



# **Examiners' Report** **June 2023**

**GCE History 9HI0 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 2023

Publications Code 9HI0\_1D\_2306\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

## Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this year's A Level paper 1D which deals with Britain, c1785-c1870: 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 any of the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity/difference and significance with a time frame of not less than ten years. Section B offers a further choice of essays using an extended time frame of not less than one third of that offered by the specification as a whole. 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 handwriting. 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 offered by both 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

Question 1 asked candidates to consider how accurate it is to say that Chartism was the most significant campaign for electoral reform in the years 1832-67. This question proved to be accessible and the majority of candidates were well prepared in terms of evidence and argument. This was the more popular question in section A.

At the top end most candidates understood that Chartism had a profound impact on attitudes to electoral reform, and were able to show how the movement connected to the aspirations of working class communities across Britain. This helped to maintain focus on the concept of significance. There was good knowledge and understanding shown of other campaigns for electoral reform as well as the changing political context and the attitudes of Peel, Gladstone and Disraeli.

Less successful candidates often started from the position that Chartism failed to realise the aims set out in the Charter, and having dismissed it, opted in favour of one other campaign for reform. In this sense less successful candidates did not focus on significance.

In the years 1832-67, there was significant progress to electoral reform with the franchise rising to 18% in 1832 and ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> 1 third of the population in 1867. This success owed much to the efforts of the working-class Chartist movement between 1836-48, which had both an ideological and political impact upon reform. However, it could also be suggested the significance of chartism is undermined by the efforts of the Reform Union in 1864 and the Reform League in 1865. In order to reach a justified conclusion, I will consider both the ideological and political progress inspired by these movements, illustrating which was more significant.

on one hand, chartism was the most significant campaign, both due to its longevity and ideological impact. Beginning in 1836 with the publication of the ~~the~~ People's charter, its 6 radical aims for the movement, the group gave hope to the working class of more substantial reforms than those achieved in 1832. Due to its radical nature, the group

(Section A continued) needed to use more moderate methods, as seen by the presentation of petitions in 1839, 1842 and 1848. However, within the movement there were internal divisions regarding this matter, with Lovett and Attwood favouring the more modest moral force, while O'Connor and O'Brian favoured the more revolutionary physical force. As such, the appearance of class solidarity within the movement was somewhat lessened by these internal divisions, although it left a legacy of such solidarity behind. This division did hinder the political progress of the movement at the time, with the government using repressive measures such as military intervention to crush the Kennington Common rally. As such, the actual movement was prevented from achieving its aims at the time due to internal divisions and external repression. While some argue this failure lessens its significance, its importance to the reform movement instead lies in its ideological inspiration, illustrating to the working class their ability to rally for what they believe in. Such working-class movement can be seen in 1865 with the Reform League, further highlighting the fact.

Although some of the aims were achieved after

(Section A continued) low-reading nature of the movement. As such, while the movement heralded reform progress in its time, it inspired working-class reformers, furthering the movement after its decline in 1848.

On the other hand, chartism was not the most significant campaign, as it <sup>was</sup> greatly undermined by the efforts of the Reform Union in 1864. This ~~group~~ <sup>group</sup> consisted of middle-class individuals, mostly mill and factory owners, who believed an increase in reform would lessen the class divide, creating more collaboration between them. Unlike the governments fearful and repressive response to the radicalism of chartism, the reform union gathered a more collaborative response.

As the union consisted of respectable businessmen, they had a heavy bargaining hand, being responsible for the country's recent economic development through industrialisation. As such, the opinions of the manufacturing interest were gaining increased weight, with many of their arguments contributing to the passage

(Section A continued) of the Second Reform Act in 1867, illustrating its tangible significance, as unlike Chartism, it inspired considerable change. As such, the Reform Union was more significant, with its respectable nature leading to moderate reform, illustrating its direct contribution to reform.

Furthermore, Chartism was not the most significant campaign, as the Reform League in 1865 was able to attain more political action. Unlike the middle-class Reform Union, this organisation was made of working-class individuals, who saw the current system as greatly unrepresentative of the desires of the wide population. This group had similarly radical beliefs to Chartism, like universal manhood suffrage, but unlike the Chartists, it maintained an appearance of respectability through moderate methods, preventing the same government repression which harmed the Chartist cause.

