

# ResultsPlus

## Examiners' Report January 2010

### GCE History 6HI02/B

**ResultsPlus**  
look forward to better exam results  
[www.resultsplus.org.uk](http://www.resultsplus.org.uk)

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 Examiners' Report 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



ResultsPlus is our unique performance improvement service for you and your students.

It helps you to:

- **Raise attainment** - by providing in-depth analysis of where your class did well and not so well, enabling you to identify areas to focus on/make improvements.
- **Spot performance trends** at a glance by accessing one-click reports. You can even choose to compare your cohort's performance against other schools throughout the UK.
- **Personalise your students' learning** by reviewing how each student performed, by question and paper you can use the detailed analysis to shape future learning.
- **Meet the needs of your students on results day** by having immediate visibility of their exam performance at your fingertips to advise on results.

**To find out more about ResultsPlus and for a demonstration visit**

<http://resultsplus.edexcel.org.uk/home>

January 2010

Publications Code US022884

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

## GCE History 6HI02 Option B

There were some very good responses to this examination, with a sizeable number of candidates able to combine effective source handling skills with focused deployment of accurate and relevant own knowledge to achieve marks at level 3 and above. It was encouraging to see that many of the issues which had been identified in the summer report as posing problems for students were no longer causes for concern. However, there were still some common errors which undermined the quality of students' work and the purpose of the following comments is to offer some guidance for raising attainment.

1. Some candidates continue to lose marks because they seem unaware of the skills that specific elements of the exam are addressing. Overall 3 assessment objectives are being addressed in the Unit 2 exam; part (a) addresses AO2a (analysis, cross-referencing and evaluation of source material) and part (b) addresses AO1 and AO2b (analysis and evaluation of how issues have been interpreted and represented, in relation to historical context). It is vital, therefore, that students appreciate the differences between these assessment objectives and understand which of the 3 AO's is being tested in the two questions they are required to attempt.

2. The most common reason for low performance in the part (a) question was an inability to comprehend and interpret the source material effectively. Occasionally, this was the result of limited vocabulary. However, more often than not, it stemmed from rushed and careless reading. It is important that candidates take time to read the sources, both content and attributions, carefully and precisely. One of the key characteristics of high performing responses to part (a) questions is detailed cross-referencing and this, first and foremost, demands clarity and accuracy in source comprehension.

3. One other area of confusion in the part (a) question surrounds the application of wider knowledge. Candidates cannot be rewarded for wider knowledge included in responses to part (a), since the questions target AO2 only. However, candidates should not ignore the historical context, or 'pretend they know nothing' outside the sources. At best, the placing of sources in a contextual vacuum may lead to a tendency to take them at face value and restrict responses to L1 or L2, or to speculation that is not focused on the defined enquiry. Therefore contextual awareness, especially an understanding of issues and attitudes, should be applied in order to help candidates:

- See the implications of statements within a source and make inferences relating to the enquiry –
- See the significance of the information given in the provenance of a source as a means of interpreting and evaluating the evidence offered by the source content. However, it should be emphasised that any references should be brief, and directly applied to developing arguments from the sources.

Contextual knowledge therefore plays a role in enabling candidates to interpret and evaluate evidence in order to reach higher levels, but it cannot be rewarded by separate marks. A brief reference may be useful in explaining the implications of a particular piece of evidence or the significance of its provenance and therefore support higher level arguments within AO2. Longer passages of contextual knowledge are a waste of time and may actually lead the candidate away from the task – which is the analysis, interpretation and evaluation of evidence from the sources, in order to reach a judgement. However, candidates should not be discouraged from applying contextual awareness in handling the sources.

4. For part (b) questions it is important that candidates appreciate what they are being asked to do. A Part (b) task focuses on combining and integrating evidence from sources with wider knowledge in order to evaluate a given statement or view, and develop a substantiated judgement on this basis. It, therefore, draws on a conceptual understanding that all historical judgements are, in fact, based upon interpretations. Thus, candidates should analyse the evidence of the source material to support and challenge the representation in the question. The sources should be approached as a set and there will be some cross-referencing of evidence between sources and/or between sources and contextual knowledge to develop relevant arguments. At higher levels, conflicting arguments will be evaluated by reference to context and provenance to attempt to establish an overall judgement. However, it is important here that candidates do not engage in formulaic or routine evaluation of provenance. Provenance need only be assessed where it helps to weigh up the quality of the evidence in relation to the claim under investigation. Thus, in the best responses discussion will proceed on the basis of reasoning from the sources and discriminating use of evidence that has been weighed and contextualised to examine conflicting arguments and reach a reasoned conclusion.

