Teacher source review

- Structured evidence and marked quotations in teacher answers and notes are checked against supplied text, not independently authenticated. Unmarked paraphrases and interpretations still require review. Some source text was generated by the model; verify its wording, attribution, and factual claims before teaching.

Global History: Industrial Revolution — Unit Test

Teacher	Educator
School	ULAT Partner
Date	October 30, 2026
Duration	45 min
Grade Level	Global History, Grade 10
Instructional Model	Gradual Release
SEL Focus	None

Section 1: 10-Component Plan

1. Title

Global History: Industrial Revolution — Unit Test

2. Standards

- **CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RH.9-10.1:** Cite specific textual evidence to support analysis of primary and secondary sources, attending to such features as the date and origin of the information.
- **CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RH.9-10.2:** Determine the central ideas or information of a primary or secondary source; provide an accurate summary of how key events or ideas develop over the course of the text.
- **CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.WHST.9-10.2:** Write informative/explanatory texts, including the narration of historical events, scientific procedures/experiments, or technical processes.

3. SEL Inquiry Aim

How did the Industrial Revolution change the daily lives of ordinary people, and who was responsible for improving those conditions?

4. Objectives

- Analyze primary and secondary sources to describe factory conditions, urban living conditions, and reform efforts during the Industrial Revolution.
- Evaluate the purpose and limits of early reform legislation such as the Factory Act of 1833.
- Construct a short written response that uses specific evidence from the provided sources to explain causes and effects of industrialization.

5. Vocabulary Bridge

English Term	Definition (English)
industrialization	The shift from handcrafted goods made in homes to machine-made goods produced in large factories.
urbanization	The movement of large numbers of people from rural areas into cities.
textile mill	A factory where cloth and fabric are manufactured using machines.
reform	A change made to a law or system in order to improve conditions or correct a problem.
legislation	Laws made by a government or lawmaking body.
mortality rate	The number of deaths in a population during a given period, often expressed per group of people.
testimony	A formal statement given by a witness, often to a committee or court.

6. Materials

- Shared Source Set: Source 1 (Paraphrased Factory Worker Testimony, 1830s), Source 2 (Engels excerpt, 1845), Source 3 (Factory Act of 1833 summary)
- Unit Test booklet (one per student)
- Master Answer Key and Scoring Guide (teacher copy only)
- Packet A: guided sentence frames and word bank for short responses
- Packet B: core practice version of the test
- Packet C: extension and synthesis version of the test
- Scratch paper and pencils

7. Lesson Flow

0-5 min

Teacher: Distribute the unit test booklet and shared source set. Read the directions aloud, remind students that the three sources may be used for the short responses, and point out the word bank and sentence frames available in Packet A. Clarify that no outside quotations are required and that answers should be based on the sources and class learning.

Students: Arrange materials, preview the test sections, and ask clarifying questions about directions only.

Key Questions:

- Which sources will you use to support your short responses?
- What should you do if you are unsure how to begin a short response?

5-35 min

Teacher: Monitor students as they complete the six multiple-choice questions and two short-response questions independently. Offer language-access supports such as rereading directions, pointing to the word bank, or restating a question in simpler terms without supplying answers. Note students who need extended time.

Students: Complete the six multiple-choice items and the two short-response items, using the shared sources and available supports.

Key Questions:

- Which detail from the source best supports your answer?
- How will you explain the connection between industrialization and urbanization in your short response?

35-45 min

Teacher: Collect test booklets and administer the shared assessment question as the closing task. Read the question aloud and remind students to answer in complete thoughts using evidence from the sources. Collect responses and confirm all booklets are returned.

Students: Write a short response to the shared assessment question, using at least one specific detail from the sources.

Key Questions:

- Which source detail will you use to support your answer?
- How does your answer connect working conditions to the idea of reform?

---

8. Differentiation Overview

- **ELL:** Provide Packet A with guided sentence frames and a word bank for the short responses; read directions aloud; allow students to restate questions in their own words before answering; permit use of the shared source set throughout.
- **IEP:** Provide extended time, a quiet testing space if available, and the option to mark answers directly in the booklet; chunk the test into multiple-choice first and short responses second; check for understanding of directions before starting.
- **Advanced:** Provide Packet C, which offers extension and synthesis prompts asking students to connect the Factory Act of 1833 to broader questions about who is responsible for protecting workers.
- **Struggling:** Provide Packet A or B based on need; preview the vocabulary bridge terms; encourage students to annotate the sources and underline evidence before writing short responses.

9. Assessment Plan

Formative: Teacher observation during testing, checks that students are using the shared sources, and review of annotated source sets to confirm students are locating relevant evidence.

Summative: Unit test scored with the master answer key and scoring guide: six multiple-choice items worth 2 points each (12 points) and two short-response items worth 9 points each (18 points), for a total of 30 points, plus the shared assessment exit question scored separately using the success criteria.

