

OCR – AS GCE
British History
Enquiries
1815–1945
F963: Option B

The Condition of England
1815–53

SOURCES
ACCOMPANYING
EXEMPLAR
QUESTION 1

SOURCE A

An extract from an official report that shows the rules that workhouse inmates were expected to abide by.

Any pauper who shall neglect to observe the following regulations shall be considered disorderly

- **Make any noise when silence is ordered to be kept**
- **Use obscene language**
- **Refuse to work**
- **Play cards or other games of chance.**

It shall be lawful for the master of the workhouse to punish any disorderly pauper by substituting, during a time not greater than forty eight hours, for his or her dinner, a meal consisting of 8 ounces of bread, or one pound of cooked potatoes, and withholding all butter, cheese, tea, sugar or broth.

Seventh Annual Report, Poor Law Commission, 1836

SOURCE B

An extract from the autobiography of John Castle, a silk weaver from Essex, who was forced to enter a workhouse in 1837.

We were ordered to strip and put on the regimentals (uniform) of the workhouse, which were composed of a pair of thick leather breaches, leather coat, low shoes, ribbed stockings, and a heavy cap with peak. We were then ordered to go to work, cutting into ribbons very greasy, old carpets. We then carded (combed) the ribbons and others used the pieces to make fillings for bed mattresses. When work was done we had a large room with a good fire where 30 or 40 of us sat round talking about days gone by or singing. After remaining at the workhouse 14 days, orders came that I was to be moved on to Buckinghamshire.

John Castle, Experiences in the Workhouse, 1837

SOURCE C

A socialist commentator and friend of Karl Marx describes conditions in workhouses in the 1840s.

In the workhouse at Greenwich, in the summer of 1843, a boy five years old was punished by being shut in a dead room (mortuary), where he had to sleep upon the lids of the coffins. In the workhouse at Herne, the same punishment was inflicted upon a little girl for wetting the bed at night. In the workhouse at Bacton, in Suffolk, in

January 1844, an investigation revealed the fact that a feeble-minded woman was employed as nurse and took care of the patients accordingly; while sufferers, who were often restless at night, or tried to get up, were tied fast with cords passed over the covering and under the bedstead to save the nurse the trouble of getting up at night.

F. Engels, The Condition of the Working Classes, 1844

SOURCE D

Part of the evidence resulting from an official investigation of the Andover Workhouse, 1846.

Evidence of Charles Lewis, labourer

Q (Investigator) What work was you employed in when you were in the workhouse?

A (Lewis) I was employed breaking bones

Q How did you break them?

A We had a large bar to break them with

Q During the time you were so employed did you ever see any men eat anything from those bones?

A I have seen them eat marrow out of the bones

Q Have you often seen them eat marrow?

A I have

Q Did they state why they did it?

A I believe they were hungry

Q Did you see any of the men gnaw meat from the bones?

A Yes

Q Did they use to steal the bones and hide them away?

A Yes

Q Was that a regular thing?

A Yes, while I was there

*Report from the Select Committee on the Andover Union,
1846*

SOURCE E

A modern historian summarises his views on the purpose of workhouses under the New Poor Law.

The workhouse system inflicted a form of psychological as opposed to physical cruelty. Silent mealtimes, monotonous work and the absence of even the smallest of extra comforts were all matters of deliberate policy, not accident. The petty rules, strict discipline and prison-like uniforms all combined to deny the identity and dignity of the pauper and take away his or her individuality. Moreover, in the interests of deterrence the commissioners were thus responsible for creating a climate of fear, which pervaded working class life for over a century.

P. Murray, Poverty and Welfare, 1999

OCR – AS GCE
British History
Enquiries
1815–1945
F963: Option B

**The Condition of England,
1815–53**

QUESTION (a)

Examiner's Specific Advice

This answer specifically requires a direct and linked comparison of the two sources set out in the question. Similarities and differences need to be drawn out to achieve a top level answer. Sources will have been chosen to enable a good contrast to be made. The comparison should demonstrate evaluation of such matters as authorship, date, usefulness and reliability. However, whilst these points provide a 'toolkit', students should not use them just as a checklist to run through without careful thought. Introductions and attributions of the sources should be used to develop an effective answer.