5. Both part (a) and part (b) tasks are challenging, requiring candidates to engage in complex cross-referencing and analysis. To meet the assessment objectives effectively requires careful preparation and it is noticeable that more and more of the higher performing scripts include substantial plans. It cannot, therefore, be stressed enough that thorough and detailed planning centred around the source material is a prerequisite for success in this unit.

## Question B1

### Question 1(a)

Most candidates found this an accessible question and were able to understand the basic message of each source, including the cartoon and then go on to link this message to the focus of the question. There was however, a marked tendency for many candidates to work through each source in turn, paraphrasing the content, making some links to the question and possibly re-stating aspects of the information provided in the provenance, often without exploring its implications. This was particularly evident in references to the provenance of source 1 where many candidates did not make the link between the date of the cartoon and the passage of legislation. Such responses can achieve a sound level 2 but are unable to move into level 3. Where candidates began to cross reference the sources more directly and more closely and linked this to a reasoned discussion of the importance of the timing of the sources, it was possible to access level 4.

(a) Sources 1, 2 and 3 all suggest that the 1832 Reform Act brought about a significant reduction in political influence of the aristocracy but the question is to what extent.

Firstly Source 1 shows a picture of the Lords Opposing the Torrent of Reform. They are in the picture drowning in the sea of Reform, suggesting that Reform has made them powerless and less authoritative; they can't control the sea and cannot control the movement for parliamentary reform. When taking into consideration the reliability of the source we must look at its background information.

This cartoon is from a satirical magazine from 1831 that had 'radical sympathies'. Do these sympathies therefore imply that the aristocracy still had high political power

and there was therefore a need to sympathise with the working class and the radicals. Examining the image closely we can see Lord Grey seated at the top saying 'I've set open the flood gates and if they are simple enough to place themselves in its way they do so at their own peril.' This has the implication that Lord Grey didn't wish for the aristocracy to have as much political power as they did pre 1832; we must ask ourselves is this likely or is it in fact an over-dramatisation of the reduction in political influence. Just looking at the source without deep analysis one would think there was a great reduction in political influence of the aristocracy largely brought about by Lord Grey, but as I said that is an opinion without deep analysis.

Moving onto source 2, which is a report from the Times of a speech made by Lord John Russell. He admits he is not for 'further change'; is this because the aristocracy had more political power than



the radicals thought they had? Lord Russell goes on to say that

((a) continued) 'whenever the opinions of the people were unequivocally declared, the House of Lords would know its place and would not oppose the wishes of the country.' This declaration suggests that the House of Lords represented the people and would not disregard their opinions due to their social status. However if we look further into this we have to ask ourselves was the House of Lords representative of the people or was Lord John Russell saying this to impress at a 'Banquet'?

Source 3 is an interesting source because it is from a middle class, radical MP. He begins discussing how the 'privilege in this country is terribly strong' and how they are 'aristocracy loving' which does support the statement that the 1832 Act brought a significant reduction to aristocracy power for these people to be content with privileges. However it is from a middle class radical who did have more privileges than those working class.

((a) continued) The source takes a different turn towards the end stating that 'most discouraging situation is in Lancashire boroughs, which apart from Manchester, are in the hands of the stupidest Tories in England, thanks to the power of the aristocracy and their allies, the snobs of the towns.' This shows anger that the Tories still have control over certain things and refers to them as snobs. To me this doesn't show a reduction in power of aristocracy but a growth in anger that some things have remained the same after the 1832 Great Reform Act.

In conclusion sources 1 and 2 do show that there was a significant reduction in aristocratic political power. Source 3 does to an extent but reveals the truth that some things have stayed the same things which encourage a growth of anger.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This response illustrates the source by source approach to this question that is taken by many candidates. The content of each source is described in turn; thus there is no genuine cross referencing although both the introduction and conclusion to the answer suggest some awareness of the need to treat the sources as a group. The provenance is largely asserted rather than used to explain. This response is a strong level 2.



