

Examiners' Report  
June 2014

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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2014

Publications Code US039078

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

## Introduction

Centres and candidates are to be congratulated for their performance this examination series, as examiners reported that the majority of candidates understood the essential requirements of the Unit 2 examination with the different focus of the two parts of the question. There was a wide range of responses seen across the mark range.

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

However, it is again disappointing to note that there was a significant 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 understand the language of cross referencing, but did not actually engage fully in the processes of cross referencing, merely asserting agreement or disagreement between sources without explaining its basis. There seemed to be an increase this series in this kind of approach, making it very hard for candidates to move beyond level 2 even where they clearly understand the issues raised by the sources. Also in this series, there appeared to be a number of candidates who were using their own knowledge to develop points raised in the content of the sources in this question. There is no credit for this in part (a) and these 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 significant minority of candidates relied very heavily on the material in the sources, which was not always fully understood. In some cases, there was no evidence of any own knowledge being used at all.

Centres are reminded that candidates are expected to have some range and depth of knowledge that can be applied to the part (b) questions. Some candidates appeared to view both parts of the examination as relating solely to the use of sources. The best answers used the sources to shape the argument and raise issues which were supported and developed with the use of detailed and specific own knowledge. Despite comments in many previous examiners' reports regarding the focus of AO2b, this issue continues to pose a challenge for many candidates. A significant number of candidates commented to a greater or lesser extent on provenance in their responses to part (b) in this exam series. Such comments are frequently 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 and significant names correctly, especially when those words and names form part of the question or the sources. Where candidates have a few minutes left at the end of the exam, they would be well advised to check their work. There were a number of candidates who used the word 'infer' extensively, without actually understanding its meaning. There also appeared to be an increase in scripts where the handwriting of candidates proved difficult to read this examination series.

## Question 1

### Question 1(a)

Candidates found the sources accessible and many recognised that the sources could be seen to both challenge and support the view expressed in the question. The best responses engaged in sustained cross referencing and were able to use the provenance of the sources to support their line of argument, reaching measured judgements about the issues. There was some tendency for some candidates to focus only on the Liberal party, despite the question and the prompts to the Conservative party in Sources 2 and 3. Weaker responses were still approaching this question on a source by source basis with limited attempts at cross referencing or the matching of quotes. Some candidates compared Sources 1 and 3 as both showing failure but did not pick up on the fact that this was a reference to two different parties. Most candidates do appreciate that provenance should be considered, but do this with varying degrees of success. At its best, candidates appreciated the significance of the provenance of the three sources and were able to apply this clearly. However, some candidates made rather generalised comments that were not explained and developed and were not always consistent such as 'Source 1 is a letter and reliable ... Source 3 is a letter and not reliable' (or vice-versa).

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

(a) Source 1 shows the attempts for the party to make political organisations have been a failure and therefore ineffective of achieving party organisation. Source 2 shows that it has been effective for the Liberal Party but not the Conservatives and has been successful but has however received a lot of criticism meaning they have not been full effective. Source 3 suggests that party political party organisation has been effective as Lord Churchill credits it for allowing the Liberal Party to win the general election. Overall, the sources agree to a small extent that party political organisation was effective and to a greater larger extent

that it was ineffective.

Overall the sources 3 and 2 show support for party political organisation. In Source 3, Lord Churchill states that 'the representative organisation' that

((a) continued) was used by the Liberal Party, 'in the general election of 1880' meant they were able to 'triumph'.

The fact that Lord Churchill believes it contributed 'greatly' shows that the organisations were effective as they were enough to please the electorate and overall win the general election of 1880. This view is also agreed upon by Joseph Chamberlain who in Source 2 when he states the new political party organisations allow 'open, popular representative associations' to have a voice in the party which is why the Tory party are trying to 'imitate' them. The fact that the Tory party are also trying to follow the Liberals creating their own organisations show that they believe it will positively impact on their election results and therefore must be effective. However, the strength of evidence the evidence in Source 2 can be questioned as

Joseph Chamberlain actually founded the National Liberal Foundation and therefore

(a) continued would want to promote it as successful as then he would receive ~~praise~~ praise for it. However, the evidence in ~~Source~~ Source 3 can be seen as strong due to the fact it was written in a letter by a leading member of the Conservative Party. This therefore means that he can be truly honest and would have no bias in praising these Liberal ~~organisations~~ organisations.

