



Pearson

# Examiners' Report

## June 2017

GCE History 9H10 1D

## **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 2017

Publications Code 9HI0\_1D\_1706\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

# **Introduction**

It was pleasing to see that candidates were able to engage effectively across the ability range in this, the first year of the reformed A Level paper 1D which deals with Britain, c1785–1870: Democracy, Protest and Reform.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. In Section A questions have a time frame of no less than 10 years. Section B offers a further choice of essays, targeting any of the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance, but questions have a time frame of no less than one third of the time frame of the option. Section C contains a compulsory question which is based on two given extracts. It assesses analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations in context (AO3). Candidates in the main appeared to organise their time effectively, although there were some cases of candidates not completing one of the three responses within the time allocated. Examiners did note a number of scripts that posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

Of the three sections of Paper 1, candidates are generally more familiar with the essay sections, and in sections A and B most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. A minority of candidates, often otherwise knowledgeable, wanted to focus on causes and engage in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates in the main were able to apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner suited to the different demands of questions in these two sections in terms of the greater depth of knowledge required where section A questions targeted a shorter-period, as compared to the more careful selection generally required for the section B questions covering a broader timespan.

Candidates do need to formulate their planning so that there is an argument and a counter-argument within their answer; some candidates lacked sufficient treatment of these. The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks, and centres should note how these strands progress through the levels. Candidates do need to be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that they draw their evidence in responses from the appropriate time period.

In Section C, the strongest answers demonstrated a clear focus on the need to discuss different arguments given within the two extracts, clearly recognising these as historical interpretations. Such responses tended to offer comparative analysis of the merits of the different views, exploring the validity of the arguments offered by the two historians in the light of the evidence, both from within the extracts, and candidates' own contextual knowledge. Such responses tended to avoid attempts to examine the extracts in a manner more suited to AO2, assertions of the inferiority of an extract on the basis of it offering less factual evidence, or a drift away from the specific demands of the question to the wider taught topic.

## Question 1

This response was the less popular of the 2 options in Section A but overall generated the strongest responses. Those candidates that chose to attempt this question had a very good grasp of the key factors and were able to effectively link them together to access the top mark band. For example, there was consideration of the impacts of the American War of Independence and the French Revolution to show where fear came from, and this was linked to the responses of Edmund Burke and Tom Paine, as well as key, anti-reform legislation. There was some exceptional knowledge offered and valid arguments, in the main, were presented.

The majority of answers reached level 4 with candidates being able to explain links between factors and many displaying level 5 qualities where the evidence was weighed up in order to reach a judgement. At the bottom end answers tended to be narratives, or offered limited material on events such as the Peterloo Massacre.

The answer below is from the top end of the responses for this question, and has been selected for its qualities of discussion and evaluation.

There is no doubt that in the years 1785- 1820, there was a considerable lack of parliamentary reform. Whether this lack of reform was due to the government fear of revolution is questionable, but does hold some weight, considering the events happening across the channel in France. However, this is certainly not the only reason for the lack of reform as it could be said that government in itself was simply not liberal at all and wanted to maintain the status quo. Thirdly, it could be also be argued that there was no reform due to a lack of protest for it, especially during the Napoleonic Wars. Finally and equally worth considering is the idea that those who wanted reform didn't actually deserve it and weren't respectable enough to be subject of parliamentary reform.

Firstly, however, it could certainly be said that the

lack of parliamentary reform in the years 1785-1820  
is due to fear of revolution. The most obvious way  
in which this could be seen is with the French  
Revolution in 1793. This, in turn, brought about criticism  
of the current British model in that it only benefitted

(Section A continued) the élite. These ideas were to be found in  
books and pamphlets like Thomas Paine's, Rights of  
Man which had sold 25,000 copies by 1793. No  
doubt the British government would've seen what  
was happening in France and feared something similar  
happening in Britain. Their fear could arguably be  
seen through the measures they took to 'defend'  
themselves, most notably the Combination Act in 1799  
and 1800 which banned Trade Unions. This decisively  
showed that there was government fear of revolution  
and they would try to stop it. Indeed, the role of  
individuals, too, like Major John Cartwright also heavily  
made the government acknowledge and fear a  
revolution in Britain as ideas of reform became  
more and more widespread amongst the public.

Therefore, these reasons had mainly driven the  
government fear. Moreover, the initiation of societies like the London  
Society for Constitutional Change, also made government  
fear some sort of revolution from below, and after  
the heights of during the War with France, people did  
begin to mobilise as their situation worsened like the

Spa Fields Riot in 1816 and St. Peter's Fields riot in 1819. Thus, it could certainly be argued, and to an extent it is accurate, that the reason for a lack of parliamentary reform during these years was due to fear of revolution, but this isn't

(Section A continued) absolute as this fear jibed with the amount of protest that actually occurred in these 25 years.

Therefore, Secondly, it would be of equal accuracy to say that there was lack of parliamentary reform because of the lack of protest that took place. Indeed, there was early spreading of thought by societies calling for change and by the like of William Cobbett, but this soon dwindled when Britain went to war with France until 1815. There was a severe lack of protest in these years as it would be seen as highly unpatriotic to revolt for something that the French had inspired. Therefore, during the early years of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the lack of parliamentary reform could be explained by the lack of pressure and opposition the government faced. There was a severe lack of protest and was only maintained by those radical ~~Re~~ reformers like Cobbett and <sup>leader Harry Hunt</sup> Cartwright, but their popularity was undermined and were soon labelled Jacobins. Hence, this idea cannot be used to explain the reason for a

lack of reform throughout the whole period as after 1815, the calls for reform were more vigorously than ever before with returning soldiers and the most famous ever in 1816. This led to events like the Marching of the Blanketeen in 1817, and therefore confirmed

(Section A continued) the idea that no reform was now heavily back on the agenda and therefore this idea doesn't hold too much weight. What is this

However, what is more accurate to say is that the reason for the lack of reform was down to the fact that government, in itself, was just not very liberal. This can be seen by events that happened both before and after the War with France as government remained repressive and unresponsive to urges from the working and middle classes to reform. Before In 1795, Prime Minister William Pitt attempted to pass a reform bill that would disenfranchise 36 of the rottenest boroughs but this was almost duly rejected by parliament signifying that they wanted the status quo of political power being held by the élite to be maintained. The ideas of the likes of Edmund Burke put forward amongst politicians as they questioned what was the point of changing something that was already. Again, after the war with France, this non-liberal nature remained within government

as they came down hard upon any rebels or conspirators. This is epitomised by the response to the Cat Street Scandal in 1820, which led to the execution of all conspirators including the radical reformer leader Arthur Thistlewood. It is true to

(Section A continued) say that some of their non-liberal ideology came about in fearing revolution. In the suspension of the Poor Laws in 1793 & the Treason Act in 1795, but nevertheless there was a fundamental belief amongst most politicians in the years 1785 - 1820 that any parliamentary reform would lead to a Henri IV moment - and thus they took on this repressive ideology in order to maintain the status quo.