For example, they prevented more radical people from joining the League, ensuring no internal divisions regarding ~~the~~

(Section A continued) their methods. moreover, they used respectable methods such as petitions and pamphlets, turning away from demonstrations which could be seen as dangerous. As such, like the Reform Union, the League was able to gain favour from the government, with many of its arguments contributing to the passage of the 1867 Reform Act. As such, chartism was not the most significant, as the Reform League had similar aims and demographics, while attaining reform in a way chartism couldn't.

Overall, while chartism was not the most significant movement in terms of genuine political reform, its legacy and ideology was essential for developing determination for reform. The movement inspired more members of the working-class to take up the cause of reform, with many members of the Reform League being ex-chartists. moreover, the failures of chartism, such as its internal divisions and potential for violence became a blueprint for the Reform League.

(Section A continued) illustrating the pitfalls to avoid in order to lobby a successful campaign. While the Reform League and Union may have achieved more political developments, Chartism secured and enduring legacy which furthered inspired developments, making it the most significant movement in the period.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is an example of a good level 4 response to the question. The candidate presents a well-judged case that Chartism, although unsuccessful, made an important impact on other campaigns for electoral reform. The candidate includes the Reform Union and Reform League as other campaigns to weigh the significance of Chartism against. Although the evidence offered is generally accurate, the examiner felt more was required to justify the conclusion.

Nevertheless, there is a consistent focus on the concept of significance, and with a bit more evidence this response would get into level 5. This response was given level 4, 15 marks.



Look at how this candidate makes the case for the significance of Chartism. The examiner is left in no doubt that this candidate has a good grasp of Chartism's place in the reform of democracy. However, an important part of the evidence is left out. For example, the Chartists led a mass movement bigger than any political movement before or since. They presented petitions to parliament with millions of signatures. They held mass meetings of hundreds of workers. They produced a national newspaper. This evidence would greatly strengthen the case for the significance of Chartism, but it would not detract from the argument the candidate makes.

## Question 2

Question 2 asked candidates to consider how far they agree that ideological pressure was the main reason for reforming the old Poor Law in the years 1785-1834. This question was accessible and produced some outstanding answers.

At the top end there was very good knowledge of the ideas of Paine, Townsend, Malthus and Bentham. At levels 4 and 5 candidates were able to construct a good argument about the role of ideological pressure weighed against other factors such as cost, population growth and urbanisation. A sizeable minority of candidates kept the terms of the PLAA in mind and wrote about the thinking of Nassau Senior and Edwin Chadwick in its formation.

Less successful candidates often tended to know about Bentham and the 'pain and pleasure' principle and used this to go beyond the time frame of the question and give evidence about workhouses.

In the years 1785 - 1834 the old poor law, based off the 1601 Elizabethan model, was increasingly challenged for its growing ineffectiveness. The development of ideological pressures, alongside political and economic issues, led to the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 - reforming the old system.

The main reason for reforming the old poor law was due to its growing ineffectiveness as a result of economic pressures. ~~The old system used the 1785 Speenhamland system which tied relief to the price of a bush of bread. This was highly criticised as~~  
The old poor relief model primarily used outdoor relief and poor houses as its main forms of poor relief. For example, by 1770 there were 2,000 workhouses built to ~~house~~ house the poor in order to ~~give~~ the poor

(Section A continued)

supports. However, these were extremely expensive to run which meant poor relief depended on the heavy use of outdoor relief - giving clothes, food and charity to the poor. This was heavily criticised by many because it was evident people could easily exploit the system, meaning there was high spending on poor relief. For example, between 1814-18 poor relief averaged £6.4 million a year. Furthermore, the old model relied on the 1765 Speenhamland system which tied relief to the cost of a loaf of bread. However, as the price of bread rose the system was heavily criticised by the poor which added economic pressure on calls to reform of the old system. Therefore, the growing economic pressures of the woefully inadequate system ~~remains~~ was fundamental to reforming the old system due to increased pressures.

A further reason for reforming the old poor law was due to political pressures created by the French

(Section A continued) Wars 1793-1815. During these periods, the general cost of living rose dramatically and food prices shot up due to the increasing need for war resources. ~~At the end of the~~ This affected the old system as it increased the level of paupers in Britain - adding huge amounts of pressure of the current system to be reformed. On top of this, at the end of the war, returning soldiers took up the already diminishing jobs which created even more paupers and therefore pressure for change. However, the political issues at the time only added to the economic strains of the poor relief. As a result, the only highlighted the economic pressure which was the fundamental cause of change.