Overall, ~~source~~ sources 1 and 2 also show that political organisation has actually been ineffective. This is because in Source 1, Joseph Comen states that attempts to set up these organisations have been a ~~and~~ failure, and that the fact that he describes it as a ~~failure~~ 'failure' shows that the organisations have not fulfilled their goal of ~~creating~~ uniting the Liberal party in order for them to become stronger. This view is shared when cross-referenced with

((a) continued) Source 2 as Joseph Chamberlain states that the 'Liberal Organisations' have been 'criticised by many.' The fact that these criticisms are given by people who have 'sympathy for the democratic system' shows that ~~and~~ they have not been fully effective in creating a more democratic system with these organisations. The strength of the evidence for source 1 can be viewed as strong due to the fact that ~~it was is as~~ it is a letter sent by Joseph Cowen who was a 'radical Liberal MP.' ~~More radical~~ Radical MPs would usually be ~~supportive~~ supportive of organisations with give larger power to the elector public so the fact that he describes it as a 'failure' shows it has been ineffective.

43

Overall, sources 1 and 2<sup>1</sup> agree to a large extent that the ~~pro party~~ political organisations have ~~not~~ been ineffective and to a smaller extent that they have been effective. ~~At~~ Although Source 2 overall agrees that

((a) continued) ~~p~~ the political organisations have been effective, the weight of evidence is weakened due to the fact that

it was from a creating of one of these organizations.



## ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response contains some valid developed cross referencing in relation to the question focus, although it would have benefitted from being more extensive in range. Provenance is considered very effectively and integrated within the argument. There is evidence of inferential skills and judgements. This combination means this response can be awarded a low level 4.

### Question 1(b)(i)

This question was answered by about half of the candidates, most of whom found the sources accessible. Some outstanding answers were seen to this question where candidates had an impressive own knowledge of the key theme, and were able to use this, in tandem with the sources provided, to support and challenge the proposition to produce a convincing argument. Many candidates were able to construct a case from the sources with varying levels of factual support. However, it was felt that many candidates did not have a sufficiently well-developed sense of the chronology around the events of 1830-2 and the phases of protest. In the place of this, many resorted to a description of early violence from the March of the Blanketeers through to the Swing riots without really making them relevant to the focus of the question. Some candidates relied heavily on the content of the sources.

It was disappointing to note that once again this year many candidates were still making generic points, some at great length, regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b. This issue has been highlighted in previous reports, but the continuing practice disadvantages candidates who spend time that would be more usefully spent on focusing on the question.

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

\*(b) i) Plan

Sol  
- see 4  
- 6

Crit  
'pop pressure'  
didn't exist.

Other factors  
- political opposition  
- duty?

Judge: Yes, but others were sig.

Answer

The 1832 Reform Act, also known as the Great Reform Act, was heralded as a triumph of democracy upon its passing. Pushed through the Commons &



leads by the Whigs, many factors contributed to its passing, including political opposition and other revolutions. One important factor was popular pressure. Whilst sources 4 and 6 seem to corroborate that popular pressure did play a significant and key role in the passing of the 1832 Reform Act, source 5 seems to suggest that political opposition played the biggest role. Considering the sources as a set, and ~~our~~ <sup>my</sup> knowledge, I believe that popular pressure ~~was~~ did play a key role in the passing of the 1832 Reform Act, although there were other significant factors too.

Finally, the sources do suggest that ~~the~~ popular pressure played a key role in the passing of the 1832 Reform Act.

(b) continued) Source 4 agrees that the existence of the 'reform <sup>campaign</sup> ~~campaign~~ was a vital element in the passing of the Reform Bill'. From our knowledge, we know that is true. At the time, many movements were campaigning for the passing of the Reform Bill, which they saw to be significant in giving them a voice. An example is the Birmingham Political Union (BPU) which grew to be the largest movement with in excess of 200,000 members. The existence of such groups did, as source 6 states, 'assist... ministers in the accomplishment of their great measure' as it placed pressure on ~~the~~ Parliament to pass the bill, given that there was so much public support for it.