What goes in with this ideology is the idea that many thought the working class - and the middle class wasn't yet respectable enough to deserve parliamentary reform in the yrs 1785 - 1820. Again, this was an idea that held prevalence amongst those in parliament as they rejected bills to propose reform. What symbolises this is the almost in the introduction of the Six Acts in 1819 following the Peterloo Massacre which resulted in the amongst other things, the banning of meetings and sedition's writing. This highlights the idea that the working class weren't ready for reform as the government continually acted harshly onto them. It can be proved in later years that this is the 3rd when considering the banigan

methods used by the middle class to ensure the passage of the Great Reform Act in 1832. However, nevertheless it does all link back to the belief that from those in power that they often would furnish their position, and this can be seen through their response to

(Section A continued) any proposals, calls and revolts for reform and here outrightly against them they were during the years 1785 - 1820.

thus, in conclusion, it is somewhat accurate to say that the continued lack of parliamentary reform was in part explained by the fear of revolution, as there is evidence to support it with the events of the French Revolution. Blasphemy resulted in the whitewash of the British model, and also the events on the home front after 1815. However, it is not wholly accurate as this fear of revolution diminished during the 1820 Napoleonic Wars as calls for reform decreased. Moreover, the underpinning ideology of many in government that reform simply was not worth it and that the Stuarts' job should be maintained is arguably the best the way to explain why there was a severe lack of reform. The view that the bourgeoisie were instrumental in the reform related fuel to this fire, but the most prominent reason for the lack of parliamentary reform was the non-Whig advice of the government, and that is the most accurate way to explain why.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is an example of a level 5 answer. The stated factor of 'fear of revolution' is dealt with comprehensively, although some candidates offered more. This is followed by a range of other factors against which the stated factor can be weighed. There is a reasoned discussion which provides the criteria by which the evidence is judged. The candidate satisfies the need for evidence with range and depth and the evidence has been selected to explore a number of possible answers and analyses. The judgement is thus sustained and earns full marks.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

By discussing the evidence we apply our judgement by using criteria. This helps us to arrive at a sustained conclusion.

## Question 2

This was the more popular option in Section A and for the most part generated some good responses with the majority being in level 4. The best responses recognised that several factors worked together to bring about the failure of the Peoples' Charter including government hostility, divisions among Chartists and the failure to win over the middle classes. There were, however, quite a few narrative responses that focused almost exclusively on the actual six points of the Charter rather than analysing a broader range of factors. Some candidates failed to stick to the time frame and offered evidence about the 1867 Act. However, it proved to be an accessible question and most candidates were able to cover a good range of material and were especially knowledgeable about the leadership divisions and tactics used by both the Chartists and the government.

A minority of candidates felt the need to challenge the premises of the question by arguing that the demands of the Charter were perfectly reasonable, but the government was horrified by unpropertied masses demanding constitutional change and dug their heels in against the Charter.

On the one hand, it is accurate to say that the chartists failed to achieve the charter because its demands were too ambitious. The ~~the~~'s six-point plan ~~the~~ which list of demands that the chartists set out in their charter were too ambitious for the time. For instance, the ~~ever~~ wanting the secret ballot and payment for MPs were too ahead for the time in which the Chartist movement was operating. The secret ballot was not achieved until (1872) and payment for MPs not until (1911). This shows that the chartists were

thinking too ahead of their time and were attempting to exercise a power over government that they did not possess. It further highlights ~~the~~ that the Chartist's

(Section A continued) movement would not be taken demands were too ambitious, because parliament would not take their movement seriously, as they displayed no desire to ~~not~~ want to involve the working class in the political regime of the country.

Another reason the chartists also failed, because of their ambitious aims in the charter. For example, in the first charter, that was introduced in <sup>May</sup> 1839, the chartists initially included a point to allow ~~women~~ women the vote in addition to their demand of universal manhood suffrage, however this was removed from the charter after it was rejected by parliament the first time in May the same year.

of '1839. This shows how the chartist main interest of the chartist movement was to ~~get~~ achieve power for the working class any power they could for the wo

(Section A continued) Working class people. By initially applying for working class women to be granted the vote as well, shows the chartists wanted equality amongst the working class, but again this was too ambitious for the time period, because only ~~upper~~ upper class and now middle class men, could vote, as a result of the 1832 Reform Act, however and even upper class could not even vote at this time. This further clarifies how the chartist movement failed due to their ambitious aims.

The chartist demands of equal rights also failed because of their ambitious demands, as they wanted the equal distribution.

On the other hand, there were other reasons for the failure of the Chartist movement between 1838-48, such as the divisions in leadership of the Chartist movement.

(Section A continued) The Chartist leadership was divided into two, due to half of the Chartist leaders wanting to adopt physical force to achieve their aims and the other half wanting to use moral force. O'Connor and, O'Bryan and Hamey wanted to use physical force to achieve the demands of the Chartist movement. Hamey even wore a red cap and wanted a revolution to take place on the scale of the French Revolution. However, both all three men were made to calm down after another ~~physical~~ one of their other leaders, John Frost, was transported after his part in the Newport Uprisings. On the other side of the leadership, Laett, Plaice and Attwood wanted to use peaceful methods of negotia-

petitioning and speeches to achieve their aims, as they believe this could be a more respectable approach to adopt. This shows that the Chartists also failed due to

(Section A continued) their massive divisions in the leadership of the movement. The fact that ~~neither~~ neither ~~nor~~ the physical or moral force approach could be ~~adopted~~ chosen by the Chartist leaders, shows how this indecisiveness made their leadership in actual fact ineffectual and therefore contributed to the lack of efficiency of the movement overall. It also highlights that this inability to make effective decisions, made the public and parliament unable to take the movement seriously, despite the ~~more~~ Chartists' attempt to show their strength as a working class movement.

