

Examiners' Report June 2018

GCSE History 1HI0 10

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 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.



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.

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.

June 2018

Publications Code 1HI0_10_1806_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

Introduction

Most candidates seemed well prepared for the range of topics and question styles in this examination.

The Historic Environment seems to have engaged candidates' interest and generally they responded well to the questions but some candidates found it difficult to apply the skills they had learned to these specific sources. In Question 2(a), many candidates were trapped in Level 2 because they focused on the source content, did not include contextual knowledge or offered simplistic comments on the provenance. Many candidates had a checklist of aspects to consider about the provenance but they often did not properly apply these ideas to the individual sources. Question 2(b) seems to have been the question they found most challenging and a number of

candidates did not gain the full four marks because they did not recognise the precise nature of, and the different responses needed for the sub-questions.

The Thematic Study focuses on change and continuity over time and therefore candidates need a good understanding of chronology and a clear understanding of the key themes and the factors involved. Candidates also need a clear understanding of the differences between key themes such as retribution, deterrence, reform and rehabilitation, the nature of crime, punishment and law enforcement.

In question 4, the focus will always be on causation but the question does not require a judgement to be made or for the answer to prioritise or show interaction of factors. Many excellent answers provided a well-argued response but no marks were available to reward this evaluation.

In questions 4, 5 and 6 the stimulus points in the question will often be useful reminders to candidates of the two sides of the issue or the chronological range covered in the question, although they will not necessarily be presented in chronological order. It should also be noted that the stimulus points will usually relate to aspects of content rather than directly indicating a factor that should be included. Candidates do not need to use these stimulus points but there is an expectation that there will be both depth and breadth of knowledge, shown by three discrete aspects of the question being covered, although this does not mean candidates need to identify three different causes or events. It was pleasing to see that candidates had understood this expectation and most answers were clearly structured in paragraphs, making it easy for the examiner to identify the different aspects being covered.

'Breadth' can be shown through coverage of the period. Unless there is a specific date that is significant, the questions are based around the chronological divisions in the specification, so it is acceptable that answers will sometimes focus on a section of the period in the question but there should be sufficient breadth to show knowledge of the wider context. A question on change or whether an event was significant or a turning point, needs the event to be placed in the context of the situation both before and afterwards. 'Depth' of knowledge is shown by the specific details that are included in the answer.

It is important that candidates have a secure sense of chronology and can recognise the periods named in the question – these are usually the terms used in the specification. Terms such as 'during the years', 'since 1900', or 'in the nineteenth century', give a clear timescale for their answer and candidates should note these parameters. If the question asks about the nineteenth century, an answer based on the 1900s is likely to score 0.

In questions 5 and 6 the focus can be on any of the second order concepts: causation, change, continuity, consequence, significance and similarity/difference and these questions also require evaluation and a judgement. Many answers remained at Level 3, despite excellent knowledge, because they missed the focus of the question. In a number of cases, candidates responded to the topic rather than the key idea, for example producing an answer generally on prison reform in question 6 rather than addressing the focus on the significance of Pentonville as a turning point. Candidates who reached Level 4 realised that the topic provides the context but that there is a specific focus on which a judgement should be offered.

Examiners felt that candidates had been particularly well prepared for the extended writing questions. They noted the use of analytical language, for example, 'a major breakthrough', 'this revolutionised law enforcement', 'this prevented progress' and the structure within paragraphs to make a point, provide the evidence, explain how the evidence proves the point and then link it back to the question.

Similarly, it was pleasing to see how many answers were clearly structured to consider both sides of the issue but sometimes other structures may be more appropriate. Although the question asks how far the candidate agrees, the answer should also take account of the second order concept being assessed, for example, structuring the answer to look at different aspects of change and continuity or of significance. Many answers remained at Level 3 because the judgement tended to be simply a summary of the two sides of the issue and the decision that the statement was 'somewhat' true. At Level 4, there should be a sense of evaluation, recognising nuances of partial agreement and showing which evidence carries most weight. Answers should also show what criteria are being applied. For example, a judgement on significance could be based on the number of people affected, the length of time that the effects were felt, the groups affected (the social groups, villages or towns, law enforcement or criminals) or how wide-ranging the secondary effects were. Ideally, this will create a sense of argument running throughout the answer and the more able answers often had plans, showing that the argument was thought through before writing began.

Examiners reported that there were a number of excellent answers, with truly impressive knowledge and thoughtful analysis and evaluation. It was also noticeable that many of the more able answers were relatively concise, demonstrating a very focused approach and clear structure.

If extra paper is taken, candidates should clearly signal that the answer is continued elsewhere – preferably on an additional sheet or the back page of the booklet rather than elsewhere in the paper, since it is difficult to match up asterisks to comments which appear at the end of another question. However, in many cases where additional paper had been taken, the marks had already been attained within the space provided rather than on the extra paper and candidates should be discouraged from assuming that lengthy answers will automatically score highly. Indeed, candidates taking extra paper often ran out of time on the final, high mark question and therefore disadvantaged themselves. There were also some completely blank answers to the final question, suggesting that time management was a problem for some candidates.

Spelling, punctuation and grammar were broadly accurate and many answers used specialist terms with confidence but examiners reported that a poor standard of handwriting made a number of answers difficult to mark and exacerbated the difficulty in understanding a badly-expressed answer.

The SPaGST marks may be affected if there are weaknesses in these areas:

- appropriate use of capital letters. correct use of apostrophes. weak grammar ('would of')
- and casual language, which is not appropriate in an examination.
- paragraphs: not structuring answers in paragraphs not only affects the SPaGST marks but may also make it difficult for the examiner to identify whether three different aspects have been
- covered.

Examiners commented that a number of well-prepared candidates demonstrated excellent knowledge being deployed to support thoughtful analysis and evaluation; such answers were a pleasure to mark. They also noted that candidates seemed very prepared for the 12 and 16 mark questions, with most answers having a clear structure and good use of specialist terms.