10. Assessment

Using at least one specific detail from the sources, explain one way the Industrial Revolution changed working conditions and one way reformers tried to respond to those changes.

Success Criteria:

- Names one specific change in working conditions described in the sources.
- Names one specific reform or response described in the sources.
- Uses at least one detail or example from the provided sources to support the explanation.

Section 2: Global Context

This section is the summative unit test for the Industrial Revolution unit, designed to assess students' ability to analyze primary and secondary sources on factories, urbanization, working conditions, and reform. Students will independently complete six multiple-choice questions and two short-response questions using the shared source set: Source 1 (paraphrased factory worker testimony, 1830s), Source 2 (Engels excerpt, 1845), and Source 3 (Factory Act of 1833 summary). The test is culturally responsive by centering the experiences of ordinary workers, including children, and by inviting students to evaluate who bears responsibility for improving labor conditions—a question that resonates with contemporary debates about workers' rights and government regulation. To support language access without revealing assessed answers, students may use Packet A, which provides guided sentence frames and a word bank for the short responses; directions will be read aloud, and students may restate questions in their own words. The

teacher will monitor and offer supports such as rereading directions or pointing to the word bank, but will not supply answers. The multiple-choice items are worth 2 points each (12 points total), and the two short-response items are worth 9 points each (18 points total), for a test total of 30 points. A separate master answer key with explanations and scoring guidance is provided for teacher use only. The problem this lesson solves is: how can we fairly and accurately measure students' source-analysis and evidence-based writing skills on industrialization while providing necessary language supports and maintaining test security?

Hook: When children as young as six worked fourteen-hour days in textile mills, who should be held responsible for protecting them—the factory owners, the government, or the workers themselves?

Section 3: Differentiated Packets

Source Documents

Testimony of a Factory Worker (Paraphrased) (Paraphrased from testimony given to a British parliamentary committee, 1830s)

> *The witness stated that children as young as six were employed in the mill. They worked from five in the morning until eight at night, with a one-hour break for dinner. The witness reported that the children were often beaten to keep them awake at their machines. The air in the factory was thick with cotton dust, and many workers developed coughs and lung problems. The witness said that the owners cared only for profit and not for the health of the workers.*

The Conditions of the Working Class in England (Excerpt) (Friedrich Engels, 1845)

> *The streets are usually unpaved, full of holes, filthy and strewn with refuse. The atmosphere is polluted by the stench of the gutters and the smoke from the chimneys. The houses are crowded together, and the rooms are small and poorly ventilated. In many cases, whole families live in a single room. The workers are poorly clothed and fed, and disease is rampant. The mortality rate among the poor is far higher than among the wealthy.*

The Factory Act of 1833 (Summary) (British Parliament, 1833)

> *This act made it illegal to employ children under the age of nine in textile factories. Children between nine and thirteen were limited to nine hours of work per day and forty-eight hours per week. They were also required to receive two hours of schooling each day. Factory inspectors were appointed to enforce the law. The act applied only to textile mills, not to other*

> *industries.*

Packet A

Word Bank: industrialization, urbanization, textile mill, reform, legislation, mortality rate, testimony

Question 1. Which detail from Source 1 best shows that factory owners cared more about profit than workers' health?
↳ *Refer to: source_1*

- The detail I choose is _____.
- This detail shows owners cared about profit because _____.
- It shows they did not care about health because _____.
- So the best answer is _____.

Answer: The correct answer is the detail that children were beaten to keep them awake at their machines. This shows owners cared about profit because they wanted machines running, not children resting. It shows they did not care about health because beating children is harmful. So the best answer is the option describing children being beaten to stay awake. “the children were often beaten to keep them awake at their machines” (source_1)

Supporting source evidence:

- “the children were often beaten to keep them awake at their machines” (Testimony of a Factory Worker (Paraphrased) [source_1])

Common error: students may pick the long hours detail, but the beating detail more directly shows disregard for children's well-being. Accept any answer that cites a specific detail and explains the profit-over-health connection.

Question 2. According to Source 2, which problem was common in working-class city neighborhoods?
↳ Refer to: source_2

- Source 2 says the streets were _____.
- It also says the houses were _____.
- This means the neighborhood was _____.
- So the correct answer is _____.

Answer: The correct answer is that streets were filthy and strewn with refuse. Source 2 describes unpaved streets full of holes and refuse, crowded houses, and poor ventilation. This means the neighborhood was unhealthy and dirty. So the correct answer is the option about filthy streets and crowded housing. “The streets are usually unpaved, full of holes, filthy and strewn with refuse.” (source_2)

Supporting source evidence:

- “The streets are usually unpaved, full of holes, filthy and strewn with refuse.” (The Conditions of the Working Class in England (Excerpt) [source_2])

Common error: students may choose an answer about factories, but Source 2 focuses on city living conditions, not factory interiors.