However, other historians may argue the main reason for reform of the old system was due to social pressure like the changing ideologies. Between 1601 to 1801, the social demographic of Britain rose by 9 million which

(Section A continued)

suggested the old poor relief model couldn't facilitate the new modernised nation. As a result, ideological pressures formed to suggest ways to counter this. For example, the vitriolic opinions of Joseph Townsend and Thomas Malthus suggest paupers were growing more violent and exploiting the current system. This gained huge public support, particularly those of the middle class, and split the nation over how poor relief should be reformed. On top of this the opinion of ~~the~~ Jeremy Bentham: Utilitarianism suggested the new system should make paupers work for the benefits of society. This was highly influential in the reforming of the old system - suggesting ideological pressures were a key cause in change. However, it can be argued these ideological pressures only formed as a result of the increasing economic strain on the current system - meaning it wasn't the main reason for reform.

(Section A continued) In conclusion, social, political and economic factors were all essential in creating pressure to reform the old poor relief system. Yet, it can be most validly argued economic pressures were the main cause for reform as it was the most pressing issue to the government and its ~~attention~~ ~~highlighted~~ the effectiveness of other factors.

it played a role in highlighting.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is an example of a successful candidate's response that earned level 4, 15 marks.

It is secure level 4 because it offers a range of reasons for the reform of the Poor Law. Each factor offered has enough evidence to support the evaluations made. The answer would benefit from comparing the other factors to the one given in the question – ideological pressure. Nevertheless, the judgement made is logical, if somewhat brief.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

It always pays to start the essay with the reason, cause or consequence given in the question. As other factors are considered they can be weighed against the evidence and argument already given.

This ideological pressure was a key reason for reforming the old Poor Law in the years 1785-1834, as there was a clear shift in attitudes and a harsher idea towards the poor. However, this should be considered with the backdrop of the political climate, as there were significant factors due to industrialisation that meant the old Poor Law was rendered ineffective. As well as this, there were huge costs of providing poor relief, and these rose significantly during this period, putting pressure for change on the government, and this in addition to a shift in attitudes towards the poor meant reform was necessary.

During this time period, there was a clear shift in attitudes towards the poor. As a general consensus, Britain moved to thinking the poor were ~~was~~ struggling were self-inflicted, and this was an argument presented by Townsend, who argued that a fatalistic perspective of the poor - that they deserved to be poor and this was down to their own actions. As well as this, Malthus's ideas surrounding population were increasingly popular and therefore this meant the even less sympathy was had for the poor, as they were seen as overpopulated. As a result, the outdoor relief provided to the poor was seen as a waste and unnecessary. Ideas surrounding deterring and

undeserving poor were also circulated. The Gilbert act had meant that the elderly and children as well as the sick were only allowed to go into workhouses, and as a result of this the 'undeserving' were default being helped by outdoor relief. Therefore this shows how this idea of them being 'undeserving' put pressure for the removal or lessening of outdoor relief. There was also a shift in ideology in Parliament, as due to the Whigs gaining power, the paternalistic ideas of the Tories were no longer as helpful in looking after the poor. As a result more harsher poor laws were seen as necessary, linking into Townsend's idea as per poor support should be discouraged. However, much of the ideological shift in attitudes came from a rising middle class, as the belief was that the growth of 'self made men' was possible, so the poor should be blamed for their own poverty as some were able to rise out of poverty themselves. As well as this, the growth of industrialisation meant more opportunities for the poor was seen, and therefore it was arguable that ~~they~~ this landscape was much more significant.

The landscape at the time was essential in discussing the reasons for the amendment, as it overshadowed a clear shift in the poor. Due to the Industrial Revolution, a shift to industrial cities and factory jobs were seen, which meant as people were employed less poor relief should have been needed. However, the consequence of this was labour was

dependent on the general economic state, and as a result the amount claiming poor relief fluctuated with this. Therefore following the recession after the end of the war with France in 1815, there was a large concentration of those seeking poor relief all at once, and the system was overwhelmed and unable to cope. This was also the case in rural areas, and due to the parish system the old poor law was not organised to be able to provide mass relief for all. In rural areas, bad harvests caused fluctuations in the numbers seeking poor relief, and therefore it is clear that this would cause the breakdown of this system. However, whilst the growth of industrial cities was essential as it meant that the current system was not practicable, there was economic growth seen in 1821-9, as GNP rose 16.8% and therefore more weight has to be given to attitudes as there was still pressure to reform the system during this period. However, this could also be attributed to the financial argument for reform, as costs increasing dramatically did place a significant burden on ratepayers, but this should also be considered with reference to ideologies, as ratepayers had harsh opinions on the poor potentially due to thinkers.