Question 1

Candidates need to be clear that the feature identified should be something characteristic of the topic and that having identified a feature, they should add further detail which will explain the feature or provide context. Many candidates easily scored the full four marks in four sentences but others struggled to identify and support two separate features of life in a workhouse or wrote excessive amounts, which was not always fully relevant. Some candidates did not seem to understand that two marks are available for each feature – one for identifying the feature and one for additional information about the identified feature; answers which listed four features or disconnected points of separate information were limited to a maximum of two marks. If the answer consisted of just one sentence it was sometimes hard to distinguish if additional detail had been provided. There were also a number of answers which tried to use the same point as two separate features, for example claiming that workhouses were dirty and unhygienic and then claiming that disease was common as a result of conditions in the workhouse.

It was disappointing to see how many candidates could not provide accurate detail about the workhouses in Whitechapel. This topic is explicitly named in the specification yet large numbers of candidates talked about low wages and dangerous machinery. Some answers also included references to rent, presumably confusing workhouses with lodging houses. Other comments about overcrowding, hygiene and disease, could have been made about any area of Whitechapel and were not a specific feature of life in the workhouse – indeed, cleaning was one of the regular tasks of workhouse inhabitants.

Some candidates tried to use details from Source B to answer this question, not realising that a workshop was not the same as a workhouse. A surprising number of answers were left blank.

When candidates were knowledgeable, they usually explained that families were divided, that uniforms were worn, that tasks included picking oakum or needlework, food was poor quality and that life was intentionally made unpleasant in order to discourage people from seeking refuge in the workhouse. A small number of candidates were very knowledgeable about the casual ward or specific workhouses, mentioning the Whitechapel workhouse and also South Grove.

1 Describe **two** features of life in the Whitechapel workhouses.

Feature 1

One feature is that Whitechapel workhouses enforced hard labour and had very strict rules; they were often seen as a last resort. One example was that, in order to stay ~~at~~ at the workhouses residents had to perform daily tasks such as oakum picking.

Feature 2

Another feature is that the workhouses had very strict rules to prevent crime and disorderly behavior. One of these rules was that families were often split up to prevent communication.



The answer clearly identifies two features of the Whitechapel workhouses: the use of hard labour and the strict rules, including the separation of families.



Try to write two sentences for each feature – identify the feature in one sentence and provide some additional detail in the other.

1 Describe **two** features of life in the Whitechapel workhouses.

Feature 1

One feature of life in the Whitechapel workhouses was that the people with nowhere to go had to work to stay in a room. They would mainly do textile related work and in return they would be given a place to sleep. This reduced the amount of homeless people.

Feature 2

Another feature of life in a Whitechapel workhouse was that it was a very contaminated area. Most people working there would be very poorly. The illnesses would be spread faster because of the crowded rooms they had to share leaving people vulnerable to diseases. (Total for Question 1 = 4 marks)



It is important that the features identified are specific to the workhouse and not simply typical of Whitechapel. Here, the spread of disease is linked to the fact that the workhouse was crowded and many people would be ill so disease would spread quickly.



An answer that continues beyond the lines may be wasting time – often the answer has already scored the full 4 marks and sometimes the extra detail is straying from the question focus.

Question 2 (a)

The evaluation of sources is a key skill in History and most candidates understand that aspects of the provenance can affect the usefulness of the content yet candidates often approach it in a formulaic way, working through a mnemonic involving a checklist of points but offering generic comments, without really applying these ideas to the specific sources. The mark scheme includes three strands within Assessment Objective 3: the usefulness of the source content; the effect of the provenance and the inclusion of relevant contextual knowledge. These strands are presented as a single bullet point, showing that they are inter-related, therefore an approach which covers each element separately, is unlikely to reach high marks.

It is important to note that the question asks about the usefulness of a source for a specific enquiry, in this case, the problems facing immigrants, and therefore any comments about the content of the source must show how the details of the source could be used by the historian in this enquiry. Simple comprehension – it states, it shows – based on the assumption that such information is useful, remains low level. Developed statements about the usefulness of the content can reach Level 2 but answers consisting solely of such comments are unlikely to progress beyond mid-Level 2, irrespective of the length of the answer, because the other strands of the Assessment Objective have not been addressed.

Source A produced a range of interpretations, with some candidates explaining how the illustration of a shelter for Russian Jews showed that immigrants needed support whereas others thought the men in the illustration looked well dressed and well fed.

The content of Source B led to many comments about the poor working and living conditions, the starvation wages and the polluted air and candidates reached Level 2 fairly easily but it was disappointing to see some excellent answers on how this content was useful in an enquiry about the problems facing immigrants, not reaching Level 3.

All the sources in this examination will always be primary sources and the assumption that a source is useful or reliable because it was contemporary, will remain at Level 1. Similarly, comments about a source being biased or exaggerated can only be rewarded when they are supported by specific examples from the source, demonstrating that bias or exaggeration.

The statement that the purpose of a source was to inform is again very generalised; when discussing purpose there needs to be some consideration of the intended audience and effect. Similarly, the assumption that a source is automatically reliable or unreliable because of its nature, does not demonstrate an engagement with the specific sources being assessed. Very few answers made use of the source content to assess reliability or explained why a source's reliability made it more, or less, useful.

It is not necessary to cover every aspect of the provenance (nature, origin and purpose) but it is important to explain how aspects of the provenance affect the usefulness of the source – ways in which they strengthen or limit the usefulness of the source.

Candidates seemed to find it more difficult to use visual sources than written ones, both in terms of how the content could be used by the historian and in terms of assessing how far the provenance affects the value of that source. It was disappointing to see how many candidates dismissed Source A because it was an illustration from a magazine and was therefore exaggerated because it was intended to entertain, or it was unreliable because it was only from one person's perspective. Interestingly, some candidates thought it portrayed such a positive image that it was intended as propaganda to increase immigration, while others thought it was intended to increase anti-Semitism. Frequently there was little discussion of the source content and its usefulness for this enquiry.