Question 3. What was one major limit of the Factory Act of 1833, according to Source 3?
↳ Refer to: source_3

- The act applied only to _____.
- It did not apply to _____.
- This is a limit because _____.
- So the correct answer is _____.

Answer: The correct answer is that the act applied only to textile mills, not to other industries. Source 3 states the act applied only to textile mills. This is a limit because workers in other industries were not protected. So the correct answer is the option about the law covering only textile mills. “The act applied only to textile mills, not to other industries.” (source_3)

Supporting source evidence:

- “The act applied only to textile mills, not to other industries.” (The Factory Act of 1833 (Summary) [source_3])

Common error: students may think the act covered all factories, but Source 3 explicitly limits it to textile mills.

Question 4. Which pair of details from Sources 1 and 3 best shows a problem and a reform response?
↳ *Refer to: source_1*

- One problem from Source 1 is _____.
- One reform from Source 3 is _____.
- These connect because _____.
- So the best pair is _____.

Answer: The correct answer pairs the problem of young children working long hours with the reform of limiting hours for children aged nine to thirteen. Source 1 describes children working from five in the morning until eight at night. Source 3 limits children aged nine to thirteen to nine hours per day. These connect because the law tried to fix the long-hours problem. So the best pair is the option linking long hours to the nine-hour limit. “They worked from five in the morning until eight at night” (source_1)“Children between nine and thirteen were limited to nine hours of work per day” (source_3)

Supporting source evidence:

- “They worked from five in the morning until eight at night” (Testimony of a Factory Worker (Paraphrased) [source_1])
- “Children between nine and thirteen were limited to nine hours of work per day” (The Factory Act of 1833 (Summary) [source_3])

Common error: students may pick two problems instead of one problem and one reform. The question asks for a problem-reform pair.

Question 5. Which statement best explains how industrialization contributed to urbanization?

- Industrialization created many _____.
- People moved to cities to _____.
- This is called _____.
- So the best explanation is _____.

Answer: The correct answer is that factory jobs drew large numbers of people from rural areas into cities. Industrialization created many factory jobs in cities. People moved to cities to work in those factories. This movement is called urbanization. So the best explanation is the option about factory jobs attracting people to cities.

Common error: students may confuse urbanization with industrialization. Urbanization is the movement to cities; industrialization is the growth of machine production.

Question 6. Which pair of details from Sources 1 and 2 best shows how industrialization affected ordinary people's daily lives?
↳ Refer to: source_1

- From Source 1, daily life included _____.
- From Source 2, daily life included _____.
- Together these show _____.
- So the best pair is _____.

Answer: The correct answer pairs the long factory hours from Source 1 with the crowded, unhealthy housing from Source 2. Source 1 describes children working from five in the morning until eight at night. Source 2 describes whole families living in a single room. Together these show that ordinary people faced long workdays and poor living conditions. So the best pair is the option linking long hours to crowded housing. “They worked from five in the morning until eight at night” (source_1)“In many cases, whole families live in a single room.” (source_2)

Supporting source evidence:

- “They worked from five in the morning until eight at night” (Testimony of a Factory Worker (Paraphrased) [source_1])
- “In many cases, whole families live in a single room.” (The Conditions of the Working Class in England (Excerpt) [source_2])

Common error: students may choose two details from the same source. The question asks for one detail from each source.

Question 7. Short Response: Using Source 1, describe two working conditions for children in the textile mill and explain why reformers wanted to change them. (9 points)
↳ Refer to: source_1

- One working condition from Source 1 was _____.
- A second working condition was _____.
- Reformers wanted to change these because _____.
- This shows the need for reform because _____.

Claim-Evidence-Reasoning

Claim	Evidence	Reasoning

Answer: A complete response names two conditions from Source 1 and explains why reformers wanted change. Sample response: One condition was that children as young as six worked from five in the morning until eight at night. Another was that children were often beaten to keep them awake at their machines. Reformers wanted to change these because long hours and beatings harmed children's health and safety. This shows the need for reform because the testimony describes treatment that no child should endure. “children as young as six were employed in the mill” (source_1)“the children were often beaten to keep them awake at their machines” (source_1)

Supporting source evidence:

- “children as young as six were employed in the mill” (Testimony of a Factory Worker (Paraphrased) [source_1])
- “the children were often beaten to keep them awake at their machines” (Testimony of a Factory Worker (Paraphrased) [source_1])

Scoring guide (9 points): 3 points for each accurately described condition from Source 1 (up to 6 points); 3 points for a clear explanation of why reformers wanted change. Common error: students may list conditions without explaining the reformer's reason. Accept any two conditions explicitly stated in Source 1.