Another reason the Chartists failed is because the govern-

ent were always one step ahead. After the failure of the second charter in 1842, protests by violence and riots broke out, such as the Lancashire Plug Riots where

(Section A continued) workers broke into factories and hammered the plugs out of boilers so the factories could not work. As a result of this, Sir Robert Peel enlisted troops to subdue the riots and transported them using the new railway networks in Britain and within a week, all the violence was over and things returned back to normal.

During the presentation of the third charter in 1848, the go to parliament, 8000 police forces and 150,000 special constables were enlisted in the event of further violence. This shows that the chartists failed due to the organisation of Gov, who used the army and the new railways to stop the

Violence of the working class people spreading throughout the country. It highlights the vigilance of the government during this time and showed

(Section A continued) they were more concerned with protecting the mainly from violent outbreaks than considering giving into the demands of the chartists and granting them political power. Thus, government action was a reason for the failure of the chartist movement between 1838-48.

To conclude, the chartists failed for a number of reasons. However, the most key reasons are government being one step ahead and the divisions in their leadership. This is because the chartists could not succeed if government would subdue

Their every action and we were not on their side. The division in their leadership undermined the effectiveness of their movement overall and showed (Section A continued) that could not effectively work together and build a successful organisation to achieve their aims.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This response is quite typical of answers offered for this question. There is a decent range of evidence which is mostly accurate. The Charter is considered in connection with its ambitions and there is a reasoned argument about this. Other factors which influenced the failure of the Charter to achieve its aims are also offered. This candidate could have built on the points being made by using discussion and making a tighter link to whether the Charter really was too ambitious. This response is at the top of level 4.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

This is a question where it is clearly useful to think about the terms used in the question. In order to work out if the demands of the Charter were 'too ambitious' it is a good idea to set out how we might decide on this. For example, if the middle classes were turned away by the demands of the Charter, or if the demands were denounced in the churches and the press, this could be used to show the demands as too ambitious for some parts of the population. The Charter was of course enormously popular too. This can be used to frame the discussion.

**(Section A continued)** The aims of the Chartists, who were founded 1836, were published in their manifesto the People's Charter 1838, were far too ambitious and even radical for the still very conservative society of 1838-1848. whilst they still retained elements of conservatism themselves, by not wanting to extend suffrage to women, their aims of universal manhood suffrage, the removal of property qualifications for MPs and pay for MPs did not align with the general feelings of society. Chartistism was a reaction to the 1832 Reform Act as they felt its provisions were not enough. 1832 only enfranchised 18% of the adult male population and only included the middle classes, not the working classes. This demonstrates the conservative nature of British society and thus the Chartist aims can be seen to be too ambitious. Within the government in particular, there was a continual fear of both revolution and the working classes. Generally, the further ideas of equal representation and seat distribution were additionally too ambitious - 1832 had only recently redistributed 56 seats, still favouring the counties, and so it was seen as too much too soon to ask for anything.

(Section A continued) more. Altogether, the Chartist aims were too ambitious and this is a key factor in their lack of achievement of their goals. The 1832 Reform Act had recently been passed and is evidence of a conservative society in which the Chartists were too ambitious and therefore not listened to.

Another reason why the Chartists failed to achieve their Charter is due to the movement's lack of direction and clear leadership in which the fundamental divisions of the group undermined their ability. Firstly, the membership of the Chartists was fairly broad, being made up of both the working and middle classes. Initially, this was positive as it gained them significant support in quantity but it was also significant in somewhat uniting the working and middle classes. However, the divisive leadership and ultimate divisions of the group fractured this unity. Leaders such as Thomas Attwood argued for a 'moral force' Chartist of peaceful and respectable methods, such as petitions and pamphlets, as

(Section A continued) the Chartist movement was made up of middle classes and therefore respectability would gain them the attention and support they needed. In 1839 a petition of over 1 million signatures was presented to Parliament asking for universal manhood suffrage. The swift rejection of this petition perhaps demonstrates how the Chartists were too ambitious in their aims - they were asking for too much so they were rejected. However, this is also evidence of the divisions of the group as this rejection led to the 'sacred month' of strikes led by physical force Chartists such as Feargus O'Connor. This continual striking for a month undermined the respectability the 'moral force' Chartists tried to display. The internal divisions of 'moral force' and 'physical force' Chartism reduced their support, they couldn't maintain their membership, as well as stagnating their own actions as one faction undermined the other. Altogether, these divisions and lack of strong leadership leading to their ultimate lack of direction can be seen as the main reason for them not achieving their charter as their fundamental conflict meant they weren't united in achieving their aims.

(Section A continued) The actions of the Chartist themselves can be seen as the main reason for failure - their ambition and their conflict - however the role of government - their determination and their legislation - must also be considered.

Firstly, the government improved living and working conditions for the working classes in a way which did not directly achieve the Chartist aims. For example, the Ten Hour Act of 1844 improved working conditions, reducing their working day to ten hours. This improved the working conditions for much of the Chartist membership. As a result, the support for Chartism waned. Furthermore, the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 improved conditions further as bread prices decreased and therefore much of the membership didn't have as much economic discontent and therefore their support for Chartism also began to diminish. Ultimately, the government improved working and living conditions for a vast amount of the Chartist membership without directly achieving the Chartist aims. This undermined Chartism.