The comments on Source B were more thoughtful as candidates usually explained that an inspector would be expected to investigate conditions and make an accurate report. Some candidates dismissed the report as biased because the language used showed the inspector's attitude but more able answers could explain that the strength of his feelings was valuable to the historian since he would have seen other workshops and therefore this was clearly worse than many others.

Many answers were trapped in Level 2 because they did not include contextual knowledge but it should be noted that there are no marks for providing contextual detail without relating it to the usefulness of the source. There were also some answers which offered detailed knowledge about why Russian Jews immigrated, not recognising that the focus of the enquiry in the question was about the problems facing them. Candidates can reasonably be expected to have contextual knowledge about the situation of immigrants in Whitechapel since this is listed in the specification. They should be able use this knowledge to show the significance of the information in a source or to show whether the situation in a source is typical of the wider context and therefore assess the usefulness of the source content. It might also be used in relation to the source's origins, for example to show that the author was in a position to have accurate knowledge, or to discuss circumstances, for example 'the increase in Jewish immigration during the 1880s and the tendency towards segregation' could have been used to explain why Source A shows a refuge specifically for Jewish immigrants or to give examples of Jewish immigrants who set up local businesses then provided support for new immigrants.

The focus should be on assessing what is in the source rather than listing details which are not mentioned. Candidates should recognise that the sources were not produced in order to be used by historians and they cannot cover every detail that might be useful in an investigation. If the answer identifies omissions from the source as limitations on its usefulness, there should be an explanation of why these details could have been expected. Candidates should also recognise that it is not enough to repeat a detail from the source and assert that this can be confirmed from the candidate's own knowledge – some additional detail is needed as a demonstration of that own knowledge.

The statement that Source A only showed us the situation of Jewish immigrants is a low level comment unless it is accompanied by own knowledge to show that other immigrants' experiences were different. This was a shelter for Jewish immigrants and therefore it would not be expected to show the situation of Irish immigrants. Similarly, the comment that Source B only gives us details about one workshop is also low level unless it is accompanied by own knowledge to suggest that most workshops were different.

There were very few answers which covered only one of the sources; these were necessarily limited to low marks since every level of the mark scheme refers to 'sources'. Source B was usually evaluated better than Source A but the majority of marks were in Level 2. Few answers covered all three strands of the mark scheme but those that did, presented them as three separate points. The focus of Level 3 is showing how some aspects of provenance and of contextual knowledge affect the source's usefulness for the stated enquiry. It was interesting to see that practically all the answers which needed extra paper focused on covering the source content in detail and remained in Level 2, while Level 3 answers were often more concise and focused on the issue of how useful the information was in the light of contextual knowledge and aspects of provenance.

The question asks 'how useful' the sources are, so a judgement should be made on the usefulness of the evidence in each source, weighing up its strengths and weaknesses. However, it should be noted that identifying weaknesses is not the same as listing limitations in the content coverage or asserting that a source is limited because it is biased.

Answers reached Level 3 by assessing the usefulness of the content in the light of the provenance and the candidate's own knowledge; the criteria used to make the judgement could be its accuracy (this is not the same as reliability), the relevance of the source, the way it could be used by the historian, how representative the source is etc. An evaluation of a source's utility should be explicit about the criteria being used, for example an answer should be able to explain that while the language may be emotive, the facts included can be supported from the candidate's own knowledge so the source is very useful despite any loaded language. Similarly, the answer might show an awareness of the different uses of a source for this enquiry: a report might be an accurate depiction of one workshop but its factual usefulness may be less than its usefulness in indicating the attitude or priorities of the government.

Although a judgement should be reached on the overall usefulness of each source, there is no requirement to compare the sources or to use them in combination and no marks are available for this. Candidates who treated each source separately were most likely to reach Level 3.

Sensationalised

2 (a) Study Sources A and B in the Sources Booklet.

How useful are Sources A and B for an enquiry into the problems facing immigrants in the Whitechapel area?

Explain your answer, using Sources A and B and your knowledge of the historical context.

(8)

Source A is an illustration published in the English Illustrated Magazine in 1890. It is useful, because it shows us what conditions were like in the Jews Temporary Shelter. It shows Jews sitting at a table and eating soup. This suggests that society welcomed these Jewish immigrants and helped them while they found work. It shows us that many immigrants struggled to find work and pay for their own lodging. However, Source A is limited, because it was published in a magazine, so the relatively good conditions shown may have been due to sensationalisation, as many Jews immigrants at the time were disliked and the public blamed them for the lack of work availability.

Source B is useful. It is a report, from an assistant inspector of factories, which was sent to a ~~government~~ government for an official report. This is useful because it is likely to be honest, due to the

fact that inspectors were employed in order to be honest. Also, it was used in an official report, so is not likely to be exaggerated. It explains the conditions in a workshop, like ~~that~~ ^{those} in which ~~most~~ many ~~immigrants~~ immigrants would have worked. ~~The~~

This is useful, because it shows us the unpleasantness in which they worked and this would have been a key problem faced by ~~immigrants~~ immigrants at the time.

"The workshop is usually found in a basement or attic, hidden from the outside world." "The immigrants are imprisoned day and night... and are paid a starvation wage!" This suggests that many immigrants were starving and had no choice but to work for such a low income. At the time, work was hard to find, so immigrants were forced to take low paid work in harsh conditions, as they had nothing ~~from them~~ when they entered the country. Often, workers exploited this fact and used immigrants for cheap labour. The source is limited, however, because it does not specifically speak about immigrants in Whitechapel.



The answer clearly focuses on the usefulness of the source content for an enquiry about the problems facing immigrants. The effect of contextual knowledge and aspects of provenance and reliability on the accuracy and usefulness of the content are considered.



Make sure you show how your contextual knowledge and aspects of the provenance affect the usefulness of the source.

2 (a) Study Sources A and B in the Sources Booklet.

How useful are Sources A and B for an enquiry into the problems facing immigrants in the Whitechapel area?

Explain your answer, using Sources A and B and your knowledge of the historical context.