Indicate which question you are answering by marking 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

18<sup>a</sup>

22<sup>abAO1</sup>

14<sup>abAO2</sup>

(a) Sources 1, 2 and 3 all agree to an extent that the 1832 Reform Act had caused a reduction in aristocratic influence, although source 3 only agrees to a lesser extent. However when the provenance of each source is considered it is clear that the evidence suggesting that there was significant change is unreliable and so it would seem there were only limited reductions in influence.

At first glance source 1 agrees that there was indeed reduced influence as it depicts people wearing top hats (i.e. the aristocracy) being flooded with reform, and it shows that all efforts made by them to oppose reform would be futile, and in doing so they would drown (as seen by person in bottom right). Similarly, source 2 agrees that the aristocrats would have to respect and acknowledge the need to reform as it states "the House of Lords would know its place," hence this aristocratically dominated institution would be influenced by the Act and have less power to act independently of public wishes. Hence both sources state that aristocrats would be pressured and have limited powers as a result.

Also, source 3 to some extent shows reduced power as it states that Manchester's <sup>boroughs</sup> ~~was not~~ were not in the hands of the aristocrats and hence the aristocrats may have lost influence in some parts of the country.

However, when inspected more thoroughly it becomes clear that the first 2 sources have a weak provenance which affects their credibility. Source 1 was written in 1831, which was before the Bill was passed and hence they could only speculate on its impacts - the

((a) continued) reality may have been different to proposed measures. Also, it was written as a cartoon in a magazine which sympathized with radicals, so could have exaggerated the impacts or been used as propaganda. Similarly, source 2 was written in 1837, so has less hindsight than source 3 and John Russell proposed the bill so may have bias to state its

Furthermore, there is considerable evidence which shows that aristocratic influence was still strong. Sources 2 and 3 agree that reform was introduced to protect the "great institutions" as source 2 states it was "not for further change". Similarly, source 3 states that only half a dozen families decide on the choice of candidates in elections and hence they have significant influence, and that people are MPs "managers to be part of the aristocracy". Hence, as source 3 was written in 1879 they have hindsight and they were both of the middle class which adds credibility to their views.

Overall, it would seem that source 3 requires more weighting and that, although there was some reduction in the power of the aristocracy e.g. politicians would have to listen, aristocratic influence remained throughout as aristocrats controlled the seats in parliament and hence there was still excessive political influence. ~~The arguments put forward in source 1 and 2 seem to be~~



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

By contrast, this response clearly engages in sustained cross referencing between the sources which are explored and developed. When dealing with the provenance of the sources, it considers the significance of the dates and examines the weight that can be ascribed to each source. This is a secure level 4 response.

**Question 1(b)(i)**

This was very much the more popular of the two choices in this section and most candidates demonstrated that they were knowledgeable about many aspects of Chartism. Weaker responses often used the sources to develop answers that were not directly linked to the question focus, frequently drifting to an exposition either of why Chartism failed or the nature of Chartist leadership. At this level of response, there was also some confusion about the precise message of source 4 although sources 5 and 6 were understood at face value and used to direct the response in the direction that has been selected. Better responses demonstrated an awareness that an interpretation was being considered and reached a judgement about whether or not Chartism was a failure, with most candidates arguing for short-term failure and longer term significance. For some this judgement was based largely or exclusively in the political arena, but some of the best responses were developed beyond this, often picking up the reference to literacy in source 6 as a starting point.

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

(b)(i) Do you agree with the view that the chartist movement was a failure? 4, 5+6 and your own knowledge.

The sources provide evidence both for and against the view that chartism was a failure. Source 4 considers the working class conditions as a reason for the 'symptom of discontent' yet not explicitly arguing either for or against the claim. However, source 5 acknowledges an innate weakness and destined failure, whilst source 6 provides a contrasting view of long-term success, despite the ~~chartist failing~~ Chartism failing 'in its aims'.

Because the six-point charter was too radical for the period 1836-58, it can be argued that the Chartists' aims failed, not securing a secret ballot until 1872. ~~and so~~ However, as Ellis argues in his 'People, Power and Politics', that out of the chartist movement came the ability of the working people to be organised on an unprecedented



scale in support of a political programme'. Furthermore Source 6 describes 'improvements in literacy' which adds to the argument that chartism strengthened the position of the working people.