There was a significant increased financial burden as a result of the poor law. The poor relief was funded by ratepayers and the 'poor rate', a system established in Elizabethan times, however the population since then had vastly increased,

in 1801 it was 9 million, significantly ~~more than~~ double what it was before when the law was established. As a result there was increased pressure and the poor rate went up, causing ratepayers to strongly oppose poor relief, and as many of these ratepayers were enfranchised, this gave them more influence in parliament and the ability to push for reform. As well as this, the poor law had systems such as the Speenhamland system, in which wages were determined by the price of bread, and due to the end of the war with France and resultant corn laws this price had gone up, so therefore the system cost of relief was also up. The alternative Fouldaman system also increased in expense as it ~~was~~ was based on auctioning of labour, and due to an increase in population size wages could be significantly brought down. As a result these expenses between 1814-1818 averaged 6.4 million, and ~~there~~ this burden was placed on ratepayers who as a result pushed for reform. However, ratepayers tended to be upper or middle class, and therefore were influenced by the ~~new~~ new ideologies surrounding the poor, and whilst the middle class opposition can be tied into industrialisation and the landscape, it was more significantly the ideas that the middle class produced, around self-made men and the poor being in poverty due to their laziness that was more essential, as pauperism being considered evil was clearly significant whereas the rising cost, whilst it did create more pressure, had always been a burden. The shift away from Tory Paternalism also

explains a ~~repaired~~ reduction in willingness to provide for the poor any longer. Whilst the financial argument for this reform does hold weight, much of this financial toll was as a result of the general landscape: industrialisation caused movement to industrial cities, ~~and~~ in addition, ideologies such as David Ricardo's wage fund theory further showed how financial circumstances have to be seen in the context of ideology.

In conclusion, ideological pressure can be seen as the main reason for reforming the poor law in 1785-1834. As the poor law system changed, the main changes made were a cut down in outdoor relief and growth in workhouses - essentially aiming for poor relief to be a 'means of last resort' and ~~that~~ this minor ideological pressures saying the poor were lazy and should help themselves, ~~and~~ Therefore this shows that for parliament, the main reason was to change relief to minor ideology, whilst the changing landscape certainly played a role in creating this ideology due to the growth of the middle class, ~~and~~ as well as showing the flaws with the current system, ~~it can also be~~ it was not as significant as the ideological pressures as much of these changes actually did not have much impact in parliament. Financial reasons are a consideration, however it is arguable that workhouses are actually more expensive to maintain than the old system, ~~disproving this argument.~~



This is an example of a level 5 response that earned 19 marks. The candidate displays a commanding grasp of the issues. The detail is very good and there is analysis offered that is generally convincing.

A key feature of responses at level 5 is the sustained focus on the changing economic and political landscape. For example, in this response the candidate shows the way that the ascendancy of the Whigs in parliament saw a move away from Tory paternalism and the move to reforms based on cost and efficiency. A little more on the terms of the PLAA would have made this analysis even more telling.



Look at the way this candidate has rooted the various pressures for reform in the changing context of increased population, urbanisation and political philosophy. The time frame in the question needs to be respected to give a fully developed analysis.

### Question 3

Question 3 asked candidates to consider how accurate it is to say that the attitude of government to factory reform changed little in the years 1833-70. This question was the less popular question in section B but was nevertheless accessible and generally well answered.

At the top end candidates framed their answer in the context of a Whig government that was committed to reform based on free market ideology rather than humanitarianism. These candidates tended to judge that government attitudes changed in response to pressures from campaigners but did not amount to much. Quite a few candidates could provide good detail on the factory reform acts, and the extent to which they were enforced, which in turn led to some well-argued evaluation.

Less successful candidates were often unable to successfully give any detail about factory reform, and some resorted to focussing instead on issues of housing and sanitation in the newly industrialised towns. The concept of change/continuity was often ignored.

