

Examiners' Report  
June 2015

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).

## ResultsPlus

### 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 2015

Publications Code US041769

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

## Introduction

Centres and candidates are once again to be congratulated for their performance this 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. Many scripts demonstrated an impressive knowledge base in the part B question which compared favourably with previous examination series. At the highest levels of attainment, these scripts were combined with well-developed analysis.

However, it is again disappointing to note that there remains a minority of candidates who perform poorly, both in terms of their skills set and their knowledge base.

In part A, a minority of candidates continue to work through the sources, largely in sequence, paraphrasing the content and with no attempt at cross referencing. Whilst it is the case that many candidates understand the language of cross referencing, not all actually engage fully in the processes, merely asserting that the sources either agree or disagree without explaining how they have arrived at this conclusion. Such responses are unlikely to move beyond level 2, even where they clearly understand the issues being raised by the sources. There also 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 in this exam series. There is no credit for this in part A and thus, such candidates waste time that would be better spent developing those aspects of the answer that do gain credit – cross referencing, a consideration of provenance linked to the arguments and judgements. There seemed to be certain stock responses given to particular kinds of sources which could not be justified on the basis of the information that the provenance provided. For example, in those options where letters were used, there were a significant number of candidates who assumed that such letters were private, even where it would appear much more likely that they would be in the public domain.

In part B, there appeared to be fewer candidates this series who relied completely on the material in the sources. More candidates demonstrated some range and depth of knowledge that could be applied to the part B questions. 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. It continues to be the case that despite comments in many previous examiners' reports regarding the focus of AO2b, candidates continue to comment to a greater or lesser extent on provenance in their responses to part B. Such comments are frequently very generic e.g. 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. Some candidates spend an excessive amount of time on this and they 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. Fewer candidates this series used the word 'infer' incorrectly, although there did appear to be some increase in the use of 'bias' often incorrectly spelled.

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

## Question 1 (a)

Candidates generally found the sources accessible and understood the differing accounts of the effectiveness of physical force Chartism in mobilising support for the movement. Many candidates 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. However, a significant minority of candidates failed to read the attributions of the sources with due care. Neither letter (Sources 1 and 3) was claimed to be a private or personal letter as so many candidates assumed. Furthermore, in Source 1, Russell's position is explicitly identified as being Home Secretary, yet a number of candidates commented that he was Prime Minister or Chancellor. There was also some tendency for some candidates to lift quotes without considering the wider implications of their meaning e.g. 'applaud physical force' in Source 3 was quoted in isolation.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

(a) The sources 1, 2 and 3 all show elements of agree that the arguments of physical force was effective in mobilising support. However, sources 1 and 2 mostly disagree.

Sources 1 and ~~source~~ 2 both claim that the ~~same~~ "manner in which physical force was discussed" was "undesirable" and "threatening". Source 1 is a ~~letter~~ letter by a member to Lord Russell who was home ~~secretary~~ secretary explaining the tone of which physical force was being ~~discussed~~ protected in through ~~language~~ the "inflammatory language used". Source 2, similarly mentioned the discussion by members of the physical force being unpopular, and in fact repelling supporters away. This supports the claim that arguments of physical force were unpopular and greatly ineffective in receiving and mobilising support. Henry Hetherington was source 2, was an article by a Chartist leader and fighter for the spread of Chartist through radicalised newspapers - Henry Hetherington's lack of support through, the effect of which

(a) continued) physical force garnered the "utmost respect to reject" by the middle class, this allows the evaluation of the source and its strength. In comparison to source 1, source 2 has slightly ~~more~~ equivalent weighting as Henry Hetherington was also a 'Chartist' leader, ~~therefore~~ his criticism of physical force can show to an extent the level of popularity it received so therefore, disagreeing with question. Source 1 is a ~~source~~ ~~personal~~ personal letter from a member (so therefore, a member of the middle or upper class) to Lord John Russell. This source gives an fairly accurate representation of the feelings of the upper classes in response to the "Chartists who held their first meeting".

