Question 5

Analyze major factors that caused people to move from the countryside to cities in Europe during the 1800s.

9–8 Points
• Thesis is explicit and explains multiple factors, both those that push people from the countryside and those that attract people to the cities in Europe.
• Organization is clear, consistently followed, and effective in support of the argument, employing strong and explicit linkage between factors and migration.
• Essay is well balanced; all major topics suggested by the prompt are covered at some length. May address the differences between earlier and later 1800s, or between eastern and western Europe. (Most essays concentrate on Great Britain.)
• All major assertions in the essay are supported by multiple pieces of relevant evidence. Will address both agrarian factors and industrial factors leading to migration and urbanization.
• May contain errors that do not detract from the argument or some information that is off task.

7–6 Points
• Thesis is explicit and explains multiple factors that caused people to move from the countryside to cities in Europe.
• Organization is clear, effective in support of the argument, but not consistently followed, employs explicit linkage between factors and migration.
• Essay is balanced; all major topics suggested by the prompt are covered at least briefly. Addresses both agrarian factors and industrial factors leading to migration and urbanization, but one may be addressed more thoroughly.
• All major assertions in the essay are supported by at least one piece of relevant evidence.
• May contain an error that detracts from the argument or information that is off task.

5–4 Points
• Thesis is explicit, but not always fully responsive to the question. May mention factors that caused people to move from the countryside OR to move to cities in Europe, or both.
• Organization is clear, effective in support of the argument, but not consistently followed. Linkage may not be well developed.
• Essay shows some imbalance; some major topics suggested by the prompt are neglected. May lean more heavily toward why people left the countryside or why they were drawn to the cities.
• Most of the major assertions in the essay are supported by at least one piece of relevant evidence.
• May contain a few errors that detract from the argument and information that is off task.

3–2 Points
• No explicit thesis or a thesis that merely repeats or paraphrases the prompt.
• Organization is unclear and ineffective, may be repetitious. Linkage may be suggested or implied. Generalizations (“the Industrial Revolution”) may be given as factors, but not linked to migration.
• Essay shows serious imbalance; most major topics suggested by the prompt are neglected. May mention factors and not support them with evidence or develop them in the essay.
• Only one major assertion is supported by evidence, which may be off task.
• May contain several errors that detract from the argument OR information that is off task, or both.
Question 5 (continued)

1–0 Points

- No discernible attempt at a thesis.
- No discernible organization, with little or no linkage to migration from countryside to city.
- One or none of the major topics suggested by the prompt is mentioned.
- Little or no supporting evidence used.
- May contain numerous errors that detract from the argument, OR may be entirely off task, or both.
Question 5 (continued)

Historical Background

The factors discussed in the essays may include:

Agricultural Revolution and agricultural changes

- Crop rotation and nitrogen-rich crops – clover, peas, beans, grasses, turnips (potatoes widely consumed by 1700s) allowed for more livestock grazing, meaning more meat and more manure as fertilizer.
- Scientific farming and new technology – Jethro Tull’s seed drill, 1701; Charles “Turnip” Townsend (1730s) field rotation and turnips; selective breeding by Robert Bakewell (1780s) and Thomas Coke (1790s) finer wool in sheep, bigger oxen; stronger horses; cast-iron plow in use by 1730.
- Enclosure movement and Enclosure Acts (mostly 1750 – 1860) – End of open field system; benefitted large landowners; land reclamation came from drainage of wetlands, accumulation of commons.
- Small farmers forced to be wage laborers (described in some texts as proletarianization) or tenant farmers. Increase of landless peasants in France, Spain, Germany, Sweden, Ireland.
- Farms become more productive. British agricultural output increased 43 percent in 1700s; required fewer workers and couldn’t support the number of rural laborers.
- Population expands: Better nutrition, decline in death rates, also some increase in birth rates; fewer plagues, but also more food; English population increased 50 percent between 1750 and 1800.
- Unique to England (and Low Countries), situation in most of Europe different. New agriculture techniques spread slowly to the rest of Western Europe, but most still lived on subsistence plots and had little surplus production. Eastern Europe – many peasants forced back into serfdom, especially Prussia, Poland, Ukraine; however, serfdom abolished in Austrian Empire in 1848, and Russia in 1861.