[Click Here For Sources Relating to this Question](#)

Exemplar Question

1 (a) Study Sources A and D.
Compare these Sources as evidence for the treatment of paupers in workhouses under the New Poor Law.
[30 marks]

[Click Here for a Chronology Relating to this Topic](#)

Examiner's Exemplar Plan and Answer 1

Plan

- Short introduction
- Analysis of Source A
- Analysis of Source D
- General conclusions

Both sources provide evidence about the harsh treatment of paupers in the new workhouses that parish unions were expected to set up under the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 (1).

Source A describes what would happen if a workhouse inmate was disorderly or misbehaved him- or herself. If paupers disobeyed regulations they were given quite severe punishments. This is what was expected according to the principle of less eligibility, which was put forward as part of the New Poor Law (2). The information comes from a government report and, although it is reliable because it is official, it might not be a true account of what happened in all workhouses (3).

Source D is also about how paupers were treated in workhouses, but the focus is on one particular institution, the notorious Andover Workhouse. It shows how paupers were so hungry that they sucked marrow and gnawed meat from old animal bones that they were meant to be crushing, so that they could be used as fertiliser. The source is also official, in that it comes from evidence supplied to a government Select Committee. However, it should be treated carefully, as the questioner asked many leading questions (4).

Overall, both sources say that paupers were treated badly in the new workhouses but the information provided is not totally reliable even though it is official (5).

Examiner's Assessment

AO1a – Level II (5 marks): historical terms are used accurately. The response is clearly presented and well organised.

AO1b – Level III (5 marks): some internal analyses, combined with discussion of key concepts. Rather uneven coverage of similarities and differences.

AO2a – Level IV (8 marks): a comparison is attempted, but the response is mostly sequential. There is some comment about provenance, but it needs further development.

Total mark of 18 (Grade C).

(1) A focused start, but a bit too brief.

(2) Shows quite good knowledge here of a key aspect of the New Poor Law.

(3) A reasonable attempt to evaluate the usefulness and reliability of the source, with reference to provenance, but quite basic.

(4) Indication here that the sources have not been linked and have been dealt with sequentially. Again, shows decent knowledge about the background to the source and picks up on the issue of leading questions; comments need developing.

(5) Sensible conclusion but, like the introduction, is quite thin.

Examiner's Exemplar Plan and Answer 2

Plan

- Introduction
- Linked comparison to show similarities
- Linked comparison to show differences
- Conclusion

Sources A and D are similar insofar as they suggest that paupers in workhouses under the New Poor Law were treated harshly. In particular, both make reference to how the provision of food could be used as a way of controlling the behaviour of inmates. However, they are also different in that A is an official view on the nature of punishments that should have been issued if rules were broken, whereas D is an investigation into how Poor Law Guardians had apparently abused their power to implement rules (1).

After the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act was passed, the Central Board issued guidelines about how the principle of less eligibility was to be implemented. It was suggested that new workhouses should be built and run under a very strict regime that would deter the able bodied unemployed from asking for relief (2). Source A suggests that rules and regulations in the new workhouses would be very strict. If broken, paupers were to be punished by having their food allowances reduced. To some extent this is supported by Source D as the inmates of Andover were clearly subject to a regime that treated them harshly by providing them with restricted amounts of food. They were so hungry that they were reduced to sucking marrow and eating scraps of meat from old animal bones that they were meant to be crushing, so that they could be used for fertiliser. The general emphasis in both sources on harsh treatment is not surprising, as official documentation from the time, whether in the form of a report or investigation, would reflect the implementation of less eligibility (3).

However, the sources differ significantly in that A suggests how paupers should have been treated if they had broken the rules of a workhouse, and proved to be disorderly. D, on the other hand, implies that the administrators had gone overboard in their treatment of inmates, and that this was inhumane. This difference is mainly due to A being an official report, that was attempting to lay down a blueprint for how rules and regulations were to be established, whereas D is part of an investigation that had been set up to establish whether claims about the terrible treatment of paupers at Andover were justified (4).

Some caution needs to be taken when using these sources. Source A is very much the official view of how paupers should have been treated. In reality some workhouse Beadles were more lenient, but in others, such as at Andover, they were obviously more brutal. Source D is an investigation into a workhouse that was probably an

(1) A very impressive start that clearly sets out key similarities and differences between the sources.