On the other hand, source 3, ~~disagrees with~~ agrees with the question claiming that the arguments of physical force did mobilise support. The source states, "the English people applauded 'physical force', creating an illusion that the people of ~~the~~ the nation agreed with Feargus O'Connor (leader of physical force) as a way to stimulate further reform and the Chartist movement."

(a) continued) source 3, unlike source 2 and 3 was an letter from a physical force sympathiser so, therefore immediately debases the weight of the source and it may have been ~~biased~~ biased and exaggerated. Nevertheless, source 3 shows the extent of which ~~workers~~ some working class people felt about physical force and its' approach. Source 3, also manages to explain the methods of ~~its~~ which physical force is enforced, "Despite all the talk in 1839 about arming; the people did not arm", in comparison sources 1 and 2 which only describe the no discontent with the concept of physical force and its' fear. Source 3, explains in the context of the time that "physical force agitation... would be ~~an~~ produce of no good" highlighting the lack of reasoning of which physical force to be used.

Overall, it can be gathered by sources 1 and 2 that talk of physical force may have triggered "fear" with the upper classes through their use of "fearless" language. However, is generic and does not mention the ~~ways of which~~ about physical force may actually be, ~~as source 3 also~~

((a) continued) although, the possibility of biasness, explains from the lower classes and the public views on physical force. source 2 is the most significant when analysing the weight of the truth of physical force being effective in maintaining support.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is a level 3 response. The answer makes a number of relevant points that are clearly linked to the focus of the question. The candidate tries to engage in some cross referencing of the sources with some development. Provenance is considered in a separate paragraph.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

This answer would have been improved by integrating the provenance alongside the cross referencing

## Question 1 (b) (i)

This was the more popular of the two questions. Candidates frequently impressed with their extensive knowledge of the impact of the 1832 Reform Act. The prompts that were offered in the sources were well used to develop arguments and analysis with a range of differing conclusions being reached about whether change and/or continuity was more significant. Some weaker candidates, lacking a secure question focus, discussed a range of issues surrounding political reform, such as the reasons for its introduction. Such answers also often simply worked through the sources in sequence, paraphrasing their content. It was disappointing to note that yet 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) ~~Continuity~~ In this essay The sources present an argument as to whether the 1st Reform Act of 1832 was one of continuity rather than change. In the essay I will therefore evaluate ~~to~~ whether the Act ~~introduced~~ <sup>considerable</sup> ~~change~~ change or rather, as the question suggests, ~~was~~ preserved the existing political system. ~~going first to the argument that~~ ~~positions only reported in that source 3 and 4 are the~~ ~~chief~~ <sup>chief</sup> ~~to~~ <sup>superior</sup> ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~of~~ ~~argument~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~1832~~ ~~Reform~~ ~~Act~~ ~~preserved~~ ~~the~~ ~~status~~ ~~quo~~ ~~with~~ ~~source~~ ~~6~~ ~~offer~~ ~~its~~ ~~best~~ ~~opinion.~~ <sup>predominant</sup>

To start by evaluating the argument for continuity I will begin with source 6. In it Griville states how as before the Aristocracy held great influence over the British political system. He ~~also~~ <sup>states</sup> explains how one newly <sup>appointed</sup> ~~stated~~ Lord had 'used his influence' to ensure the election of 'three <sup>who</sup> ~~big~~ <sup>big</sup> MPs in the house of Commons. I know from my own knowledge that, despite the disenfranchisement of some 56 rotten boroughs, that 70 still remained, with the contest easily determined by