(8)

Source A is ^{only slightly} ~~some what~~ useful for an enquiry into the problems facing immigrants as it tells me how Russian Jews had to go to a shelter for somewhere to stay while they looked for work. It is limited, as it is an illustration, ~~a picture~~, so it doesn't show the difficulties of immigrants finding a job, but it does show me how they had to rely on shelters to survive. This illustration may also be biased as the ~~error~~ ^{illustration} only shows stereotypical Jews, the lives of ^{immigrants} ~~Jews~~ ~~and~~ maybe even harder. From my own knowledge, I know that many immigrants were trying to go to America but ended up in England instead, and has to stay in the cheaper parts of London, like Whitechapel.

However, Source B, is also ~~some what~~

useful as it ~~de~~^{des} describes the conditions in which the ~~the~~^{immigrants} worked in. Herbert Evans describes the workhouses in an unpleasant way, for example "the smells are unpleasant" and "they are clothed in rags". ~~from my own~~^{Furthermore} it states that 'a few women are employed'. From my own knowledge, I know that women found getting a job difficult, especially in those times, so many turned to prostitution. However, this source is also limited because it doesn't tell me if all workshops are like this.



This answer does focus on the usefulness of the source content but the comments about provenance and reliability are undeveloped. It says Source A may be biased but does not offer any evidence from the source to support that beyond the comment that it 'only shows stereotypical Jews'. It repeats details from Source B but without showing whether they can be taken at face value or why these details are useful.



Only say a source is biased or exaggerated if you can provide the evidence from the source.

Question 2 (b)

This was an unfamiliar question style and while many candidates gained the full four marks, some candidates found it difficult to present their answers clearly. Unfortunately, some candidates wrote about the wrong source and therefore scored 0.

The whole question should be treated as a package linked to the enquiry that was identified in question 2(a) (the problems facing immigrants) and the aim is for candidates to show that they know how historians work. The first sub-question simply asks them to identify a detail from the source – this is most easily done by quoting a phrase from the source. However, candidates do need to identify a specific detail; generalised comments such as ‘conditions in the workshop’ are not referring to details and are not precise enough to be rewarded. Also, the detail needs to be from the source and not from the provenance.

The next section is linked to this detail – candidates need to state the question they would ask to follow up this detail in relation to the overall enquiry and consequently, the question should be broader than following up one individual’s experiences. The mark scheme states ‘Award 1 mark for selecting a detail that could form the basis of a follow-up enquiry and 1 mark for a question which is linked to it’, so this means that no marks can be given if the candidate’s question is not linked to the detail identified or does not relate to the overall enquiry. A number of candidates did not identify a detail but wrote a question, which they then repeated in the second section.

The most commonly asked questions were about the ‘starvation wages’, the families being imprisoned and living in the same room, and the comment about dangerous fumes in the room. Some questions were unsuitable, for example why the workshop in Source B was a danger to the community – this is not clearly linked to the enquiry focus on the problems facing immigrants and this then made it difficult for marks to be awarded in the next two sub-questions.

The third and fourth sub-questions ask candidates to identify a source where they could find information to answer the question they have just posed. Candidates need to be clear that this must be a specific primary source – history books, the internet, documentaries were all unsuitable answers. Instead, it would be more appropriate if they tried to think about the sources consulted by the writers of history books, internet articles or documentaries.

While it is recognised that candidates cannot have detailed knowledge of all possible sources, the specification states that candidates should be aware of the types of sources available and the nature of the information they contain. Answers such as ‘the National Archives’ or ‘official records’ are too generalised to be rewarded. In some cases, where a generalised source was named in sub-question three, a mark could be awarded because the explanation made it clear what sort of information might be located in those records and how that information would help the historian with the overall enquiry but if the explanation is not clear, then marks cannot be awarded for either of these sub-questions.

If a diary or photograph is suggested as a potential source, it should be as specific as possible, including the possible author (for example a workshop owner), the date and place – for example, the diary of a workshop owner in the East End of London, from 1870-1900 when many immigrants arrived. However, a diary or photograph can only offer a single view and candidates should think carefully about whether that is an appropriate source for their wider enquiry. Some of the suggested sources were unrealistic – immigrants who were treated as prisoners were unlikely to be recorded in a census, Booth’s maps did not record details of ethnicity, and few of the immigrants would be likely to write letters or diary entries providing the details that the candidate sought and it would not be possible to interview an immigrant from that period.

Where possible, credit was given but the explanation was again important – comments such as ‘this would help me to find out what I want to know’ or ‘because this source would be true’ could not be rewarded and sometimes meant the source also could not be rewarded. An explanation of the sort of information that the source might contain and how it would be used to answer the candidate’s question could sometimes be used to validate the suggested source. For example, it would be valid to suggest that employers would have some records showing the number of their workers who lived and worked in the workshop and therefore a statistical analysis could be done to show the frequency of such treatment but the simple statement that employer records would have details of the immigrants and their problems is not precise enough to be rewarded. Some answers suggested Source A or another report as a potential source without being able to clearly explain how that would help to answer their proposed question.

Success in this question depended on the selection of an appropriate question in the first part of the answer, a question which broadened from that detail to the wider enquiry and then a well-explained suggested source. When multiple suggestions had been given to a sub-question, it was often counter-productive. Offering more than one detail or question meant that the follow-up sections were often not clearly linked, while offering multiple sources meant that the explanation in the final section was usually invalid.

In general, the simple approach was the most effective. Questions about starvation wages could be followed up by checking employers’ financial records or the census was suggested as a way of checking where immigrants were living whereas attempts to follow up on the dangerous conditions tended to be too generalised – checking would not really provide the necessary information. It was also important that candidates treated this question as a package and thought about the follow-up question and the source to be consulted before writing the answer to the first sub-question.

(b) **Study Source B.**

How could you follow up Source B to find out more about the problems facing immigrants in the Whitechapel area?

In your answer, you must give the question you would ask and the type of source you could use.

Complete the table below.

(4)

Detail in Source B that I would follow up:

"The ~~the~~ family ^{all} sleep in the same room"

Question I would ask:

Was it really that hard to accomodate the increasing population of immigrants?

