

## Teacher Resource Bank

GCE History

Candidate Exemplar Work (June 2009):

- HIS2S: Liberal Democracies, Power to the People?



The following responses are not 'model' answers, nor are they indicative of specific overall grades, but are intended to illustrate the application of the mark scheme for this unit. These responses should be read in conjunction with the HIS2S Question Paper, Sources Booklet and Mark Scheme.

Copies of the paper and are available from e-AQA or the AQA History Department.

E-mail: [history@aqa.org.uk](mailto:history@aqa.org.uk)

## **AQA GCE History Teacher Resource Bank Commentaries on June 2009 AS answers**

### **General Introduction by the Chief Examiner**

The first June examination series for the new AS specification saw some excellent examples of well prepared candidates who were able to demonstrate their breadth of knowledge and depth of understanding by addressing the questions set directly and efficiently. Sadly, it also suggested that, whilst some candidates knew the material quite well, they struggled to apply it successfully to the questions asked. At the lowest end, there were, of course, some candidates whose knowledge let them down, but even these might have been able to achieve more highly had they thought more carefully about each question's demands.

The importance of timing for both Units needs to be stressed. In Unit 1 candidates should allow themselves approximately 12 minutes for the first part question and 25 minutes for the second. In Unit 2, they could spend 15 minutes on the first part question and 30 minutes on the second, but they are likely to need slightly longer for the source question. Good time keeping is essential in any examination. No matter how successful the answer to the first part question, an incomplete second part question will always mean a loss of marks (notes receive limited credit).

These commentaries are intended to help teachers and candidates to understand the demands of each question type and consequently to encourage students to perform at the highest level of which they are capable. Please note that errors relating to Quality of Written Communication (of spelling, syntax, etc.) have been reproduced without correction. Please note that the AQA convention for question numbering will be changing as from the June 2010 examination papers. Examples of the new format for question papers can be found elsewhere in the Teacher Resource Bank.

### **Unit 1**

The first part of each question in Unit 1 (those questions labelled 01, 03 and 05 in the new numbering style from June 2010) asks candidates to 'explain why' an event, issue or development came about. The best candidates answered this question, not only with a selection of reasons (and a minimum of three well-explained reasons was expected for Level 3/4), but also by showing how those reasons linked together. This is essential to meet Level 4 criteria and can be achieved by prioritising, differentiating between the long and short-term factors, or showing how different categories of reasons, such as political, social and religious inter-link. It is not, however, enough to simply assert that the links exist – they also needed explaining.

Candidates who only performed at Level 2 often wrote too descriptively, whilst many achieved a good Level 3 by offering a range of relevant and clearly explained reasons but failing to make any links between them. As the exemplars demonstrate, answers did not need to be long but they had to be effectively focused and directed to achieve good marks.

The second part of each question (those questions labelled 02, 04 and 06 in the new numbering style) asked for a response to a question beginning 'how far, how important or how successful'. Each question stem invited candidates to offer a balanced response and this was the key to an award at high Level 3, 4 or 5. Most answers which achieved only a Level 2 or a low/mid-Level 3 mark contained too much description, were excessively one-sided or lacked depth and precision in their use of examples. Some candidates also failed to address the full question set, often

by ignoring starting or finishing dates. To achieve the higher levels, candidates needed to balance one side against another. For example, a question asking how far 'X' contributed to 'Y' demanded a consideration of the importance of other factors which also contributed to 'Y'. Sometimes questions, particularly 'how important' questions (e.g. how important was 'X' in bringing about 'Y?'), could be balanced by considering the ways in which 'X' was important as opposed to the ways in which it was not, rather than introducing 'other factors'; either approach was equally legitimate. The crucial test of an answer was, therefore, the degree to which the candidate was able to argue the issue and how well that argument was supported by accurate and precise evidence. The best answers at Level 5 managed to sustain a focus and convey convincing individual judgement.