In contrast to this Source 5 ~~des~~ analysing the movement as 'doomed to failure'. This can be

((b) continued) exemplified as the <sup>support</sup> ~~role~~ of the monarchy was still important in determining political agenda. Similarly, Conservative ~~oposition~~ <sup>opposition</sup> to the ~~the~~ radicalism of the movement still existed, reflecting Peel's assessment of previous reform that 'I was unwilling to open a door of which I saw no prospect of being able to close.'

Chartism can be seen as a failure by its separation both between leaders, agendas and regions. ~~✶~~ Few attempts were made to unite the chartists and it can be argued that those which were made were short-lived. For example the Northern Star acted as an attempt to unite the movement, yet this began publication in 1837 and ended in 1852.

Another attempt at unity, also supporting Briggs' claim that it was 'doomed to failure' is Joseph Sturge's National Reform League which also faded away.

Published in 1840, ~~✶~~ Carlyle would have been

familiar with the support of the movement with the Birmingham Bull Ring Riots in July 1839 and ~~the~~ riots in Sheffield and Bradford 1840. It can therefore be argued that Carlyle's experience of Chartism first hand and his understanding of the pressures

((b) continued) Garrett supports his claim that the working classes poses a threat at present. However Source 4 portrays more concern to the roots and causes of the movement as opposed to its consequences.

In contrast to this, Source 5 clearly supports the claim that Chartism was a failure. This can be substantiated as Briggs reports 'even had the leaders agreed about methods' which portrays disunity. An example of this is the conflict between Lovell and Place's London and Birmingham moral force and O'Connor's, northern-based physical force. Sabotaging the beilers, also known as the plug-plot riots displays the attempt to overcome the ~~half~~ 'half-reformed House of Commons'.

Carlyle's <sup>arguments</sup> ~~assertions~~ of the poor working class conditions can be supported by ~~an~~ interest of the physical force chartists 'peaceably if we could, forceably if we must'. Source 4 can therefore be seen to support the intentions of the Chartists, and although cannot be viewed as



a reliable reflection of the movement, being published in 1890, gives little evidence that chartism was a failure.

Paradoxically, Source 5, ironically titled 'the age of Improvement' does little to suggest that the movement offered substantial change.

((b) continued) It can be inferred that Briggs views the Chartist movement as an intrinsic failure, by the claim that, 'they could have never never have forced their visions of parliament on the country'. However, by 1842 the movement had gained sufficient support, evident in the petition to parliament, although rejected 287 to 49 votes.

Sources 5 and 6 provide contradictory evidence and it can be deduced that although 'chartism failed in its aims' there was longer term effect, it leading to the further reforms of 1872, 1883, 1884 and 1885.

1867 However, the movement was a failure considering its severe dislocation, leadership divisions and dependency on the state of the economy.

Taken together the sources argue that chartism was a short-term failure and a long-term success.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Although this candidate may have run out of time in view of the brevity of the judgement made in the conclusion, this response demonstrates a number of features that exemplify a response that can achieve level 4 for both assessment objectives. The sources are used as a group and cross referenced to drive an argument. The candidate has fully elicited material from the sources e.g. the reference to literacy from source 6. It is worth pointing out that the candidate does not make very much reference to provenance in this response; this is perfectly acceptable as this is not what AO2b is testing or rewarding. This candidate has strong own knowledge in places which is well integrated with the sources.

### **Question 1(b)(ii)**

This was not a popular question and where tackled attracted largely weak responses with a very few high quality responses. Weaker candidates often did not use the sources very effectively, either paraphrasing them with virtually no own knowledge to support their arguments or making a range of generalised comments that made only limited reference to the sources and the question focus. However, where this question was tackled successfully, candidates performed at a very high standard. They showed themselves able to use the sources as a group to consider the nature of both Liberal and Conservative approaches to party campaigning techniques and promises and were able to support this with very good own knowledge that was well integrated with the sources to produce a well-developed analysis of a range of relevant issues.

## Question B2

### Question 2a

The sources in this question did pose some problems for some candidates. Whilst most candidates appreciated the basic message conveyed by Malthus in source 10, their ability to read the message of the other two sources varied. Some candidates misinterpreted source 11 and others source 12. This meant that even where candidates attempted to cross reference the sources, they were not always successful in doing so as their cross referencing was based on a mistaken interpretation. Provenance was frequently re-stated, rather than used to consider the weight that could be given to the sources; this was often linked to an approach which paraphrased the content of each source in turn without attempting to cross reference them. Such responses can achieve a sound level 2 but are unable to move into level 3. Better responses engaged in accurate cross referencing, considering the counter claims of sources 11 and 12. They also began to explore the significance of the provenance in terms of time and place.

