



Mark Scheme

Summer 2017

Pearson Edexcel GCE AS
In History (6HI02) Paper 2B

Unit 2: British History Depth Studies
Paper 2B: British Political History in the 19th Century

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by 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 or 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.

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

Summer 2017

Publications Code 6HI02_B_1706_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:

i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear

ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter

iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.

GCE History Marking Guidance

Marking of Questions: Levels of Response

The mark scheme provides an indication of the sorts of answer that might be found at different levels. The exemplification of content within these levels is not complete. It is intended as a guide and it will be necessary, therefore, for examiners to use their professional judgement in deciding both at which level a question has been answered and how effectively points have been sustained. Candidates should always be rewarded according to the quality of thought expressed in their answer and not solely according to the amount of knowledge conveyed. However candidates with only a superficial knowledge will be unable to develop or sustain points sufficiently to move to higher levels.

In assessing the quality of thought, consider whether the answer:

- (i) is relevant to the question and is explicitly related to the question's terms
- (ii) argues a case, when requested to do so
- (iii) is able to make the various distinctions required by the question
- (iv) has responded to all the various elements in the question
- (v) where required, explains, analyses, discusses, assesses, and deploys knowledge of the syllabus content appropriately, rather than simply narrates.

Examiners should award marks both between and within levels according to the above criteria. This should be done in conjunction with the levels of response indicated in the mark schemes for particular questions.

At the end of each answer, examiners should look back on the answer as a whole in the light of these general criteria in order to ensure that the total mark reflects their overall impression of the answer's worth.

Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level

The first stage is to decide the overall level and then whether the work represents high, mid or low performance within the level. The overall level will be determined by the candidate's ability to focus on the question set, displaying the appropriate conceptual grasp. Within any one piece of work there may well be evidence of work at two, or even three levels. One stronger passage at Level 4, would not by itself merit a Level 4 award – but it would be evidence to support a high Level 3 award – unless there were also substantial weaknesses in other areas.

Assessing Quality of Written Communication

QWC will have a bearing if the QWC is inconsistent with the communication descriptor for the level in which the candidate's answer falls. If, for example, a candidate's history response displays mid Level 3 criteria but fits the Level 2 QWC descriptors, it will require a move down within the level.

6HI02: Generic Level Descriptors

Part (a)

Target: AO2a (8%)

(20 marks)

As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-5	<p>Comprehends the surface features of the sources and selects material relevant to the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-5 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	6-10	<p>Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify their similarities and/or differences in relation to the question posed. There may be one developed comparison, but most comparisons will be undeveloped or unsupported with material from the sources. Sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information. The source provenance may be noted, without application of its implications to the source content.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 6-7 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 8-10 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	11-15	<p>Comprehends the sources and focuses the cross-referencing on the task set. Responses will offer detailed comparisons, similarities/differences, agreements/disagreements that are supported by evidence drawn from the sources.</p> <p>Sources are used as evidence with some consideration of their attributes, such as the nature, origins, purpose or audience, with some consideration of how this can affect the weight given to the evidence. In addressing 'how far' there is a clear attempt to use the sources in combination, but this may be imbalanced in terms of the issues addressed or in terms of the use of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 3: 13-15 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>

4	16-20	<p>Reaches a judgement in relation to the issue posed by the question supported by careful examination of the evidence of the sources. The sources are cross-referenced and the elements of challenge and corroboration are analysed. The issues raised by the process of comparison are used to address the specific enquiry. The attributes of the source are taken into account in order to establish what weight they will bear in relation to the specific enquiry. In addressing 'how far' the sources are used in combination.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 16-17 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 4: 18-20 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
---	-------	---

NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.

Part (b)

Target: AO1a and AO1b (10% - 24 marks)

Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

AO2b (7% - 16 marks)

Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.