(2) A good amount of contextual information is utilised here, which creates a solid lead in to a comparison of the two sources.

(3) A cogent, well structured analysis of similarities between the two sources.

(4) Maybe this section is a little bit too brief but the key difference is well spotted and linked to comment about provenance.

(5) Some very valid observations

Access to History – Online OCR British History Enquiries – The Condition of England 1815–53 – Standard AS Question

exception. It was one of the worst, if not the worst, case of inhumane treatment of paupers that was discovered. Also, as with many social investigations at the time, the skills of the investigator (interviewer) seem rather limited. In this case, the interviewer asks many leading questions in what appears to be an attempt to get the evidence he needs to support his worst fears (5).

Overall, both sources emphasise the harsh treatment of paupers, and confirm that the principle of less eligibility was adhered to. However, as in the case of Andover, officials in central government seemed to believe that there was a difference between inhumane and uncivilised treatment of paupers and the more acceptable harsh treatment that would deter sectors of the population from claiming relief (6).

are made here that relate to the reliability of the sources as evidence.

(6) A solid concluding comment that is consistent with the rest of the response.

Examiner's Assessment

AO1a – Level IA (6 marks): a good range of historical terms are used and integrated into a clearly structured, well-communicated response.

AO1b – Level IA (8 marks): sustains relevance and an analytical approach. Key concepts and the importance of the main issues are well understood.

AO2a – Level IB (14 marks): an effective comparison is made with a sound evaluation of the qualities and limitations of the sources.

Total mark of 28 (Grade A).

[Click here for a Mark Scheme that accompanies the exemplar answers provided above](#)

Mark Scheme, Question 1 (a). Treatment of paupers in workhouses under the New Poor Law

Examiners use Mark Schemes to determine how best to categorise a candidate's response and to ensure that the performances of thousands of candidates are marked to a high degree of consistency. Few answers fall neatly into the mark levels indicated below: some answers will provide good comparisons but offer little internal provenance; others may rely heavily on own knowledge. Examiners therefore try to find the 'best fit' when applying the scheme. Each answer has a final mark based on three Assessment Objectives (AO1a, AO1b and AO2a) worth $6 + 8 + 16 = 30$ marks. As the standard of the two answers lies between Level 1 and Level IV, only the descriptors and marks for these levels are tabulated below.

Answers need to directly compare the two sources and may evaluate matters such as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the sources 'as evidence for ...'. The introductions and attributions for each source should be used to aid comparison. These two sources have a common theme in that they are both 'official' and highlight the importance of diet as a way in which the behaviour

Access to History – Online OCR British History Enquiries – The Condition of England 1815–53 – Standard AS Question

of inmates in workhouses was controlled. However, the purpose behind the official reports was different with Source A emphasising how diets should have been used to enforce less eligibility and Source D indicating how the power to enforce dietary standards seemed to have been abused. There is much material to help candidates make an effective comparison between the two sources.

Marking Grid for Enquiries Question (a)

Assessment Objectives	AO1a Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate clearly and effectively	AO1b Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation and analysis	AO2a Analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination
LEVEL IA	Uses a range of appropriate historical terms; clearly and coherently structured and communicated answer. 6 marks	Consistently relevant and analytical answer; clear and accurate understanding of key concepts and significance of issues. 8 marks	Provides a focused comparison of both content and provenance; evaluates qualities and limitations of sources. 16 marks
LEVEL IB	Uses a range of appropriate historical terms; clearly and coherently structured and communicated answer. 6 marks	Judgements are supported by appropriate references to content and provenance; very good understanding of key concepts and significance of issues. 7 marks	Provides an effective comparison of both content and provenance; evaluates qualities and limitations of sources. 13–15 marks
LEVEL II	Uses historical terms accurately; clearly and mostly coherently structured and clearly communicated answer. 5 marks	Good attempt at explanation/analysis but uneven overall judgements; mostly clear understanding of key concepts and significance of issues. 6 marks	Provides a relevant comparison of both content and provenance; evaluation lacks completeness and may be confined to the conclusion or second half of the answer. 11–12 marks
LEVEL III	Uses relevant historical terms but not always accurately or extensively; mostly structured and clearly communicated answer. 4 marks	Mixture of internal analysis and discussion of similarities and/or differences; uneven understanding of key concepts and significance of issues. 5 marks	Provides a comparison; makes limited links with the sources by focusing too much on content or provenance. 9–10 marks
LEVEL IV	Some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant; some unclear, under-developed or disorganised sections but satisfactorily written. 3 marks	Mostly satisfactory understanding of key concepts and significance of issues; some unlinked though relevant assertions, description/narrative but without a judgement. 4 marks	Attempts a comparison but comments are largely sequential; makes few points of comparative provenance or similarity/difference of content. 7–8 marks