Aristocratic benefactors who supported candidates. ~~It~~ The source further claims that 'the electors ~~do~~ did not know by sight the MP representing them. Again I know that after the Reform Act it still remained so that nearly a third of elections were not contested ~~but~~ <sup>and decided</sup> by the Aristocracy. ~~The The argument that the Aristocracy still supported by source S in which it is said that I believe that I can have confidence in this source's reliability as it mentions how he 'knew many of the leading politicians of the day' thus it is safe to presume his insight is balanced and not tampered with. The fact that the monarchy held such a monopoly over political power is also expressed in source S in which it says that 'three-quarters of the MPs in the 1830s were drawn from the aristocracy and gentry', ~~It~~ Not only was that the case but in the years ~~1832~~ 1832 - 67 ~~to~~ all but one (Robert Peel - middle class of the Prime Minister) were aristocrats. The Reform Act ~~was~~, with a <sup>property</sup> ~~high~~ <sup>property</sup> qualification and ~~no~~ <sup>no</sup> ~~striking~~ <sup>striking</sup> ~~qualifications~~ <sup>qualifications</sup> in the borough and counties respectively excluded the vast majority of the working class. Whilst more, as source 6 states, it could 'dominate ~~the~~ cabinets' thanks to the <sup>retard</sup> ~~inclusion~~ <sup>inclusion</sup> of ~~power~~ <sup>power</sup> ~~possessing~~ <sup>possessing</sup> ~~classes~~ <sup>classes</sup> such as the ~~chamber~~ <sup>chamber</sup> ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~commons~~ <sup>commons</sup>. ~~This~~ <sup>lack of wage for MPs</sup> ~~change~~ <sup>change</sup> to implement a wage for MPs (thus excluding working class and middle class candidates) and the chamber <sup>seemingly</sup> ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~commons~~ <sup>commons</sup>. These classes although democratic, having given the~~



it that even if not directly leading to the establishment of a democratic state it contributed largely towards that ~~goal~~ <sup>achievement</sup>.

As source 6 <sup>mentions</sup> ~~states~~ it ~~would~~ <sup>would</sup> ~~prove~~ <sup>prove</sup> to 'open the floodgates of reform' which then would be no 'prospect

((b) continued) ~~of~~ 'closing'. I know that the ~~1st~~ Reform Act did spur on demand for change, being a crucial ~~precedent~~ precedent to future Reform such as the second reform Act of 1872 and third in ~~1885~~ the years 1884/5. Once the system had been challenged once it became necessarily likely to occur again.

To conclude <sup>the argument of the source</sup> ~~concludes from source~~ is clear. The change produced by the reform Act itself was ~~the~~ largely disappointing. However it was perhaps not the ~~contents~~ <sup>of the most</sup> of the Act but its ~~existence~~ <sup>of the most</sup> ~~done~~ <sup>impact</sup> that was really ~~the~~ <sup>of the most</sup> ~~impact~~ <sup>impact</sup> to British ~~the~~ politics. Personally I would agree with this collective interpretation. limited change was perhaps understandable (however it was actually much more radical than originally planned) by from a cautious, divided elite. The actual principle of change to a centuries old system would prove very influential to that systems future.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response has a sustained question focus. It integrates the sources and some reasonable own knowledge to reach clear judgements about the claim in the question. This is sufficient for level 4 in AO1 and level 3/4 marginal in AO2.

### Question 1 (b) (ii)

This was the less popular of the two questions. Most candidates were able to argue about the respective roles of the Conservative and Liberal parties, but it was disappointing that many responses did not directly reference the role of popular protest. This was clearly signposted by the reference to the Reform League and the protest meeting in Hyde Park in Source 8, but the majority of candidates did not pick up on this reference and develop this as part of their line of argument. A significant minority of candidates lacked sufficient own knowledge to understand the content of Source 9, suggesting that Salisbury initiated the legislation.

There were however also some impressive answers which displayed an erudite awareness of the controversy, and of the achievements and limitations of the Conservatives and their leaders, as well as the motivation and actions of successive 19th century governments.

It was disappointing to note that yet 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. However, it is possible to use the provenance relevantly, and some candidates successfully achieved this by identifying Source 7 as an Adullamite and used this information to advance their argument.

There were a few factors that contributed to the passing of acts between the years of 1857 ~~to~~ to 1885, one of them being internal conservative pressure.