What type of source I could use:

census of 1881

How this might help answer my question:

compare the local population with the immigrants ~~and~~ to see if there were more immigrants than locals to accomodate.



The question is clearly prompted by a detail from the source and relates to the wider enquiry in the question. The explanation of the source that could be consulted is clear, showing what information might be found and how that would help to answer the question. Although this level of detail might not be included in the census return, it is a reasonable suggestion, based on knowledge of the nature of sources available from this period.



These sub-questions show that you understand how sources are used in an enquiry.

(b) **Study Source B.**

How could you follow up Source B to find out more about the problems facing immigrants in the Whitechapel area?

In your answer, you must give the question you would ask and the type of source you could use.

Complete the table below.

(4)

Detail in Source B that I would follow up:

What dangers would the community as a whole be in?

Question I would ask:

Why did no one try to prevent this from happening.

What type of source I could use:

Another c1900 ~~or~~ source about workhouses.

How this might help answer my question:

To compare the two sources together.



The answer does not identify a detail from the source and the question asked is not related to the problems the immigrants faced. The suggested source is too vague and the explanation of why it should be consulted does not explain how that source would help to answer the candidate's question.



Try to name a specific type of source and then explain what information you would hope to find and how it would answer your question.

Question 3

Most candidates found this question straightforward. They could identify a difference in the nature of punishment by describing the move from retribution to reform in the purpose of punishment or the change from physical, harsh punishment to punishments such as prison and fines. They could also provide examples from each of the periods to demonstrate that difference.

Some candidates wrote about the use of the death penalty but the abolition of capital punishment is not, in itself, a change in the nature of punishment. Where answers brought in examples from the USA, these details could not be rewarded, since this Thematic Study is about Britain. It should also be noted that trial by ordeal was not a punishment and changes in law enforcement or policing were also not relevant.

In some cases the difference was not clearly identified, with details from the two periods simply being juxtaposed. In other cases, the supporting information was unbalanced, describing the situation in one period and simply stating that it was different in the other period, or the information given was out of period. Some answers offered a range of points about each period but these were not linked and therefore they merely offered information about the two periods rather than identifying a difference. The answer does need to explicitly identify the difference and then offer evidence from both periods to provide support.

While the majority of candidates scored the full four marks, some wrote far too much; there are only two marks available for the supporting detail from each period.

- 3 Explain **one** way in which the nature of punishment during the years c1500–c1700 was different from the nature of punishment in the period c1900–present. ~~substantive~~

One way that the nature of punishment has changed, is that in the period c1900–present, punishment is focused more on reforming. During c1500–c1700 criminals were usually punished by a number of methods such as execution, mutilation or fines (for petty crimes). However the change to reformation is shown through the abolition of the death penalty in 1999 and use of alternative methods to ^{prison} punishment such as community service which aims to reform people and letting them reflect on their actions rather than a harsh punishment which people thought weren't effective in ~~detering~~ ^{detering} others.



This answer starts with detail from one period, then explains how this is different from the earlier period and provides detail from that time. Overall, it identifies a difference in the purpose and the nature of punishment during the two periods.



It is a good idea to state the difference at the start of the answer and then provide the supporting detail from each period.

3 Explain **one** way in which the nature of punishment during the years c1500–c1700 was different from the nature of punishment in the period c1900–present.

In the medieval times they had tithings, wergild and hue and cry and the punishments were getting harsher as time went by and killing as punishment was called capital punishment. This is different from c1900–present because punishment became more lenient and they now have a policing system whereas before they did not. Also before the 2000s capital punishment was abolished due to controversial cases.



This answer is confused: tithings and hue and cry were not forms of punishment and the reference to policing c1900–present is also irrelevant. Wergild was a punishment but not relevant for the period in the question. The comment that punishments were getting harsher is not a valid difference between the two periods but possibly refers to change during the years c1500–c1700. Similarly, the comment that punishments were getting more lenient may refer to changes during the years c1900–present. The difference has not been clearly identified and most of the detail is irrelevant; the only point that can be rewarded is that capital punishment was abolished in the later period.



Remember to provide supporting detail from each period.

Question 4

Most candidates could write confidently about crimes against authority and many could explain why the definition of such crimes changed during this period and new definitions were introduced. The stimulus point 'poaching' usually led into an explanation of William I's introduction of Forest Laws, with a number of answers explaining the Norman desire to assert authority over the conquered land. Poaching was also explained as a more general crime against authority in terms of trespass but references to the Black Acts in 1723 were out of period.

There were a number of answers which made good use of contextual knowledge, for example in linking the context of the Norman Conquest and fear of rebellion to the idea of murdrum. Henry VIII's assumption of religious supremacy and the frequent changes of religion were also well used to explain the new definition of heresy as a crime. However, in some cases the focus on causation was missed and instead of an explanation of why certain actions were redefined as a crime against authority, the answer became a description of crimes against authority, for example a description of the Gunpowder Plot or changed attitudes towards witchcraft. A number of candidates seemed to be confused about heresy and treason, defining heresy as rebelling against the king. Answers about vagabonds were less common but they were usually well done. Smuggling was a valid example but the answer needed to be read carefully to ensure it was within the period in the question – comments about the Hawkhurst gang were not valid.

Examiners commented how pleasant it was to be able to award full marks to a number of answers. These answers tended to focus on the changes in circumstances as a reason why crimes against authority were redefined and then provide supporting examples. Some answers included knowledgeable explanations of the authority of the monarch, Church and landowners and examiners commented on impressive knowledge of the extent of William I's forests, the terms of his Forest Laws, the religious changes in the Tudor period and the numbers of executions for heresy. Some candidates tried to structure their answer around various factors such as the role of individuals, or technology but these were less successful. Examiners also noted that some Level 3 answers contained more detailed information than many Level 4 answers but they stayed at Level 3 because the analysis was not developed.

Less able answers used examples that were outside the timeframe of the question or simply wrote about changing definitions of crime rather than crimes against authority. Some candidates treated the stimulus material as key points in the answer, trying to explain that poaching was a reason why there were changes in the definition of crimes against authority rather than using poaching as an example showing how legal changes were made to protect the rights of the elite. Other answers drifted away from the focus of the question and discussed poaching and smuggling as social crimes.