Source 6's ~~repeated~~ reference to the bill as a 'great measure' is significant given that the source is from a newspaper (The Times) and therefore would represent public opinion, <sup>thus</sup> implying that the popular opinion of the public was that the ~~new~~ bill was a great thing that should be passed. Equally, ~~the~~ its origins - from May 1832 - are significant. In May 1832 were the 'Days of Maye' - a series of revolts and riots made in protest of the unwillingness of the Lords to pass the bill. The slogans 'Stop the Duke' and 'Go for Gold' became popular at this time and, as supported by source 4, this felt was vital in the passing of the bill for ~~the~~ the argument of a possible revolution was 'made convincing ((b) continued) by agitation outside parliament'. The people's willingness to fight for the bill evidently showed the degree to which it was popular, which then made the argument of the bill 'needed to avoid revolution' more strong and convinced the Tories to pass the bill. Thus it was popular pressure which, as source 3 says, 'Enticed] the Tory cry that the people are indifferent to reform', meaning ~~the~~ without popular pressure, the Tories wouldn't have stopped fighting the bill, so its main ~~of~~ opposition would have not been defeated & the bill wouldn't be passed. So, without popular pressure, the bill would have never been passed, meaning it did play a ~~key~~ key role in the passing of the 1832 reform act.

However, it is possible to criticise the view that popular ~~the~~ pressure played a key role in the passing of the reform bill. Firstly, it is possible to criticise the argument that there was 'popular pressure' in the first place. ~~From our~~ <sup>from our</sup> & own knowledge, we know that though many did campaign and create 'pressure' for reform, many did not. Considering that most of the campaigning took place in around large <sup>industrial</sup> towns and cities, clearly everyone was not ~~to~~ campaigning for reform. Rural counties and Scotland and Wales were not desperately (b) continued) fighting for reform - only large towns like Birmingham and London were. ~~Thus, then,~~ Thus, as not everyone was taking part in the campaigning for reform, it is fair to say that "popular" 'pressure' ~~to~~ played a role, as this pressure clearly wasn't very "popular" - only some took part. Equally, there was little pressure for the <sup>most part</sup> ~~most part~~ though the bill was passed in 1832, <sup>we know that</sup> plans and discussion had been taking place since 1829-1830. Given that there was ~~was~~ only significant pressure in mid 1832 (the Days of May), and ~~to~~ between the other years ~~there~~ there had not been much <sup>visible</sup> pressure, surely it can't have been such an important factor in the passing of the bill. Finally, there are many others that led to the passing of the bill. Source 2 highlights one factor - 'political opportunism'. As it states the 'divisions in the Tory Party' were an excellent

opportunity for the Whigs to become the superior party. As source 2 states Whigs 'hoped to gain the votes of those <sup>whom</sup> they enfranchised' - by passing reform, they won the support of the middle and working class and then beat the ~~low~~ Tories with this new found support. From our own knowledge we know this is true. Ben Lord Grey stated that 1832 was 'reform in order to preserve', meaning he wasn't committed to reform as much as to the votes it would bring.

((b) continued) Equally, as source 2 states, we know there were 'divisions' in the Tories. The issue of Catholic Emancipation had split the party in two, and with a fractured and ~~less~~ fragmented Tory party, this would be the perfect opportunity for liberals to act. However, this does not mean ~~the~~ popular pressure is less important. Even with mainly towns supporting it, <sup>we know</sup> most people lived in towns at this time, due to the Industrial Revolution, and even with the lack of violent pressure, there was a still other pressure such as through the ~~existence~~ <sup>existence</sup> of organisations like the BPU. Thus it was still a key factor.

In conclusion, the <sup>strongly</sup> ~~fact~~ <sup>fact</sup> that the popular pressure was played a key role in the passing of the 1832 Reform Act. Without the popular pressure, the bill would have never been passed, meaning, even though there were clearly other factors,

popular pressure was the most important factor and played a key role in the passing of the 1832 Reform Act.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a strong level 4 response in both assessment objectives. The answer argues very clearly from the sources and develops the arguments with relevant, specific and detailed own knowledge to reach reasoned judgements.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

The introduction to this answer clearly shows an understanding of the issues that are to be considered.