## Unit 2

The first part of question 1 (labelled 01 in the new numbering style from June 2010) asks students how far the views in two given sources (A and B) differ, in relation to a given topic. Perhaps the most common error was to waste time writing a paragraph or more about the source content before addressing differences. Levels were awarded according to how well candidates identified and explained differences of **view**. This was not simply an exercise in source comprehension, so such answers received an award of only Level 1/2. Contrasting 'views' required students to go beyond the mere words of the sources or their omissions, and to assess 'how far' the sources differed required some awareness of the degree of **similarity** they contained. To meet the full demands of the question and obtain an award at high level 3/4, candidates also needed to introduce some contextual own knowledge to explain the differences and similarities identified – possibly (but not necessarily) referring to provenance when it helped the explanation, and, more often, explaining references in the sources and drawing on their contextual knowledge to account for differing views.

In the second part of question 1 (labelled 02 in the new numbering) candidates were asked to answer a question beginning 'how far, how important or how successful' with reference to the sources as well as their own knowledge. The best answers to these questions maintained a balanced argument (as explained for Unit 1 above) and the information given in the sources was used in support of that argument. Poorer answers tried to address the sources separately – at the beginning or end of the answer, or sometimes as an asterisked afterthought. Those who omitted them altogether could not obtain more than top Level 2. Whilst the main criteria for the higher levels was the degree of argument, the precision of the evidence and the judgement conveyed, in addition to these, good source use could ensure that students were placed higher in a level than those who used the sources in a perfunctory way. Source use needed to be explicit, and the best candidates appreciated that Source C was provided to give further ideas and/or information that was of direct relevance to this question.

In questions 2 and 3 (03/04 and 05/06 in the new numbering) candidates were asked to respond to an 'explain why' question – on which comments will be found under the Unit 1 commentary above – and a short, provocative quotation about which they were invited to explain why they agreed or disagreed. The demands here were similar to those for the second part of Unit 1 (b) questions. In adopting a view about the quotation, candidates were expected to examine the opposing arguments in order to reach a balanced judgement on the extent of their agreement/disagreement.

Sally Waller Chief Examiner December 2009

## GCE History HIS2S: Liberal Democracies, Power to the People?

### Responses to June 2009 Questions

#### Candidate 1

- 1 (a) Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to the demand for parliamentary reform in the years 1830 to 1832. (12 marks)

Both sources A and B agree that parliamentary reform is needed; the two sources are from MPs in favour of allowing reform and the sources make two cases for reform to be passed. They also both believe that reform is crucial due to the positive effect it will bring to Britain. "This bill would be the country's best protection against a revolution", this is the view Macaulay holds which agrees with Hume's view that the "Ills and evils of this country will only be resolved through a thorough reform of Parliament."

However, there is a great difference between how far each source would wish the reform go. Macaulay in source A says "I oppose Universal suffrage", and wished the reform to include only the wealthy and industrious middle class, which goes against source B's wish of "granting the vote to every individual who pays taxes and rates". Macaulay wants to reform only to protect from a revolution, which he states will come from allowing universal suffrage or doing nothing. He stresses that there are many "with property and intelligence, who are most interested in preserving peace" and that the reform is needed to include these. Macaulay was however a whig orator, and he needed to gain support for the Whigs and their reform act, so he would have to have shied away from the idea of universal suffrage to keep the support of conservative Tory's and whigs. Hume was a radical, and therefore he demanded universal suffrage and a secret ballot because of the radicals ideas for fairer democracy. Macaulay in source A mentions nothing of the secret ballot due to it being against Whig principles.

Overall the sources differ a fair bit, mainly due to their opposing stances on universal suffrage and how wide a franchise, but there is still strong ties with the need to reform full stop.

#### **Principal Examiner's Comments**

*This reaches level 4 because it discusses both similarity and differences. It places the sources in context, drawing out from own-knowledge the different perspectives of Macaulay and Hume. Treatment of similarity is thin but a strength of the response is a clear explanation of the major difference between the two sources. There is clearly a good understanding of the issues raised by the sources and an appreciation of the extent of difference. Level 4, 10 marks.*

**Candidate 2**

- 1 (a) Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to the demand for parliamentary reform in the years 1830 to 1832. (12 marks)

Source A and B both are on the basis of parliamentary reform, but for different reasons.

Source A written by a Whig MP, is persuading the House of Commons to pass the reform bill in which would widen the franchise vote to middle class citizens, the speech was initially made to gain mass support for the Whig and party as at the period of 1830-32, the Tories were dominant force, however with the growth of industrialisation, where the improvements of factories and machinery were on the rise, members in towns in places such as Birmingham were under-represented and sought to look for change in parliament. The period 1830 was an introduction to entrepreneurs who thought urban labour was more important than property franchise, therefore wanted more democratic say in how the nation should be governed.