4 Explain why there were new definitions of crimes against authority in the years c1000-c1700.

You may use the following in your answer:

- poaching
- heresy

You **must** also use information of your own.

Bloody code, poaching death
rich protecting interests
Reformation heresy = treason
maintain control
William I

After the Norman conquest in 1066, when Duke William of Normandy invaded England and declared himself king there was much opposition to his new rule. In order to show his authority William introduced new laws which aimed to protect Normans, increase the treasury and oppress the Anglo-Saxons, all of which aimed to increase his control over the country. The Forest laws were created to prevent Anglo-Saxon spilling hunting ground by collecting wood or hunting for food themselves, both of which became crimes against authority. Also, the wergild was changed to the king's peace, compensation for murder or injury was paid directly to the king, as assault was changed from a crime against the person to a crime against the king. All of this was done to increase William's control over the country.

After the reformation, when Henry VIII changed the English faith from Roman Catholicism to English protestantism, there was much opposition to the changes. As Henry was the supreme head of the church of England any opposition to protestantism was opposition to him, and could become rebellion. Therefore, to protect his power, Henry made Heresy^{heresy}, opposition to official faith of ^{the} country, a capital crime. Heresy was also considered to be a crime against the king or par with treason. This meant that all Catholics who openly opposed protestantism were executed, usually by burning. In this way Henry VIII secured his power as the king of England, and head of the church of England.

In the late 1600s, ~~early~~ the rich landowners sought to protect their wealth from the poor. This was because of several factors. Due to an increased population and poor harvests there was an increase in crime, and the rich landowners stood to lose the most from crime. Also, because of increased political power the rich landowners were able

to change the law to protect their own interests. This desire to protect their wealth led to ~~the~~ the creation of the 'Bloody code,' which made over one hundred crimes capital offences. Such crimes ~~were~~ ^{included} poaching, theft of over a certain amount and many others relating to stealing. The crimes were no longer considered petty, but crimes against authority, which warranted death. They were deemed to be so in order to protect the wealthy from the poor.



This answer covers three aspects of new definitions of crimes against authority. In each case it identifies what changed and gives a reason why that change happened. It scored full marks.



Make sure you focus on the specific question – this is asking why change happened so focus on the reasons for change, don't just describe the change.

4 Explain why there were new definitions of crimes against authority in the years c1000–c1700.

(12)

You may use the following in your answer:

- poaching
- heresy

You **must** also use information of your own.

~~was~~ firstly, When William I ~~the~~ ~~is~~ came into power he needed to introduce new laws or slightly change old laws to establish his control and authority over his new kingdom. One way in which he did this was by introducing the forest Laws which made poaching a capital punishment although it was still widely seen as acceptable by the working class as it was done to catch food and help people survive. Williams forest Laws stated that in the ^{Royal} forest no ~~the~~ animals could be harmed or killed and wood could not be collected unless they had a licence. ~~The~~ The Royal forest was mainly used by the King and the Normans.

Secondly, William I also ~~introduced~~ changed the crime of rebellion. He still treated the rebel with capital punishment as the Anglo-Saxons did. However, he also punished people associated with the rebel / rebellion. This was to ~~impo~~ show his authority.

~~Heresy~~ Thirdly, Heresy changed as it became ~~interlinked~~ interlinked with treason. This was during the time of the Tudors ~~when~~ and Stuarts when religion kept changing between Catholic and Protestant when the monarch (except from Mary I) was the head of the church so going against religion was going against the monarch.



This answer does identify three aspects of new definitions of crimes against authority but it does not offer much supporting detail.



You need to include specific detail to support the points that you are making.

Question 5

This was the less popular choice and that perhaps reflected the fact that candidates seemed insecure in certain aspects of knowledge.

The work of the Fielding brothers in developing the Bow Street Runners was usually fairly well known and many answers identified the significance of this work as the first attempt to set up a professional force. Few answers went beyond the Bow Street Runners, to discuss the importance of their work in keeping records, the publication of *The Public Hue and Cry* or the work of the Horse Patrol or identified any problems with the Bow Street Runners, for example, the limited geographical coverage.

Examiners commented that confused knowledge of chronology limited many answers. Most candidates could link the Bow Street Runners to the establishment of the Metropolitan Police and use this to evaluate importance of the work of the Fielding's but a surprising number found it difficult to make use of the 'town watchmen' stimulus point and many confused them with early constables. Candidates do not need to use the stimulus points and for some, it would have been better to ignore this one. It could have been used to discuss the weaknesses in law enforcement before the Fielding's and how ineffective the system was in the context of industrial towns but many candidates appeared to think the Fielding's introduced watchmen. Additional points could

have been a discussion of thief-takers or the expansion of the Metropolitan Police to a national body.

The focus of this question was change and continuity – whether the Fieldings' work led to improvement, and this meant that a chronological approach was often the most successful. A number of more able answers identified the Fieldings' work as a turning point, moving away from community based law enforcement and towards an organised, professional police force.

However, many candidates approached this question as if it asked 'what was the greatest improvement in law enforcement'. It was possible to see the relevance of a discussion of Peel's creation of a police force in showing that the Fieldings' work was not a major improvement but in many cases the judgement offered in the conclusion made it clear that the answer was not evaluating the work of the Fieldings. Where the answer discussed the use of transportation or prison reform, the relevance to the question was less clear.

Most answers offered a conclusion but it was often simply a restatement of what had already been said. However, it was pleasing to see answers at Level 4, with a sense of an argument and evaluation developing consistently throughout the answer and then in the conclusion, explicit criteria being applied to explain the final judgement.

Before the Fielding Brothers did their work then in 1748 the law enforcement capability of the country was scarce. In most recent times before, the most advanced forms of law enforcers were town constables and watchmen. And though the town constables were about regularly with a watch of sorts both then and night watchmen relied on volunteers from the communities, there was no proper way to monitor their effectiveness. That is why people like thief takers and other sorts of vigilantes began to appear. To get a job done that these positions, while not ineffective, couldn't achieve by themselves. This is why policing reform was so badly needed to get an efficient force out there cleaning up the streets.