Source 1, agrees with the question explaining that Disraeli, Disraeli was ~~a conservative who~~ <sup>conservative</sup> ~~idea~~, of which he had personal hate for Gladstone due to prior personal disputes. Source 1 explains, the 'Right honorable ~~man~~ gentle man 'Disraeli' and how his 'factions' was use-ful and still was essential and necessary to create changes. After, Gladstone's attempt to get a reform act passed in 1867, the peers voted against his action. This gave

Disraeli a "political advantage" of which Disraeli commended and even personally made deals with peers at the Houses of ~~Commons~~  <sup>Lords</sup> to get the more radical bill passed. Disraeli "treated them as we treat" a shy lawyer" ~~that~~ he personally explained the benefits that would come from a

Reform Bill in 1866, to his party. This was tactics that outmaneuvered Gladstone's attempt. With the adjustment and reorientation of his party Disraeli managed to get ~~the~~ <sup>his</sup> reform act passed; which "clearly he was determined from the beginning that house held suffrage was the principle he intended to introduce". The conservative party was an "intended parliamentary course for the passing of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Reform Act, due to Disraeli's ~~and his personal~~ party and his personal ~~ambitions~~ ambitions. Additionally, source 9 also supports this as Lord Salisbury in 1884 had compromised with Gladstone to create the 3<sup>rd</sup> reform bill of 1884/85. The "It was Salisbury's firm use of the Lords in 1884 to resist the franchise

Reform Bill": This meant that with the demand of the Franchise Reform Bill it allowed negotiations that ~~the~~ would also benefit Salisbury and his party.

This tactic ~~so~~ moreover - lead to the simultaneous negotiations of the redistribution act

(b) continued) With the understanding that the Franchise act would gain the Conservatives the vote from the public ~~and~~ the  $\frac{1}{3}$  who were now able to vote. The Conservatives were pushing for Franchise act as Gladstones and his party had not been in for 20 years, with the collapse of the party. Gladstones' attempt to get a final act passed, means that Salisbury had to compromise Gladstones above to gain benefits as if not the Liberal party will suffer.

However, Source 8 is quite the contrary. Source 8, explains that there were extreme pressures such as public pressure. "In 1866 the Reform League and the Reform Union organised demonstrations", this simply explains that there were unrest within the

public of which outcomes such as "Hyde Park" turning into a riot. In addition to Hyde Park riots, the use of the Reform League were organised groups of working class people who organised campaigns and demonstrations to put pressure on parliament and the government. Source 8 is a book of what

(b) continued) was published in 1996, which with the benefit of hindsight, could evaluate multiple sources to form a conclusion.

Source 8 has a valued weighting ~~to~~ due to the fact that it was composed decades later also, as with hindsight Hyde Park riots did help wedge decisions in the right direction as it added to reasons of which reform was needed. The Hyde Park riot was of 1868, which was in protest to the failure of the reform and at which was external pressure. Additionally to the Reform League, the Reform Union of which was middle class, which showed the additional effect of having both working class and middle class in protest of the lack of change. That occurred and the failure of the passing of the 1866 reform act.

It is within question to believe that the external pressures were the most significant when analysing whether ~~the Conservatives were~~ it was more significant ~~to~~ in relation of the passing of bills and reforms.

((b) continued) The external parliamentary pressures helped aid, but was not more significant than internal conservative pressure. With Asquith and his personal tactics to pass the 2<sup>nd</sup> reform act was a crucial testimony to the conservative party. I believe, that at different times there were more other significant factors other than ~~the~~ Conservatives when passing reform to. For example Chamberlain and his leaders, which also had a great impact on the passing of 2<sup>nd</sup> reform act.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Although this answer does engage in some descriptive passages at times and does not always develop its points fully, it also does contain some argument that relates to the focus of the question. It uses the sources as the basis of this argument. This is a response that has made some AO2a comments about provenance and, as is pointed out in the Principal Examiner's reports every year, these are not credited in this question. It achieves level 3 for both the assessment objectives.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Comments on the provenance of secondary sources does not contribute to the mark for AO2b which is what is tested in this question. The time spent on this could be more usefully used on developing the argument further

## Question 2 (a)

There were some sharply analytical responses to this question. Many candidates were able to weigh the comments about conditions in the workhouse of Sources 10 and 11 against Source 12's later praise for the treatment of paupers in Manchester. The best responses were able to offer incisive evaluation of the different dates, authors and purpose of each writer to inform and explain their judgements.

