

GCSE (9-1)

History B (Schools History Project)

**J411/13: The People's Health, c.1250 to present with Britain in
Peace and War, 1900-1918**

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for June 2025

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

© OCR 2025

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

PREPARATION FOR MARKING RM ASSESSOR

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on-screen marking: RM Assessor Online Training: OCR Essential Guide to Marking.
2. Make sure that you have read and understood the mark scheme and the question paper for this unit. These are available in RM Assessor
3. Log-in to RM Assessor and mark the required number of practice responses (“scripts”) and the required number of standardisation responses.

MARKING

1. Mark strictly to the mark scheme.
2. Marks awarded must relate directly to the marking criteria.
3. The schedule of dates is very important. It is essential that you meet the RM Assessor 50% and 100% (traditional 40% Batch 1 and 100% Batch 2) deadlines. If you experience problems, you must contact your Team Leader (Supervisor) without delay.
4. If you are in any doubt about applying the mark scheme, consult your Team Leader by telephone, email or via the RM Assessor messaging system.
5. **Crossed-Out Responses**
Where a candidate has crossed out a response and provided a clear alternative then the crossed-out response is not marked. Where no alternative response has been provided, examiners may give candidates the benefit of the doubt and mark the crossed-out response where legible.

Rubric Error Responses – Optional Questions

Where candidates have a choice of question across a whole paper or a whole section and have provided more answers than required, then all responses are marked and the highest mark allowable within the rubric is given. Enter a mark for each question answered into RM

Assessor, which will select the highest mark from those awarded. (The underlying assumption is that the candidate has penalised themselves by attempting more questions than necessary in the time allowed.)

Multiple-Choice Question Responses

When a multiple-choice question has only a single, correct response and a candidate provides two responses (even if one of these responses is correct), then no mark should be awarded (as it is not possible to determine which was the first response selected by the candidate).

When a question requires candidates to select more than one option/multiple options, then local marking arrangements need to ensure consistency of approach.

Contradictory Responses

When a candidate provides contradictory responses, then no mark should be awarded, even if one of the answers is correct.

Short Answer Questions (requiring only a list by way of a response, usually worth only one mark per response)

Where candidates are required to provide a set number of short answer responses then only the set number of responses should be marked. The response space should be marked from left to right on each line and then line by line until the required number of responses have been considered. The remaining responses should not then be marked. Examiners will have to apply judgement as to whether a 'second response' on a line is a development of the 'first response', rather than a separate, discrete response. (The underlying assumption is that the candidate is attempting to hedge their bets and therefore getting undue benefit rather than engaging with the question and giving the most relevant/correct responses.)

Short Answer Questions (requiring a more developed response, worth two or more marks)

If the candidates are required to provide a description of, say, three items or factors and four items or factors are provided, then mark on a similar basis – that is downwards (as it is unlikely in this situation that a candidate will provide more than one response in each section of the response space).

Longer Answer Questions (requiring a developed response)

Where candidates have provided two (or more) responses to a medium or high tariff question which only required a single (developed) response and not crossed out the first response, then only the first response should be marked. Examiners will need to apply professional judgement as to whether the second (or a subsequent) response is a 'new start' or simply a poorly expressed continuation of the first response.

6. Always check the pages (and additional objects if present) at the end of the response in case any answers have been continued there. If the candidate has continued an answer there, then add the annotation 'SEEN' to confirm that the work has been seen and mark any responses using the annotations in section 11.
7. There is a NR (No Response) option. Award NR (No Response):
 - if there is nothing written at all in the answer space
 - OR if there is a comment which does not in any way relate to the question (e.g., 'can't do', 'don't know')
 - OR if there is a mark (e.g., a dash, a question mark) which is not an attempt at the question.

Note: Award 0 marks – for an attempt that earns no credit (including copying out the question).