Question 8. Short Response: Using Source 2, describe two problems in working-class city neighborhoods and explain how those problems could lead to poor health. (9 points)
↳ Refer to: source_2

- One problem from Source 2 was _____.
- A second problem was _____.
- This could lead to poor health because _____.
- So the evidence shows _____.

Claim-Evidence-Reasoning

Claim	Evidence	Reasoning

Answer: A complete response names two problems from Source 2 and explains the link to poor health. Sample response: One problem was that streets were filthy and strewn with refuse. Another was that whole families lived in a single room with poor ventilation. These could lead to poor health because dirty streets and crowded rooms help disease spread. Source 2 also states that disease was rampant and the mortality rate among the poor was far higher than among the wealthy. So the evidence shows that unhealthy housing and streets harmed workers' health. “The streets are usually unpaved, full of holes, filthy and strewn with refuse.” (source_2)“In many cases, whole families live in a single room.” (source_2)“The mortality rate among the poor is far higher than among the wealthy.” (source_2)

Supporting source evidence:

- “The streets are usually unpaved, full of holes, filthy and strewn with refuse.” (The Conditions of the Working Class in England (Excerpt) [source_2])
- “In many cases, whole families live in a single room.” (The Conditions of the Working Class in England (Excerpt) [source_2])
- “The mortality rate among the poor is far higher than among the wealthy.” (The Conditions of the Working Class in England (Excerpt) [source_2])

Scoring guide (9 points): 3 points for each accurately described problem from Source 2 (up to 6 points); 3 points for a clear explanation linking the problems to poor health. Common error: students may describe problems without explaining the health connection. Accept any two problems explicitly stated in Source 2.

Packet B

Question 1. Which statement best describes the working hours of children in the mill according to the paraphrased factory worker testimony?
↳ *Refer to: source_1*

Answer: The testimony states that children worked from five in the morning until eight at night, with a one-hour break for dinner. This means they worked a very long day, from early morning to late evening, with only a short break. Therefore, the correct answer is the option that says children worked long hours from early morning until evening with only a one-hour break.

Supporting source evidence:

- “They worked from five in the morning until eight at night, with a one-hour break for dinner.” (Testimony of a Factory Worker (Paraphrased) [source_1])

Common error: choosing an option that says children worked short days or had many breaks. The source clearly describes a long workday with only one break.

Question 2. According to the excerpt from The Conditions of the Working Class in England, what was one effect of urbanization on workers' living conditions?
↳ *Refer to: source_2*

Answer: The excerpt describes crowded housing, small and poorly ventilated rooms, and whole families living in a single room. It also mentions that disease is rampant and the mortality rate among the poor is far higher than among the wealthy. Therefore, a correct answer is that urbanization led to overcrowded and unhealthy living conditions for workers.

Supporting source evidence:

- “The houses are crowded together, and the rooms are small and poorly ventilated. In many cases, whole families live in a single room.” (The Conditions of the Working Class in England (Excerpt) [source_2])

Common error: selecting an option that says workers lived in spacious, clean homes. The source emphasizes crowding, poor ventilation, and disease.

Question 3. Using source 3, explain the purpose of the Factory Act of 1833 and describe one limit of the law.
↳ *Refer to: source_3*

Answer: The Factory Act of 1833 was passed to improve conditions for child workers in textile factories. It made it illegal to employ children under nine, limited the hours of children aged nine to thirteen to nine hours per day and forty-eight hours per week, required two hours of schooling each day, and appointed factory inspectors to enforce the law. However, the act applied only to textile mills, not to other industries, so it did not protect children working in other types of factories. This is a significant limit because many children outside the textile industry remained unprotected.

Supporting source evidence:

- “The act applied only to textile mills, not to other industries.” (The Factory Act of 1833 (Summary) [source_3])

Common error: stating that the act covered all industries. The source explicitly says it applied only to textile mills. Another common error: forgetting to mention enforcement through inspectors.

Question 4. Compare the description of factory conditions in source 1 with the description of urban living conditions in source 2. What is one similarity between the two descriptions?
↳ *Refer to: source_1*

Answer: One similarity is that both sources describe unhealthy environments for workers. Source 1 mentions that the air in the factory was thick with cotton dust and that many workers developed coughs and lung problems. Source 2 describes polluted air from gutters and chimneys, crowded housing, and rampant disease. Both sources show that workers faced serious health hazards in their daily lives, whether at work or at home.

Supporting source evidence:

- “The air in the factory was thick with cotton dust, and many workers developed coughs and lung problems.” (Testimony of a Factory Worker (Paraphrased) [source_1])
- “The atmosphere is polluted by the stench of the gutters and the smoke from the chimneys.” (The Conditions of the Working Class in England (Excerpt) [source_2])

Common error: focusing only on differences (factory vs. home) and missing the shared theme of poor health conditions. A strong answer identifies a specific similarity, such as air pollution or disease, and supports it with details from both sources.