### Question 1(b)(ii)

This question was answered by about half of the candidates, most of whom found the sources accessible. Many candidates who tackled this question generally appeared to have less supporting own knowledge than those tackling question 1(b)(i). There were a number of responses that relied very heavily on the sources and did not develop the arguments very far beyond paraphrasing the material drawn from the sources. However, there were also some impressive answers which displayed an erudite awareness of the issues, the achievements and limitations of the Chartists and their leaders, and the motivation and actions of successive 19th century governments. Such answers integrated their own knowledge with the issues raised by the sources to produce clearly reasoned responses.

It was disappointing to note that once again this year many candidates were still making generic points, some at great length, regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b. This issue has been highlighted in previous reports, but the continuing practice disadvantages candidates who spend time that would be more usefully spent on focusing on the question.

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

\* (b) (ii) The Chartists were a predominantly working men organisation which ran from 1838 to 1858. It was a movement based around passing 6 acts from the 'People's Charter' written by the LWMA in 1838. However none came to fruition during its life span. Source 7 suggests that it was still a success as it has seen all but 1 of those acts passed today. Source 8 and Source 9, however,

think it hasn't had much impact as, by the time new reform was chased after, chartism had been long forgotten. Overall, using own knowledge and the sources, it is evident that Chartism was not successful.

~~Other sources suggest Chartism was successful~~

Chartism was successful to a limited extent. Chartism was able to "raise fundamental constitutional questions in parliament." According to source 7. This is evident from the two petitions of ~~1839~~<sup>1839</sup> and 1841 where there were collectively 4.3 million signatures, this being at a time when total ~~was~~ population was only 6 million men ~~and~~ ~~that~~ despite being rejected by over 200 votes in the commons it shows the first organised, non-violent congregation of working-class men and some middle class men too. This happened only nine years after the 1832 Reform Act which had the cynical intention of creating a rift between (b) continued) the middle and working class men. By 1885, there had been universal male suffrage, equal distribution of seats and ~~to~~ a secret ballot. This was achieved less than fifty years after chartism suggested it and they likely played some part if not directly but indirectly as it been part of the culture to talk about politics highlighted in source 9 where it says "You would see these ~~discussions~~ in groups discussing the great doctrine of politics that every man ought to have the right to vote." This suggests that Chartism developed talking about

politics which made the working class appear both knowledgeable and respectable, a leading cause for the introduction of the 1867 Second Reform Bill.

~~However, Chartism~~ Chartism, however, was still more of a failure than success. Despite numerous events such as the Newport Rising, the Plugpot riots and the congregation on Kennington Common in 1848 no desired changes were made by parliament to benefit the Chartists. Although many believe the Chartists were responsible for later reforms, their contribution was very limited. "It is only hindsight which permits us to trace these links with the future," according to source 8, which suggests, that the Chartist movement had little impact on the later reforms especially when you consider they were mainly introduced by a state which had defeated Chartism and no longer

((b) continued) felt threatened" which is also from sources. This is supported by source 9 where it says "Working men have ceased to think and want to hear no thoughtful talk." This suggests that even the tendencies of Chartist factions have been forgotten and therefore have no impact on society anymore. The strength of evidence for this is very strong.

The author, Thomas Cooper, was a ~~man~~ leading member of Chartism and is able to admit that everything he tried to achieve politically, only three decades ago, was useless, shows how insignificant Chartism was and how it only ~~was~~ filled a void for when there was economic hardship and a

government happy to rest on their laurels, as the Whigs were, due to ~~the~~ their reputation as 'the reforming party' after the 1832 act.

Overall, Chartism was a failure, its aims were seriously overambitious, ~~the~~ of which they failed to achieve ~~one~~ even a single one during its life span. Despite ~~or~~ having large support the movement was always divided by moral and physical force and all sorts of plots were failures too. Although their aims have largely been accomplished now, they had very little to no influence as most were organized by the initiated by the government. The sources also suggest that Chartism was not successful except for source 7.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response achieves level 3 in both assessment objectives. Although more extensive use could be made of the sources, where they are used it is done very effectively. The candidate argues from a source and then develops that argument with the use of own knowledge.