On the other hand, a minority of candidates struggled with some of the specifics. In Source 11, for example, some assumed that Dickens' comment about the better treatment of "the dishonest criminal" applied not to prisoners but to paupers in the Whitechapel workhouse. There also seemed to be a lack of familiarity with the contribution of Edwin Chadwick to poor law policy with a range of differing attitudes to the new poor law being attributed to him, despite the fact that he is a named individual on the specification.

The sources 10, 11 and 12 have ~~both~~ wide ranging evidence that both suggests that in the mid 19th century paupers were well provided for in the workhouse, and the opposing standpoint which suggests that paupers were not well looked after, where source 10 and 11 suggest evidence to suggest that the paupers were not well provided for, source 12 suggests evidence for agreement with the notion that paupers ~~were~~ were well provided for in the workhouse in the mid 1800s.

Source 10 strongly disagrees with the view that paupers were well provided for in the workhouse, whereas source 12 paints a completely different picture, one that ~~also~~ strongly suggests that paupers were indeed well provided for in the workhouse. From a letter that Edwin Chadwick writes to the

(a) continued) Clerk of Poor Law Guardians regarding the Chelsea workhouse, the evidence could be interpreted as slightly biased and clouded due to the fact Chadwick wanted to overhaul and reform the whole poor law system, therefore him possibly meaning he would want to portray workhouses as bad and in need of a change. He writes that "The Poor Law Commissioners regret to learn that the Chelsea workhouse is in a very unsatisfactory state"; This paints a picture of an inadequate workhouse not able to provide well for paupers. This view is countered by source 12 to a large extent as it writes ~~that~~ "compared to the rows of hovels in which the poor live, this place is a palace." This gives the complete opposite view of source 10 as it strongly suggests that the Manchester workhouse was a 'palace' therefore indicating it would be able to provide a ~~the~~ good place of living for paupers. The context behind source 12 is that

((a) continued) it being from Hippolyte Taine, a Frenchman, it could be said to be less biased and one-sided in comparison to Chadwick and Source 10, where Chadwick had an agenda, Taine as a Frenchman would have relatively little for him to then cloud his evidence on workhouses.

Source 11 again corroborates with the view and standpoint given in source 10, which in turn makes it significantly disagree with source 12 over the matter of paupers and how well they were provided for in the workhouse. Source 11 is from Charles Dickens in his 'A walk in a workhouse', which could indicate similar, if not the same, level of bias and one-sided nature of evidence like source 10. While not a prominent campaigner like Chadwick, Dickens was on the side of trying to improve paupers' lives by documenting the bad conditions they faced in his novels. His notable works include Oliver Twist and like source 11 A walk in A workhouse. ~~These~~ This

((a) continued) would have arguably led to a small amount of sympathetic bias in his evidence, even though it was a true account like source 10 from Chadwick. ~~He~~ writes that he "walked through the little world of poverty enclosed within the workhouse walls." This significantly suggests that the paupers were not well provided for as the conditions in the workhouse were 'poverty' like. Source 12 disagrees to a profound extent as it writes that the Manchester workhouse ~~is~~ it looked out was "perfectly clean and well-maintained with big courtyards". This highlights profound disagreement as where source 11 describes the workhouse conditions as 'poverty' like, source 12 paints a picture of workhouses being "clean" and "well maintained", which would in turn mean that paupers were indeed well provided for in the workhouse.

Strong agreement is also shown between source 10 and 11. ~~As~~ source 10 writes that "there was throughout

(a) continued a lack of order, cleanliness, and ventilation." The issues detailed are corroborated with source 11 as it writes that the workhouse it looks at was "inhabited by a population of some 1500 to 2000 paupers". This would then lead to lack of cleanliness and ventilation like source 10 details due to the huge scale of paupers in a workhouse like source 11 details.