Question 5. Which of the following was a reform described in source 3 that addressed problems faced by child workers?
↳ Refer to: source_3

Answer: Source 3 states that children between nine and thirteen were required to receive two hours of schooling each day. This was a reform because it aimed to provide education to child workers, addressing the problem of children working long hours without schooling. Therefore, the correct answer is the option that mentions required daily schooling for children aged nine to thirteen.

Supporting source evidence:

- “They were also required to receive two hours of schooling each day.” (The Factory Act of 1833 (Summary) [source_3])

Common error: choosing an option that describes a working condition rather than a reform. The question asks for a reform, which is a change made to improve conditions.

Question 6. Based on source 1, what was one reason factory owners were criticized by the witness?
↳ Refer to: source_1

Answer: The witness said that the owners cared only for profit and not for the health of the workers. This criticism suggests that owners prioritized making money over the well-being of their employees, including children who were beaten and exposed to unhealthy conditions. Therefore, the correct answer is the option that says owners were criticized for caring only about profit and not workers' health.

Supporting source evidence:

- “The witness said that the owners cared only for profit and not for the health of the workers.” (Testimony of a Factory Worker (Paraphrased) [source_1])

Common error: selecting an option that says owners were praised for their concern. The source clearly states the opposite.

Question 7. Using source 1 and source 2, describe two ways the Industrial Revolution changed daily life for ordinary people. Support your answer with one detail from each source.
↳ Refer to: source_1

Answer: One way daily life changed was in working conditions. Source 1 describes children working very long hours, from five in the morning until eight at night, with only a one-hour break, and being beaten to stay awake. This shows that work became regimented and harsh, especially for children. Another way daily life changed was in living conditions. Source 2 describes crowded, poorly ventilated housing where whole families lived in a single room, and disease was rampant. This shows that urbanization led to overcrowded and unhealthy homes for workers. Together, these changes meant that ordinary people faced difficult conditions both at work and at home.

Supporting source evidence:

- “They worked from five in the morning until eight at night, with a one-hour break for dinner.” (Testimony of a Factory Worker (Paraphrased) [source_1])
- “In many cases, whole families live in a single room.” (The Conditions of the Working Class in England (Excerpt) [source_2])

Scoring guidance: 9 points total. 3 points for each clearly described change (working conditions and living conditions), and 3 points for using at least one specific detail from each source. Accept any reasonable description that is supported by the sources. Common error: describing only one change or using details from only one source.

Question 8. Using source 3, explain the purpose of the Factory Act of 1833 and evaluate one limit of the law. Use at least one specific detail from the source to support your answer.
↳ Refer to: source_3

Answer: The purpose of the Factory Act of 1833 was to regulate child labor in textile factories. It set a minimum age of nine for employment, limited the hours of children aged nine to thirteen to nine hours per day and forty-eight hours per week, required two hours of daily schooling, and created factory inspectors to enforce the law. One limit is that the act applied only to textile mills, not to other industries. This means that children working in other types of factories, such as mines or potteries, did not receive the same protections. Therefore, while the act was an important step, its impact was limited to a single industry.

Supporting source evidence:

- “The act applied only to textile mills, not to other industries.” (The Factory Act of 1833 (Summary) [source_3])

Scoring guidance: 9 points total. 3 points for explaining the purpose, 3 points for identifying and evaluating a limit, and 3 points for using at least one specific detail from the source. Accept any reasonable evaluation of the limit. Common error: stating that the act covered all industries or failing to explain why the limit matters.

Packet C

Question 1. Multiple choice (2 points). Analyze Sources 1 and 2 together. Which conclusion about industrial cities is best supported by combining the factory testimony with Engels's description of working-class neighborhoods?
↳ Refer to: source_1

Answer: The best answer is the option stating that poor working conditions inside factories and unhealthy living conditions in crowded cities reinforced each other, so workers faced danger at both work and home. Source 1 describes long hours, beatings, and lung problems from cotton dust “The air in the factory was thick with cotton dust, and many workers developed coughs and lung problems.” (source_1); Source 2 describes filthy streets, crowded single-room homes, and high death rates among the poor “In many cases, whole families live in a single room.” (source_2). Together they show that industrialization harmed workers in more than one setting, which is why reformers targeted both workplaces and cities. Distractors that focus on only one source, or that claim conditions improved automatically, are incomplete.

Supporting source evidence:

- “The air in the factory was thick with cotton dust, and many workers developed coughs and lung problems.” (Testimony of a Factory Worker (Paraphrased) [source_1])
- “In many cases, whole families live in a single room.” (The Conditions of the Working Class in England (Excerpt) [source_2])

Award 2 points for the synthesis option; 1 point if a student selects a single-source option but can explain the limitation. Common error: choosing an option that treats factory conditions and urban conditions as unrelated. Language-access support: allow students to restate each source in one sentence before choosing.