(40 marks)

AO1a and AO1b (24 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-6	<p>Candidates will produce mostly simple statements. These will be supported by limited factual material, which has some accuracy and relevance, although not directed analytically (i.e. at the focus of the question). The material will be mostly generalised. There will be few, if any, links between the simple statements.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks As per descriptor.</p> <p>High Level 1: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 1.</p> <p>The writing may have limited coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>

2	7-12	<p>Candidates will produce a series of simple statements supported by some accurate and relevant, factual material. The analytical focus will be mostly implicit and there are likely to be only limited links between simple statements. Material is unlikely to be developed very far or to be explicitly linked to material taken from sources.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks As per descriptor.</p> <p>High Level 2: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2.</p> <p>The writing will have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. Some of the skills needed to produce effective writing will be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
---	------	--

3	13-18	<p>Candidates answers will attempt analysis and show some understanding of the focus of the question. They may, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus. Factual material will be mostly accurate, but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor. At this level candidates will begin to link contextual knowledge with points drawn from sources.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks As per descriptor.</p> <p>High Level 3: 17-18 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 3.</p> <p>The writing will be coherent in places but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. Only some of the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are likely to be present. Syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
4	19-24	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material, which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. There will be some integration of contextual knowledge with material drawn from sources, although this may not be sustained throughout the response. The selection of material may lack balance in places.</p>

	<p>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks As per descriptor.</p> <p>High Level 4: 23-24 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 4.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes may not be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing but there may be passages which lack clarity or coherence. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p>
--	--

NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.

AO2b (16 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-4	<p>Comprehends the sources and selects material relevant to the representation contained in the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-4 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	5-8	<p>Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify points which support or differ from the representation contained in the question. When supporting the decision made in relation to the question the sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 7-8 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	9-12	<p>The sources are analysed and points of challenge and/or support for the representation contained in the question are developed from the provided material. In addressing the specific enquiry, there is clear awareness that a representation is under discussion and there is evidence of reasoning from the evidence of both sources, although there may be some lack of balance. The response reaches a judgement in relation to the claim which is supported by the evidence of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 9-10 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 3: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
4	13-16	<p>Reaches and sustains a conclusion based on the discriminating use of the evidence. Discussion of the claim in the question proceeds from the issues raised by the process of analysing the representation in the sources. There is developed reasoning and weighing of the evidence in order to create a judgement in relation to the stated claim.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 13-14 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 4: 15-16 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>

NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.

Unit 2 Assessment Grid

Question Number	AO1a and b Marks	AO2a Marks	AO2b Marks	Total marks for question
Q (a)	-	20	-	20
Q (b)(i) or (ii)	24	-	16	40
Total Marks	24	20	16	60
% weighting	10%	8%	7%	25%

Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

B1 Britain, 1830–85: Representation and Reform

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (a)	<p>The sources offer evidence to both support and challenge the claim in the question. Candidates may well begin by reference to Source 1 which directly offers support for the claim in the question, suggesting, as it does that in 1866 Disraeli wanted to 'get rid of the Liberal government' and achieve 'a personal triumph' over Gladstone. Sources 2 and 3 both appear to offer alternative explanations when examined at face value. Source 2 suggests that a desire to educate the party and 'principle' were the factors that motivated Disraeli. This positive view of Disraeli's actions clearly contrasts to the message of Source 1 which suggests that Disraeli is less interested in party and principle than he is in beating Gladstone. This might be explained by reference to the provenance. Disraeli in Source 2 is putting a positive interpretation on his actions, whereas Lord Stanley in Source 1, although he is a supporter of Disraeli, has clearly stated that he is not in agreement with him. Candidates might develop this point further by pointing out that whilst Source 1 predates the 1867 Reform Act, Source 2 is a reflection on events after the passage of the legislation. Source 3 offers another alternative explanation – that Disraeli has merely reacted to pressure from the 'mobs'. Higher performing candidates may develop both of the alternative explanations offered by Sources 2 and 3 and by inference suggest that both 'educating the party' and a response to the 'mobs' can be linked to Disraeli's personal ambition. This might lead some candidates to the conclusion that all three sources can be used in different ways to support the stated view. Candidates might point out that Sources 1 and 3, despite the differing attitudes of their authors to Disraeli, are in agreement that his motives are not as virtuous as Disraeli implies in Source 2.</p> <p>Any valid conclusion that is drawn by candidates should be credited. Developed responses based on these arguments can reach Level 2. At Level 3 candidates will both support and challenge the stated claim, using evidence from different sources interpreted in context. At Level 4 they will use the sources, interpreted in context as a set, to reach a reasoned judgement about how far Disraeli's actions during the Reform crisis of 1866–67 were motivated by his pursuit of personal ambition.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (i)	<p>The focus of the question is whether those who defended the political system that existed before the passing of the 1832 Reform Act had valid reasons for doing so. Candidates are likely to begin by referencing Source 4, a contemporary view from Robert Peel, a leading Tory. This sums up many of the arguments that were used by those in positions of power who did not want to see change in the political system enacted. Some candidates might comment on the provenance of this source which is derived from an opponent to change speaking in Parliament on the Reform Bill. This may be credited if it is linked to the line of argument being developed. Candidates might well develop this line of argument by reference to Source 5, which extends beyond the privileged political classes to include arguments that pertain to the middle classes ('manufacturers and merchants') and by inference, also to the working classes ('even those who were not themselves directly represented nevertheless were 'virtually represented''.) Candidates might use their contextual own knowledge to extend this line of argument further by incorporating specific examples of these issues. Some candidates may argue that Source 5 is simply re-stating the arguments that were being made by contemporaries and that the final sentence of the extract may suggest a degree of scepticism. Such lines of argument should be appropriately rewarded. The counter argument is clearly presented in Source 6. Candidates are likely to use the information from this source and to develop it further using their contextual own knowledge to provide specific examples of the arguments that are being raised. Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available. The sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes.</p> <p>Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of whether those who defended the political system that existed before the passing of the 1832 Reform Act had valid arguments, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view. The best responses may very well consider the interaction of different factors to explain the apparent conflict and offer an overall judgement.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<p>1 (b) (ii)</p>	<p>The focus of the question is whether or not the Chartists were well led. Candidates are likely to begin by reference to Source 7 which encompasses a range of issues that candidates might draw upon. It suggests that the leadership was essential in light of the background of much of its membership. Some candidates may use their contextual own knowledge to develop the nature of that membership. It further suggests some of the strategies and techniques that were used by the leadership to good effect; specific examples of this may be derived from contextual own knowledge. Finally, it suggests that the leadership was aware of 'the rapidly changed social and economic needs of urban working people' and that it behaved accordingly. However, Source 7 can also be used to present alternative arguments. It refers, for example, to the leadership as being 'diverse, squabbling, vain and over-ambitious'. This may well be used in conjunction with the arguments in Source 9, which was written by Lovett. In this source, the scale of the divide between O'Connor and Lovett is clear. Candidates are likely to use the content and comment on what this reveals about the physical force/moral force divide within the movement. Many candidates will appreciate the provenance of the source and comment appropriately on this. However, Source 8 does offer some support to Source 9 on the nature of O'Connor's leadership. The best answers are likely to contrast the negative attributes of leadership presented in Sources 8 and 9 to the more positive interpretation taken by Source 7. Source 8 can also be used to argue that in the light of the challenges faced by the Chartist leadership, they probably did a reasonable job. Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available. The sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes.</p> <p>Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of whether or not the Chartists were well led, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view. The best responses may very well consider the interaction of different factors to explain the apparent conflict and offer an overall judgement.</p>	<p>40</p>

