



# Examiners' Report

## Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2022

Pearson Edexcel GCE  
In History (9HI0/1D)

Paper 1: Breadth study with interpretations  
1D: Britain, c1785-c1870: democracy,  
protest and reform

## **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](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).

## **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)

Summer 2022

Publications Code 9HI0\_1D\_2206\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

Question 1 asked candidates to consider whether trade unionism changed significantly in the years 1834–70.

This question was accessible for the vast majority of candidates. They were largely able to have three reference points along the way - collapse of the GNCTU, formation of the ASE and the formation of the TUC. Thus they were able to comment on factors such as the skilled/unskilled divide, organisation and finance, strike militancy, government attitudes and legislation. The majority of candidates were able to deal with the second order concept of change and continuity.

Successful candidates were able to combine detailed knowledge about how trade unionism changed with a decent attempt to deal with continuity. At the top end candidates showed understanding of how important trade unionism was for working class people who were unable to vote and were persecuted by the law if they attempted to organise. The best answers understood that trade unions were bolstered by the increasing economic strength of Britain in the world, and that the importance of skilled labour meant that governments needed to recognise the rights of trade unions.

Less successful candidates tended to portray the NMUs as completely different to the unions they grew out of, and were less able to offer material on continuity. There was often a description of features of trade unions and an assertion of the extent of change. At the bottom end there was often the assertion that trade union militants were violent at the beginning of the period but less so at the end.

Question 2 asked candidates to consider whether efforts to achieve parliamentary reform in the years 1852–67 were very different from efforts to achieve parliamentary reform in the years 1820–32.

Question 2 was the less popular option in Section A, and although the question was accessible, it did pose a few difficulties. The main problem candidates had with the question was what to do about the intervening years, and a reluctance to do as the question asked and compare two distinct periods. The second order concept of similarity and difference was generally the focus of candidates' responses and did not noticeably add to its difficulty.

Successful candidates were able to offer detail on both the time periods and were able to offer a comparative analysis. Good knowledge of Liberal and Tory developments within parliament in the later period was offered as a key difference to the earlier period. Candidates also cited the mobilisations of working and middle class campaigns as being relevant. At the top end the contribution of the Chartists was noted rather than dwelt on, and it was used to point to the different political climate in the later period, e.g. the short comings of the 1832 act. Although, having said this, level 5 was also accessed without any reference to the Chartists as per the question's instructions.

By contrast at the bottom end there was little on offer about the period 1820-31, and the decisive year of 1832 was often described in broad terms. Candidates that were only able to access levels 2 tended to describe the Luddites, Captain Swing and Peterloo, and then assert that this led to reform in 1832. The Chartists were often described at length and solid similarities and differences between the two periods were generally missing beyond general descriptions.

Question 3 asked candidates to consider whether squalid living conditions were the main consequence of the growth of industrial towns in the years 1785–1848.

This was a popular and accessible question. Most candidates were able to address the negative consequences of the growth of industrial towns as per back-to-back housing, sanitation, disease and squalor. Thereafter candidates tended to struggle a bit with the selection of other outcomes of the growth of industrial towns and how to compare them with the stated factor.

Successful candidates offered material included in the indicative content of the mark scheme, such as the growth of transport links, banking and infrastructure. The best answers pointed to how, by the end of the period, town planning and government intervention was developing a changing urban scene. As ever, the criteria by which a consequence can be judged proved a decisive factor in accessing level 4 and above.

A mid-range of candidates read the question as being about the consequences of industrialisation generally. These candidates often looked at working conditions in mine and mill, and the inclusion of child and female workers. These answers, when linked to the stated factor, still provided an analytical response, but it tripped up candidates drawn into stating all they knew about industrialisation.

At the bottom end candidates tended to turn the question into one about causation and often offered some vivid descriptions of industrial towns with weak links to the question.

Question 4 asked candidates to consider whether changing attitudes to the poor shaped by the middle classes in the years 1834–70.

This question was both popular and accessible, and candidates were well prepared. It worked well apart from a lack of certainty at the bottom as to who the middle class were. The majority of candidates were able to offer material on writers like Dickens, Smiles, and Mayhew as well as various philanthropists. These candidates could include the workhouse scandals and relate all the above to the workings of the PLAA. The criteria candidates chose to reach a judgement often included evaluation of the impact of literature and media on an increasingly literate population, as well as protests that mobilised workers in the north during the Chartist years.

At the top end there were some excellent answers that went beyond the mark scheme. For example, candidates who argued that the middle class, whose interests lay in reducing the cost of subsidising the poor, were the architects of the PLAA, and were not the friends of the poor that the question implied. On the whole there was excellent knowledge on display, and a grasp of the importance of the issue to social historians. At this level the extent to which attitudes changed was considered.

At the bottom end there was often a lot of description of the actions of McDougal and his wife at Andover, and this was often the centre piece of the answer about why attitudes changed. Less able candidates were able to access the question and there were only a few level 1 responses.

Question 5 asked candidates to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider whether the slave revolt in Haiti was a crucial factor in the abolition of the slave trade.

Section C worked well, and performed to expectations. The extracts offered clear contrasts and were easily identified as rival interpretations. Extract 1 carried sufficient evidence and argument for candidates to write about the actual revolt in Haiti, and extract 2's advocacy for the

importance of humanitarian campaigning challenged extract 1 on the issues of economic reasons for abolition as well as slave revolts.

Most candidates were able to offer own knowledge on slave revolts and the Williams' thesis to develop an analytical answer, and at the top end there was some very real commitment to the controversy over all. This historical debate seems to invite strongly argued views and centres must take a lot of credit for the preparation of their candidates. A minority of candidates showed a good understanding of the significance of the loss of Britain's American colonies and the way this altered Britain's imperial preferences away from the Caribbean and towards India.

Less successful candidates tended to paraphrase the extracts and offer tentative bits of own knowledge that the extracts missed. There was still a small minority of candidates who judged the extracts on their provenance and the information they failed to include.

Nevertheless, most candidates handled question 5 well.