However, with industrialisation on the rise, more political thought was enhanced for example events of French revolution opened up radicals mind for change, radicals believed in equal rights and thought humane that you should get the vote based on property, they wanted to start again and allow a 'universal suffrage', as the current system was corrupt and 'evil'. They were influenced by enlightened thought from philosophers such as Tom Paine who reinforced the opinion of his dislike to the monarch and hereditary rights he went on to say when we are born we have unalienable rights and freedom of speech.

The economic deterioration, of high food rates also demanded for parliamentary reform, and mass activities and speeches were made to influence others eg Peterloo Massacre also leading radical Carlile who too believed in change.

Source A contains language of menace as almost a warning sign that if the government don't change the current system it would lead to destruction just like the fall of Charles X in France who ignored the electoral problem.

However, Macaulay wrote the speech to allow their party to sit in Commons and also he thought reforming the system a little they would 'perpetuate' it; they also wanted to break the alliance of middle and working class to get the support of the middle as Hill says the middle class know best.

Demand for reform was stated because counties were either over or under represented e.g Old Sarum had handful of people but only 2 MPs this was seen as unjust and there was a demand for change.

**Principal Examiner's Comments**

*This is a level 2 response. There is a general understanding of both similarity and difference. However, treatment of Source B is very limited and hence differences have not been fully drawn out. The response has been poorly structured with knowledge included often for its own sake. There is excessive paraphrasing of Source A without a direct and sustained comparison with Source B. Level 2 – 10 marks.*

**Candidate 3**

- 1 (b) How far did the Whigs' desire to protect propertied interests shape the terms of the 1832 Reform Act? (24 marks)

The extent to which the Whigs desire to protect terms of the 1832 reforms is debateable. The Whigs and the Tories were opposing political party and were on the rise in 1830 Britain due to downfall of Tories due to their split over Roman Catholic emancipation. The 1832 reform extended suffrage to the middle class, who were growing in size, power and money. The Propertied is another word for the upper class of Britain, those who owned substantial plots of land or property.

One example of the Whigs desire to protect propertied interest in the 1832 reform was by only extending suffrage to the middle class. This extension of suffrage meant that revolution in theory was diverted, thus protecting the propertied classes as no more reform would have to be made to appease the general public and thus protecting their way of life and role in politics in Great Britain. The middle class were growing in size and wanted this reflected in representation and their franchisement. Source A reflect this, 'I oppose universal suffrage but support the bill before us'. This seemed acceptable as they were intellectual and had property, and Tories did not fear they would ruin the electoral system like the working class may. Therefore, we can see by only extending suffrage to the middle class the propertied interests were protected as it stopped any further reform and pleased the middle class who were increasing in power. Another example of how the 1832 reform act allowed the Whigs to protected the propertied interest was by introducing a £10 pound voting qualification law in the 1832 reform act. This in effect meant you had to have ten pounds in order to vote. This protected the propertied class as it was basically a way of only allowing middle class to be able to vote, as the working class could not afford this. Therefore their interest were protected as it meant the working class could not vote and where therefore not associated with the propertied class. It also diverted revolution as it essentially split the alliance created by Attwood between the working and middle class in their efforts to achieve suffrage. The ten pound qualifacation allowed the middle class to vote, they therefore no longer needed to campaign and left the working class, and without the financial support of the middle class the working class could no longer campaign. Therefore, we can see that the 10 qualification stopped the working class being given the vote and also split up the alliance, this benefited the propertied class as it only allowed the middle class to vote, and they could be trusted, but it also diverted revolution that was destroyed the alliance of the middle and working class meaning there was no longer a threat of revolution. Source C shows us Grey's intension, 'principle of my reform is to prevent the necessity of revolution'. One more example of how the Whigs protected the propertied class in the 1832 reforms was by keeping the open ballot. This essentially let corruption continue in small boroughs and counties. It let lords and large landowners, who where the propertied class, blackmail people into voting, therefore protecting them as it allowed them to choose who represented them. The historian Murphy tells us that by allowing the lords of rural areas to keep their control over tenants by keeping open ballet appeased the lords to the extension of suffrage to the middle class, by still allowing them a degree of control over their workers the Lords where still happy.