**(Section A continued)** As it reduced general discontent leading to a decreased support for Chartism. Additionally, the government's determination against the Chartists is also a factor in their not achieving their aims. The presentation of the 3rd Chartist petition at the Kennington Common Rally in 1848 was met with 8,000 soldiers and 15,000 special constables. Whilst this may demonstrate the governments' fear of Chartism it additionally shows their determination to quell any signs of revolution or rebellion. With the rejection of the 3rd petition on the basis of false signatures, Chartism was effectively over. The government's actions can be seen as the main reason for their failure to achieve the charter as they undermined the cause through impairments, reducing support, as well as showing strong determination to stop them, fracturing the movement to the point of failure.

To conclude, the ambition of the Chartists' aims was too high and is a factor in their failure to secure their aims. Society was still very much conservative and they were

(Section A continued) Simply asking for too much. In addition, their lack of direction due to poor leadership and divisions prevented them from presenting an effective, united front. They alienated themselves and this led to failure. However, the role of government is perhaps the most important reason why they failed as they reduced support through improved conditions and were determined to give them no matter what. This is due to their ambition but ultimately the continued fear of government towards any rebellion or revolution.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This response was marked at mid-level 5, 18 marks. The response builds an argument up from the start. The evidence is argued for, rather than merely stated, and there is some discussion. This response can be judged to have based its case on reasoned argument and this provides the criteria to form a judgement.

### Question 3

This question was tackled well on the whole. Many candidates drew a distinction between harshness in the early part of the period and a move towards a more enlightened attitude later. The more able candidates argued that the harsh treatment of the poor was rooted in the laissez faire approach of the government and their refusal to acknowledge that the economy was generating social problems it did not want to pay for. There was usually a range of material on the workhouse system and the principle of 'less eligibility'. The Andover and Huddersfield scandals were often mentioned. The work of individuals was generally well documented with Dickens and Angela Burdett Coutts prominent as examples. Candidates at the top end pointed to government legislation towards the end of the period showing a change of thinking, whereas candidates at the bottom end remained focused on the horrors of Britain in the industrial revolution.

On the one hand some historians would agree to a large extent that harsh treatment towards the poor was the most significant was worse (growing) in the years 1834 to 1870. This can be seen through the Poor Law Amendment Act which passed to punish the poor. This stopped all outdoor relief and set up workhouses that were set up like prisons to more people and those who really needed it could claim poor relief. This was based on Jeremy Bentham's ideas of utilitarianism which agreed that people were only motivated by two things pleasure and pain therefore if stands to reason to get people motivated to help themselves poor relief should be really harsh and

overcrowded. Work houses were set up where families were completely separated, had to be hard intensive labour or ~~paid~~ <sup>unpleasant</sup> work.

(Section B continued) jobs, they were given a scarce food that if one workhouse or another people were found to be fighting over scraps of meat and cracking over power to divide the ration out or then because they were so starved. Not only this but they were given uniforms to which strip away their identity and in away dehumanise them. This was all based on the ~~radical~~ approach to poverty saying these people suffered a defect in character that made them poor so they deserved to live this and they were lazy.

Poverty researcher Thomas Malthus believed a rising population would stop natural selection which occurring at so intensify the issue of ~~poverty~~ <sup>overpopulation</sup> being made poor as they are wiped out faster and insect reproduction increasing poor population. Other scandals occurred like in one workhouse they were uncleaned and forced to stay in the dirty bed bug ridden beds that

had been defeated or. with all of these  
scandals although Society's attitude  
towards poverty may have become a bit more

(Section B continued) Sympathetic it was said did not  
lead to much change as new roads and  
new workhouses were built with little done  
to stop the bad treatments so it could  
be said that this positive approach  
towards poor was the most  
significant response to poverty at  
this time.

On the other hand however it could be  
argued that although this happened  
there was also of opposition and  
different approaches to poverty. For example  
the Tory party were heavily opposed to this  
plan and many voted against it as they  
took a paternalistic more fatalistic view towards  
the poor and they were morally obliged  
to care for. In addition to this social  
reformers like Owen Robert Owen  
amongst others argued the belief that  
if given the opportunity the working  
classes would look after themselves which  
in a way inspired the the workers  
charity that arose in a way looked

like a job centre providing work for people and setting them targets to reach to get them back on their own two feet

(Section B continued) Another social reformer ~~involved~~ included Oliver Thomas paine who believed the Government should pay child benefits of £4 a year for up to 14 year olds and persons for over 50 years old so all those deemed 'deserving' as they are unable to look after themselves rather than being punished for it are taken care off. There were many other writers who inspired different ideas toward the poor for example Charles Dickens based his novels like Oliver twist showed people and influenced their opinion against the animal approach as it was extremely unfair. This is the case for writer Elizabeth Gaskell who also challenged traditional opinions of poverty. One really significant writer would be Thomas Malthus who carried out research connecting factors empirical data and on the causes of poverty claiming low wages so encouraging the idea that to deal with poverty wages should

rise so the poor are able to save

for a rainy day. His book was widely  
read among the middle classes and

(Section B continued) so had a huge impact on  
their opinions.

Again, however, it can be concluded  
that harsh treatment of the poor was  
the most significant response to poverty  
as ever though it was found not  
to work as people would still rely  
on poor relief and all the scandals  
about how <sup>more</sup> harsh they <sup>were</sup> care or  
there was little attempt to change it  
and so belief was that they should  
be treated harshly <sup>remained</sup> was the dominant  
idea of that time period.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

This response was judged to be well argued with enough for level 5 and received 17 marks. The candidate covers the harsh treatment that the poor received and offers some analysis based on nineteenth century thinking about why this happened. The other side of the argument is also put forward and thus there is evaluation to reward. The candidate acknowledges the battle for ideas that was taking place and cites authors and thinkers to good effect. The response could have discussed the evidence a little more and this would have pushed the mark towards the top of the level.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Tip

When discussing an emotive issue such as poverty and the workhouse system it is important to remember that people at the time did not think like us. Life for the poor was grim whether they were in workhouses or not. Show that you understand this in your introduction.

(Section B continued) In 1834 ~~a~~ the Poor Law a New Poor Law was introduced to Britain which took a rather harsh approach punitive approach to paupers towards providing for paupers by introducing ~~the~~ workhouses across the country. This was motivated by a hardening of attitudes towards the poor, and a desire to reduce the cost of caring for them. Although there ~~certainly were~~ was evidence of some more caring, humanitarian attitudes towards the poor, between 1834 and 1870, this often came from individuals or small charities and <sup>generally</sup> did not reflect the views of most people towards pauperism ~~most of the~~ the government towards pauperism. Hence, I would argue that that to a great extent, harsh treatment of the poor was the most significant response to poverty during this period.