## Question 2

### Question 2(a)

This question worked well and the sources were accessible, although there were some phrases that were not fully understood and some misreading of aspects of the sources by some candidates such as reading the reference to 'profit' in Source 11 as financial profit. Many candidates were able to cross reference successfully in assessing the issue of the costs involved, but there was some confusion around the essential message of Source 12. It seemed that arguments around laissez faire and the necessity for state intervention were not well understood by some candidates. The best answers were able to cross reference the sources for both agreement and disagreement, incorporate an evaluation of the provenance to test the weight that could be ascribed to the sources and reached clearly substantiated judgements. Weaker answers often did make reference to the provenance, but generally attempts at developing it were limited and generalised comments only were made.

(a) The sources as a collection suggest that cost was not efficiently distributed in the 1840s which therefore led to an obstacle in public health improvements. However, cost was not the only factor that did not lead to progression in public health but also the opposition of the public and the need for a central authority to provide a fair treatment for the whole country without ~~being~~ relying on others to 'look\* after' them.

Sources 10 and 11 generally agree that the main obstacle to public health improvements was the cost due to 'imposing taxation' on the public who previously weren't charged for improving everyone's ~~state~~ public health conditions. For example, Source 10 shows a personal account on opposing to the Amendment Bill due to taking away 'powers' of the authorities. This suggests that the country is no longer under the doctrine of laissez faire and suggests that many are changing their views on who should take charge of costs and how it should be distributed.

Source 11 supports the view on 'profits' that are directly supplied by the population. Source 11 shows that the cost is not efficiently spent and this suggests that people would start opposing the view on what they can and can't pay for depending on what they will benefit from. As it states, only 5.7% of the population were profited by the supply of

((a) continued) water and the rest of the water has not been used...

Sources 10 and 11 both show that this new idea of charge and payments that are taken out of people's wages is unfair when ~~pay~~ the public don't use it. Especially those who had to pay for the poor and others which led to 'objection'. On the other hand, as ~~see~~ in Source 10, the MP would oppose of a Commission that would 'impose taxation upon those who have been exempt' shows that cost wasn't the only factor/obstacle that the public thought about. It suggests that there would be an effect in society if taxes rose due to public health provisions that nobody believed in.

Source 12 does not view that the cost was the most effective reason to regress the public health improvements, but the idea that not effective measures were taken by the authority in order to improve public health. This suggests that Cholera had an effect on the impact of cost and the need for change by the authorities, but every town varied due to what applied best for them. On the other hand, Source 12 also links with the other sources as it suggests that the need for money could result in new facilities in order to wear away the 'nuisance of unflushed sewers'.

In conclusion, I believe that cost was an obstacle, but it was not as significant as the need for central authorities to get involved and introduce centralisation in order to result in much faster public health provisions as Source 10 suggests with the idea that it's 'totally

((a) continued) foreign to every principle of the English Constitution' and therefore centralisation shows that the British public were opposing change.



Although there is some of the language of cross referencing in this answer, it does not engage in genuinely developed cross referencing. There is no reference to the provenance of the sources. For these reasons, this response cannot move beyond level 2.



Cross referencing must be evident in answers and provenance should be considered.

### Question 2(b)(i)

This question was answered by slightly less than half of the candidates, most of whom found the sources accessible and were able to use them to create a debate about the issues. The most impressive answers to this question were those that fully recognised the nature of the 'fear' expressed in Source 13 and developed their response around this. There were many effective answers to this question which integrated the sources very well with their own knowledge to form a convincing judgement which evaluated and compared the reasons for opposition. Weaker answers tended to rely on a description of poor conditions. Some candidates failed to appreciate the provenance of Source 15 which suggested the existence of regional variations in opposition.

It was disappointing to note that once again this year many candidates were still making generic points, some at great length, regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b. This issue has been highlighted in previous reports, but the continuing practice disadvantages candidates who spend time that would be more usefully spent on focusing on the question.

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

\*(b) i) As a collection, the sources ~~can~~ corroborate that the fear of the poor of the new system was a significant factor ~~and~~ which supports the notion that, while vested interests and political traditional supporters were influential, their work only enhanced the influence fear for the poor had on opposing the new Poor Law.