Question 2. Multiple choice (2 points). Evaluate the Factory Act of 1833 using Source 3. Which statement best evaluates both its purpose and its limits?
↳ Refer to: source_3

Answer: The best answer is the option stating that the act protected some child workers in textile mills by setting age and hour limits and adding inspectors, but it left many workers unprotected because it covered only textile mills and did not address adult hours or wages. Source 3 shows the age-nine minimum, the nine-hour and forty-eight-hour limits for children nine to thirteen, required schooling, and inspectors “Factory inspectors were appointed to enforce the law.” (source_3), but it also states the act applied only to textile mills “The act applied only to textile mills, not to other industries.” (source_3). A strong evaluation names both the reform and its boundary.

Supporting source evidence:

- “Factory inspectors were appointed to enforce the law.” (The Factory Act of 1833 (Summary) [source_3])
- “The act applied only to textile mills, not to other industries.” (The Factory Act of 1833 (Summary) [source_3])

Award 2 points for the option naming both protection and limitation; 1 point for an option naming only one side. Common error: assuming the act ended child labor everywhere. Exemplary responses connect the limited scope to the idea that reform was gradual.

Question 3. Multiple choice (2 points). Synthesize Sources 1 and 3. A historian argues that the Factory Act of 1833 was a direct response to the abuses described in worker testimony. Which evidence best supports this argument?
↳ *Refer to: source_1*

Answer: The best answer is the option pointing out that Source 1 describes very young children working extremely long days and being mistreated “They worked from five in the morning until eight at night, with a one-hour break for dinner.” (source_1), while Source 3 sets a minimum age and limits hours for young children “Children between nine and thirteen were limited to nine hours of work per day and forty-eight hours per week.” (source_3). That pairing shows legislation targeting the specific abuses reported. Options that cite only Engels, or that describe the act's limits without linking them to testimony, do not support the causal argument as directly.

Supporting source evidence:

- “They worked from five in the morning until eight at night, with a one-hour break for dinner.” (Testimony of a Factory Worker (Paraphrased) [source_1])
- “Children between nine and thirteen were limited to nine hours of work per day and forty-eight hours per week.” (The Factory Act of 1833 (Summary) [source_3])

Award 2 points for the option linking a specific abuse to a specific legal remedy; 1 point for a partial link. Common error: confusing correlation with proof, since the sources do not state that Parliament relied on this exact testimony. Language-access support: permit students to underline the abuse in Source 1 and the matching rule in Source 3 before answering.

Question 4. Multiple choice (2 points). Analyze Source 2. Engels's excerpt is a secondary account written to persuade readers. Which feature of the excerpt most clearly shows an effort to persuade rather than simply to describe?
↳ Refer to: source_2

Answer: The best answer is the option noting the contrast drawn between the mortality of the poor and the wealthy, which frames urban poverty as an injustice demanding action. Source 2 describes unpaved, filthy streets and polluted air “The streets are usually unpaved, full of holes, filthy and strewn with refuse.” (source_2) and then states that death rates among the poor far exceed those among the wealthy “The mortality rate among the poor is far higher than among the wealthy.” (source_2). That comparison pushes readers toward a moral judgment, which is characteristic of persuasive writing.

Supporting source evidence:

- “The streets are usually unpaved, full of holes, filthy and strewn with refuse.” (The Conditions of the Working Class in England (Excerpt) [source_2])
- “The mortality rate among the poor is far higher than among the wealthy.” (The Conditions of the Working Class in England (Excerpt) [source_2])

Award 2 points for the option identifying the persuasive contrast; 1 point for an option that identifies description without explaining persuasion. Common error: treating all description as neutral. Note that multiple readings of tone can be defensible if supported with evidence.

Question 5. Multiple choice (2 points). Synthesize all three sources. Which claim about responsibility for improving working conditions is best supported by the source set as a whole?
↳ Refer to: source_3

Answer: The best answer is the option stating that responsibility was shared: factory owners were criticized for prioritizing profit “The witness said that the owners cared only for profit and not for the health of the workers.” (source_1), urban poverty created public health crises that demanded attention “The workers are poorly clothed and fed, and disease is rampant.” (source_2), and Parliament began to act through legislation and inspectors “This act made it illegal to employ children under the age of nine in textile factories.” (source_3). The sources together support a shared-responsibility claim rather than placing blame on a single group. Options naming only owners, only workers, or only government ignore part of the evidence.