8. The RM Assessor comments box is used by your Team Leader to explain the marking of the practice responses. Please refer to these comments when checking your practice responses. Do not use the comments box for any other reason.
9. Assistant Examiners will send a brief report on the performance of candidates to their Team Leader (Supervisor) via email by the end of the marking period. The report should contain notes on particular strengths displayed as well as common errors or weaknesses. Constructive criticism of the question paper/mark scheme is also appreciated.
10. For answers marked by levels of response:
 - To determine the level – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer
 - To determine the mark within the level, consider the following

Descriptor	Award mark
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level

11. Annotations

<i>Stamp</i>	<i>Ref No.</i>	<i>Annotation Name</i>	<i>Description</i>
	311	L1	Level 1
	321	L2	Level 2
	331	L3	Level 3
	341	L4	Level 4
	441	L5	Level 5
	3261	L6	Level 6
	811	SEEN	Noted but no credit given
	501	NAQ	Not answered question
	1371	H Wavy Line	Incorrect/muddled/unclear
	1681	BP	Blank page
	151	Highlight	Part of the response which is rewardable (at one of the levels on the MS)

	11	Tick	Tick
---	----	------	------

1. Subject-specific Marking Instructions

INTRODUCTION

Your first task as an Examiner is to become thoroughly familiar with the material on which the examination depends. This material includes:

- a. the specification, especially the assessment objectives
- b. the question paper and its rubrics
- c. the mark scheme.

You should ensure that you have copies of these materials.

Please ask for help or guidance whenever you need it. Your first point of contact is your Team Leader/PE.

INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXAMINERS

- 1 The practice and standardisation scripts provide you with *examples* of the standard of each band. The marks awarded for these scripts will have been agreed by the PE and Senior Examiners.
- 2 The specific task-related indicative content for each question will help you to understand how the band descriptors may be applied. However, this indicative content does not constitute the mark scheme: it is material that candidates might use, grouped according to each assessment objective tested by the question. It is hoped that candidates will respond to questions in a variety of ways. Rigid demands for 'what must be a good answer' would lead to a distorted assessment.
- 3 Candidates' answers must be relevant to the question. Beware of seemingly prepared answers that do not show the candidate's thought and which have not been adapted to the thrust of the question. Beware also of answers where candidates attempt to reproduce interpretations and concepts that they have been taught but have only partially understood.

Mark scheme
Section A: The People's Health, c.1250 to present

Question 1–3 marks	
(a) Give one example of how early modern towns tried to improve public health in their local areas between 1500 and 1750.	[1]
(b) Name one way in which people in towns obtained their water between 1750 and 1900.	[1]
(c) Name one person whose work during the 1900s had a positive effect on public health.	[1]
Guidance	Indicative content
1(a) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)	<i>For 1(a), likely valid responses include:</i> • (York): saying pigs had to be kept in a sty and not allowed to wander the streets; not allowing people to put household waste out for the scavengers until after 7pm; fining people who made a dunghill in their yard; fining people for throwing urine and excrement into the street at night; not allowing people to build their privies over the Queen's Dike; ordering householders to clean the street outside their property twice a week; not allowing anyone to block the gutters which ran down York's main streets. • (London): after the Great Fire, using brick, tile, stone and to re-build houses (fewer rats); widening some streets (better ventilation and sunlight); introduction of several water companies by 1750 that would pipe water into homes; Hugh Middleton's reservoir • (Various towns): introducing oil-burning lamps on the streets; building footways for pedestrians; paving their streets with stone; building large terraced housing around big open squares. • NOTE: Allow answers which describe local areas putting into action aspects of national plague legislation, e.g. 'pesthouses', 'watchmen', etc. • NOTE 2: Do not allow answers which simply state national legislation / government responses to plague, e.g. 'Gin Acts'; 'Plague Orders' • NOTE 3: Do not allow answers which are clearly medieval, e.g. scavengers, rakers, cesspits, moving dung heaps outside of town walls, etc. <i>For 1(b,) water pumps in streets; local rivers/ streams; piped water to homes; bought water from water sellers; rain water caught in cisterns or butts.</i> • NOTE: Allow water fountains/ conduits/ pipes <i>For 1(c), Seebohm Rowntree; Charles Booth; David Lloyd George; Dr. James Niven; Aneurin Bevan; William Beveridge; Princess Diana; Clement Attlee</i> Any other historically valid response is acceptable and should be credited.
1(b) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)	
1(c) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)	