The Government's attitude to factory reform changed little in the years 1833-70. There is evidence of slight change with the introduction of the 1833 Factory Act that limited work. Due to this act children under the age of 9 were not allowed to be employed, children between 9 and 13 were limited to 8 hours a day and ages between 13 to 18 limited to 12 hours. Also it gave children an education. Despite this change for children, it was ~~more~~ limited due to the government favouring employers. The factory Act 1833 ~~change~~ highlighted some change, but not enough. The government still allowed exploitation of the employees as employers could decide the wage and hours men and women received. Punishments such as fines for lateness, were not



(Section B continued) It is accurate to say that the attitude of government to factory reform changed ~~little~~<sup>little</sup> in the years 1833-70. ~~The change~~ The improvements made to factories was not due to <sup>the</sup> government's own attitude but the pressure ~~for~~ from the Royal Commission established in 1842. This was used to investigate the quality of the factories and make changes where needed. Factory conditions were poor. For example children were used as ~~scavengers~~<sup>for dropped cotton</sup> due to their size. An example of the suffering is Maria Appert, who lost some of her fingers when collecting the dropped fabric. She could no longer work so was fired. The government did not change their attitude towards this as it was beneficial to stay on good terms with the employers. The Royal Commission introduced ~~investigation~~ inspections in the workplace to ensure it was ~~safe~~ sanitary and less risk of injury or illness. They even provided safety <sup>equipment</sup> as this was not given by ~~the~~ the factory workers employer. The government was forced or pressured to make changes due to the Royal Commission as even then they were reluctant. therefore it is accurate to say the government's attitude changed little in the years 1833-70 as it was ~~some~~ force such as the Royal

(Section B continued) Commission who had a more positive attitude towards the factory reform.

~~In conclusion, there was a slight change in~~

The attitude of the government changed more in 1867 towards factory reform. In these years there was high demand for equal pay, equal fair hours and better conditions. Some was achieved but not enough for the betterment of the workers.

It wasn't until the 1867 Great Reform Act that when attitudes began to drastically change. The modifications made in the 1867 act ensured that more working-class people had the ability to vote. The government had to ensure that the working-class were pleased or ~~at least had~~ to ensure votes. The working-class made up the majority of the British population and their vote mattered.

More ~~improvements~~ improvements were made such as the Sanitation Act in ~~1857~~ the 1850's that improved sanitation in living and the workplace. Therefore, in these years leading up to the Second Reform Act in 1867 government had continued to change their attitude. The Act ensured that ~~the~~ the government changed more.

(Section B continued) ~~In 1833~~ In conclusion, between the years 1833 and 1867, ~~there was a~~ it is accurate to say that there was a slight change of the government's attitude for factory reform. Well-known laws were ~~being~~ improved for children and eventually extended to women. Education was also given to give children more opportunities. This was only a slight change. The Royal Commission pushed for conditions to be improved and investigation help this. It wasn't until the 1867 Great Reform Act when <sup>the</sup> government realised the working-class had some power. ~~The~~ Some of the working-class could now vote, this was crucial as they made up the majority of the population. Attitudes by the government had to change to appease the working-class ~~and still~~ but still not lose the interests of the employer. Therefore it is ~~accurate~~ partially accurate that the government's attitude towards factory reform slightly changed in the years 1833-67 but more fixed in 1867, had was pressured to ~~change~~ make changes.



This is an example of work that was judged to get into level 5, albeit at the bottom end.

In this extract the candidate displays reasonably good knowledge of factory reform and explains some of the pressure that led government to consider reform. The candidate keeps a tight focus on the concept of change over time and is successful in covering the time frame and the changing political context. The conclusion is measured and well-argued and this focus on the question pushed this response up to level 5.



This response shows the value of planning. A plan is a way to run through the evidence and argument before writing an answer and provides a check list of what must be included.

## Question 4

Question 4 asked candidates to consider how far they agree that the aims of the co-operative movement were very similar to the aims of the trade unions in the years 1785-1870. This proved to be both a popular and accessible question.

At the top end a sizeable minority were able to consider the focus of the question throughout the time period, showing an awareness of the changing social context as Britain industrialised. At levels 4 and 5 candidates offered good analysis on how the co-operative movement and the trade unions shared core objectives of improving the lives of the working class, and similar values of mutualism. Key differences that formed the counter argument tended to be on methods and activities, shops versus strikes.

Less successful candidates could point to some similarities or differences without developing an argument around the focus of the question. Nearly every candidate could offer something on the Rochdale Pioneers and the New Model Unions.

on one hand, the aims of both trade unions and the co-operative movement were very similar, as they sought protection from the

(Section B continued) exploitation of employees. In the trade unionism movement, most were campaigning for either higher wages, shorter days or improved factory conditions, but all of these features were sacrificed for the sake of higher profit margins. A prime example of the exploitative nature of employers is through the use of the document, which defeated the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union in 1835. Employers used this document as a prerequisite to employment, making employees give up their loyalty to the union, preventing them protecting themselves. When 1,500 mill workers were locked out for refusing to sign, the GNCTU could only support them for 4 months, collapsing under the financial burden. Such exploitative measures highlight the need for protection, as well as the need for stronger trade unions against such repression. In the co-operative movement, the New Lanark mill in 1799 under Robert Owen also indicates an aim for better conditions and less exploitation. ~~As~~ As a social reformer, Owen turned away from profit focus,

(Section B continued) instead creating a positive work environment. For example, he didn't use a punitive system, instead introducing the silent monitor, a coloured wooden block to incentivise hard-work. As such, the move away from exploitation to a more mutually beneficial production illustrates the fact of exploitative employees was an aim of both movements, highlighting their vast similarities.