OCR – AS GCE
British History
Enquiries
1815–1945
F963: Option B

The Condition of England, 1815–53

QUESTION (b)

Examiner's Specific Advice

This question requires you to put together an answer which includes some of the analysis you have had to do for part (a) and then go further by considering all the sources. Make sure you allow two-thirds of the time allocated for the whole paper (that makes 60 minutes for this question). Do a brief plan to remind yourself of agreement/disagreement with the proposition in the question. Identify themes which the sources pick up on; these should emerge in questions set by the examiners.

Make sure you have covered all the sources by the end of your answer, but avoid the temptation to cover each in turn. This 'sequential' approach would seriously limit your chances of achieving a top level. Your own knowledge is essential to a good answer. Use it to interrogate the sources and to question critically any assertion they make.

Develop analysis of a source by examining a range of examples from your more comprehensive knowledge. Do not just describe what's in a source. However, avoid a common mistake of deploying so much of your own knowledge that the sources aren't properly considered. This is after all a source-based paper. Avoid the temptation to quote chunks from each source; the examiner should know what is there! Rather, confine yourself to significant words or short phrases. A conclusion is necessary to tie your discussion up. It doesn't need to be long, but should be clear for greatest impact.

[Click Here For Sources Relating to this Question](#)

Exemplar Question

1 (b) Study all the Sources.

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the sources support the interpretation that the treatment of paupers in workhouses set up under the New Poor Law was cruel and inhumane.

[70 marks]

[Click Here for a Chronology Relating to this Topic](#)

Examiner's Exemplar Plan and Answer 1

Plan

- Introduction
- Sources explained and discussed
- Own knowledge
- Conclusions

All of the sources and my own knowledge need to be used to make a judgement about whether treatment of paupers in the new workhouses was cruel and inhumane. Paupers were treated harshly but only in certain parts of the country and at certain points in time (1).

Source A is an official report that suggests what should have happened if paupers did not behave themselves properly. It was important that discipline was maintained, otherwise paupers would think the workhouse would provide them with an easy life. Conditions had to be a fair bit worse than those they would experience even if in poorly paid employment (2).

Source B tells us about the experience of a skilled worker who fell upon hard times. Although he didn't like the workhouse uniform and the work he had to do, he gives the impression that conditions were not too bad. At the end of the day he sat around a warm fire with other inmates, singing. This is also supported by the fact that he wasn't in the workhouse for too long, and seemed to be moved on to another place, where there was probably work. So, this source seems to suggest that paupers were not always treated cruelly and inhumanely (3).

Source C also deals with the harsh way in which paupers were treated. Engels shows how it wasn't just the able bodied that suffered, but also children and the 'feeble minded'. The source is interesting as it suggests that the idea of providing separate treatment for separate categories of the poor was not being stuck to (4). Also, we need to be careful about trusting the source, as it comes from Engels, who was a friend of the communist and revolutionary thinker, Karl Marx. He was bound to be critical of the New Poor Law (5).

In Source D there is further evidence of how badly fed paupers might have been, although the Andover case was probably an extreme one. Again, we need to be careful when using a source like this as the interviewer was obviously determined to find out information that confirmed the concerns he had over pauper treatment (6).

The historian in Source E argues that treatment was cruel and inhumane as a 'climate of fear' was purposefully created to deter people from entering workhouses. Through a variety of methods, e.g. monotonous work, petty rules, they were subjected to psychological cruelty that took away their individuality. This source is very useful, as it doesn't

(1) A reasonable start with an interesting comment about the prevalence of harsh treatment of paupers.

(2) A sequential approach is adopted from the start. Source A is interpreted correctly, although mention could have been made of the principle of less eligibility.