B2 Poverty, Public Health and the Growth of Government in Britain, 1830–75

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (a)	<p>The sources offer evidence both to support and challenge the claim in the question. Candidates may well begin by contrasting the views expressed in Sources 10 and 11. Source 10 suggests that those employed as labourers receive parish relief to supplement the level of their wages. He seems to be suggesting, at least at face value, that money is available and that it does provide relief when it is needed. This contrasts with the view expressed in Source 11 that although relief is offered, it is clearly insufficient to meet the basic needs of the labouring classes. Candidates may comment on the use of language by Cobbett to confirm his opinion, but they might also note that he is apparently using statistics to support his argument, which they may perceive as making his views more objective, or they may wonder what the source of the statistics is and thus question their validity. Any relevant line of argument should be rewarded. Candidates may use the provenance to explain these differences between the two sources. Source 10 is written by a magistrate who might be assumed to support the systems in operation, whereas Source 11 is written by a radical who sympathised with the problems faced by the poor. However, some candidates may also begin to explore how far Source 10 really believes that the system was effective. Firstly, he refers to the relief being given in a 'limited' way. Secondly, some candidates may infer that relief was linked to the level of wages that was received. Thirdly, Source 10 also makes the point that relief is provided for families, from which it might be inferred that it is not available for the able-bodied single men and women. This contrasts strongly with Source 12's view which suggests that able-bodied men are accessing excessively good treatment via the Oxford Workhouse. He talks of 'no rules' which contrasts sharply to the systems described in Sources 10 and 11. Some candidates will, however, make the point that the purpose of this report was to criticise the old Poor Law. Candidates may raise a number of valid points about the provenance of the sources, including the fact that they all pertain to the South of the country, that they deal with differing systems of poor relief and that, to some extent, they are anecdotal – relating to individual areas.</p> <p>It is unlikely that candidates will consider all of these issues and due credit should be awarded for the development of valid arguments. Developed responses based on these arguments can reach Level 2. At Level 3 candidates will both support and challenge the stated claim, using evidence from different sources interpreted in context. At Level 4 they will use the sources, interpreted in context as a set, to reach a reasoned judgement about whether the systems of relief in operation under the old Poor Law provided effectively for the able-bodied poor.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<p>2 (b) (i)</p>	<p>The focus of the question is the obstacles that impeded progress in public health in the years 1830–75. Candidates are likely to begin by an examination of Source 13 which offers clear support for the view in the question. It refers to the costs of specific engineering projects and the lack of sources of money to pay for this. Candidates are likely to develop this line of argument linked to appropriate contextual own knowledge which may discuss the range of vested interests who had financial concerns. A further obstacle to progress is identified in all three sources – the problems linked to the predominant laissez-faire philosophy. This is hinted at in Source 13 ‘the government was reluctant to grant loans’ and developed more fully in Sources 14 and 15. In the latter source, candidates may comment on a view that found expression in a number of contemporary sources. They may comment on the tone of the piece to help develop their argument. Candidates are likely to link laissez-faire ideas to the slow pace and ineffective powers of legislation in the period. Source 14 suggests a third obstacle – the antipathy caused by Edwin Chadwick and candidates may develop this argument on the basis of their contextual own knowledge. The sources therefore provide access to three key obstacles and it is perfectly acceptable for candidates to develop only these three obstacles. However, it is equally acceptable for candidates to go beyond these obstacles on the basis of their contextual own knowledge to consider a very wide range of other obstacles that might include the short-term impact of cholera epidemics or lack of knowledge about the areas into which to broaden the legislation. Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available. The sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes.</p> <p>Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the obstacles that impeded progress in public health in the years 1830–75, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view. The best responses may very well consider the interaction of different factors to explain the apparent conflict and offer an overall judgement.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (ii)	<p>The focus of the question is the extent to which the treatment of paupers changed in the years 1834–75. Candidates are likely to begin by reference to Source 16 which largely supports the view expressed in the question. It suggests that although there was some easing of the rules in the 1850s, things had reverted at the end of the period to what they had been at the start. Candidates may well use their contextual own knowledge to elaborate upon the treatment of paupers in this period. They should pick up from Source 16 the need to discuss both indoor and outdoor relief. However, especially among weaker candidates, there may be a tendency to merely describe the conditions in workhouses in the 1830s and 1840s. Where candidates are able to range more widely over the period and refer to both indoor and outdoor relief, they should be rewarded accordingly. Source 17 is likely to be used as the basis of the counter argument based on its reference to ‘a different attitude’ being in place by the end of the period. The reference to children could be supported by contextual own knowledge about the different types of educational establishments that were being operated by the Poor Law, such as separate schools and district schools; there might also be reference to the operation of the 1870 Education Act. The reference to the sick might generate cross-referencing with Source 18 which makes it clear that there should be exceptions to the principle of less eligibility. Candidates may make reference to the provenance of Source 18 as being someone who is likely to know what is happening. Candidates might also develop the reference to the ‘old’ in Source 17. All valid arguments should be credited appropriately. Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available. The sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes.</p> <p>Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of whether the treatment of paupers changed in the years 1834–75, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view. The best responses may very well consider the interaction of different factors to explain the apparent conflict and offer an overall judgement.</p>	40