On the other hand, a significant difference on the movements is that the trade unions only sought protection from the effects of industrialisation, whereas the ~~co-operative~~ co-operative movement sought a complete alternative, based upon mutual benefit rather than combative ideas. For example, this idea of mutual benefit is encapsulated by the Rochdale Pioneers, a group of 28 men who formed the Rochdale Society of Equitable Pioneers in 1844. This co-operative shop operated for mutual benefit, using democratic and progressive principles, like offering every shareholder a vote, and giving the correct weights

(Section B continued) measures of goods sold. Such a progressive organisation was greatly appealing, as by 1862, of the 332 co-ops, 281 were created after the Coaldale Society. As such, while both opposed industrialisation's exploitation, the co-operative movement was the only development to seek an alternative, with its widespread success highlighting the appeal of such an aim.

Moreover, the aims of the co-operative movement and trade unionism were different due to the alternate government attitudes.

Initially, the government was fearful of Friendly Societies, introducing the Friendly Societies Act in 1797 as a war measure, requiring they register with JP's and give a report every 3 months. This legislation became a motive for their development, however, as the groups aimed to criticise the law to attain a legal identity and protection for their funds, allowing more widespread actions. As such, a key aim of the movement's development was a desire to criticise

(Section B continued) The government's protection to aid others. Alternatively, the government was more repressive of trade unions, introducing the 1799 and 1800 Combination Acts as a way measure to repress trade unions; while repealed in 1825, the 1823 Master and Servant Act became used against many, as it made the breaking of an employment contract a punishable offence.

However, far from stopping the spread of trade unions, the movement grew, largely to protest such repress. For example, the tragic nature of the Tolpuddle Martyrs, a group of 6 agricultural labourers who had the Unlawful Oaths Act used against them in 1834, or sentencing them to 7 years imprisonment and transportation to Australia, increased the ~~for~~ vigorous nature of trade unionism, as a way to stand against government repress and tyranny. To such, ~~the~~ the nature of government attitudes contributed to different aims, making co-operatives spread with an aim to exploit government legislation, and trade unions increase as a way to protest government repression.

(Section B continued) Overall, the movements share many similar reasons and motivations for their actions, but the actual aims of the movements are mostly similar.

While both aim to protest against the unstoppable and unregulated progress to industrialisation, their aims surrounding this differ greatly. While trade unions merely desire protection against it, co-operators desire a complete overhaul of the system, replacing it with one of mutual benefit. Moreover, while both are greatly influenced by government regulations, it affects their aims differently, with ~~co-ops~~ friendly societies exploiting their opportunity and trade unions protesting their repression in the aim to change it.

As such, while they may appear similar, with greatly overlapping base motivations, the aims derived from these backgrounds are greatly different.



This is an example of a secure level 5 response that was given 18 marks.

This response has a consistent focus on the concept of similarity and difference, and the candidate has selected evidence and argument that gives a sustained analysis. The candidate has covered most of the time frame and the comparative examples have been well selected.

The candidate makes a valid point that government attitudes show a discernible difference between trade unions and the co-operative movement, but this is not as well argued as the rest of the response. Having said that this response is well organised and offers good detail and evaluation.



This example is useful in showing how to maintain focus on the historical concept at the heart of the question – similarity and difference. Selecting meaningful comparators is important. This response has done this by sticking to the aims of the trade unions and co-operative movement as the question requires.

## Question 5

Question 5 asked candidates to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the view that 'free market arguments' played the main role in the abolition of the slave trade.

The majority of candidates were able to demonstrate understanding of the extracts in terms of 'free market arguments' versus the work of humanitarians. Candidates at the top end could develop the interpretations in both extracts through the addition of their own evidence and argument. The majority of successful candidates knew something of Eric Williams' thesis, and its strengths and weaknesses, which were then counter posed to the energetic endeavours of Clarkson and Wilberforce. A minority of candidates made the point that Williams' 'Decline Thesis' was about slavery, rather than just the slave trade. This helped them to explain that economic arguments provided a backdrop to parliamentary and campaigning events.