Firstly, it is clear that the 1834 Poor Law was largely introduced ~~in order to~~ as a result of a hardening of attitudes towards the poor, because it created harsh conditions a harsh response designed to punish the poor, rather than to help them improve their situation. For example, the main provisions of the act were the abolition of traditional outdoor relief, which was to be replaced with a workhouse <sup>system.</sup> ~~the workhouses were~~

(Section B continued) Parishes were to join together in unions and build workhouses which would cater for both the able-bodied and disabled poor people. However conditions inside the workhouse were purposely brutal, with 'the principle of less eligibility' stating that conditions had to be worse than those of the poorest labourer. Therefore this was designed to reduce ~~cost~~ the cost of caring for the poor, and to act as a deterrent from entering <sup>the</sup> workhouse. Further evidence of this harsh treatment of paupers is the fact that inside the workhouse, families would be separated; men and women were split up; and inmates had to wear uniforms and carry out labour ~~in order to maintain~~, creating a prison-like environment. This ~~re~~emphasised the sense that the poor were <sup>being</sup> punished rather than helped. Some workhouses were particularly horrific, such as Andover Workhouse which caused a public scandal in 1845 when it was discovered that inmates had been abused by the workhouse master. guardian; and that many were forced to eat suck the bone marrow from animals' bones they had been crushing to avoid starvation. Despite public outcry, the workhouse master was not imprisoned and conditions within workhouses continued to be brutal. Therefore it is clear that

(Section B continued) under the 1834 Poor Law, treatment of the poor was extremely harsh. Therefore I would argue that to a ~~large~~ great extent cruel treatment of the poor was the most significant response to poverty between 1834 and 1870.

This New Poor Law was largely motivated by a hardening of ~~afflicted~~ attitudes towards the poor. For example, in 1832 a Royal Commission was established to investigate the existing system of poor relief. Nassau Senior and Edwin Chadwick were ~~the~~ responsible for carrying out the research, however they had written most of the report before all the evidence was even in. ~~These~~ Their findings showed that the poor relief system was 'inadequate' <sup>and</sup> 'easily taken advantage of' which pleased the Whig government who were happy to use the report as an excuse to introduce harsh measures in regard to poor relief. This ~~study~~ demonstrates that the government, who were responsible for the treatment of the poor, were eager to ~~the~~ introduce tough measures on the poor regardless of evidence. These ~~at~~ harsh attitudes were influenced by key individuals such as Joseph Townsend, Thomas Malthus and David Ricardo. Townsend claimed that ~~poor~~ some poverty was

(Section B continued) necessary as it not motivated people to work hard. Malthus published his 1798 essay on the principle of Population, which argued that poverty was a natural solution to the rising population over-population and that there would be a 'Malthusian catastrophe' if the government were too generous with poor relief. And Ricardo, an economist, believed that poor relief harmed the economy by taking from those who contributed to it, and giving to those who contributed nothing (paupers). The 1834 Act was also directly influenced by Jeremy Bentham, who believed in utilitarianism: the theory that the government should promote the greatest happiness for the greatest number of people. To him, this meant a prison-like system of poor relief evidenced by which was adopted by the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act. Hence, it is clear that the main system of poor relief from 1834 was motivated by the 'cold' government attitude that the poor were a burden on society who should be punished in order to deter them from claiming state funded poor relief. Therefore, to a great extent, harsh treatment of the poor was the most significant response to poverty in the years 1834 to 1870.

(Section B continued) However, there were some ~~or small examp~~ examples less significant, but more caring responses towards the poor between 1834 and 1870. By the 1850s, there was a growth in charities, largely partly motivated by the idea of 'self help' which was emerging. In 1859, Samuel Smiles published his book 'Self-Help' which argued that the poor needed to be helped in order to help themselves. This idea had been adopted by humanitarian mill owner, Robert Owen, as early as 1800 with his New Harmony Mill. He believed that the poor were a product of their environment, therefore treating them well would lead to more prosperity. His ideas ~~were copied~~ influenced Titus Salt who set up Salttaire in 1848, a model cooperative community which took care of poor workers. Therefore ~~to some extent~~ to a small extent, it could be argued that harsh treatment of the poor was not the most significant response to poverty between 1834 and 1870. However, it is important to emphasise that Salt was the exception to the rule ~~as~~; furthermore he only helped a small minority of employed poor people. Whereas the main concern for the authorities were the unemployed paupers that relied on Workhouse for support. Other individuals such as Charles Dickens were perhaps more significant, as his books, such as

(Section B continued) Oliver Twist (1837-39), helped to evidence a more sympathetic and caring attitude towards the poor. He helped portray the poor as real people and his books were extremely popular, moving many members of the public. As a result, some charities such as Urania Cottage 1848, were set up by Dickens, to help female paupers who had turned to prostitution. Hence it could be argued that the work of harsh key individuals and humanitarians shows that <sup>treatment</sup> ~~was not~~ the only response to the poor. However, it is clear that these humanitarian responses were small scale and did not reflect the reality of the treatment faced by most of Britain's paupers.

Therefore although there was some evidence of kind treatment of the poor, the it is clear that harsh treatment was the most significant response to poverty between 1834 and 1870. This was mainly because the official system of poor relief <sup>stipulated by the law</sup> was a very punitive system <sup>New Poor Law of 1834</sup>, based on a ~~hard~~ or 'cold' attitude towards paupers.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is a very good answer to the question and was given full marks. The key qualities of this response are: well selected evidence that is used to build an argument, good discussion and evaluation, which in turn leads to secure analysis and judgement. The response functions at the level of both ideas and legislation and is thus an exploration and analysis of the subject matter.