(3) A fairly solid link with the question is made here, although the sequential approach to analysis is continued.

(4) Good use is made here of 'own knowledge' to analyse the source.

(5) A fair point but 'bound to be critical' needs to be developed further.

(6) A rather thin section; maybe a bit more contextual information could be provided about Andover.

(7) The comment concerning provenance is rather basic.

Access to History – Online OCR British History Enquiries – The Condition of England 1815–53 – Standard AS Question

just dwell on the physical cruelty that existed, and, also, it comes from a modern historian, who has had a much greater range of information to work from (7).

In conclusion, most of the sources do support the view that paupers were treated cruelly and inhumanely. However, B implies that things weren't always bad and E points out that there was a difference between physical and psychological cruelty (8).

Access to a greater range of 'evidence' does not necessarily make the views of a historian more reliable.

(8) Quite a sensible conclusion that makes a balanced judgement.

Examiner's Assessment

AO1a – Level III (6 marks): evidence and historical terms are used in a fairly accurate and relevant manner. There is some lack of contextual material in places. Clearly written and quite well structured.

AO1b – Level III (7 marks): analysis is attempted but discussion of similarities and differences is rather uneven. Shows a decent understanding of key concepts although a bit uneven in places.

AO2a – Level IV (15 marks): contains some pointed comments about provenance, but the sources are analysed sequentially.

AO2b – Level III (12 marks): analysis and evaluation overall is sound but there is some unevenness between use of own knowledge and sources.

Total mark of 40 (Grade C).

Examiner's Exemplar Plan and Answer 2

Plan

- Introduction
- Argument to support the interpretation
- Argument to challenge the interpretation
- Conclusion – judgement of the interpretation

A number of the sources suggest that treatment of paupers was cruel and inhumane, although Murray, in Source E, makes the point that the psychological cruelty that the New Poor Law created was more significant than that of a physical nature. It is also important to consider the difference between the imposition of a strict disciplinarian approach to the treatment of paupers as indicated by Source A, and one that goes beyond that, as suggested by Sources C and D. Finally, one must consider, in general, how 'cruelty' and 'inhumanity' are to be defined and measured, and also how consistently Boards of Guardians imposed the principle of less eligibility (1).

(1) This is a very good start that clearly sets out how the question is to be tackled and with a good sense of how the sources are going to be used to support the argument.

Access to History – Online OCR British History Enquiries – The Condition of England 1815–53 – Standard AS Question

Once the Poor Law Amendment Act was passed in 1834, the Central Board of Poor Law Commissioners quickly went about their work to encourage Boards of Guardians to impose the principle of less eligibility. The idea was to deter pauperism by making conditions in new workhouses the only form of relief to be made available to the able bodied, worse than those experienced by the poorest person who was in employment. This was to be enforced through the construction of specially designed Panoptican institutions, which resembled prisons (or Bastilles, as they were called) and which were to be run in a very strict and disciplined manner. The rules for conduct were clearly spelt out, as Source A indicates, and if they were broken, harsh punishments were to be imposed. This included restricting food supplies, although not intentionally to the point whereby inmates were starving, as suggested in Source D. It is important to note that the Commissioners seemed to propose that a strict, disciplined approach was required, but not one that resulted in cruelty. As Sources C and D suggest, local officials were the ones responsible for what appeared to be inhumane treatment and they seemed to misinterpret what was meant by 'less eligibility' (2).

The physical hardship of being a workhouse pauper related to the work that was expected, the food that was issued and the accommodation experienced. Work was tedious and genuinely hard, involving, for example, the picking of oakum (tarred ropes) or the breaking of animal bones (as mentioned in Source D). Diets were regulated according to six standard 'menus', which were issued according to the level of behaviour of inmates. Sources A and D both refer to the use of food as a way of controlling behaviour of inmates, although they differ in that D intimates that paupers at Andover were malnourished, regardless of their behaviour and simply because of the cruel nature of the workhouse officials. However, Andover and other infamous workhouses, such as Eye in Lincolnshire, were probably extreme cases, and highlighted by those who were simply against the New Poor Law (3). Accommodation was very basic and the new purpose built workhouses were generally bleak buildings that resembled prisons. More significantly, they were designed so that families could be split up to further instil the less eligibility principle. Some contemporaries argue that this was more than the implementation of harsh treatment and was an inhumane way of dealing with people, who were asking for relief because they were desperate (4).