Candidates at level 3 tended to see their own role as being to decide whether what the rival extracts say is true or false. Their judgement was then based on which extract stands up best to this kind of interrogation. Nevertheless, the majority of these candidates were able to bring in own knowledge, often about the role of Clarkson, that added important information and produced an answer that was partially successful.

Less successful candidates tended to lack wider knowledge about the economic arguments for abolition and as a result were dismissive of Extract 1. Candidates at level 2 also tended to either write an answer as a paraphrase of the extracts, or as an account of abolition based on their own knowledge.

However, this view is made less convincing by the argument's source two that it was an "increasingly profitable slave trade". While revolts may have been an issue, the trade was evidently still beneficial. It produced many jobs in shipbuilding and fitting, as well as leading to the prosperity of Liverpool as the main port for the trade.

Moreover, the presence of the West Indian Lobby group, who had 50 MP affiliates, increasingly defied the trade's economic benefit highlight as continued financial renewal, despite

the potential for industrialisation to be ~~rather~~ increasingly profitable. As such, the view proposed by extract 2 makes extract 1 less ~~or~~ convincing, as it is evidently still possessing some financial benefit, either the infrastructure of plantations.

Alternatively, the view that economic free trade arguments was the reason for abolition is made less convincing by extract 2, which suggests "reasons for abolition are found in the humanitarianism... not in economic arguments."

The efforts of Evangelical Christians is a prime example of this, as they used their religious teachings to offer weight to their arguments, leading a moral crusade against slavery. For example, the Society for Effecting the Abolition of the Slave Trade was formed in 1787, and used propaganda to highlight the suffering and immorality of the trade.

For example, the plaque created by Josiah Wedgwood reading "Am I not a man and a brother" became an enduring image, with such longevity for the highlighting its impact. Moreover,

within the humanitarian group, individuals such as Thomas Clarkson and William Wilberforce were essential, as they "highlighted the cruelty of slavery". The men worked in tandem, with Clarkson researching and presenting the horrors, such as iron manacles, and Wilberforce using this evidence to lobby in parliament, presenting a bill every session from 1791 to 1799. As such, regardless of the economic implications, the presence of humanitarian groups and individuals throughout suggest it was a driving force.

Furthermore, the view that economic factors were the most important as made less convincing by the political factors of "war with France": occurring from 1793-1815, Britain's war with France influenced the environment surrounding abolition. When Napoleon ~~re-introduced~~ re-introduced slavery in 1802, it made abolitionist sentiments increasingly patriotic. This allowed for an easier passage for abolition, so while previously Wilberforce had been labelled a Jacobin, his lobbying was more

socially accepted, illustrating the importance of environment upon abolition.

Overall, I disagree that the free trade agreement was the most significant factor for reform, instead arguing it merely contributed to a more accepting environment, conducive for humanitarian efforts to achieve reform.

The presence of humanitarian campaigners throughout the period, regardless of the economic benefit or disadvantage of reform strengthens this, highlighting them as an immovable driving force. Moreover, not only did the declining economic benefit and possibility of reform strengthen this the environment for reform, but so too did the war with France, creating an environment conducive to change as a result of the lobbying of humanitarians. As such, while the economic factor is significant, it is only due to the environment of created surrounding reform, allowing humanitarian individuals and groups to be accepted in their lobbying.



This is an example of a response that was awarded level 4, 16 marks. The candidate clearly understands the views in both extracts. In this clip from the response the candidate develops the view in Extract 2 concerning the importance of humanitarian intervention in particular. The candidate develops Extract 2 with their own knowledge about the roles of evangelical Christianity, abolitionist propaganda and the role of individuals.

The focus on rival interpretations is insufficient for level 5.



The key to a good response in section C questions is to grasp the overall view of each extract. In this case Williams acknowledges that the cruelty of the slave trade was the point of attack for abolitionists, but economic factors were driving the intensity of the debate. Hilton, in Extract 2, reverses Williams' argument. He argues that the economy was not affecting opinion as much as the moral case for abolition. If a candidate can work on the debate over interpretations, rather than the evidence alone, their answer is more likely to get into level 5.

5) In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that 'free market arguments' played the main role in the abolition of the slave trade [Extract 1, line 3]?

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

(20)

Prior to the abolition of the slave trade in 1807, the trade was generally viewed as profitable and helpful for growing the economy. However, in the years leading to abolition, a view that the trade was not as economically viable as it once was grew, becoming the basis of 'free market arguments', that factories were becoming the more sensible investment rather than slave ships.