#### Question 4

This question drew a range of responses. At the top end candidates understood the dramatic change that the factory system brought to the working classes, and the power imbalance it created between the factory owners and the workforce. This change and impetus to trade union growth was compounded by other factors that compelled workers to try and unite, such as falling incomes after the Napoleonic Wars. Successful candidates were able to talk about specific examples of trade union growth in relation to the factors being discussed. The very best answers showed how change occurred across the time frame. At the bottom end responses tended to assert that working conditions worsened due to factory production and there was a tendency to use adjectives rather than evidence. Thus the misery caused by industrialisation led to trade union growth.

There is one very good response offered to show how the question could be successfully handled.

During the late 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, Britain underwent a period of rapid industrialisation, beginning with Arkwright's establishing of the first factory in Cromford in 1776. Following this move to an industrial economy came the growth of Trade Unions in response to poor treatment of workers and the increasingly dehumanised nature of the workplace. In this, two factors are of great significance; the shift to factory production and the laissez-faire attitude of the government because both led to the strengthening of the position of the employer and the creation of a master/worker identity. Of lesser importance was the War with France and the improved communications in industrial Britain.

First, the shift to factory production was very important in the growth of trade unionism. The new industrial workplace severed the previous tie between the master and his apprentice and led to the establishing of the master/worker identity. This led to growing hostilities as the master (employer) gained

increased power over their employees. This can be seen as early as in 1793 when the London printers used collective action (gaining 593 signatures on a petition) to force a compromise from their employer over the length of the working day. Such collective action (trade unions) was therefore required as a result of the factory system and the strengthening of employers positions. It can be seen again in 1799 in the Weavers of Wigan Association who grew to have 14 branches by May, 1799 (an argument for the role of greater communications, perhaps), with their greater size allowing greater bargaining power. Indeed, trade unions were of greater size and declining individualism, compared to trade societies of the 17<sup>th</sup> century and this can be seen entirely because of the factory system and the greater power of employers. Therefore the adoption of the factory system was of huge importance in the growth of trade unions because it established the master / worker identity and the growing power of employers.

Next, of equal significance was the laissez-faire mentality of the government at the time. Indeed, such an attitude is inherently biased towards the employer and the government actions of the time (motivated by their free trade ideology) simply served to strengthen the position of the employer. The

(Section B continued) enforced (particularly after the War with France), as seen in continued and widespread strikes in 1810 and 1819 from Lancashire weavers (with the 1819 strike spilling across trades to include colliers), they both clearly served to reinforce the position of the employer. Therefore, such a clear support of employers and free trade from the government simply exacerbated the master / worker identity and facilitated further growth in trade unions.

Next, the War with France from 1793 - 1815 played a somewhat significant role in the growth of trade unions. Given the working class' association with so-called 'Hunger Politics', a decline in living standards during the War contributed a great amount to membership of trade unions. Indeed, during the War, the price of bread rose 6x, highlighting a clear decline in living standards. Following the war, the economic climate worsened as there was a labour surplus when 200,000 soldiers arrived home (strengthening again the position of the employer) and the introduction of the Corn Laws in 1815 simply maintained the high price of living by maintaining high bread prices. Even the middle class were disillusioned with such a measure that was seen to be the aristocrats looking after the landed elite. Such a time of economic hardship in the late 1810s and 1820s clearly

(Section B continued) contributed to the growth of trade unions through hunger politics (as seen in the 1818 Philanthropic London and Philanthropic Society, as well as in John Doherty's Grand General Union for the Protection of Labour in 1829 - a year of consecutively poor harvests). Therefore, the War with France was somewhat significant in contributing to trade unions via hunger politics.

Finally, the role of greater communications is somewhat important for the growth of trade unions. In 1826, the first railway line was built (Stockton to Darlington) but this had been preceded by huge improvements in postal services and the canals. Such improvements led to more widespread communications, as seen in the 1791 Sheffield Corresponding Society and 1792 London Corresponding Society and, more significantly a growing attempt for a 'union of unions'. Such attempts clearly demonstrate a growth in trade unionism and several attempts were made throughout the period 1785-1834. First was the 1818 Philanthropic Societies then the 1829 Grand General Union of the Operative Spinners of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the 1829 Grand General Association for the Protection of Labour (both by John Doherty). Most important (claiming 1 million members) was the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union<sup>of 1834</sup>, and such a union simply wouldn't have been possible without the facilitating

(Section B continued)

factor of improved communications.

In conclusion, all the factors must be examined in relation to one another as they often overlap, however the two most significant factors were the adoption of the factory system and the laissez-faire attitude of the government. Whilst the War with France led to some growth due to hunger politics and the improved communications facilitated the establishment of 'union of unions' these were less significant. Indeed, both the adoption of the factory system and the government's laissez-faire ideology led to the establishment, and exacerbation of, the master/worker identity ~~was~~, and the strengthening of the position of the employer. This catalysed the growth of trade unions and the two factors are therefore the most significant.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This is a very good answer and was awarded full marks. The detailed evidence supplied and the reasoned argument about the way factory production altered the industrial relations of the period is comprehensive. The response backs up the argument with well selected evidence and there is discussion and evaluation throughout. The argument and the conclusion link two important factors - the laissez faire approach of government and the factory system - to offer a very convincing explanation.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

When a question asks about the importance of causes it is essential to argue that there are few examples of mono-causal changes in history. Causal factors work together. This response offers a valuable illustration of how to link causes together. The government's attitude was a background factor which allowed the increased power of the employers who controlled the factories to be used against the workers - thus leading to trade union growth.

## Question 5

This question provided a range of responses. Most candidates could correctly analyse the extracts in terms of the main points of Nonconformist Christians versus the role of individual abolitionists, and were able to develop these interpretations with their own knowledge. At the top end candidates included some of the more nuanced points in the extracts in order to expand the authors' arguments. For example, quite a few were able to discuss the economic connection between British workers who thought of themselves as 'wage slaves' and the real slaves in the Caribbean, and the potential pressure this placed on government. This then allowed a more sophisticated debate about the roles of individuals like Equiano, Wilberforce and Humanist arguments in general. At the bottom end the extracts were often used as sources of information, followed by a complaint about what the extracts fail to mention and the addition of own knowledge which was not integrated with the extracts.