Question 1 Question 2 

(a) first and foremost, Thomas Malthus discusses in source 10 how the settlement laws are "inconvenient and tyrannical", whilst being "contradictory to all ideas of reform. In this he is clearly stating that he believes the laws are working against ideas of freedom ~~and~~ and do not help those who are "struggling to support themselves" in the late 1700's.

From some of the sources it is possible to gain the opinion that the settlement laws in fact looked only to move problems on to other areas, rather than providing a steadfast solution, if true this would in reality support Malthus' claims! The order made by Cheshire JP's depicts a situation where 'the overseers' 'have complained' about a certain family, resulting in their swift removal "from the said township". The fact that "the overseers" were looking to remove them immediately from the area, rather than

offer help or support displays ~~are~~ how the system of the time (ie fetterment laws), simply didn't look to solve the problems, only more than on. Ultimately, source 11 therefore supports quite strongly the 'claims' made by Malthus in 1798 that the laws didn't

((a) continued) give help to those "struggling". The validity of the source as a true reflection of the status quo across the country may however be questionable. The source in question focuses on one township (Lutton); thus failing to demonstrate any other representation of the situation anywhere else in the country at the time being a county of very different demographics, systems and living conditions the source may only be used to support Malthus' claims as ~~it~~ falsified in one, very specific area. In summation, the source 11 as a specific example of one case in one area does 'support the claims' made by Malthus in source 10, but only to a certain extent as it falls short of enlightening us as to the situation across the rest of the country.

Looking at source 10, it may be suggested that Malthus overexaggerated his portrayal of the fetterment laws as unhelpful and 'inconvenient'. The claimant, William Douse of Malton, describes how the poor rate in his case actually 'helped' him 'despite contrary



to live at Wainfleet which was not his original area of settlement. On face value then, this source appears to show how unlike source 11, in this case Dove was not made to move away from his current abode and was even supported by local authority.

((a) continued) This surely shows Malthus to be wrong; however once more this ~~is~~ source is case and area specific and does not shed any light onto or how the settlement laws are employed nationwide - because every area across the county is most likely to be different. Furthermore, the date of the source's origin renders it less useful in terms of supporting Malthus' claims. In 1825, the date of Dove's claim, the New Poor Law had recently come into operation which made the settlement laws extinct. Therefore, although he discusses a period of time much earlier, although this does not support Malthus as it is 9 years after his claim his claim is not made until after the eradication of the Settlement Laws. Therefore on this alone the source is hardly suitable at all to answer or give any support on to the validity and truth of the claims made by Malthus.

In all, the specificity of the given sources to one area and one case, coupled with the chronologically unsuitable source 12, mean that both sources are unable to <sup>support</sup> ~~answer~~ fully the 'claims' made by Malthus that



The settlement laws were onerous and 'tyrannical' source 12 can be completely discounted whereas 11 only adds weight to Malthus' claims in one area and therefore cannot be used as a representation of what the

((a) continued) laws are like generally due to its nature.



### ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response clearly demonstrates an awareness of the need to cross reference the sources and attempts to do so, although it is not always fully effective in this. It does however use the provenance quite strongly to probe the weight that the sources can bear. This combination of features makes this response a level 3/4 borderline answer. To be a secure level 4 response, the cross referencing would need to be developed further and sustained through the answer.

## Question 2(b)(i)

There was no significant disparity between the numbers attempting each question in this section. Most candidates were able to understand the key arguments that were presented in the sources and were able to integrate this with some own knowledge, even if this amounted to little more than an awareness of some of the worse of the excesses and scandals that characterised the workhouse. However, it was surprising that so few candidates from across the range picked up on the reference in source 15 to the example of the success of deterrence at Cuckfield. Weaker responses tended to work through the sources sequentially with some additional comment and links made to the question. Better responses used the sources as a group to present evidence to support the statement, usually using source 15 as their starting point with support from source 13. Source 14 was then used to offer an alternative view which was developed in stronger responses to show that the new Poor Law was not unremittingly deterrent. Some candidates additionally began to consider and develop other explanations for deterrence, such as economic costs. Such responses with a range of arguments developed from the integration of sources and own knowledge could move to level 4.

