

History

Answers and commentaries A-level (7042)

1F Industrialisation and the people: Britain, c1783 — 1885

Marked answers from students for questions from the June 2022 exams. Supporting commentary is provided to help you understand how marks are awarded and how students can improve performance.

Contents

The below content table is interactive. You can click on the title of the question to go directly to that page.

Question 1	3
Question 2	10

Answers and commentaries

Please note that these responses have been reproduced exactly as they were written and have not been subject to the usual standardisation process.

This resource is to be used alongside the A-level History Component 1F Industrialisation and the people: Britain, c1783–1885 June 2022 Question paper and inserts.

Question 1

Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to the attitude of the Tories to reform in the years 1812 to 1832.

[30 marks]

Mark scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of the interpretations put forward in all three extracts and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. Evaluation of the arguments will be well-supported and convincing. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25–30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of the interpretations given in all three extracts and combines this with knowledge of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. The evaluation of the arguments will be mostly well-supported, and convincing, but may have minor limitations of depth and breadth. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19–24**
- L3:** Provides some supported comment on the interpretations given in all three extracts and comments on the strength of these arguments in relation to their historical context. There is some analysis and evaluation but there may be an imbalance in the degree and depth of comments offered on the strength of the arguments. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13–18**
- L2:** Provides some accurate comment on the interpretations given in at least two of the extracts, with reference to the historical context. The answer may contain some analysis, but there is little, if any, evaluation. Some of the comments on the strength of the arguments may contain some generalisation, inaccuracy or irrelevance. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7–12**

A-LEVEL HISTORY – 7042/1F – ANSWERS AND COMMENTARIES

- L1:** **Either** shows an accurate understanding of the interpretation given in one extract only **or** addresses two/three extracts, but in a generalist way, showing limited accurate understanding of the arguments they contain, although there may be some general awareness of the historical context. Any comments on the strength of the arguments are likely to be generalist and contain some inaccuracy and/or irrelevance. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Student responses

Response A

In Extract A, Pearce and Stearn argue that the Tories were resistant to political reform, and used both parliamentary and physical means to rebuff the whig's comparably radical zeal. This is a somewhat convincing view, where Extract A contains the claim that the Tories had the backing of the 'monarchy and armed forces – invaluable in times of challenge', and used these to prevent reform. Indeed, Liverpool utilised the yeomanry to suppress the radical agitation at St. Fields, Manchester in August 1819, and used the army to block the 1817 march of the Blanketeers, this reinforced Pearce and Stern's assertion that the forces were staunchly against reform. Extract A also convincingly states that the Tory attitude to reform meant that the whigs were 'powerless' to raise reform bills in parliament, which is convincing. This is demonstrated by the Radical Sir Francis Burdett; 1825 Catholic Emancipation Bill which was launched by the Ultra Tory, pro-Anglican lobby. Plus, the extract gains convincingness by identifying how the Tories' opposition to reform took the form of repression of radicalism and the form of parliamentary opposition to whig efforts at reform.

However, there are some limitations to Extract B's argument that 'the Tories will strong enough to resist all demands for reform' – this was not the case, and indeed there are examples of political reform even before the Liberal Tory elimination of Liverpool's industry. This is demonstrated by the redistribution of seats from the rotten boroughs of Grampound in 1819, which contradicts his claim that the Tories between 1812 and 1832 were all opponents of reform. Similarly, Extract A loses convincingness when Pearce and Stern claim that it was the resignation of Liverpool which fractured the party and paved the way for Whig reforms: this is a simplistic perspective which fails to take into account the pro-reform Canningites lobby, their staunch favour of reform, as demonstrated by Huskisson's resignation from Wellington's cabinet in May 1828 over the issue of political reform of rotten borough seats, is a testament to the way in which factionalism within the Tory party over the issue of reform was a potential reason for their collapse. This, perspective which treats the Tories as a homologous, anti-reform groups.

Overall, Extract A largely retains convincingness by demonstrating the overriding anti-reform sentiment of the Tories, and the ways this manifested in repression on a military and parliamentary level.