Extract 2 from Eric Williams shows the interpretation that 'free market arguments' and the capitalistic powers led to the destruction of slavery in 1807. Williams argues that the attack

on slavery was "an attack by supporters of Adam Smith and his free market theories" alongside "abolitionists" who were "supported modern economic theory." This reveals the view that the central arguments being made against slavery were on an economic basis in favour of industrial free trade rather than a "monopoly of slave owners." Williams then continues his argument by stating "Capitalists in Britain [...] now turned and destroyed the slave trading system; and that slavery was "an inefficient and increasingly unprofitable method of production." William's argument is very much in line with his "decline thesis" that suggests that industrial factories were ~~becoming~~ becoming a better investment than slave ships, which is supported by the emerging middle class growing alongside industrial advancements. The idea that the slave trade was becoming less financially viable

is supported by the fact that ~~thousands~~ of slave ~~ships~~ ships experienced some kind of revolt. Further, revolts or rebellions in the colonies, such as Grenada ~~was~~ in 1795, cost millions for the vested interests, with Grenada costing around £2.5 million. However, Williams' argument is too dismissive of the role of humanitarian abolitionists, as despite mentioning that they "attacked slavery" at its weakest and most indefensible spot, the cruelty of the slave trade, "he suggests they are ~~not~~ merely believers in economic theory with a humanitarian lean, rather than a ~~major~~ major force: humanitarians, such as the Quakers, did not base arguments on economic theory but rather ~~universal~~ universal morality, as seen in the 1789 pamphlet "the Case of our Fellow-Creatures," which had 10,000 copies distributed, including among MPs, showing the strength of the moral arguments. Because of this flow

~~Explain~~ Williams' argument cannot be viewed as wholly convincing.

Extract 2 details Hilton's view that slavery remained economically viable, so humanitarian ~~was~~ morality was necessary to win achieve abolitionist victory in 1807. Hilton begins by stating "The British West Indies was far more valuable to Britain in the decade or so leading up to 1807," supporting this claim with the fact that "the property value of the slave colonies had doubled since 1789," showing the continued ~~notably~~ success of slavery from the economic view point. Hilton further supports his view by highlighting how acquisition of Caribbean territory meant slavery "was nowhere near its 'maximum economic potential'." Hilton therefore believes that because slavery was "aborted in its prime" the "reasons for abolition are to be found in the humanitarianism of the abolitionist

movement, highlighting the need to expose moral flaws in the trade in order to ~~and~~ destroy a cruel, yet profitable system. Hilton's view is supported by the 20% to 50% return on investment offered by the trade, showing the economic strength of slavery for investors. Additionally, Hilton's comments that "Britain's trade with Europe had been very badly hit by the war with France" is supported by the trade of slaves for guns and weapons that took place in Africa during these years to keep Britain's economy stable. The fact that the moral arguments were accepted by major political figures such as William Wilberforce who was a Quaker and introduced annual abolition bills from 1791-99 demonstrates how vital ~~this aspect~~ the humanitarian aspect of the abolition movement was. Without these, a system as beneficial for the British economy as slavery would never have ~~been~~

had a reason to be abolished in the eyes of parliament, ~~as there would be no convincing reason from any other~~ Therefore, Hilton's interpretation is extremely convincing.

Overall, the view slavery was abolished because of the 'free market arguments' is not entirely convincing. This is because slavery was more beneficial for the economy than not, so these arguments lack a significant backing in the economic realities of the trade. The view that humanitarianism brought about abolition is more convincing since the morality appealed to both popular and parliamentary pressure.



This is an example of a response awarded level 5, 19 marks.

The candidate shows that the extracts have the potential for debate, and grasps that these are historical interpretations. The candidate selects the main points of interpretation in each extract and considers them in the light of points in the opposing extract. A clear judgement is made on the discussion that the candidate has provided. The candidate gets reward for developing the arguments rather than just adding information.



The economics of slavery and the slave trade are often difficult for candidates to engage with. The understanding of these arguments is best resolved in revision, rather than waiting for the exam itself. One way of dealing with the arguments is to judge them in the light of the 1807 Act. For example, if abolition was economically foolish why did the British economy continue to grow and become the 'workshop of the world'? Alternatively, if the reasons for abolition were essentially based on free market arguments why did none of the politicians debating abolition in 1807 refer to them?

## 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 over 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/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, cause, 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.

## **Grade boundaries**

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

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