In terms of the significance of poor people's fears of the new Poor Law, Sources 13 and 14 both corroborate that the fear was influential; 'rumours spread... extermination centres' in Source 13 suggests through 'spread' the wide influence fear had and the extremity of the allegations, 'extermination camps' that fear through ~~no~~ rumour had influence over a wide majority and the fears were, in nature, extreme and centred toward the work of the new Poor Law.

There is evidence to support this; no rumour was known to be widespread, with publications like 'The Book of Murder', in which it suggested that pauper children would be gassed, were known to have a wide circulation. The focus on the workhouse is also supported; the workhouse was often nicknamed 'the bastille' and a significant fear among the poor was to be removed to a remote, prison-like workhouse, with some areas, like Todmorden, refusing to build one until 1877, a reasonable time after the initial opposition following the Amendment Act in 1834. My own knowledge therefore gives more weight to the source evidence that fear through rumour was influential.

((b) continued) This is also corroborated in Source K6, which focuses on the influence fear had through active protest against new Poor Law implementation. Source 14 focuses on the words 'the Anti-Poor Law... the new law', the movement's ability to create 'success' in 'delaying' through 'the local radicals' in the case of Huddersfield, suggests that fear of the new Poor Law that galvanised the local radicals had at least some success and thus some influence in being the main reason of opposition. The source does have some bearing on my own knowledge; the Anti-Poor Law Movement, already mobilised by the Chartist 10 hour Movement, was hugely influential in creating organised protest against Amendment Poor Law implementation, with protests in Bradford preventing commissioners from implementing the Act and with Lancashire and West Riding, Yorkshire being exempt from the Prohibitory Relief Order in 1838, demonstrating the success the movement had in delaying and stopping

implementation and, by linking the role fear played 'in galvanising the poor into these protests, the demonstration of the influence fear had in opposing the Poor Law Amendment Act. This knowledge thus supports the sources and so gives it extra weight and, due to its corroboration with the evidence of Source 13, adds further weight for the argument of fear's influence, which is also supported, by their provance; the use of objective language like consideration of varied response in the North suggests the

((b) continued) objective nature of Source 14's provance, with and lack of motive or subjective language in Source 13 supports its objectivity, gives both sources more reliability and thus their content more weight, further supporting the argument.

Source 15 does ~~not~~ however suggest the influence of fear may be lessened by its lack of county-wide influence; 'as soon as ... alterations gladly', suggesting that the protest that made fear so influential was less pressing in the south (Dorset) and that as such, the lack of a wide-spread protest would diminish fear's influence. There is some evidence to support this; riots and protests were fewer in the south and were less organised due to the lack of the 10 hour Movement and that, due to the commission's report in 1832 focusing on the south for its study, the recommendations that formed the Poor Law Amendment Act were better suited to the south, and so were better received. However, the source does refer to the lack of understanding, 'fear really understood' as the source of protest, suggesting that fear was responsible, for initial opposition, as well as our knowledge

suggesting that there was some prevailing protest, such as in Buckinghamshire and East Angles, and thus reduces the credibility of the source. The source's provenance is also solely focused on Devon; the lack of a wider study area suggests the limitations of the studies source's findings and their lack of weight in judging the south or the whole, and thus reduce the weight of the source.

((b) continued) It is also worth considering other factors that contributed to the opposition, such as vested interests of Board owners, and the 'traditional right' felt by the poor to relief, however their lack of significance or expansion given in Source 13 suggests their irrelevance in comparison to the cause is being stimulated by fear of change.

To conclude, the sources and the weight provided by own knowledge suggests that, while other issues such were influential and the fear of the poor law and its influenced 'varied' (as seen in Source 14), its overall superiority of as an effect on delaying the implementation and its influence on other factors suggests it was the greatest reason for opposition to the Poor Law Amendment Act.

\* through Anti-Poor Law



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response is mixed in its approach. There are relevant sections of argument with some valid supporting own knowledge, but the focus is not sustained throughout. There is extensive discussion of the provenance of the secondary sources, which cannot be credited under AO2b. This response achieved level 3 for AO1 and strong level 2 for AO2.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Do not spend time discussing the provenance of secondary sources as this question targets AO2b, not AO2a.