Source E emphasises the psychological impact of the workhouse regime, and argues that it was imposed in a particular manner to create fear and terror amongst the able bodied. This is supported by Source C. Engels highlights the mental torture that must have been endured by children being forced to sleep in mortuaries and 'feeble minded' women being employed to tend to the sick. Care needs to be taken when interpreting the work of Engels, as he was a leftwing critic of the New Poor Law, and must

(2) An impressive amount of 'own knowledge' is skilfully blended with analysis of Sources C and D.

(3) The argument is maintained and well supported by reference to a number of the sources. Comment about reliability is also nicely integrated.

(4) Focus on the demands of the question is maintained (i.e. the issue of 'humane' treatment).

(5) Another very helpful comment linked to provenance and which logically flows from the key point being made about psychological trauma.

Access to History – Online OCR British History Enquiries – The Condition of England 1815–53 – Standard AS Question

surely have purposefully sought out the worst examples of how paupers were treated to support his ideology (5).

Two general points need to be made before a conclusion can be reached about the treatment of paupers. Firstly, not all paupers were treated in the same way in all parts of the country and, as time progressed, the adherence to less eligibility slackened. This is supported partly by Source B, as John Castle gives some indication that workhouse conditions were uncomfortable, but not cruel and inhumane. Even his complaints are likely to have been exaggerated due to the fact that he was accustomed, as a skilled silk ribbon weaver, to a much more comfortable lifestyle. Secondly, by the standards of the time, the treatment of paupers may not have been cruel and inhumane. As Dickens indicated in 'Hard Times', life for working people in the first half of the nineteenth century was generally very hard and often cruel. We have to be careful about judging past events by standards we are used to in the present (6).

In conclusion, the treatment of paupers was certainly harsh, but it was the intention of the Commissioners that it should be. Whether it was cruel or inhumane depends on how some of the evidence is interpreted and the standards we use to measure and define these terms (7).

(6) Two very sound evaluative points that provide balance to the response and show that careful thought has been given to how the key words in the question should be interpreted.

(7) An interesting and thoughtful conclusion. It is short but makes a clear judgement.

Examiner's Assessment

AO1a – Level IA (10 marks): uses accurate, detailed and relevant evidence; clearly structured and coherently written.

AO1b – Level IB (10 marks): clear and accurate understanding of key concepts and issues; judgements are supported by appropriate references to content and provenance

AO2a – Level IB (25 marks): the value and limitations of the sources are evaluated and, generally, they are effectively linked and compared.

AO2b – Level IA (20 marks): excellent analysis and evaluation of the interpretation using all sources and own knowledge to reach a clear conclusion; fully understood that the sources both support and refute the interpretation.

Total mark of 65 (Grade A).

[Click here for a Mark Scheme that accompanies the exemplar answers provided above](#)

Mark Scheme, Question 1 (b). The treatment of paupers in workhouses under the New Poor Law

Examiners are told *not* to look for a set answer. The interpretation in the question may be agreed with or rejected – but it must be considered seriously, even if the claim is then rejected. Answers need to use *all five sources*, evaluating them as to their strengths and limitations as evidence and testing them against contextual knowledge. Four of the sources indicate that workhouse paupers may have been treated cruelly and inhumanely, although much depends on how these terms are defined. Source E, for example, emphasises the psychological rather than physical cruelty of the New Poor Law. Source B is very helpful in that it implies that the hardship of paupers may have been exaggerated and what an individual perceived to be cruel and/or inhumane was dependent on their own personal standards. A response that makes the point that making a judgement about the treatment of paupers involves considering issues of relativity (i.e. to time, place and individuals concerned) should be rewarded very highly. Overall, the best answers to this type of question are likely to be in the form of a balanced argument that is supported by ‘own knowledge’ and the sources in an integrated fashion. Evaluation of the evidence should also be blended in and not simply bolted on at the end.

Each answer has a final mark based on four Assessment Objectives (AO1a, AO1b AO2a and AO2b) worth 10 + 12 + 28 + 20 marks = 70 marks. As the standard of the two answers lies between Level I and Level IV, only the descriptors and marks for these levels are tabulated below.