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

~~(b)(i) To some extent I believe that the main aim of the Poor Law administration after 1834 was to deter the able-bodied poor from seeking relief, but I also believe other factors were important. A variety of aims, with cost and deterring the able-bodied poor the two most important ones.~~ New paragraph

The New Poor Law of 1834 was based around the principle of less eligibility - that workers ~~same~~ the quality of life of somebody claiming relief should be worse than that of the lowest paid labourer. This was an attempt to discourage the able-bodied poor from choosing poor relief over work, and the prominence of less eligibility ~~is~~ in the New Poor Law would ~~suggest it was a major~~ therefore, suggest that deterring the able-bodied poor from finding work was a major aim.

Source 15 supports this idea, telling us that the law was "designed to be unpleasant" and giving us figures that out of the "236 men" who applied for relief, "only 11 accepted the offer of the workhouse", and of these, "three left after a few hours". This suggests

((b) continued)

that the system was aimed at the able-bodied poor, and that it was working. Although it must be noted that Source 15 is only describing one event and may not be reflective of the situation nationwide, in general the new Poor Law did discourage the able-bodied from claiming relief.

However, there were other motives for the implementation and continuation of the New Poor Law after 1834. ~~Costs had been to ratepayers~~ The cost of ~~to ratepayers~~ ~~had been~~ spir of Poor Relief had been spiralling as ~~increasing~~ in the years leading up to 1834 as more and more people chose relief. With the wealthy middle class - ratepayers - having been given the vote in 1832, they were concerned

with the amount they had to pay.

Consequently, it can be argued that the New Poor Law was introduced to cut costs ~~and~~ in an attempt to appease the voting middle class, and this is

((b) continued) Supported by the fact that costs did indeed go down. Detering the able-bodied from claiming relief was a way to cut costs.

~~There was also another reason for~~ Source 13 gives a good idea of another reason for the ~~implem~~ main aim of ~~the poor relief~~ the Poor Law administration after 1834 - to improve the morals of the poor. At the time, England was a very Christian country, and it was thought that poor relief encouraged "laziness" and "vice". It was believed that the New Poor Law would ~~stop~~ encourage morally better behaviour.

Source 13 is written from the ~~the Poor Law Report~~ a ~~Report~~ ~~to report~~ the Poor Law Report, which outlined the main reasons for the introduction of the New Poor Law, and was ~~str~~ followed quite strictly in terms of what made up the eventual New Poor Law.



~~The fact that it is a~~ This means it is a reliable source, as it ~~gives the reason it~~ gave the main reasons for the New Poor Law. However, the writers did have an agenda - they wanted the introduction of a ~~the~~ new system of Poor Relief - and so if they

((b) continued)

thought that saying the New Poor Law would discourage Idleness and Vice would get the ~~legisla~~ law introduced, they would say it.

~~The evidence that~~ There is little evidence the behaviour of the poor did subsequently improve, but it is difficult to measure.

~~Source 13 also links to the idea of less eligibility and so deterring the poor from seeking relief, and so as it tells us that "when the proper class is placed... below... the independent labourer"~~

Source 13 also suggests improving the economy was a reason, telling us the a result of the New Poor Law would be that "the permanent demand for their labour has increased". However, the fact that the



economy actually 'suffered' as a result of the New Poor Law suggests this was not a major aim.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Despite the fact that there is some repetition in this answer, the candidate does understand many of the key issues that are raised by this question. There is sound contextual own knowledge which is integrated with the sources to support the arguments that are presented. For this reason, the answer reaches low level 4 in AO1, but would have been more secure in the level with some further specific own knowledge to support the arguments. The sources are used in terms of support and challenge to the view and for this achieve high level 3. Some time is spent discussing reliability, but this is not an essential feature of AO2b.

### Question 2(b)(ii)

Most candidates were able to understand the key arguments that were presented in the sources and were able to integrate this with some own knowledge, although this was often quite generalised. Some candidates read source 16 only at face value, but many candidates recognised the implicit reference to *laissez faire* in source 18. The sources provided candidates with a range of obstacles for consideration, especially if they were able to go beyond face value of the sources in their interpretation, such as using source 16 as the basis of a discussion on the engineering difficulties that faced projects. Weaker responses tended to work through the sources sequentially with some additional comment and links made to the question. Better responses used the sources as a group to consider the role of local interests before turning to a consideration of other obstacles. They were able to integrate the sources with their own knowledge, which was for some candidates largely contextual. Some candidates were very well informed about a range of issues and were able to use this knowledge in conjunction with the sources to impressive effect to argue about the relative significance of local interests.