Supporting source evidence:

- “The witness said that the owners cared only for profit and not for the health of the workers.” (Testimony of a Factory Worker (Paraphrased) [source_1])
- “The workers are poorly clothed and fed, and disease is rampant.” (The Conditions of the Working Class in England (Excerpt) [source_2])
- “This act made it illegal to employ children under the age of nine in textile factories.” (The Factory Act of 1833 (Summary) [source_3])

Award 2 points for the shared-responsibility option; 1 point for a single-actor option with partial evidence. Common error: assuming workers could fix conditions alone. Exemplary responses explain how each source assigns part of the responsibility.

Question 6. Multiple choice (2 points). Evaluate this counterargument: Some historians argue that early factory legislation did more harm than good because it raised costs for mill owners and reduced jobs for poor families. Using Source 3, which response best addresses this counterargument?
↳ *Refer to: source_3*

Answer: The best answer is the option acknowledging that the act imposed real costs and limits on employers “Children between nine and thirteen were limited to nine hours of work per day and forty-eight hours per week.” (source_3) while arguing that the law still addressed documented harms to children through age limits, hour limits, schooling, and inspectors “They were also required to receive two hours of schooling each day.” (source_3). A strong response does not dismiss the counterargument; it weighs the trade-off. Multiple interpretations can be valid here, so credit should go to the option that both recognizes the economic concern and defends the reform with evidence.

Supporting source evidence:

- “Children between nine and thirteen were limited to nine hours of work per day and forty-eight hours per week.” (The Factory Act of 1833 (Summary) [source_3])
- “They were also required to receive two hours of schooling each day.” (The Factory Act of 1833 (Summary) [source_3])

Award 2 points for the balanced option; 1 point for an option that addresses only one side. Multiple defensible evaluations exist, so do not require students to reject the counterargument outright. Exemplary responses explicitly weigh costs against protections.

Question 7. Short response (9 points). This question has three parts. (a) Analyze how Sources 1 and 2 together describe the effects of industrialization on ordinary workers. (b) Evaluate whether the Factory Act of 1833 (Source 3) adequately responded to those effects. (c) Address a counterargument: some people at the time argued that regulating factories would hurt business and cost jobs. Justify your position using evidence from at least two sources.
↳ *Refer to: source_1*

Claim–Evidence–Reasoning

Part	Claim	Evidence	Reasoning
(a)			
(b)			
(c)			

Answer: A complete response has three parts. Part (a): Source 1 shows long hours, physical mistreatment, and lung disease inside the mill “The witness reported that the children were often beaten to keep them awake at their machines.” (source_1), while Source 2 shows crowded, unsanitary housing and high death rates among the poor “The houses are crowded together, and the rooms are small and poorly ventilated.” (source_2); together they show harm at work and at home. Part (b): Source 3 responded to some harms by banning employment under age nine, limiting hours for children nine to thirteen, requiring schooling, and appointing inspectors “Factory inspectors were appointed to enforce the law.” (source_3), but it covered only textile mills, so the response was partial. Part (c): A strong answer takes a position and justifies it. One defensible position is that the act was worthwhile because it reduced documented harms to children even if it imposed costs on owners; another defensible position is that the act was too limited to count as an adequate response because it left other industries and adult workers unregulated. Both positions can be valid if supported with evidence. The response should acknowledge the economic counterargument rather than ignore it.

Supporting source evidence:

- “The witness reported that the children were often beaten to keep them awake at their machines.” (Testimony of a Factory Worker (Paraphrased) [source_1])
- “The houses are crowded together, and the rooms are small and poorly ventilated.” (The Conditions of the Working Class in England (Excerpt) [source_2])
- “Factory inspectors were appointed to enforce the law.” (The Factory Act of 1833 (Summary) [source_3])

Scoring guide (9 points): 3 points for part (a) with evidence from both Sources 1 and 2; 3 points for part (b) naming both a protection and a limitation from Source 3; 3 points for part (c) stating a position,

> *addressing the counterargument, and citing at least one source. Award partial credit for two of three parts done well. Multiple interpretations are valid; do not penalize a defensible position that is well supported. Exemplary responses explicitly weigh costs against protections and use precise evidence. Language-access support: allow students to answer in labeled parts (a), (b), (c) and to use short bullet points within each part.*

Question 8. Short response (9 points). Open-ended construction. You are an adviser to a British parliamentary committee in the 1830s. Propose a reform plan that addresses the factory and urban problems described in Sources 1 and 2, and explain how your plan relates to the Factory Act of 1833 (Source 3). In your response, (a) propose at least two specific reforms, (b) justify each reform with evidence from the sources, and (c) explain one likely objection to your plan and how you would answer it.

