

---

# AS HISTORY

Paper 1F Industrialisation and the People: Britain, c1783–1832

---

**Mark scheme**

---

---

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

## AS History Paper 1 Specimen Mark Scheme

### 1F Industrialisation and the People: Britain, c1783–1832

#### Section A

0	1	With reference to these extracts and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two extracts provides the more convincing interpretation of working-class standards of living in Britain in the years 1780 to 1830?	<b>[25 marks]</b>
---	---	---	-------------------

*Target: AO3*

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

#### Generic Mark Scheme

<b>L5:</b>	Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. They will evaluate the extracts thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated judgement on which offers the more convincing interpretation. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context.	<b>21-25</b>
<b>L4:</b>	Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion as to which offers the more convincing interpretation. However, not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements may be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context.	<b>16-20</b>
<b>L3:</b>	The answer will show a reasonable understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. Comments as to which offers the more convincing interpretation will be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context.	<b>11-15</b>
<b>L2:</b>	The answer will show some partial understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be some undeveloped comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context.	<b>6-10</b>
<b>L1:</b>	The answer will show a little understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be only unsupported, vague or generalist comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context.	<b>1-5</b>
	Nothing worthy of credit.	<b>0</b>

## Indicative content

**Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.**

In responding to this question, students may choose to respond to each extract in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach of individual arguments. Either approach could be equally valid, and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

### Extract A:

Students could assess the extent to which the interpretation is convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate as follows:

- Hartwell alleges that there is no questioning the fact that National income was rising at an unprecedented rate 1780–1830
- he cites the increased consumption of food, clothing and other household necessities as evidence that standards of living were rising fast
- he believes there were other indicators of improvements in the 'way of life' with reference to opportunities for women, greater literacy, working associations
- he suggests that the working classes had some control over their own lives and some effective influence in this period.

Students could assess the extent to which the interpretation is not convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to challenge as follows:

- contextual knowledge might be used to point to downturns in the economic growth across the period 1780–1830
- whether the consumption of food, clothing and other household necessities provide the best gauge of rising living standards could be questioned – particularly with respect to the 'quality of life'
- the other indicators of improvement cited could all be questioned. Opportunities for women were often limited to harsh factory (and mines) work, the extent of literacy remained limited and working associations were curbed by legislation like the Combination Acts for much of this period
- working-class 'control' can also be questioned, given the discipline of factory work and the workers' lack of a franchise.

### Extract B:

Students could assess the extent to which the interpretation is convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate as follows:

- Hobsbawm suggests industrialisation destroyed old ways of life in a negative way
- he believes the worker was forced into regular and monotonous work
- he condemns the new city environment as unhealthy, dirty, stressful and detrimental to society
- he suggests an increase in material poverty – pointing out that this was relative – but crucial since the poor got poorer in relation to the middle classes who grew wealthier

---

Students might assess the extent to which the argument is not convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to challenge as follows:

- Hobsbawm's negative interpretation is in marked contrast to Hartwell's and does not take consumption data or rising wages (except to mention 'relative' poverty) into account; it is solely based on a 'way of life' analysis
- Hobsbawm does not provide factual detail to back his claims which give a more general and sometimes over-dramatic picture of working class life and conditions, e.g. 'And what cities!'
- contextual knowledge would point to an increase in real wages that meant most factory employees were lifted out of poverty – and the uncertainty of pre-industrial life.

Students should reach a conclusion as to which is the more convincing with reference to their own contextual knowledge. They are likely to point to some of the similarities between the extracts – both acknowledge some poorer times – Hobsbawm in the entirety but Hartwell in 'the problem of the Napoleonic wars' and both acknowledge a change in working practices occurred as a result of industrialisation in this period, that there was a wage increase – although Hobsbawm looks at this relatively – and appreciate that 'way of life' is a relevant measure of living standards. Despite their apparently opposite views, students may well try to reconcile the two interpretations, showing that while wages rose and on economic grounds standards of living improved, the quality of life was diminished in many ways since Hobsbawm's case here is more easily supported than Hartwell's.

**Section B**

- |          |          |
|----------|----------|
| <b>0</b> | <b>2</b> |
|----------|----------|
- 'Pitt successfully dealt with the challenge of radicalism in the years 1783 to 1801.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

**[25 marks]**

*Target: AO1*

*Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.*

**Generic Mark Scheme**

- |            |  |              |
|------------|--|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement.   | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated.   | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question.   | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment.   | <b>1-5</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit   | <b>0</b>     |

## Indicative content

**Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.**

Students will need to consider Pitt's success and failures in dealing with the radical challenge and offer a balanced judgement on the degree to which he succeeded or failed to control radical forces.