Marking Grid for Enquiries Question (b)

Assessment Objectives Access to History, Online OCR British History Enquiries, The Condition of England 1815-53, Standard AS Question	A01a Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate clearly and effectively	A01b Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation and analysis	A02a Analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination	A02b Analyse and evaluate how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented
Level IA	Uses a range of appropriate historical terms; clearly and coherently structured and communicated answer. 9–10 marks	Consistently relevant and analytical answer; clear and accurate understanding of key concepts and significance of issues. 11–12 marks	Provides a focused comparison of both content and provenance; evaluates qualities and limitations of sources. 26–28 marks	Excellent analysis and evaluation of the interpretation, using all sources and own knowledge to reach a conclusion. 20 marks
Level IB	Uses a range of appropriate historical terms; clearly and coherently structured and communicated answer. 8 marks	Judgements supported by appropriate references to content and provenance; very good understanding of key concepts and significance of issues. 9–10 marks	Provides an effective comparison of both content and provenance; evaluates qualities and limitations of sources. 23–25 marks	Focused analysis and evaluation of interpretation, using all sources and own knowledge to reach a clear conclusion. 17–19 marks
Level II	Uses historical terms accurately; clearly and mostly coherently structured and clearly communicated answer. 7 marks	Good attempt at explanation/analysis but uneven overall judgements; mostly clear understanding of key concepts and significance of issues. 8 marks	Provides a relevant comparison of both content and provenance; evaluation lacks completeness and may be confined to the conclusion or second half of the answer. 20–22 marks	Focused analysis and evaluation of interpretation, using all sources and own knowledge to reach a clear conclusion; some imbalance between use of own knowledge and sources. 14–16 marks
Level III	Uses relevant historical terms but not always accurately or extensively; mostly structured and clearly communicated answer. 6 marks	Mixture of internal analysis and discussion of similarities and differences; uneven understanding of key concepts and significance of issues. 6–7 marks	Provides a comparison; makes limited links with the sources by focusing too much on content or provenance. 17–19 marks	Sound analysis and evaluation; there may be some description and unevenness between use of own knowledge and sources. 11–13 marks
Level IV	Some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant; some unclear, under	Mostly satisfactory understanding of key concepts; some unlinked though relevant assertions	Attempts a comparison but comments are largely sequential; makes few points	Some analysis and evaluation with increasing amounts of

Chronology: Key Events in *The Condition of England, 1815–53*

[Note: don't set in grid format]

1815		End of the French Wars. Introduction of the Corn Laws.
1816		<u>Spa Fields meetings</u> (1). Rural and urban riots.
1817		<u>March of the Blanketeers</u> (2). <u>Pentrich Rising</u> (3).
1819		Peterloo Massacre.
1820		<u>Cato Street Conspiracy</u> (4).
1824		Combination Acts repealed.
1829		Grand General Union of Spinners is founded.
1831		Cholera outbreak.
1832		Royal Commission on the Poor Law. The Great Reform Act.
1833		Royal Commission on Factory Reform. Factory Act. <u>First government grant made to education</u> (5).
1834	February March	The Grand National Consolidated Trades Union (GNCTU) is founded. Tolpuddle Martyrs. Poor Law Amendment Act.
1836	June	London Working Man's Association is formed.
1837		Beginnings of Chartism.
1839	February May	First Chartist Convention is called. Presentation of first Chartist national petition. The appointment of James Kay-Shuttleworth as secretary to the Committee of Privy Council for Education. The Newport Rising.
1842	April/May	Presentation of the second

Access to History – Online OCR British History Enquiries – The Condition of England 1815–53 – Standard AS Question

	July	Chartist petition. <u>Sanitary Report published (6).</u> Mines Act. 'Plug Plots' emerge.
1844		Factory Act. <u>Rochdale Equitable Pioneers Society is founded (7).</u>
1845-46		Andover Workhouse scandal.
1847	May	O'Connorville opened. Factory Act (The Ten Hours Act). Poor Law Amendment Act.
1848	April	Third Chartist petition is presented. Cholera outbreak. Public Health Act.
1853		Cholera outbreak. Factory Act.