First Industrial Revolution

- Rural poor move to cities for industrial jobs; end of cottage industry, putting-out system.
- Textile inventions: Kay’s flying shuttle (1733); Hargreaves’ spinning jenny (1760); Arkwright’s water frame (1769) – by 1790s cotton yarn production grew 10 times, and by 19th century all cotton spinning was concentrated in large-scale factories and first steam engine introduced in Nottingham in 1790; Crompton’s spinning mule and Whitney’s cotton gin (1790) and Cartwright’s power loom (1800). By 1820, cotton cloth made up almost half of British exports; by 1830, mechanized cotton accounted for 22 percent of country’s entire industrial production.
- Steam inventions – Newcomen engine (1702); James Watt’s and Matthew Boulton’s steam engines (1760s); by 1780s it was a practical and commercial success in Britain; Henry Cort’s puddling furnace (1780s) leads to rolling mills for iron production.
- Early factories – single workspace replaced widespread home-based manufacture; employed entire families initially; relied on unskilled or semi-skilled labor; discipline, regulated time maximized production; work repetitive and boring, sometimes dangerous; pay was regular.
Second Industrial Revolution

- New inventions in medicine, electrical machinery, chemicals, weapons, large-scale commercial food canning created jobs in cities; department and catalogue stores needed workers; white-collar and clerical jobs expanded the urban population (clerks for banks, railroads, insurance companies, etc.).

- Later factories quickly grew as cottage industries declined; artisans and cottage industries replaced by machines; machine tools introduced in greater numbers beginning in 1840s; Henry Cort – puddling furnace 1780s and steam powered rolling mills. In 1740s iron production was 17,000 tons; in 1806, 260,000 tons; in 1844, 3 million tons. Once expensive, iron became cheap, indispensible building block of economy. Bessemer process (1850s) led to large-scale production of steel.

- Jobs for men, women, and children, but after 1830s divided by sex and no longer sharing the same working hours; stable wages.

Advances in transportation

- Railroads – provided jobs for rural populations who built them; workers needed for operations, maintenance, management as well; Ease of transportation – George Stephenson and The Rocket (1829), Liverpool and Manchester Railway; reduced costs and uncertainty of shipping freight promoted growth of large factories as well as cities; encouraged by governments – 1835 British Parliament passed acts to establish 750 miles of track. By 1852, there were more than 7,500 miles of track. Belgium sponsored unified railway network in 1830s; Prussia guaranteed interest and principal on RR bonds.

Urbanization

- Growth of cities 1750-1900 – Began in England in 1770s and 1780s in textile manufacturing and spread rapidly on the Continent in the 1830s and 1840s. Less than 8 percent of English population in agriculture by 1900; over 50 percent of English population lived in cities by 1850 (Manchester 25,000 in 1772; 455,000 in 1851).

- Death rates were higher than birth rates in most large cities in first half of 19th century, so population grew because of influx of people from the countryside.

- Major cities and commercial hubs no longer needed to be near water because of steam engine.

- Poor living conditions – tenements, unsanitary, open drains; Dickens’ novels (e.g., Hard Times) mention coal dust, factory smoke, workhouse conditions (Oliver Twist).
Reforms, Policy Concerns, Economic Theories

- The Poor Laws (1834) created workhouses, reduced costs to communities; the Sadler Commission (1832) documented working conditions for women and children in textile mills; The Factory Act of 1833 and the Mines Act of 1842 regulated hours and conditions for women and children; Edwin Chadwick’s “Report on the Sanitary Condition of the Laboring Population of Britain” (1842) led to campaigns and legislation against cholera, prostitution, crime e.g., the Public Health Act (1848); the Vaccination Act (1853); the Contagious Diseases Act (1864).

- Adam Smith’s *Wealth of Nations* contributed to laissez faire economics; Thomas Malthus’s work argued that overpopulation would lead to poverty; David Ricardo’s “Iron law of wages” postulated that wages would always sink to the subsistence level.