There are however, also arguments suggesting that the Whigs did not desire to protect the the propertied. One argument is that by allowing extending of suffrage to the middle class, the Whigs essentially paved the way for universal suffrage in the UK. By showing that reforms could be made and that the government was

more powerful than the House of Lords and the Monarch as long as the Commons supported them, meant that reforms were not as difficult as they were once perceived to be. Another argument that the Whigs 1832 reforms were not just aimed at protecting the propertied was that it got rid of countless corrupt 'rotten boroughs' and extend representation further north, as this was where wealth of country was coming from due to industry. This therefore shows that the Whigs were not only looking out for the upper classes, they wanted to make a fairer electoral system for all. By giving representation to cities such as Birmingham which was growing city but pre reform had no representation. Also by changing amount of MPs in certain boroughs and counties dependent on population made the electing MPs fairer and proportionate. However, one of the main causes the Whigs fought for, the reform act, was to achieve political stability and stop revolution so that injury and cost of damage and cost to political and social structure of GB was not damaged. Source C tells us that to Earl Grey (Whig Leader) 'moderate reform only way to secure route to political stability'. Another key argument against the Whigs shaping reform to benefit upper class was that the whole reforms point was to extend suffrage to the middle class, due to the rise in wealth and power they deserved representation and suffrage, and this was what drove the Whigs.

In conclusion we can see that the Whigs main intention was prevent the necessity for revolution. They wanted to safeguard the privileges of the upper classes, but this was second priority to keeping revolution at bay. By giving the middle class the vote it split the alliance between the working and middle class, thus averting the revolution and also causing the smallest amount of reform possible. The Historian Smith tells us that the primary role of the reforms was to prevent revolution, but also to safeguard the privileges of the upper class.

### **Principal Examiner's Comments**

*This is a level 5 response. A clear focus on the question is provided and there is explicit understanding of the issues and of the demands of the question. Sources have been integrated into the answer and have been used to advance the main arguments. Two sources have been cited specifically and a third implicitly. The response keeps the question firmly and securely in its sights and sustained line of argument is completed by an informed judgement. Level 5 – 22 marks.*

### **Candidate 4**

- 1 (b) How far did the Whigs' desire to protect propertied interests shape the terms of the 1832 Reform Act? (24 marks)

The Whig's desire to protect propertied interests shaped the terms of the 1832 Reform Act to a significant degree.

It is evident by the attempt to keep the educated landowners in control that the whigs were greatly concerned with this preservation. This led to the property qualifications set by the Great Reform Act to prohibit those of no property from standing in parliament or becoming an MP. It was greatly feared that those of intelligence and land were being pushed out of parliament despite their knowledge and ability to preserve peace and prevent revolution. Middle classes and the aristocracy feared that without such qualifications set by the Reform Act, the uneducated would gain power and attempt revolution, ignoring the middle classes. As stated in source A "I do not believe that in a country like this, the happiness of the people can be promoted by a form of government in which the middle classes



place no confidence”.

On the otherhand, the views presented in source C differ from this, in which Grey states “The principle of my reform is to prevent the necessity for revolution.” This implies that it was not mainly to desire to protect propertied interest that shaped the terms of the 1832 Reform Act but the desire to prevent revolution, which radicals believed was necessary; “Ills and evils of the country will only be resolved through a thorough reform of Parliament” as stated in source B.

To contradict this however, source C states that the Whigs “strengthened [aristocratic government] by attaching to the existing constitution the new forms of propertied interests.” Implying that the maintenance of power of those of property was the priority. To conclude, the Whig desire to protect propertied interests shaped the terms of the 1832 Reform Act to a significant degree, however the desire to prevent revolution must also be taken into consideration. A combination of the two factors were greatly influential and connected as “If these men are shut out of power they will turn to revolution”, as stated by source A.

### **Principal Examiner’s Comments**

*A level 2 response. There are some explicit links but this is not sustained throughout the answer. However, material offered is confined to the source and doesn’t develop beyond an explanation of motives. This lacks balance because it does not link motives to the terms of the 1832 Act as demanded by the question. Level 2 – 10 marks.*

### **Candidate 5**

- 3 (a) Explain why the Estates-General became the National Assembly in the months May-June 1789. (12 marks)

The Estates-General became the National Assembly in the months May-June 1789 mainly because the Third Estate (who was made up of everybody below the clergy and nobility) were unhappy that the First and Second Estates could outvote them as each estate got 1 vote each rather than every person getting a vote, and they wanted change.