(1) Crowds gathered in Islington, London to listen to Henry 'Orator' Hunt talk about political, economic and social reform. The meeting became disorderly, confirming the fears of the government that a revolutionary challenge to authority was underway.

(2) Unemployed textile workers from Lancashire and Cheshire decided to march to London to submit a petition to the Prince Regent for parliamentary reform in the hope that this would lead to better living and working conditions. On their trek they carried blankets to keep warm but this was of little help; only a few got past Stockport.

(3) A group of radicals in Pentrich, Derbyshire were encouraged by the preaching of 'Oliver the Spy' (an *agent provocateur*) to launch an attack on Nottingham. Their hope was to overthrow the city with the false belief that other groups of radicals were simultaneously doing the same elsewhere in Britain. They failed and were transported to Australia.

(4) This was an unsuccessful attempt, led by Arthur Thistlewood, to murder the Cabinet. The leaders of the plot were hanged.

(5) This consisted of £20,000 that was to be distributed between the two main providers of elementary education at the time, The National Society and The British and Foreign Schools Society. It was to be used for the building of

Access to History – Online OCR British History Enquiries – The Condition of England 1815–53 – Standard AS Question

new schools and was to be extended in the years that followed according to need.

(6) This provided damning evidence about living conditions in towns and cities, although, mainly due to opposition from vested interests, it took another six years before the government decided to take action. Even when they did, the resulting legislation was of a permissive nature.

(7) This was the forerunner of the Co-Operative Society, which still exists today. Its main aim was to provide quality food and domestic goods at reasonable prices.

Teaching activities

1. Research the life of Friedrich Engels using the internet (see websites in resources list). Summarise your findings in the form of a biographical dateline. Use this information to analyse and evaluate Source C in more depth. Make reference to the nature, origins, purpose, value and limitations of the source as evidence about the treatment of paupers under the New Poor Law.
2. Source B is part of an autobiographical account written by a silk ribbon weaver called John Castle. Working with a partner, list the strengths and weaknesses of using such a source as evidence for the experiences of people who had been placed in workhouses.
3. Using the Google Images search engine, research workhouses under the New Poor Law (type 'Plans of Workhouses'). What do the pictures tell you about how the new workhouses were designed so as to allow enforcement of the principle of less eligibility? Share this task with a partner, with each of you analysing different pictures, and then compare your findings.
4. Make a list of all the different types of sources that might be useful when studying Poverty and the Poor Law from 1815 to 1853. Categorise them under the following headings:
 - Written official, e.g. Reports of Commissioners
 - Written unofficial, e.g. pauper letters asking for relief
 - Non-written official, e.g. workhouse buildings such as at Southall
 - Non-written unofficial, e.g. paintings of the poor

With reference to the list, discuss the following statement with a partner:

'Written official sources are **far more** reliable than any other category of sources when researching the causes of poverty in the first half of the nineteenth century and the way in which poverty was tackled by governments.'

Resources

- J. Belcham, *Popular Radicalism in Nineteenth Century Britain* (Palgrave Macmillan, 1995)
- R. Brown, *Revolution, Radicalism and Reform: England 1780–1846* (Cambridge Perspectives in History, Cambridge University Press, 2000)
- C. Culpin and E. Evans, *Chartism* (Longman, 2000)
- M.J. Daunton, *Progress and Poverty: An Economic and Social History of Britain 1700–1850* (Oxford University Press, 1995)
- D. Englander, *Poverty and Poor Law Reform in 19th Century Britain, 1834–1914: From Chadwick to Booth* (Longman, 1998)
- E. Evans, *The Forging of the Modern State: Early Industrial Britain 1783–1870* (Longman, 2001)
- D. Fraser, *The Evolution of the British Welfare State* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2002)
- A. Kidd, *State, Society and the Poor in Nineteenth Century England* (Palgrave Macmillan, 1999)
- P. Murray, *Poverty and Welfare 1830–1914* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1999)
- E. Royle, *Chartism* (Longman, 1996)

Weblinks

- www.chartists.net
- www.cottontimes.co.uk
- www.historyhme.co.uk/peel/factmine/factories.htm
- www.schoolshistory.org.uk/IndustrialRevolution/womenandchildren.htm
- www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk
- www.workhouses.org.uk