Students might cite some of the following evidence to illustrate ways in which Pitt successfully dealt with the challenge of radicalism in the years 1783 to 1801:

- 1793 – the Aliens Act prevented French revolutionary agents entering Britain
- Pitt used the courts legislation to break up radical associations and prevent the spread of radical thinking. Radicals were put on trial and habeas corpus was suspended in 1794–1795 and 1798–1801
- the 1795 Treasonable Practices Act and Seditious Meetings Act – hit at radical tactics; the crime of treason might include speaking and writing and public meetings of more than 50 had to be licensed by a magistrate
- newspapers were controlled by taxation and government regulation
- used spies to penetrate underground activities
- radical societies were banned, e.g. 1799 – ban on London Corresponding Society and United Irishmen
- trade unions were made illegal under the 1799 and 1800 – Combination Acts
- as well as legal measures Pitt and the government used the army or local militias to put down the troubles – as in 1795
- to prevent radical infiltration via Ireland, the Act of Union, 1800, followed the Irish Rebellion. It strengthened control by abolishing the separate Irish Parliament.

Students might cite some of the following evidence to illustrate ways in which Pitt was not successful in dealing with the challenge of radicalism in the years 1783–1801:

- Pitt's repressive tactics, particularly the 1795 Treasonable Practices Act and Seditious Meetings Acts simply drove radicals underground
- England faced radical danger in 1795, when high food prices produced public agitation and stones were thrown at the King's carriage. Naval mutinies 1797 and Fox's pro-revolution stance showed radicalism had not been curbed
- there were further riots over high food prices in 1801 and bouts of machine-smashing
- corresponding societies were set up including the London Corresponding Society, 1792. Although crushed, its ideas survived and sympathy for the plight of the workers eventually brought its repeal in 1824
- the period saw increasing literacy which helped to politicise workers and increase radical agitation
- the attempted revolution in Ireland in 1798 came near to success and was only defeated by the non-appearance of expected French help.

In conclusion, students may argue that Pitt's strong and repressive policies were

responsible for curbing radicalism and ensuring that England and Wales did not have a revolution in this period. However, it would be equally valid for students to argue that radicalism was never defeated and there is plenty of evidence to show that it continued underground where it was potentially more dangerous.



**0 3** 'The 1832 Reform Act came about because of the mounting popular pressure from 1812.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

**[25 marks]**

*Target: AO1*

*Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.*

### Generic Mark Scheme

- |            |  |              |
|------------|--|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement.   | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated.   | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question.   | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment.   | <b>1-5</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.  | <b>0</b>     |

## Indicative content

**Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.**

Students will need to consider the mounting popular pressure from 1812 and assess the extent to which this contributed to the Reform Act of 1832 – as opposed to other factors which brought that act about. They should attempt to provide a supported judgement on whether they agree or disagree with the quotation.

Students might cite some of the following evidence to suggest that the 1832 Reform Act was the result of popular pressure from 1812:

- issue of parliamentary reform, was not new in 1812 but the formation of 1812 Hampden Club in London by John Cartwright began new political activism and was copied in large towns and regions
- increased literacy, helped by the Sunday School Movement, helped politicise the working class and attracted them to Hampden clubs
- work of Cobbett and the radical MPs Burdett and Lord Cochrane (in parliament from 1807) increased popular concern; from 1816, Cobbett produced the Political register which spread reforming ideas
- despite repression, the debates and demands that began in the Hampden clubs continued with direction from radical agitators, e.g. Henry Hunt – as at Spa Fields 1816 and 'Peterloo' 1819
- pressure grew stronger with formation of Attwood's 1829 Birmingham Political union
- popular pressure kept the cause of reform alive 1831–1832 with riots in Nottingham, Derby and Bristol, 1831 and the May days to 'stop the duke' in 1832
- it was the fear of revolution, refusal to pay taxes and of army mutiny that persuaded parliament to pass the Great Reform Act.

Students might cite some of the following evidence to suggest that the 1832 Reform Act was not the result of popular pressure from 1812 and/or was the result of other factors:

- the reform bill might be seen as the tool of political calculation; before 1830 parliament decisively rejected reform proposals and repressive legislation was used against radical societies and pro-reform meetings
- the bill only came about because the Whigs wanted bill to appease middle class for political advantage
- the bill was the result of the break-up of the Tory Party after Lord Liverpool
- 1830 Wellington's resignation allowed Grey to take office with pledge to reform parliament
- Wellington's determination to oppose reform forced the Whigs into action. With cross-party support Grey could afford to be bold
- the problems of 1831–1832 were less to do with popular pressure than the opposition of the die-hards and the specific details of the bill.

Students may conclude that popular pressure was important in forcing change – particularly in the later stages, but they might equally argue that the pace of change was dictated by parliament and that without the conviction of the Whigs, no act would have come about. Some might also comment on the fact that the resultant act did not provide the liberal terms

that had been sought by the popular movement.