King Louis had demanded that the Estates split and meet separately from now on. The third estate were unhappy because of the voting system and demanded that the clergy and nobility join them. Louis disagreed. The Third Estate then gave the other estates an ultimatum, either they join the Third Estate, or the Third Estate would start the work of the Estates-general without them. Louis was furious and demanded a meeting of his people. The clergy decided to join the Third Estate and the planned to meet the next day. However, Louis men were already there so they had to take refuge somewhere else, which was a tennis court. They made the Tennis Court oath on the 21<sup>st</sup> June 1789, which agreed that they would carry on meeting until everyone joined them in the Estates general. Louis feared a big scale revolution and backed down. The estates joined and became known as the National Assembly.

### **Principal Examiner’s Comments**

*This is a level three response because it offers a range of relevant factors, such as voting procedure, the attitude of the King and the role of the Third Estate.*

*However, though pertinent to the question, there is limited supporting details, explanation and precision. In places, the response leans too greatly towards a narrative rather than sustaining its focus on the factors of change. Level 3 – 8 marks.*

### Candidate 6

- 2 (b) 'At the Philadelphia Convention of 1787 the Founding Fathers were mainly motivated by the desire to create a democratic system of national government.' Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

It could be said that the Founding Fathers were motivated by the desire to create a democratic system of government. The Founding Fathers were all greatly influenced by great philosophers such as John Locke and many others who often believed that democracy was extremely important. They had already shown in the Declaration of Independence that 'men are created equal' and discussed 'inalienable rights' showing that they believed that everyone should have a say in the government therefore meaning they were influenced to create a democratic system.

Another factor showing that they desired to create a system of democracy is shown through the constitution they agreed on. Based on Roger Sherman's Connecticut plan the new system of government was democratic in many ways therefore suggesting they were motivated to produce a democratic system. The 'separation of powers' of the legislature, judiciary and executive and the checks and balances between the three show the system was democratic. For example the president had a veto but this could be overturned by a two-thirds majority in Congress showing the government was not tyrannical and has democratic features.

However it could be said that they were not mainly motivated by a desire to create a democratic system of government. Many, such as the historian Charles Beard, claim that the founding fathers produced a constitution at the Philadelphia Convention that was an 'stitch-up' to protect their interests. Therefore as they were mainly trying to help themselves rather than the country as a whole they were not democratic. Much of the system created also shows traits that are clearly not democratic showing they were not mainly motivated by this. The Electorate College can put a President into power against the will of the majority showing democracy was not in place.

Another factor suggesting democracy was not their main motivation was their push towards a stronger national government. The Virginia Plan proposed by James Madison suggested a bicameral congress with voting by population rather than being equal. This would mean that states like Madison's Virginia would be able to impose themselves over smaller states such as Rhode Island or Delaware. This shows more resemblance to tyranny than democracy (such as equal voting regardless of population) showing they were not mainly motivated by creating a democratic system.

The founding fathers such as James Madison, Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin had seen the Articles of Confederation fail first hand meaning that instead of wanting a democratic system they wanted a way of ensuring the states did not weaken. Many of the states had began quarrelling and the removal of the British as a trading partner had lead to economic depression setting in. Therefore the

founding fathers were motivated to create a system of government to allow the states to prosper rather than being democratic.

In conclusion the founding fathers were not mainly motivated by the desire to create a democratic system of government although it was taken into account to an extent. After the debacle of Shay's Rebellion, where Daniel Shays a revolutionary war officer from Massachusetts and a group of over taxed farmers tried to seize the arsenal at Springfield, the founding fathers were anxious to think what could have happened to the country if the rebellion had been successful. Therefore the Founding Fathers were mainly motivated by the desire to push for a strong national government, at the expense of democracy if necessary to ensure that the country did not descend into mob rule and that the people were part of America first, then the individual states.

***Principal Examiner's Comments***

*This is a very secure level four response that targets the demands of the question explicitly and with appropriate supporting detail. A balanced argument is achieved. Though treatment has not been fully developed, there is an appropriate range of factors, but these are not fully explained. Level 4 – 19 marks.*