In Extract B, Watts argues that the repressive stance taken by Tory leadership has been overestimated and instead many in the party were willing to adopt reform as a stabilising action but struggles to do so out of lack of knowledge. This is a fairly convincing appraisal, which balances both the really repressive stance taken to radicals agitation against the adoption to reform towards 1832 as an avenue for change. Firstly, Watts convincingly acknowledges the 'repressive' policies which were initially fostered, including the 1812 suspension of the Habeas Corpus to ease the worst of radicals after the December 1816 Spa Fields radicals meeting. Watt's view that even then they were willing to reform but had little idea' of how to go about it is also convincing, as demonstrated by the redistribution of rotten borough seats from Grampound in 1819, while simultaneously exacting the repressive 'Six Acts' that year. This portrays an image of leadership unable to fully commit to either

A-LEVEL HISTORY – 7042/1F – ANSWERS AND COMMENTARIES

repressive or reform, which Extract B convincingly communicates. Watts is also valid in his argument that towards the end of the period 1812-1832, the politicians knew it was time to adapt some moderate reform as a means to 'stabilise' society. This is shown by the concession of Paul and Wellington of Catholic Emancipation in 1829, as a means to appease Irish radical Daniel O'Connell's County Clare election victory. Thus, extract B gains convincingsness in showing how the attitude of the Tories to reform softened over time.

However, the extract is restricted by Watt's view that the Tories did not initially adopt reforms because 'parliament was lacking in accurate information about the nature and actual distress.' This is highly unconvincing; the high number of petitions to parliament across the period 1816-1819, including 700 petitions to parliament from December 1816's Spa Fields meeting is a testament to this. Aside from the political distress felt by many of the disenfranchised, evidence of economic hardship was also blatantly ignored, as demonstrated by the rejection of a handloom – weaver's petition to parliament in 1812. Thus, the extract presents an unconvincing image of Tories who were naïve of the extent of unrest and distress in the nation. Furthermore, extract B loses convincingsness with the broad claim that 'several were unwilling to adopt parliamentary reform after 1830: this fails to recognise continuing opposition to reform. Indeed, reform was only possible with the arrival of Coney's pro-reform cabinet in November 1830, following Wellington's claim that the current political system was 'near perfect.' The notion that Watt's specifically names Peel is unconvincing, especially since his own house was attacked during radical affiliation for a parliamentary reform act in October 1831. Thus, the extract's convincingsness is somewhat limited.

Overall, however, Watts claims detail validity in demonstrating the move of many in the party away from a path of repression into a new direction of openness, which had the pragmatic aim of retaining 'instability' and maintaining the status quo.

In Extract C, Evans argues that the Tories remain in opposition to social and political reform by 1832, which was due to their preoccupation with the economy and treating symptoms of post-war social-distress. His view that the economic reforms of the early stage of Liverpool's ministry were actuated by necessity is largely convincing. With the government's spending exceeding income by 45% on the last year of war, paying off the £876 million nations debt cost £30 million per year, and motivated Vansittart's borrowing of money from the City, while only reserving cash payouts from the Bank of England in 1819, Evans also identifies that later economic reforms were actuated by a laissez-faire, 'free trade; outlook, which is convincing. Indeed, the budget of Robinson and Huskisson in 1823 to 1824 reduced the tariffs on manufactured goods from 50% to 20%, and on raw materials from 20% to 20%. This increased government income by 64%, suggesting that radical economic reforms under the liberal Tories protected the interests of 'industrialists' as Evans asserts. Extract B also contains convincing claims that Tory social reforms sought to 'alleviate.... unemployment', which is convincing. Indeed, the 1817 Poor Unemployment Act gave grants to public work schemes reinforcing the validity of Extract C overall.