↳ *Refer to: source_2*

Reform Plan Proposal

Proposed Reform	Source Evidence	Justification	Likely Objection and Response

Answer: A complete response proposes a plan and defends it. Part (a): possible reforms include extending age and hour limits beyond textile mills, requiring ventilation and dust control, and improving urban housing and sanitation. Part (b): the plan should be justified with evidence. Source 1 supports limits on child labor and dust control because children worked very long days and suffered lung problems “The witness stated that children as young as six were employed in the mill.” (source_1); Source 2 supports housing and sanitation reform because streets were filthy and families lived in single crowded rooms “The atmosphere is polluted by the stench of the gutters and the smoke from the chimneys.” (source_2); Source 3 shows a model for enforcement through inspectors that could be extended “The act applied only to textile mills, not to other industries.” (source_3). Part (c): a likely objection is that reform will raise costs and reduce jobs; a strong answer responds that the harms documented in the sources impose costs on workers and society, and that inspectors could enforce rules fairly. Multiple plans are defensible if they are specific and evidence-based.

Supporting source evidence:

- “The witness stated that children as young as six were employed in the mill.” (Testimony of a Factory Worker (Paraphrased) [source_1])
- “The atmosphere is polluted by the stench of the gutters and the smoke from the chimneys.” (The Conditions of the Working Class in England (Excerpt) [source_2])
- “The act applied only to textile mills, not to other industries.” (The Factory Act of 1833 (Summary) [source_3])

Scoring guide (9 points): 3 points for two specific, relevant reforms; 3 points for evidence-based justification using at least two sources; 3 points for naming a plausible objection and answering it. Award partial credit for two of three parts done well. Multiple reform plans can be valid; do not require one particular plan. Exemplary responses connect each reform to a specific source detail and treat the

objection seriously rather than dismissing it. Language-access support: allow students to draft the plan as a labeled list before writing sentences.

Section 4: Teacher Toolkit

3-Point Mastery Rubric

3 — Complete Mastery: Meets all of these criteria accurately: Names one specific change in working conditions described in the sources.; Names one specific reform or response described in the sources.; Uses at least one detail or example from the provided sources to support the explanation.

2 — Partial Understanding: Shows relevant understanding but partially meets or inaccurately addresses one or more of these criteria: Names one specific change in working conditions described in the sources.; Names one specific reform or response described in the sources.; Uses at least one detail or example from the provided sources to support the explanation.

1 — Needs Significant Support: Shows limited evidence of meeting these criteria: Names one specific change in working conditions described in the sources.; Names one specific reform or response described in the sources.; Uses at least one detail or example from the provided sources to support the explanation.

Common Misconceptions

Reform Immediately Fixed Conditions

Students think: Students often believe that the Factory Act of 1833 instantly improved all working conditions for everyone.

Why: They may overlook the act's limited scope (only textile mills) and weak enforcement, assuming laws are always fully effective.

Fix: Have students re-read Source 3 and highlight the act's specific limits, then discuss how enforcement challenges might affect real-world impact.

Urbanization Was Uniformly Negative

Students think: Students may think that urbanization only brought misery and had no positive effects.

Why: Sources like Engels focus on harsh conditions, leading students to overlook economic opportunities or gradual improvements.

Fix: Use a graphic organizer to list both positive and negative effects of urbanization, prompting students to consider multiple perspectives from the sources.

Child Labor Was Always Illegal

Students think: Students might assume that child labor was already illegal before the Industrial Revolution or that it was quickly abolished.

Why: They may lack background knowledge about pre-industrial labor laws and the gradual nature of reform.

Fix: Provide a brief timeline showing key legislative changes and ask students to compare the Factory Act's provisions with earlier practices described in Source 1.

Implementation Notes

- Setup: Distribute the unit test booklet and shared source set at the start of the testing session. Read the directions aloud and point out the word bank and sentence frames in Packet A, ensuring all students know they may use the sources throughout.
- Pacing: Follow the exact pacing outlined in Section 1's Lesson Flow. Monitor students as they work independently, offering language-access supports such as rereading directions or restating questions in simpler terms without supplying answers.
- Grouping: Students work individually on the test. For students with IEPs or language needs, provide a quiet space and extended time as specified in their plans, and allow them to chunk the test into multiple-choice first and short responses second.
- Tiered Packet Flow: Assign Packet A to students needing guided frames and a word bank, Packet B for core practice, and Packet C for extension and synthesis. Ensure that all packets assess the same standards and that the shared assessment exit question is administered to all students at the end of the testing period.

Extension Activities

- Early Finisher Task: Ask students to write a brief diary entry from the perspective of a child worker in a textile mill, using at least two details from the sources to describe daily life and one reform that might improve conditions.
- Cross-Curricular Connection: Have students create a graph showing the change in urban population or child labor hours before and after the Factory Act of 1833, using hypothetical data clearly labeled as such, and write a paragraph explaining the trend.
- Real-World Application: Students research a current labor law or workplace safety regulation and compare its purpose and enforcement to the Factory Act of 1833, presenting findings in a short oral report.