In conclusion, sources 10, 11 and 12 have broad wide ranging evidence both for and against the matter of whether paupers were well provided for in the workhouse. Where source 12 suggests evidence for, source 10 and 11 ~~rather~~ suggest evidence against the notion that paupers were well provided for in the workhouse. Being outnumbered and the strength of evidence in S10+11, it could be said that S12 is not the typical view, and that paupers were not well provided for.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This is a sound level 3 response. The introduction to the response shows an understanding of the need to use the sources in combination. There is some evidence of developed cross referencing, although this is not always sustained. The provenance is considered and integrated, and on one occasion is also cross referenced.

## Question 2 (b) (i)

This was marginally less popular than 2bii. Most candidates found the sources accessible and were able to use them to create a debate about the issues. The most impressive answers to this question developed their response by weighing the stated factor - cost - against concerns about the condition and morale of the poor and a desire for centralisation. There were many effective answers to this question which integrated the sources very well with their own knowledge to reach a convincing judgement.

Weaker answers tended to rely on a description of the content of the sources and generalised own knowledge which often contained some errors. Some of these answers were unable to distinguish between what happened before 1834 and after, so it was not uncommon to see a description of the Andover scandal.

It was disappointing to note that yet 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) The 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act heralded a new dawn in the way relief was given to the poor in Great Britain. The commission led by Nassau and Chadwick, had found in 1832, that the rising cost of relief was leading to angry ratepayers. While reducing the cost of relief had been a key aim and reason for the 1834 Amendment Act, there were other factors as outlined in sources 14 and 15. Factors such as fear of revolution, riots, other relief systems and unfairness associated with handing out relief in return for no work all arguably featured as to why the Poor Law was eventually amended in 1834. Whereas source 14 and 15 look at other factors, source 13 does indeed

suggest that it was the cost of operating the poor law which was the main reason behind the decision to change the system in 1834.

source 13, from Eric Hopkins 'A social

((b) continued) History of the English working classes' was published in 1979. This published book arguably has good credibility given it is a published work and in the next century, allowing time for more evidence and accounts to come out in regards to the administration of the poor law. It strongly suggests that the cost of the poor law was the main reason behind the change in 1834 as it writes that "The cost of poor relief began to rise after 1826, and by 1831 it was above £7m. By this time there were very strong feelings that the poor law must be reformed." This strongly suggests that cost was the main reason behind the 1834 change as it details that following the rapid rise of relief to £7m in 1831, people had strong feelings that the system needed

to be reformed/changed. Indeed following the Amendment Act in 1834, the cost of relief was £4m in 1840 suggesting that indeed the Act of 1834 was shaped and brought about to

((b) continued) reduce the cost of relief. One of the key aims and objectives by Nassau and Chadwick was to make the poor law more efficient as ratepayers who were wealthy and rich complained about high rates to fund the poor law relief system.

~~Source 14~~ on the other hand, source 14 suggests that wage compression and other relief systems were the cause behind the 1834 Amendment Act, strongly disagreeing with source 13. It from M.E Rose in 'The Relief of Poverty 1834-1914' which was published in 1972, could be said to have similar levels of credibility as source 13, given it likewise was a published book a century after the main action of the poor law. It shows significant contrast with source 13 as it

writes that the "Speenhamland system was undermining the independence of the agricultural labourer." And that "This seemed

(b) continued) to strengthen the case for a system of poor relief in which outdoor payments to the able bodied would be abolished". This shows stark disagreement with source 13 as it indicates that the effects of the Speenhamland relief system were leading to the 'undermining' of the agricultural labourer, in terms of wage and the compression on it brought to the fore by the Speenhamland system. Indeed the Speenhamland system was a form of relief by topping up labourers wages from ~~the~~ parish funds, first started in 1795. This then led to wage compression not cost issues, as employers could then pay labourers less due to them knowing the parish would then top up their wage. This led to a deep feeling of injustice from labourers who felt their overall wages be slowly compressed due to the unfair and inadequate relief system.

