and the number of circulars issued to forbid or restrict outdoor relief (e.g. 1844, 1852, 1863, 1871) to demonstrate that the practice continued. Source 15 also offers evidence that the number of paupers helped 'indoors' rose in number, but remained similar as a proportion of population. On the other hand, the number helped 'outdoors' fell, in absolute numbers, and more steadily as a proportion of population. Candidates can interpret such evidence in different ways to assess how far the situation changed, and may also consider other factors such as growing prosperity, to assess how far changes were caused by the Poor Law. Similarly, candidates can use wider knowledge to demonstrate that the workhouse was held in great dread across most areas, by referring both to recorded attitudes and to knowledge of workhouse conditions in various places. However, judgement of the 'deterrent' effect and the impact of such fears will also offer opportunities to assess 'how far'. The best responses may well define key objectives, assess how far each was achieved, and combine them into an overall judgement.</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 arguments, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (ii)	<p>The focus of the question is the extent to which cholera was responsible for the progress made in 1848-75 in public health provision. The reference to 'repeated' epidemics allows candidates to consider the cumulative effect of the disease, and possibly to relate progress to a pattern of epidemics across the period. Source 16 indicates the impact of the disease, and candidates can use wider reference to the speed of its spread, the violence of the symptoms and the proportion of deaths to highlight its impact. It can also be argued, however, that the comment in Source 16 relates to 1832, and that the impact diminished as the disease became more familiar. Source 17 supports the claim with the advantage of an overview, but also suggests other reasons for progress, as does Source 18. Candidates can draw on wider knowledge of parliamentary reform and the extension of the franchise, the development of scientific understanding such as germ theory, the example provided by cities where improvements did take place, such as Liverpool, the impact of the Boards of Health and Medical Officers of Health after 1848, improvements in both administration and technology and the growing body of evidence that reforms could be effective, to explain why progress was made. Candidates may list factors and seek to evaluate their impact, but the best responses may well see that the sources offer two broader alternatives – the importance of 'shock' value in stimulating a desire for reform and the steady acquisition of knowledge and expertise in making it effective. This latter point can be linked to the dedicated individuals of Source 17. Candidates can argue that the one outweighed the other, or suggest that both played a significant and complementary role in bringing 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 why progress was made 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 publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code US028141 June 2011

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