However, Evans's claim that the Tories as a homologous group were unwilling to introduce any 'parliamentary reform' reduces the extract's convincingsness. Indeed Huskisson resigned from Wellington's cabinet in May 1828 over the Prime Minister's refusal to consider the

redistribution of rotten borough seats; it is also noteworthy that while Huskisson died in September 1830, this Tory reforming spirit enabled the passage of the Great Reform Act in 1832, since Canningite Tories including Palmerston served in Grey's November 1838 Cabinet. This rebuts Evan's claim that the Tories' continued to oppose parliamentary reform'. Furthermore, Evans underestimates the significance of some of Liverpool's early social reforms, by suggesting the Tories dismissed the social sphere and favoured the economic. Instead a more convincing approach would take into account the 1819 Truck Act – which protected factory works from payments-in-kind – and the 1819 Factory Act, which put in place new safety regulations for the first time. This indicates a willingness to accept social reform which weakens the convincingness of Extract C.

Overall, Evan's perspective that the Tories sought to protect industrial interest with their economic reforms, in addition to alienating symptoms of judicial distress, is valid. However, the extract loses convincingness by failing to acknowledge the pro-parliamentary reform faction, and the significance of Tory social reforms.

This is a Level 5 response

This response is very formulaic in response – identifying reasons that the identified arguments might be considered to be convincing in the opening paragraph for each extract and then reasons that identified arguments might be less convincing. This aids the clarity of the argument. It is done in a very comprehensive manner with short and focused quotation to illustrate points and well-selected knowledge in order to provide evidence for the evaluation. It is clear that there is a very good understanding of the arguments contained within each extract and that all judgements are fully substantiated. At no stage is knowledge simply included for its own sake.

Response B

In Extract A, the historian talks about the Tories being opposed to any reform around 1812, but becoming weaker in its resistance, and they are portrayed as constantly 'resisting' reform even after Lord Liverpool's resignation. The historian portrays the Tories as being very traditional still, which they were, they worked to protect the King and to maintain the hierarchy of power as it was, and reforms would go against it. The Whigs were much more supportive of reform than the Tories were, but they took it for granted that they would stay in power since they had the backing of the monarchy, the armed forces and opposition was weak, so there would be no threat to their position. The Tories saw no need for reform or for keeping the people content. The historian says that 'the resignation of Lord Liverpool, who had helped keep the Tories together.' was one of the reasons that the Tories were not able to resist reform as much, and this was probably also influenced by Liverpool being very against reform, while his successors were more supportive of it and open towards the idea. Overall, I think that this of reform. This extract portrays Tories not as becoming supportive or some being supportive, but as being unable to ignore pressure and demands – it portrays them as completely unwilling and unsupportive, and instead as not having any other choice but to consider reform. It would be more convincing if it had mentioned some Tories as being in favour of them, or as slowly becoming more open minded due to politics becoming slowly more modern.

In Extract B, Watts discusses Liverpool as Prime Minister and his attitudes towards reform during his years in power. I know that Liverpool did not support social or parliamentary reform, and only introduced any because he had to, not because he supported reform personally. Watts states that, 'Repressive policies were simply the result of the Tory government struggling to deal with immensely complex problems...', and this is true to some extent. The government feared a revolution and being overthrown, but a majority of the time they did not attempt to understand the problems that existed and only dealt with what threatened them and their position, as well as the king's. They would also introduced measures that prevented the discontent population from sharing the issue that they faced. Despite their 'awakened willingness' for reform, they did still oppose parliamentary reform and that is demonstrated by the Peterloo Massacre in 1819 – when a famous and popular radical, Henry Hunt, gave a speech at a peaceful gathering in the St. Peter's Fields in Manchester, armed forces attacked and killed 11 people from with the crowd, including a child. The government congratulated the armed forces on their bravery and action, which I think shows that the government wanted to continue to fight, resist and oppress pressure for political change. During this time period, there was also the Catholic Emancipation in 1829, This was a political reform, but it did not occur because the Tories had decided to, it was due to Daniel O'Connell being elected as MP after winning the County Clare Election in 1828, which meant that the government was forced to pass Catholic Emancipation – may still opposed - , but they did not choose to or agree on it. The extract says that Tories usually went through with reform because they had no other choice or because it would play to their advantage in some way, 'the Tories knew when it was time to adapt to the needs and the realities of time', which was accurate, time was moving forward with politics becoming more and more modern slowly, and they knew that they would have to adapt in order to keep people content and stay in power and so they needed to win support from the population and prevent discontent. Overall, Extract B is very convincing in terms of the attitudes that Tories had towards reform,

as it says how the Tories generally were not supportive of reform, but would pass reform if it would benefit them and it also portrays that even through the majority of the Tories didn't support reform, some did, such as Peel, which is correct – in 1846 Peel repeals the Corn Laws despite publicly being against the repeal.