### SECTION C

**Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.**

- 5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the abolition of the slave trade was achieved through the campaigning of Nonconformist Christians? - Humanitarian worked through individuals.

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

(20)

The ~~arg~~ view that the abolition of the slave trade was because of the work of Nonconformist Christians is highly convincing. As ~~sos~~ Extract 2 explains they managed to create a 'growing band of British supporters' for the abolitionist cause, which indeed they did. In extract 2, although argues it was the individuals ~~who~~ <sup>who brought about</sup> ended the slave abolition in 1807, does still support the humanitarian argument as many of the individuals such as the mentioned Clarkson, were members of nonconformist groups. Views not addressed in the sources however that do also contribute to the abolition of the trade are the & economic and political arguments.

Extract 1 <sup>is convincing</sup> supports this in arguing the slave trade was abolished due to nonconformist christians.

as it states they created a 'growing band of British Supporters'. Indeed they did to this in that the Quakers produced 10,000 copies of a pamphlet on the abolitionist cause which they distributed amongst MPs, the royal family and other prominent figures. This was fundamental in gaining the support the cause needed as well as bringing the issue to the

and ~~send~~ building pressure on parliament  
attention of the British ~~pop~~ public.

The Extract 1 also states that 'British nonconformists naturally felt a bond of sympathy for their enslaved co-religionists'. One of the major and most important things these nonconformists, Quakers and the Evangelical Christians, did was to begin humanising the slaves, which makes <sup>the view of Extract 1</sup> ~~this argument~~ more convincing. Both groups set up the Society for Effecting the Abolition of the Slave Trade <sup>which</sup> ~~and with~~ it used the emblem of an enchain'd slave with the caption 'Am I not a man and a brother'. This imagery helped to contribute to the growing band of British supporters' but also <sup>become</sup> ~~helped the group~~ a 'major social force' as the imagery had a powerful and understandable effect on the British public, opening their eyes to the horrors of the trade, in a way <sup>which</sup> ~~they~~ <sup>could understand</sup>.

Extract 2, despite arguing the view that it was the work of individuals <sup>which</sup> brought about

abolition in 1807, does still support the view in extract 1, making it more convincing. As a separate view firstly, the work of individuals in itself is a convincing view in terms of abolition as the work of Wilberforce in parliament, producing six annual bills between 1791 - 98, ended became becoming the basis of the 1807 act. The work of Olaudah Equiano in his autobiography 'Interesting Narrative' and his 'embarking on a national tour' is also significant in the individuals view. He was able through these two actions to bring to life the horrors of the slave trade, making for a very successful campaign alongside Thomas Clarkson who also travelled some 35,000 miles around the country. Clarksons essay ~~was~~<sup>in part</sup> was in fact used by Wilberforce in his parliamentary acts and indeed the ~~as~~<sup>work</sup> of these individuals together caused a 'boycott of slave produced West Indian sugar', making it in its own right a convincing argument within extract 2.

This extract does still support extract 1 however as the likes of Wilberforce and Clarkson were members of the evangelical Christian religion, making them part of the nonconformist groups that created the 'growing band' of supporters. Indeed extract 2 also states that it was a nonconformist 'evangelical leader John Wesley' who convinced Wilberforce to join the abolitionist cause, making the extract 1 view of the humanitarian argument highly

convincing.

Neither source however mentions the political or economic issues that contributed to the abolition of the trade. The idea of the trade becoming less of a financial gain and ~~the~~ threat of revolutions due to the American war of independence made for a decline in support of the trade on behalf of the British government. The trade had been an important factor in industrialising Britain and so for it to become a potential area of loss would have also contributed to the welcoming of abolition.

In conclusion however the arguments presented in extracts 1 and 2, ~~mainly the views~~ that it was in fact the action of the nonconformist christians which achieved the abolition of the slave trade in 1807, is the most convincing argument. Without these groups there would not have been the public support on such a scale which lead to the pressure being too great on the government, forcing them abolish the trade or to avoid any consequences of not listening to the public.



This response contains many elements that were shown in a number of answers to this question. The candidate frames the interpretations correctly as representing the roles of Nonconformist Christians versus the roles of individual abolitionists. The candidate correctly notes that many of these individuals were also Nonconformist Christians. The analysis of the extracts is limited to these roles and ignores the other important elements such as the excitement this created in Britain's new industrial heartlands, and the fact that Equiano was well received as a former slave. Indeed, Equiano broke the stereotype propagated by the slavers at every turn and this is crucially important. The candidate brings in the wider historiography as an alternative view and ignores the clear link to the Decline Thesis that is present in Extract 1. Nevertheless this is well written and the core points in the extracts are developed and set out to create a debate. This response was awarded 16 marks.



Analyse the extracts fully before planning the essay. In all the extracts there is the main point of interpretation and then more nuanced points of argument. This will help you to develop a debate about the rival interpretations.

The ~~ab~~ slave trade abolition of the slave trade can be viewed as a shocking event due to the simple fact that the trade benefited Britain economically in a time where Britain's economy needed all the help it can get. By 1790 the trade had made Liverpool the world's largest port and yet, by 1807 the trade was abolished. There are many interpretations as to how this happened with some, like Walvin placing an emphasis on religion understandable as by 1783 the Quakers had set up a committee against the trade and others praising the work of abolitionists, such as Reddick Jones. In the light of these differenc

interpretations the abolishment of the trade in 1807 is still somewhat surprising.

Walvin attributes the end of the slave trade to the work of non-conformist Christians throughout the period suggesting that "missionary work had remarkable consequences". This view seems sound considering the Quakers were the first to vocally oppose the trade, establishing their Committee against the Slave Trade in 1783 and distributing pamphlets promoting their cause to MPs and the general public in 1784.

The Quakers were also joined in opposition by evangelical Christians who believed the trade to be a sin and, due to the nature of their religion they spoke openly against it to persuade others to provide the campaign against slavery with new support. These two non-conformist religions then joined together, establishing the Society for Effecting The Abolition Of The Slave Trade to promote their disapproval. By 1807 the Society had 1200 branches suggesting that Walvin's interpretation that the slave trade ended because of humanitarian efforts from non-conformist efforts stands strong as it was them these religions that

"gave voice to" the need to end slavery first and throughout the period.