Urban Reform and Improvements

- Urban reform programs in Vienna, Rome, Paris, London, and Berlin drew people with parks, widened streets, museums, city halls, opera houses, public gardens, and leisure time organized activities; Georges Hausmann’s rebuilding of Paris created boulevards, green spaces, wiping out slums; civic pride drew people who liked the excitement of the city – Crystal Palace in London (1851); electric streetcars in 1890s.

- Government projects to modernize sewer and sanitary systems; sewers in London, Paris, Vienna; London and Riga (then in Russia) piped in fresh drinking water.
The 1800s were a time of great change that saw the population movement from the countryside to cities. This population movement was the result of technological advances, agricultural revolution, and changing social environments that pushed the lower levels of society towards cities to find prosperity.

Near Early in the century places such as Great Britain experienced an Agricultural Revolution where agriculture was changed to produce more food with less resources. This came as a result of the enclosure acts that privatized land and encouraged development. Along with changes in technology such as Jethro Tull that introduced scientific farming. As well as the invention of the steel plow and crop rotation system. These changes caused an Agricultural Revolution that allowed more food to be produced with less. Therefore, more food was available for a boom in population in the cities but also people were freed from farming since it was more efficient so there was an opportunity to move to cities.

The most important factor for this move to cities was the Second Industrial Revolution that modernized industry and offered jobs in the city that freed up farmers could now
The Bessemer Process was a process that allowed for the creation of better steel. This started a new market for steel products that required workers to make, but as these were industries, they were in cities. So as a result, people flocked to cities. With steel, there were new markets for ships, weapon and domestic products. These new jobs attracted people into cities.

In addition, new markets opened up for the entire family to work such as in textiles but also children could find employment. In times when there was economic trouble, people moved to cities as most jobs were concentrated there due to thriving industries of the Industrial Revolution. This can be seen in books by Charles Dickens showing the population contained and attracted by cities because there was no other employment.

Due to technological advances, transportation improved by land and sea. By land people could travel greater distances by train, so the wealthy who could afford it lived outside of cities and commuted in. This left cheap housing in the cities so as a result the larger lower class crammed into the cheaper living thereby increasing the city population from the countryside.
Thomas Edison also discovered electricity thereby allowing for heavy machinery in cities but also new social experiences and light. With electricity even more industries sprung up resulting in more jobs that pulled people into cities. Along with improvements in water transport this created export cities that shipped goods and offered jobs.

Also within the cities due to electricity there was a new social scene during the night created by lights. This also attracted people from the countryside into cities who craved new experiences.

Lastly, due to new technology, more coal mining was allowed so instead of people moving to towns, coal mines initiated by technology had towns grow around them. With new technology mining increased opening up jobs for men and children which attracted people to work in cities. Examples of this include cities such as Manchester.

Some might argue that people moved to cities because of. Finally, due to more private property and ownership people rose into the middle class and were able to afford luxurious houses on the outskirts of cities.

Some might argue that this movement was caused
primarily by political reasons to engage in politics, but the truth is that most people were not able to participate greatly politically in many of these countries and that would only move a small part of the population. The enormous movement of people from the country to the cities was allowed by greater efficiency from the Agricultural Revolution, then technological advances attracted people socially but most importantly economically by new jobs created by the Second Industrial Revolution. All in all movement to urban centers is done by the lower classes of society who are ultimately motivated by employment.
During the 1800s, more and more of the farming and countryside communities found its members leaving to go to cities in Europe where in hopes of making a living for themselves. The factors that caused the migration of people were the push of the Agricultural Revolution and the pull of through new technology and techniques that reduced the amount of labor necessary to produce food, and the pull of the Industrial Revolution which offered jobs to those that had lost theirs in the countryside.