In Extract C, Evans discusses Liverpool's attitudes towards reform as Prime Minister, and Peel's attitude towards reform as Home Secretary. After the Napoleonic Wars had ended and the blockade on British trade links was gone, foreign grain and corn flooded England. To combat this, but protected the farmers, landowning classes, etc – the Corn Laws banned the importation of foreign grain, meaning that only British bread and grains had to be bought, which was more expensive for the working classes but protected the farmers' and landowning classes' businesses. So I support Evans' statement of 'economic policies were created to protect the interests of the landed classes...', especially since not only did Liverpool introduce the Corn Laws, Liverpool ended the collection of income tax in 1816, and reintroduced the indirect taxes, which burdened the working classes further. The wealthy classes were promised that income taxes would only be a wartime policy, which meant the Liverpool had to end it after Britain's victory at Waterloo in 1815, but indirect taxes heavily taxed everyone on everyday items, such as tea, sugar, etc., and it was most damaging to the working classes. This shows that Evan's argument of 'the Tories were primarily concerned with economic reform, but opposed parliamentary or social reform' is accurate and convincing, but only mainly in relation to the wealthy, landowning, elitist, etc. class minorities, rather than the working class majority. Liverpool did also recognise the danger of neglecting the economic needs of the working classes, and he repealed the Combination Acts, but at the same time put repressive measures in place such as the suspension of habeas corpus once again in 1817, and the Six Acts in 1819 (which banned unofficial military training, banned seditious meetings, gave magistrate more power and the right to search people's homes for weapons, sped up the judicial process in law courts, etc.). However, Liverpool did introduce some social reforms such as the Factory Act, Poor Unemployment Law Amendment Act, etc., but mainly to keep the working classes content, not because he was in support of reform that didn't protect the higher up classes or impact free trade. I know that the Tory government continued to stay opposed to parliamentary reform, as they eventually lost to the Whigs and the Whigs passed the Great Reform Act under Lord Gray in 1832. Overall, this extract was quite convincing as I know that the attitude of the Tories towards reform was somewhat flexible depending on the situation they were in, and used it to their advantage, but never supports it fully or at least not all types of reform.

This is a Level 3 response

The response begins with a lengthy summary of the content of A, only embarking on an evaluation in the last couple of sentences. This is a typical indicator of a Level 3 response. Even here, some of the judgement is not very convincing and lacks either specific reference to the extract or to contextual knowledge in order to justify a point. The attempt to consider what the extract does not mention is irrelevant. As the response develops, there is more effort to offer an actual evaluation and to arrive at a judgement about how convincing the arguments in each extract may be, but this remains tentative and limited really to Source C.

Question 2

'In the years 1783 to 1812, British governments successfully overcame the political challenges they faced.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Mark scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is 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. **6–10**
- L1:** 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. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Student responses

Response A

In the years 1783 to 1812, British governments did successfully overcome the political challenges they faced. Pitt's Reign of Terror successfully achieved what it set out to by limiting the influence of radicalism and French revolutionaries. There are arguments from historians, such as E.J. Thompson that highlight that Pitt's Terror only pushed radical activity underground, but this is usually seen as a far stretch. There were many wartime pressures on the government, which saw a succession of administrations come and go, challenged Britain, but it ultimately was on its way to winning the war. The political challenges in Ireland were also successfully dealt with. Therefore the British government's did successfully overcome the political challenges they faced in 1783 to 1812.