Source 15 also disagrees with Source

(b) continued 13 to a reasonable extent as it suggests that the reason behind the 1834 change was not the cost of the system, but the unfairness coupled with cost. It being from the 'Report of His Majesty's Commissioners into the Administration and operation of the poor laws' (1833), could be argued as both strengthening and hindering its credibility, due to the fact it is an official government report, but they may have an agenda which is then influencing the nature of the evidence then given in Source 15. It writes that "on Saturday 13 October last, 27 men were paid at least 12 shillings each, though no work whatever had been done." This reasonable suggests unfairness with the system and cost then leading to the 1834 Act, as it, ~~does not~~ didn't seem ethical or economical to give out a great deal of relief, when no work was then done by those in ~~reception~~ recipient of relief. Indeed

((b) continued) Economists like Malthus and Ricardo cited the very account given in source 13, as the main reason as to why the poor law should be abolished. They like other leading economists at the time saw the current system both as unfair and too costly.

In conclusion, source 13 strongly agrees with the notion that cost was the main reason behind the 1834 Act to change the poor law, where source 14 and 15 cite other reasons to a significant extent such as unfairness and other relief systems causing wages of labourers to go down. In corroboration with my own evidence and the sources it can be argued that SB is right.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a sound level 3 response in both assessment objectives. The candidate is aware of the need to argue a case from the sources and to develop the arguments of the sources on the basis of own knowledge. The introduction shows an awareness of a range of explanations, although not all are actually explored within the response.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Avoid frequent lengthy quotes which may impact on the time you have to spend on your argument. When quoting, keep it brief!

## Question 2 (b) (ii)

This was marginally the more popular question.

Many of the candidates were extremely well informed about factors other than cholera, such as growing medical knowledge and the pioneering work of individuals such as John Simon, John Snow, Louis Pasteur, Joseph Bazalgette and Edwin Chadwick, and were able to bring some impressive own knowledge to bear in order to develop what was in the sources on these issues. What was less impressive was the lack of knowledge on the stated factor of cholera. Many candidates had to rely exclusively on the content of the sources for this. The best responses were able to discern the diminishing influence of cholera over the full length of the period covered in the question.

It was disappointing to note that yet 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.

(b) (i) The argument that cholera was the key factor in the improvements of public health is debateable. This is because cholera was ~~un~~ epidemic (source 16) and it did cause 'terror' (source 17), that led to administrative action that sped up change. ~~It is~~ However, there were a number of other factors such as individuals, growth of local government and improvement in knowledge that also sped up change in public health.

~~That~~ ~~the~~ One ~~was~~ would argue that cholera was one of the key factors in improving public health. This is because the ~~to~~ fear that cholera caused led to ~~so~~ many administrative changes. Source 17 supports this

claim by ~~stating~~ stating the 'terror' caused by cholera made 'ruling classes' take more of an initiative with public health. This can be shown by the fact that after the first cholera epidemic in 1831, temporary boards of health ~~was~~ were created. Another example is the 1848 Public Health Act which was in the same year the 2nd epidemic killed 64,000. The cholera epidemic ~~made the upper class~~ affected the upper class which meant the improvement in public health ~~administration~~ administration was likely to take place as the upper class were the most influential. It could be argued that cholera outbreaks changed the laissez faire attitude ~~that the upper class had~~ attitude ~~that the upper class had~~ that the upper class had as soon as it struck. A source 17 supports this by claiming that cholera outbreaks had prompted otherwise 'obscure corporations' with 'frantic activity'. So it could be argued that cholera epidemic was ~~the~~ the most key factor because it ~~cause~~ caused

((b) continued) Change in ~~the~~ public health  
the ~~quickest~~ fastest.

~~On~~ the other hand it ~~could~~ individuals  
were also a key factor in  
improving public health between  
1830 and 1875. Edwin Chadwick  
~~Chadwick~~ ~~done~~ ~~good~~ ~~was~~ was influential  
with his 1842 report suggesting,  
medical inspectors and Boards of  
Health. He was also influential in  
the 1848 public health Act. Source  
18 supports this by claiming  
Chadwick 'had done good work  
before 1834'. However, Chadwick's  
bullying attitude and belief  
~~in~~ in miasma arguably  
limited the work he had done  
in public health.

John Simon was also 'dedicated' (S.F.)  
to public health. ~~At~~ John  
Simon helped an ~~assortment~~ 'assortment' ~~of~~  
of acts (S.17) such as the ~~Public~~  
Local Government Act (1858), to  
get passed. These acts helped

((b) continued) ~~of~~ improvements in public health because they stopped the permissiveness and allowed greater more enforced changes in public health which sped up change.