However, if non-conformist religions had as much influence as Walvin claims why didn't they first begin protesting the trade? Reddie suggests that rather than non-conformists it was the work of abolitionists that really resulted in the abolition of slave trade. Reddie places emphasis on Equiano, an ex slave who'd brought his own freedom, joined the abolition campaign and even managed to publish an autobiography. Reddie suggests that it was the humanity of the abolitionist movement, the first hand account of Equiano, the efforts of Clarkson who travelled 35000 miles giving lectures regarding the trade, even buying shackles to display to promote his cause, that gave the resulted in abolition. These campaigns made "the British public aware of the cruelty" from a personal, not just moralistic stance, not just a moralistic religious one. To Reddie ~~the~~ the work of abolitionists was far more significant as it resulted in the boycott of slave produced West Indian Sugar & suggesting they inspired

wider action that made it impossible to keep the trade. This is a view supported by Antsey who calls abolition a "moral crusade" ~~and~~ so the one giving weight to abolitionist dedication in presenting first hand accounts to make the no "capture the imagination or rich and poor alike" and appeal to peoples morality not religious views. This interpretation stands strong in the face of Walvin as it evidences actual change (the sugar boycott) that resulted from abolitionist campaigning rather than just suggesting claiming ~~they~~ increased voices demanding the end.

Both interpretations however, can be challenged by the view of Richardson who suggests that given the vast amounts of money involved ~~in~~ in the trade, it is likely the trade ended because of economic reasons, echoing Eric Williams' Decline Thesis that actually critiques abolitionists for selective morality as they did not oppose the cruelty of mining in England. Richardson suggests that the pro-slave trade lobby was reduced as west Indian planters began to realise that an efficient way to remain ~~as~~ the dominant traders would be to

prevent new plantations having slaves, reducing profit as they'd have to pay for their workforce. As a result of this it became a business plan of many to oppose the trade something that allowed abolitionists and non-conformists to be taken more seriously. There was also an increase in war time privateering that meant people could make profit elsewhere suggesting many were simply less economically invested in the trade meaning it was easier to oppose and easier to abolish. Williams proposes that it was only when the trades profit was reduced that abolitionist and non-conformist voices grew and so economic factors were a more convincing view.

However, to conclude, as suggested by Flachschild it is people who take advantage of conditions to push for change and so, although economics had influence it makes sense to place more faith in a human driven movement as humans make change. In terms of being convincing it can be said that, although the <sup>weight of</sup> defence of abolitionists has weight due to the excessive work of Clarkson, the personal motivation of Equiano, and the political influence of Wilber-

force who was instrumental in drawing up the reform bill that the non-conformist view is more convincing. Non-conformists began what Anstey dubbed a "moral crusade", becoming a "major social force in Britain" and, had it not been for these non-conformist Quakers and evangelical Christians the abolitionist campaign may not have been as strong as Clarkson himself was an evangelical Christian, hence why his vocal opposition to the trade. For these reasons the view that the trade ended because of non-conformist campaigning stands strong and is convincing.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This response is an example of a level 5 answer. The extract shows the candidate working the extracts and providing a debate about the interpretations. Towards the end the candidate brings in the wider historiography but connects it well to the debate offered in the extracts. This answer was awarded 18 marks.

# Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

Section A/B responses:

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Candidates paying close attention to the date ranges in the question
- Sufficient consideration given to the issue in the question (e.g. main factor), as well as some other factors
- Explain their judgement fully – this need not be in an artificial or abstract way, but demonstrate their reasoning in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about in order to justify their judgements
- Focus carefully on the second-order concept targeted in the question
- Give consideration to timing, to enable themselves to complete all three questions with approximately the same time given to each one
- An appropriate level, in terms of depth of detail and analysis, as required by the question – e.g. a realistic amount to enable a balanced and rounded answer on breadth questions

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Pay little heed to the precise demands of the question, e.g. write about the topic without focusing on the question, or attempt to give an answer to a question that hasn't been asked – most frequently, this meant treating questions which targeted other second-order concepts as causation questions
- Answer a question without giving sufficient consideration to the given issue in the question (e.g. looking at other causes or consequences, with only limited reference to that given in the question)
- Answers which only gave a partial response, e.g. a very limited span of the date range, or covered the stated cause/consequence, with no real consideration of other issues
- Assertion of change, causation, sometimes with formulaic repetition of the words of the question, with limited explanation or analysis of how exactly this was a change, causation, of the issue within the question
- Judgement is not reached, or not explained
- A lack of detail

## Section C responses:

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Candidates paying close attention to the precise demands of the question, as opposed to seemingly pre-prepared material covering the more general controversy as outlined in the specification
- Thorough use of the extracts; this need not mean using every point they raise, but a strong focus on these as views on the question
- A confident attempt to use the two extracts together, e.g. consideration of their differences, attempts to compare their arguments, or evaluate their relative merits
- Careful use of own knowledge, e.g. clearly selected to relate to the issues raised within the sources, confidently using this to examine the arguments made, and reason through these in relation to the given question; at times, this meant selection over sheer amount of knowledge
- Careful reading of the extracts, to ensure the meaning of individual statements and evidence within these were used in the context of the broader arguments made by the authors
- Attempts to see beyond the stark differences between sources, e.g. consideration of the extent to which they disagreed, or attempts to reconcile their arguments

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Limited use of the extracts, or an imbalance in this, e.g. extensive use of one, with limited consideration of the other
- Limited comparison or consideration of the differences between the given interpretations
- Using the extracts merely as sources of support
- Arguing one extract is superior to the other on the basis that it offers more factual evidence to back up the claims made, without genuinely analysing the arguments offered
- Heavy use of own knowledge, or even seemingly pre-prepared arguments, without real consideration of these related to the arguments in the sources
- Statements or evidence from the source being used in a manner contrary to that given in the sources, e.g. through misinterpretation of the meaning of the arguments, or lifting of detail without thought to the context of how it was applied within the extract
- A tendency to see the extracts as being polar opposites, again seemingly through expectation of this, without thought to where there may be degrees of difference, or common ground.

## **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.