## Question 2(b)(ii)

This question was answered by just over half of the candidates, most of whom found the sources accessible and were able to use them to create a debate about the issues. Many candidates convincingly explored the reasons for the improvements to public health, using the sources as the starting point and developing their responses with detailed and specific own knowledge in order to form a judgement on the most significant factor. Whilst candidates were often well-informed about alternative factors such as growing medical knowledge, the pioneering work of individuals like John Simon, John Snow and Louis Pasteur or the increasing use of compulsion by governments, most had to rely on using the content of Source 16 for information on the stated factor of civil engineering; it was a rare candidate who could go beyond this. Many candidates were able to recognise the connection between Sources 16 and 17 and saw that Bazalgette's work was only approved and funded as a consequence of the Great Stink.

It was disappointing to note that once again this year many candidates were still making generic points, some at great length, regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b. This issue has been highlighted in previous reports, but the continuing practice disadvantages candidates who spend time that would be more usefully spent on focusing on the question.

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

~~or~~ b) i) I disagree strongly with the view that advances in public health provision in the years 1848-75 came about mainly as a result of progress in civil engineering. Although this was undeniably a contributing factor, ~~a combination of~~ it was surpassed in importance by medical advances and, in particular, the work of key individuals. Taken as a whole, Sources 16, 17, 18 ~~are testaments~~ provide evidence for this.

Certainly, ~~the~~ progress in engineering techniques ~~was~~ ~~played~~ brought about significant changes in public health in this period, ~~even~~ providing perhaps the most "measurable improvements" in this area, due to their visibility. In London, in particular, the work of engineer Joseph Bazalgette in planning "the sewerage systems of both Manchester and London", (in Source 16's words), utterly changed the face and general hygiene of those major population centres. Rapid industrialisation

in the late 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> centuries had brought about both a doubling of the population between 1801 and 1851 and mass migration into ~~the~~ urban areas. ~~As such, ~~the~~ ~~health~~ ~~conditions~~ worsened~~ <sup>in cities</sup> health conditions worsened dramatically due to overcrowding, ~~as~~ its source 17 describes London in 1859, "The sewage of a mighty city lies in a ~~ho~~... under our very noses". Local authorities ~~did~~ struggled

((a) continued) to cope with <sup>unprecedented</sup> large quantities of waste, which <sup>spread</sup> caused a vast array of 'dirty' diseases, such as typhoid, ~~cholera~~ and diphtheria and tuberculosis. As such, industrialisation can be said to have acted as a driving force not only for such problems but also, indirectly, for the ~~seeking~~ quest for solutions, as it became ~~as~~ calls emerged for public health reform, as in 'The Times' "Something must be done". Joseph Bazalgette, as chief engineer of the ~~London~~ Metropolitan Board of Works from 1855, built an entirely new system of sewerage tunnels to carry out ~~the~~ London's waste to the Thames Estuary, where it could not flow back into the Thames. Completed in 1865, this system ~~allowed~~ protected the Thames as a cleaner source of water for London, causing Source 16's MacDonald to ~~credit~~ <sup>credit</sup> Bazalgette with "saving" more lives... than any other person. ~~However~~ <sup>However</sup>, Source 17 implicitly contradicts the view that improvements in engineering brought about improvements in itself. Instead, it suggests that it was the Great Stink of 1858, in which waste and high temperatures combined to cause an unbearable stench to come from the Thames, which ~~compelled~~ brought about change, ~~it~~ merely through desperation, "forcing us to address the sanitary administration".

Indeed, even if we are to credit engineering <sup>advances</sup> with reforming sanitation in certain major centres, if we are to



explain "improvements on a national" level, we must look to the work of ~~two~~ key individuals: in particular, Edwin Chadwick and John Simon. It was the former, through his tireless work