¶ Joseph Bazzelgette was also important to public health because ~~he stopped the~~ in 1858 after the great stink, he ~~rebuild~~ and the ~~the~~ Metropolitan Boards of Works ~~rebuilt~~ rebuilt London's sewage system. This ~~was~~ improved public health because it removed ~~the~~ the 'damp, moisture, stink' that epidemised London. This ~~was~~ also created an example for public health improvements all over the country, such as in Birmingham where Joseph Chamberlain helped rebuild the city.

~~It can also be argu~~ Growth of local government was also a key factor in the improvement of public health. This is

((b) continued) because the growth of local government made improvements in public health easier. Before 1830 ~~everyone would be~~ there would be 300 bodies under 250 acts ~~in public~~ working in public health, there was no organisation and as a result there was no change. The growth of local government led to more authority over public health. This led to more administrative action (S. 17). An example of ~~the~~ this is Sanitation Act (~~1866~~ 1866), where local government were given the power to knock down a ~~house and the~~ poorly built house and would in fact be fined if they didn't. This is also showing how improvements in local government helped eliminate vested interests as builders and water companies ~~that~~ now had to build houses ~~proper~~ and build drainage properly.

~~Lack of knowledge~~ Improvement in knowledge was ~~also~~ also vital in improvement in Public Health between 1830 and 1875. Before 1830 ~~people did~~ Before Pasteur's germ theory (1865) ~~so~~ people were unsure what caused disease. ~~As the~~ ~~a result~~ ~~lack of knowledge~~ ~~the most~~ The most common belief was miasma, source 16 shows this by ~~say~~ saying 'atmospheric impurities' is what caused poor public health. The belief in miasma meant that improvements in public health was slow down. ~~It~~ For example recommendations in 1831 included leeches to cure disease, which certainly did not stop cholera. ~~How~~ However, advancements in knowledge through John Snow's observations of the pump in Soho and ~~B~~ Pasteur's germ theory meant that there ~~was~~ more knowledge to what caused disease. As a result

(b) continued) ~~act~~ by 1875 medical inspectors and boards of health were compulsory. ~~The~~ The boards of health and medical inspectors helped monitor sanitation to decrease 'susceptibility to disease' (S.16).

In conclusion, it could be argued that cholera was in fact the greatest factor in improvement in public health because it caused the most 'vigorous' ~~change~~ (S.17) change. The terrifying effect of cholera led to improvements in ~~knowle~~ ~~know~~ knowledge, ~~public~~ in Local Government and the work of local government, that led to improvements in public health by 1875.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response is aware of a range of factors that impact on public health improvement and has some sound own knowledge to support what is drawn from the sources. It is also impressive that this answer has engaged with the chronology of the question quite fully. The sources are certainly the basis of the answer, but their use could have been more fully developed.

AO1 achieves level 4 and AO2 achieves level 3.

## 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.

Too many candidates are using certain phrases, such as 'using the sources as a set', as a substitute for actually engaging in the task that they are claiming.

Engaging with the sources needs to go beyond accepting the content at face value and to test it for validity considering provenance in part a and by testing the opinions in part b with knowledge set in the context of the period.

### Part A

1. Candidates should spend sufficient time reading the sources to ensure that they understand the nuances of the arguments presented.
2. 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.
3. 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 stereotypical comments about the provenance that could apply to any source and avoid labelling a source as both reliable and unreliable and thus negating any conclusions drawn. The key to a successful response is the ability to weigh the sources to reach a final judgement.
4. 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.
5. There are no marks available for knowledge in part a. Candidates should avoid arguing from their knowledge since it cannot be credited and often impacts on the amount of time they have available to complete part b.

### Part B

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. Candidates need to ensure that they are aware of the focus of the question and the time period specified and that they maintain the focus throughout their answer, to avoid straying into irrelevant areas that cannot be rewarded.

## **Grade Boundaries**

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

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



Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.