This is where the Fielding Brothers appear as Henry Fielding creates a small group of paid volunteers to investigate more and more crimes happening. Then with his brother, formalising it with a base of operations on Bow Street. The Runners became a government paid position to patrol the streets of London. There were around 20 constables per district and in 10 years time they were a respected (and feared by the common criminals) presence on the street it would give the people a sense of protection and safety when they were around and common thieves and thugs would run from their presence nearby. This made the idea of public policing popular at least. And while progress may have been slow it definitely made an impact in the society.

This is where we get to Robert Peel's reformation of crimes punishment and law enforcement. In his time in office as home secretary he formed the official Metropolitan Police. With this new system. The ideas of the ~~Fieldings~~ Fieldings with the original ideas of public cooperation from the constables and watchmen Peel managed to change the world of how law enforcement was performed and organised. Like with the Fieldings, progress was sluggish across the country, but soon it became a national state of enforcement. It would base itself on all the principles that had been built up over the last 800 years of crime and punishment. Now it was national

This makes it clear to me that undoubtedly the Fielding Brothers and their groundbreaking creation of the Bow Street Runners had a tremendous effect on modern law enforcement. It might even go as far as to say that Peel effectively rebranded it and made it country wide. Something the Fieldings could never quite achieve. If not for them it would've taken people like Peel much longer to formalize and governmentize the system of law enforcement to the scale it is today



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This was a well-structured answer, placing the work of the Fielding brothers securely in context and showing how the Bow Street Runners were an improvement on the system of town watchmen and laid the foundations for the development of the police force. There was a good range of specific detail included and the line of argument builds to a consistent judgement.



Have a clear line of argument running all the way through your answer – make sure it is consistent.

The statement is correct, ~~because~~ ~~of~~ This is because the Fielding brothers set up the Bow Street runners in the mid 1700s, who charged a fee in exchange for catching criminals and gathering evidence. ~~the~~ Eventually, they were employed by the government as, effectively, the first police officers.

Town watchmen were introduced to patrol an area for crime and effectively deter people ~~from~~ from crime as they knew a watchman would be nearby, so they shouldn't commit crime. This was implemented by the government as a measure to stop crime without disturbing peace.

Eventually, Robert Peel started the Metropolitan police. This 'police force' was funded by the government (eventually) and so that they were taken more seriously as law enforcers. They were given uniforms different to the army to show that they were non-violent and were around to help, not hurt. This force was obviously partly inspired by the work of the Fielding brothers because they were funded to be taken seriously and were basically an upgrade to the Bow Street runners.

To conclude, the improvement of law enforcement is definitely based on the work of the Fielding brothers. They were the first to be government funded, the forerunners of detective work (by gathering evidence) and inspired Robert Peel to start the Metropolitan police. This all shows aspects of future enforcement techniques, reinforcing the Fielding Brothers influence on law enforcement.



There are some good points in the conclusion to this answer but much of the detail is presented as description. There is relatively little about the work of the Fielding brothers and it is confused about town watchmen.



Do not try to use a stimulus point if you don't know anything about it; think of an alternative point from your own knowledge.

Question 6

Pentonville prison is named as a case study in the specification and generally candidates could describe the intention of reform, the use of the separate system and its consequences for the mental health of the prisoners. Examiners commented on the impressive detail included in some answers, included statistics on mental health issues. However, a surprising number of answers became confused about the term 'separate system' and explained it in terms of the reforms of Howard, where genders and classes of criminals were separated. Similarly, open prisons were assumed to be prisons before the reforms of Howard and Fry, where debtors and those awaiting trial mingled in large cells. Candidates do not need to use the stimulus points and for some, it would have been better to ignore this one.

The idea of a turning point is explicitly stated in the specification but many answers did not address it. Answers needed a secure sense of chronology to place Pentonville in context; unfortunately, a large number of answers remained at Level 3 even though they contained an excellent section on Pentonville because they were unable to place this in the context of prisons before and afterwards. In some cases, candidates thought Howard and Fry suggested reforms after Pentonville. Most answers remained rooted in the 19th century and did not go beyond it.

Some candidates treated this as if the question asked 'what was the biggest turning point in the use of prisons'. It was possible to consider alternative aspects of the use of prisons, for example the reforms of Howard and Fry, or the development of borstals or open prisons and show how they provided foundations for the approach used in Pentonville or moved away from it, but answers which focused on alternative developments in the use of prisons or alternative punishments such as transportation, missed the focus in the question on the significance of Pentonville.

Where answers were based on a secure sense of chronology, there were a number of thoughtful criteria being used. Many suggested that Pentonville was not significant because the shift to reform had already been initiated by Howard and Fry, whereas others suggested it was not significant because the separate system was abandoned, shown by the use of open prisons in the twentieth century. Others said that Pentonville was a significant staging point in a programme of reform, that it was significant because so many other prisons were built using it as a model, or that it was significant because it showed the government's commitment to prison reform.

Most answers offered a conclusion but it was often simply a restatement of what had already been said. However, it was pleasing to see answers at Level 4, with a sense of an argument and evaluation developing consistently throughout the answer and then in the conclusion, explicit criteria being applied to explain the final judgement.

I mostly agree that the establishment of Pentonville prison was a turning point in the use of prisons from 1700 - present for several reasons. For example, it contrasted the previous system of Bridewells with its harsh but clean conditions and developed the Separate System that was used for many years. However, Robert Peel made changes to prisons beforehand that could be seen as more influential and modern prisons have abandoned the Separate System to focus on rehabilitation perhaps indicating it was not a turning point.