(b) Source 16 is an extract from 'a Report on the Condition of the Town of Leeds' written by a local resident, James Smith in 1848. The Source says about sewerage work within the town and how the Council ~~was~~<sup>Surrey</sup> just miscalculated the sewer and then just ~~redesign~~ redesigned - their own cost aggressive sewer.

Source 17 is an extract from A. Wood, *Nineteenth Century Britain* published 1960. The Source says about the resistance of Public Health reform by Common and local authorities.

Source 18 is from an editorial in *The Times* newspaper, July 1854. The Source says about views against the work of the Board of Health.

Yes I agree with the view that the main obstacle to improvements to Public Health were local interests. Much of the reason why the 1848 Public Health act ~~had~~<sup>didn't</sup> make improvements ~~was~~<sup>was</sup> caused by a mixture of opposition from people with Vested interests; ~~to~~ like water companies, and also because local authorities and local Boards of Health did not want to ~~to~~ tackle greater Public Health.

problems. Source 17 supports this by saying "the effort to bring in any measure of reform was fiercely resisted in the Commons and by local authorities". Another local interest which stood as an obstacle to improvement was the cost of reform. Many local <sup>Boards</sup> ~~gave~~ of Health

((b) continued) did not want to have to pay large amounts of money on ~~the~~ Public Health reforms, and Source 16 shows us an example of this, saying that ~~the council~~ <sup>the council</sup> adopted their own surveyor's plans as "it was more calculated to save money than to ensure efficiency".

However, all this said, No I don't agree that the main obstacles to Public Health improvement was local interests. A lack of medical knowledge at the time was an obstacle for Public Health improvement, and as Source 17 says "Before the 1800s the foul, insanitary conditions of the towns was accepted". People at the time believed that disease was spread ~~thru~~ through Miasma, and ~~as~~ Source 18 shows us examples of just how much people lacked an understanding of disease by saying, "He prefer to take over with Cholera and ~~that~~ ~~the~~ the rest", and also "There is nothing a man hates so much as being cleansed against his will". A lack of engineering and ~~health~~ sewerage disposal was also a obstacle to Public Health improvement. Source 16 shows us just how much of a lack of engineering knowledge people on Councils had, "The Council's surveyor miscalculated the level of the first sewer he attempted

by some two feet, which caused stagnation of the water.<sup>11</sup>  
 A lack of compulsory National legislation was also  
 a obstacle to Public Health improvement. ~~The~~ <sup>The</sup> 1848 Public  
 Health act was only implemented into places with  
 ((b) continued) worst death rate, but everywhere ~~was~~ <sup>else</sup> it had to  
 be voted in. This was a downfall as people didn't think that  
 there needed to be a reform, and as Source 18 puts it, they  
 thought they were being "Pun bullied into Health".

In Conclusion, Yes I agree that Local interests were an  
 obstacle to Public Health improvement; being that local  
 authorities didn't want to take on the ~~mass~~ responsibility and  
 the cost of Health improvements. However, I don't agree that  
 it was the main obstacle to Public Health improvements. There  
 are many other obstacles that were of equal <sup>importance</sup>  
 to local interests, these being; lack of Medical Knowledge and also  
 lack of Compulsory legislation and actions taken by the  
 Government. With the lack of medical Knowledge it made it  
 hard to know how to improve public Health and ~~was~~ <sup>where</sup> to  
 make reforms, ~~and~~ With lack of Compulsory legislation, many  
 local authorities could use loop-holes so they didn't ~~to~~ have  
 to provide Public Health.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This candidate has clearly understood the focus of the question, but the material presented lacks depth and development – hence low level 3 for AO1. A little additional time may have been available for greater development if the candidate had not spent so much time at the start summarising the sources; this added very little to the argument. Quotations are selected from the sources to buttress the argument – a level 2 quality for AO2b.



**6HI02 B Statistics**

## Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Maximum Mark (Raw)	Mean Mark	Standard Deviation
60	37.1	8.3

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	45	40	35	30	26
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40
% Candidates		21.3	41.4	60.7	81.2	92.8



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 US022884 January 2010

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

Ofqual  




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