Pitt's Reign of Terror successfully overcame the political challenges from radical agitation. In 1792 Hardy's London Corresponding Society was created and many other emerged during this time. Most influenced by Tom Paine's 'The Rights of Man' published in 1791. All of these were ended with Pitt's Combination Laws of 1799-1800. The suspension of habeas corpus in 1794 also deterred agitation. Thus Muir's sentence to transportation in 1793 during trials for treason in 1793 would have made people rethink any idea of political agitation. Pitt's Seditious Meetings Act and Treasonable Practices Act (both 1795) helped to prevent the spread of radical ideas. The pressure of these Acts did successfully overcome political challenges of radical agitation in the years 1783 to 1812.

There were still some political challenges to suggest the clamp down on radicalism was not as successful as previously thought. But most of these pressures were economic, not political. According to E.J Thompson Pitt's Reign of Terror wasn't successful as it pushed radicalism 'underground'. Thompson argues that Navel Meetings at Spithead and Nore in 1797 showed the 'political consciousness of the minority.' However, it is more likely the mutinies were more to do with dreadful pay and conditions than a real political agenda. The black lamp conspiracy (1800-02) is also used as an example of underground political activity, but this is usually dismissed as a fabrication from an alarmist spy. Luddism also broke out in 1811 and luddites caused £6000 worth of damages in its first year breaking 1000 frames. Thompson again argues the Luddite 'tending to become a socialist movement'. But it is more likely the Luddites saw machines as threatening their livelihood. The 'political underground' therefore was not a challenge to the British government as the majority did support the government. By 1793 there were 9000 Royalist groups. Therefore Pitt's Reign of Terror and the strength of subsequent governments overcome the very little challenges from the 'political underground'.

The biggest political pressure the government overcame was the pressure of the war with France. Addington dealt very well with organising Britain for war with his Levee en Masse Act of 1803. Which put 800 000 men under arms. Addington also cleared up corruption in the Navy Board and made the collection of Income tax more efficient (introduced in 1798). The war made national debt increase by £288 million by 1801, to £456 million. This ceased all progress of the Sinking Fund (1786). Yet by 1806 income tax (set at a minimum of 10% for all incomes over £60) started to offset the cost of the war. Pitt's government, followed by Grenville's, then the Duke of Portland all failed to come up with a comprehensive war

strategy, but this challenge had started to be overcome by Spencer Perceval. According to Briggs Perceval 'provided the nucleus of the administration that won the war'. While there were magnificent political challenges from the war, the British government did successfully overcome them.

Ireland was a political challenge for the British government in the 1790s that was successfully overcome by the Act of Union in 1800. The United Irishmen (founded in 1791) under Wolfe Tone threatened an uprising and attempted one in 1798. However, their foreign support never turned up and Tone was captured and the uprising ended in failure. Pitt did attempt to dampen radical support with his Catholic Relief Act in 1793, but this did not overcome the challenge of the United Irishmen. However, the 1800 Act of Union did help to bring Ireland under control of the Westminster parliament which did successfully overcome the political struggles the British government had with Ireland in the years 1783 to 1812.

The British government did, therefore, successfully overcome the political challenges in the years 1783 to 1812. Radical activity had deterred due to Pitt's Terror and the 'political underground' did not threaten British politics too much due to support of loyalist strength, it was more economic times. The war, being the biggest threat to the British politics was challenging for many administrations but was experiencing an upturn with Spencer Perceval. The political challenge with Ireland was also overcome with the Act of Union in 1800. Therefore in the years 1713 to 1812, British governments did successfully overcome the political challenges they faced.

This is a Level 5 response

Whilst the introduction is lengthy, it is very effective. It clearly establishes the judgement and indicates the information that will be used in support in the rest of the essay. The supporting information is very carefully selected – it is specific and explicitly linked to the argument advanced. In addition, the balance is presented in a sophisticated manner, recognising for example in the case of radical clubs, that there is some reason to support alternative views, but that these are ultimately not as convincing as the overall judgement being advanced. The attempt to identify the greatest political pressures facing the government is a good example of how the use of knowledge moves beyond simple recall in order to produce an argued, prioritised evaluation of factors and of themes.