While the plow and 3-field system of farming had already been adopted by country folk and implemented, the seed drill was a new invention that mechanized the planting time period of the year. This new technology increased planting efficiency dramatically for farmers and allowed them to produce more crop and more goods to sell, creating more profit, and using that profit to produce more the next year. There was also a discovery that clovers and legumes put nitrogen back into the soil, allowing for fields to be re-formed and the crop to be more bountiful. This discovery facilitated the transition from the traditional 3-field system that involved an annual rotation between fields to a 2-field system in which crops could
be grown on one field and herd animals to graze on clovers and other plants on the other field, thus also fertilizing the soil through manure. This new farming technique made the production of goods from livestock and farming much more bountiful and efficient, allowing these new technologies and techniques of the nineteenth century allowed for one farmer in the countryside to produce much more than they had been able to in the 1700s, resulting in a surplus of food and a surplus of labor, since not as many farmers were needed to feed the nation.

The Industrial Revolution of the 1800s saw the creation of factories and new technologies that allowed for the production of more goods. The surplus labor force that was available in the countryside could now be used to work in the factories since more labor was needed since production of some products may have been done by artisans and craftsmen, which there were not enough of. The availability of work in the city attracted the unemployed workers from the countryside and brought them to the city.

Ultimately, the surplus labor force created by the Agricultural Revolution from new technologies and techniques was drawn to the availability of
jabs within the city from new techniques and technologies of production from the Agricultural Industrial Revolution.
The 1900s in Europe was a time of changing demographics. More and more, rural Europeans were packing up and moving to the cities for a number of reasons.

The first and most obvious reason would be new, better paying jobs. The majority of those moving into cities were poor and destitute with no chance for jobs or higher pay in the countryside. But in the cities they saw factory jobs that not only allowed them escape from the rural country, but also offered higher pay than in the country, which attracted many new people to live and work in the cities.

Another factor for movement in the city was a chance for education. Most times education was not common in the countryside, but in cities, there were colleges and universities that had a wealth of knowledge. And with this knowledge, those moving into these cities saw a chance to get ahead and maybe get involved in the government.

The final reason is one that gave those who moved the most hope, a chance to get out of poverty. According to the history of many countries, it has been seen that many of the countryside’s poor moved to the city because their life in the country was so bad.
Had picking up and moving to the city was a much better idea than staying in the countryside and continuing their poverty. The city, with its factories, jobs, higher pay, and education, gave those in poverty hope that moving to the city would break the cycle and allow them to finally succeed.
Question 5

Overview

The intent of this question was for students to analyze multiple (more than one) factors responsible for rural to urban migration in the 19th century. The question required analysis, meaning that students were expected to identify factors and place these factors in a proper historical context, explaining how and why the factors led to migration and urbanization. The question offered students the chance (but did not require them) to organize their responses by analyzing “push” factors (mostly related to the Agricultural Revolution and transformation in farm landholding patterns) and “pull” factors (mostly related to industrialization).

Sample: 5A
Score: 9

The essay offers a strong thesis, good organization, and multiple pieces of specific evidence. There are multiple layers of argument for each factor (technological advances, the Agricultural Revolution, and changing social environments) with good detail on each (Jethro Tull, scientific farming, crop rotation, the Bessemer process, family employment in textiles, etc.). The essay shows great analytical skills in connecting demographic, social, and technological factors to migration processes. The section on electricity and the “new social scene” puts migration in the larger context of social change in the late 19th century. The conclusion presents an incisive summary that offers an evaluation of the relative importance of several factors. The essay earned the maximum of 9 points.

Sample: 5B
Score: 6

The essay has a strong thesis that identifies both “push” and “pull” factors (the Agricultural Revolution reducing the need for farm labor and the jobs offered by the Industrial Revolution in the cities, respectively). The evidence on changes in farming techniques and technologies (seed drills, clovers and legumes, implementation of crop rotation, fertilization, etc.) and their effects on migration is very detailed. By contrast, the evidence on the Industrial Revolution and its links to rural-to-urban migration is much less specific. This creates a considerable imbalance, which, together with a weak conclusion, prevented the essay from earning a score higher than 6 points.

Sample: 5C
Score: 2

The attempted thesis merely restates the prompt. There are three attempts to identify factors (availability of factory jobs, educational opportunities in cities, and desire to escape from an impoverished countryside), but there is little specific evidence linking these factors to actual migration processes. The discussion of educational opportunities in the cities as drivers of migration is incorrect. The essay earned 2 points because its discussion of factory jobs in the cities was broadly on task, and it was clearly organized.