(a) continued) ~~the~~ linking poor hygiene with both disease and increased pauperism in his 1842 'Report on the Sanitary Conditions of the Labouring Population', who catalysed the development of the 1849 Public Health Act, the first major interference of the state in health provision (albeit a permissive one). This enabled the "public health initiatives" which "underpinned the improvements in health", according to Source 16, by allowing the creation of local boards of health. This Act also ~~for~~ created the General Board of Health, which Chadwick served on as commissioner, tirelessly campaigning for ~~improvements~~ ~~the~~ increased status of sewerage and water ~~supply~~ supply within legislation. However, his bullying tactics and stubborn nature came to be widely resented, causing him to be ~~resign~~ contributing to the dissolution, in 1858, of the General Board of Health. In the latter half of this period, then, it was John Simon who led the way in pushing for public health provision. As medical officer to the Privy Council, his influence was great, and his more politically adept manner, less steadfast than Chadwick's, enabled him to ~~bring about~~ bring about almost single-handedly such legislation as 1860's adulteration of Foods Act. Most important, however, was his role in developing ~~sanitary~~ what Source 19 calls "sanitary legislation with teeth in it". He brought about a shift from the 'laissez-faire' attitudes evident in the first Public Health Acts, as the "removal of nuisances became enforceable", ~~and~~ when 1868's Sanitation Act introduced the concept of fixing ineffectual local authorities. His major work culminated, arguably, in the ~~and therefore~~ acted as a major turning point.

1872 and  
(a) continued 1875 (and final) Public Health acts, which forced the creation of "local boards of health" and the "compulsory appointment of medical officers of health". The role of these two individuals, then, was vital in this period.

What allowed the government to commit with such certainty to a new role as enforcer of public health provision was, perhaps, ~~an increase~~ <sup>progress in</sup> medical understanding in the mid- to late nineteenth century. Previously, most Britons, including <sup>those</sup> in the medical profession, had assumed 'miasma' (that is, noxious ~~and~~ fumes in the air accompanied by a bad odour) to be the major cause of disease. Even Edwin Chadwick pronounced "all miasma is disease", causing him to ~~not~~ call for the counter-productive emptying of sewers into rivers. This theory might also explain Lousie 17's evident alarm at "the stench of June". In 1861, however, scientist Louis Pasteur published his theory that micro-organisms caused <sup>many</sup> human illnesses. Though not accepted in all circles for ~~so~~ many years, his ideas still spread, and encouraged the government to push for certain standards in hygiene, such as "the removal of nuisances". Additionally, the work of Dr John Snow in the cholera epidemic of 1853-4 (which killed ~~over~~ 64,000) established a link between the spread of the disease and the water supply. When John Simon eventually accepted his theory in 1870, it confirmed that <sup>such</sup> "key figures" policy was being guided by such ~~the~~ <sup>recent</sup> medical ~~was~~ ~~the~~ discoveries. The knowledge of this, then, would contradict Lousie 16's opinion that

(a) continued "improvements in public health" did not follow on as a result of improvements and breakthroughs of medical science".

In conclusion, then, it was not <sup>progress in</sup> civil engineering that has acted as a main factor in the improvement of public health provision between 1848 and 1875. Although it did play a major role (in large part thanks to Joseph Bazalgette) in some urban centres, the government was in this period not yet ~~open~~ willing to spend large ~~sums~~ money on large-scale projects which would use engineering advances to the full. ~~As such, it is~~ The primary factor, then, was the work of both the key figures Edwin Chadwick and John Simon, as the former was central ~~not~~ in persuading the government that health was a matter for the state, while the latter almost single-handedly introduced the concept of compulsion into ~~the~~ legislation. ~~As secretary of~~ The secondary ~~second~~ crucial factor in this period was played by advances in medical (rather than engineering) understanding, as this acted as a background ~~motivate~~ motivation for all such reform.

- \* Source 16's scholarly & nature and <sup>much</sup> date would seem to render it fairly reliable.
- \*\* ~~That~~ Source 18 deems "a significant breakthrough".
- ... which



## ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a very well informed response that integrates issues that are developed from the sources together with very detailed knowledge in order to reach very well supported judgements. Level 4 was achieved in both assessment objectives.

## 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 phrases such as 'using the sources as a set', without actually engaging in that task.

### 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. Weaker candidates work through sources sequentially. Such responses cannot go beyond level 2.
- Provenance should be integrated within the argument and decisions need to be made on the relative strengths and weaknesses of the sources. 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 and avoid labelling a source as both reliable and unreliable without coming to any judgement on its worth.
- 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. Sources should be used to develop lines of argument and reasoning rather than used for information to develop a descriptive answer.
- 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 A02b. 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 the time period specified. They should maintain the focus throughout their answer and 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