Response B

From 1783 to 1812, British governments became more efficient at dealing with issues. During Pitt's time in office he encountered multiple threats towards his office and with so much discontent occurring it left Britain to be under added stress. With the economy growing due to the early industrial revolution, it was clear that certain policies had to be put in place so that the government could grow as a whole. With the Napoleonic Wars being a key hinderance for Britain, it left issues to need serious treatment.

The British government can be considered to have successfully overcome the political challenges they faced. With Pitt's financial, administrative and trade policies allowing Britain to grow it made a serious impact on the country. Pitt's government was able to establish the Commissioned Audit in 1786 in order to have greater control over the government. The decision to make smuggling seem unattractive by putting the Hovering and Commutation Acts in place allowed for Britain to be benefited as it caused for smuggling to reduce significantly allowed for Britain to be benefited from this. With indirect taxes also being key, it allowed for greater expenditure for the British economy. As well as this, Britain dealt with its administrative problems by removing sinecures and placemen in 1787. The political issues bothering Britain couldn't be significantly dealt with until the war had ended so greater reform could be implemented. Issues like the national debt which was at £228 million in 1783 could be dealt with through the sinking fund, ensuring that funds were taken care of in a sufficient way.

The British government was also successful in dealing with universal suffrage starting with Wolf Tone and the Irish Rebellion in 1791, clear issues occurred as Pitt struggled to suppress the growing support of these radicals. With Thomas Payne's book 'Rights of Man' influencing many working classes to become involved in reform, it caused Pitt to have more discontent to deal with. Pitt's government were challenged with this until the Combination Act was put in place in 1798 as it banned the formation of trade unions. Political suffrage was a key issue during Pitt's reign and as he needed to appeal to the majority, he could allow himself and his government to gain greater support from the middle classes. As British governments had become greater centred around keeping themselves on top, it allowed for the radicalists to be dealt with effectively.

However, British governments were unsuccessful at dealing with political challenges, especially the successors of Pitt. With Pitt resigning in 1801 and dying in 1806, it cause for his successors to struggle with dealing with the Napoleonic Wars. With successors like Addington and Spencer Perceval failing to successfully assist Britain, it caused the cost of war to grow massively and with national debt reaching £456 million, it was clear that Britain would be heavily negatively impacted from the war and from the poor leadership. The British government wasn't truly under sufficient control until Lord Liverpool became Prime Minister, with a lack of any real leadership, it caused Britain to be less successful at dealing with these political challenges they faced. The government can't be viewed as successful whilst so much radicalist discontent occurred, with the industry growing it caused key groups like the Luddites in 1811 to hinder the progress made.

Overall, the British governments were successful in overcoming the political challenges they faced, with radicalism and other pressures for change having significant assistance from reform, it meant that Britain could become more solid. There were obvious drawbacks with the government seeing distress with Pitt's successors lacking any real drive as they caused national debt to grow so high. Political issues were becoming more and more apparent during the Napoleonic wars as the government decided to send out the Berlin and Milan decrees in 1806. In conclusion the British governments had severe backlash from multiple causes of pressure and discontent, under poor leadership following Pitt's death. Until 1812, there would be no significant guidance as the British began to destabilise rapidly.

This is a Level 3 response

The introduction is contextual and does not clearly identify the judgement that is to be advanced. The overall tone of the response is broadly narrative. Some of the information is quite general, but it is presented in a largely descriptive manner, with some attempt at evaluation and analysis. Where there is a greater attempt at analysis in the penultimate paragraph, this largely lacks the type of carefully selected information necessary for higher levels. There is some attempt to present balance, but this is not always focused on the set question. The overall impression is of a loosely focused piece with some attempt at evaluation and analysis as expected at this level.

Get help and support

Visit our website for information, guidance, support and resources at aqa.org.uk/7042

You can talk directly to the History subject team

E: history@aca.org.uk

T: 0161 958 3865

Copyright © 2024 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

AQA Education (AQA) is a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334) and a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723).

Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX.