The primary reason I mostly agree is how Pentonville contrasted previous prisons with its methods of punishment and imprisonment. It was the first prison to utilize the Separate System where prisoners were kept alone for 23 hours a day and forced to work in silence and alone. This contrasted old Bridewells where

people of all ages were put together inside a prison and mixed with no further attempts at punishment. In addition, the prison cells, a standard 4 x 2m size, contrasted the old system as well which would have put many prisoners in one room in horrible squalid conditions where disease could spread and only if you could pay could you get your own cell. This made prisons more equal again showing Pentonville as a turning point in modern prisons. Overall, the primary reason I agree is that Pentonville heavily juxtaposed old prisons creating a new and distinctive style that would be used for many years showing it strongly as a turning point.

The secondary reason I agree is how the advent of the prison in 1842 led to developments in punishment that were used in that prison in 1865. In 1865 the system of hard labour, hard fare, hard board was introduced to prisons including Pentonville after experience from the 20 years of opening showing again

how Pentonville was a turning point as it led to these changes that would be used for many years. The new System replaced the hammocks prisoners had, with hard wooden boards, forced them to do hard manual labour, and gave them a basic and poor diet in order to exact retribution for their crimes. This System was used in prisons up until 1902 when hard labour was ended. Showing how Pentonville was a turning point in prisons as it led to these long lasting changes. In this is the secondary reason I agree although it heavily shows Pentonville as a turning point* it does not do so as massively as the stark contrast between old prisons and the newer style introduced in Pentonville.

* due to how it led to long lasting influential changes,

However, Pentonville can be viewed as merely a result of reforms imposed in 1823 by Robert Peel with influence from Elizabeth Fry. This shows how perhaps it is not a turning point and the real turning point happened beforehand. The Gaols Act in 1823

Introduced wages to Gaolers and removed release fees aiming to improve conditions in prisons. These changes were present in Pentonville along with other changes Robert Peel made such as female warders for female prisoners possibly indicating that it was the 1823 Gaol Act and Robert Peel's actions that were the true turning point in prisons. In addition, the majority of these changes are present today while the separate system was abolished in 1922 and open prisons, reflecting the philosophy of the separate system, were established in 1933 to aid rehabilitation. Overall, these long lasting changes could indicate Robert Peel's actions as the true turning point in modern prisons and Pentonville a temporary byproduct as his changes are still present today.

In Summary I mostly agree with the statement as to how it was the first prison to contrast the horrific system of old and how it led to important and widespread change in 1865 and while it may not be entirely present today I believe it was heavily influential in

prisons even if not all aspects are around today due to how large and significant the changes it brought were.

TOTAL FOR SECTION B = 36 MARKS

TOTAL FOR PAPER = 52 MARKS



There is a good focus on the significance of Pentonville prison, placing it securely in context in order to show its impact and to offer a judgement about whether it was a turning point in the use of prisons.



The fact that the question asks for a judgement on whether Pentonville was a turning point is a signpost, telling you to examine the situation before and after its establishment in order to make your judgement.

The use of prisons ~~in the 18th century~~ before the 1700s was considered to be a place for petty criminals which contained very poor conditions. However due to the establishment of the separate system ^{at} Pentonville prison and the Reformers in the 18th and 19th century contributed greatly to the ^{change in} purpose of prisons.

The separate system at Pentonville prison ~~was~~ was the first prison opened aiming to use prisons as a form of punishment. The idea behind it was that ~~prisoners~~ criminals could pay back society through hard labour, hard fare and hard board. Inmates ~~were allowed~~ stayed in their cell 23 hours a day which was considered as a way to reflect without being able to keep in contact with any other prisoner. Reflection - self-reflection was also allowed when they were let out 1 hour a day in order to go to the chapel. These solitary conditions ~~were considered to be~~ often resulted in prisoners developing mental illnesses. The prison contained the most up to date technology which ~~stressed~~ stressed the importance for the use of prisons to punish. Therefore the use of the separate system at Pentonville prison contributed greatly to the change in the use of prisons 1700 - present.

Another contributing factor to the change in the purpose of prisons was due to the reformer Elizabeth Fry. She first visited Newgate prison in 1813 where she was appalled by ^{the} conditions and the

fact that women, children and serious criminals were all confined in one space. She decided that she would teach sewing and allow self-reflection by tea reading passages from the Bible.

By 1817, she campaigned for improved conditions and ensured that female warders took care of female prisoners. Through Fry's reforms, she identified the need of a prison system that allowed prisoners to reform, rather than just punish, therefore this contributed highly to the idea of the prison system.

~~The~~ The emphasis on reformation rather than punishment was highlighted by Robert Peel, who sympathised with Elizabeth Fry and campaigned for a more unified prison system.

~~the~~ In the 1823 Gaols Act, he ~~established~~ the idea that Gaolers should be paid and the fact that female warders should be taken care of by female prisoners was emphasised. Robert Peel's reforms in the 1820s ~~included~~ consisted of reflection through ~~regular~~ regular visits from chaplains, which he considered to have a better chance of reform ~~rather~~ compared to the separate system at Pentonville Prison. His reforms had a huge effect on how the prison system works today.

In conclusion, the Pentonville prison and reforms of Elizabeth Fry had a large effect on the ~~the~~ nature of prisons. However, ~~Robert~~ Robert Peel's reforms had the largest influence on the prison system today as he considered the human rights of prisoners ~~and~~ and what would be the most successful way for them to reform.



This answer has excellent detail about Pentonville prison and also a good range of detail on the reforms of Howard, Fry and Peel. However, the conclusion suggests a focus on evaluating the importance of various reformers rather than whether Pentonville was a turning point.



For a 'turning point' question, a chronological structure can help to make your argument clearer.

Paper Summary

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

- They need a secure understanding of the chronological periods and terms used in the specification as well as the term 'century'.
-
- They need to understand the themes within the specification.
To reach the highest level they need to focus on the specific question being asked and deploy precise detail.
- It is not necessary to use the stimulus points in the question and candidates should not attempt to do so if they do not recognise them; however, candidates should aim to cover three separate aspects of the question.
- While there is good knowledge of some topics, candidates cannot rely on knowing just a few key topics and hoping to use that information in whatever question is asked.

Grade Boundaries

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

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

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