Question 2–9 marks Write a clear and organised summary that analyses responses to outbreaks of plague during the period 1348 (the Black Death) to c.1670 . Support your answer with examples.	
Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 6 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 3 marks	Notes and guidance specific to the question set <i>Answers should show connections in the situation defined in the question and use these to organise the answer logically.</i> <i>Answers may show use of second order concepts such as:</i> Causation (e.g. why people/ authorities had the responses they did, given beliefs at the time) Consequence (e.g. impact of responses) Change / continuity (e.g. changes and continuities with regards to beliefs about the causes of plague; change/ continuity of responses from ordinary people; development of centralised government responses during early modern period, which was a big change from the medieval period). Diversity (similarity and difference): e.g. comparison of responses between different local areas. <i>Please note that answers do not need to name the second order concepts being used to organise the answer, but the concepts do need to be apparent from the connections and chains of reasoning in the summary in order to meet the AO2 descriptors (see levels descriptors).</i> <i>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that is unrelated to the topic in the question.</i>
Level 3 (7–9 marks) Demonstrates a well-selected range of valid knowledge of characteristic features that are fully relevant to the question, in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). The way the summary is organised shows sustained logical coherence, demonstrating clear use of at least one second order concept in finding connections and providing a logical chain of reasoning to summarise the historical situation in the question (AO2).	
Level 2 (4–6 marks) Demonstrates a range of knowledge of characteristic features that are relevant to the question, in ways that show understanding of them (AO1). The way the summary is organised shows some logical coherence, demonstrating use of at least one second order concept in finding connections and providing a logical chain of reasoning to summarise the historical situation in the question (AO2).	
Level 1 (1–3 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of characteristic features with some relevance to the question, in ways that show some limited understanding of them (AO1). The summary shows a very basic logical coherence, demonstrating limited use of at least one second order concept in attempting to find connections and to provide a logical chain of reasoning to summarise the historical situation in the question (AO2).	
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	

Question 2–9 marks Write a clear and organised summary that analyses responses to outbreaks of plague during the period 1348 (the Black Death) to c.1670. Support your summary with examples.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 3 (7–9 marks)	Typically, a summary based on second order concept(s) with <u>two or more</u> valid supporting examples, e.g. [Causation/ consequence] <i>Throughout this period, many believed that the disease was God punishing people for sinning. This meant that their responses including things like prayer and confessing their sins.</i> <i>Another popular belief was that the plague was spread by miasma (bad air). So as a result, people did things like carrying around sweet-smelling herbs.</i> [THRESHOLD – 7 MARKS] [Change over time] <i>When the Black Death hit England in 1348, the government response was extremely limited. King Edward III wrote a letter to the Mayor of London in 1349 ordering him to clean the streets, and there were orders for bishops to parade through cities, but otherwise did nothing.</i> <i>However, by the 17th century, governments were being far more proactive. For example, Elizabeth I's 1578 Plague Orders included instructions for infected houses to be completely shut up for at least six weeks, with all members of the family still inside. Watchmen were appointed to enforce this order. [9]</i> [Continuity] <i>When the Black Death hit England in 1348, one popular belief was that it was caused by miasma, as shown by how many people carried posies of flowers or herbs to purify the air.</i> <i>This belief continued throughout the next few centuries during further outbreaks of plague. For example, Elizabeth I's Plague Orders contained instructions to burn barrels of tar in the streets to get rid of the bad air. [8]</i>
Level 2 (4–6 marks)	Typically, a summary based on a second order concept with one valid supporting example, e.g. [Continuity] <i>When the Black Death hit England in 1348, one popular belief was that it was caused by miasma. This belief continued throughout the next few centuries during further outbreaks of plague. For example, Elizabeth I's Plague Orders contained instructions to burn barrels of tar in the streets to get rid of the bad air.</i> [THRESHOLD – 4 MARKS]
Level 1 (1–3 marks)	Typically, descriptions of responses to plague with no clear organising concept, e.g. <i>People were very scared when plague hit as they didn't know how to cure it. Some people burned sweet smelling plants to purify the air. Others tried bloodletting or changing their diet as a way of dealing with it. These things did not work. People thought that it was God's punishment, or it was miasma. [3]</i> NB – descriptions of plague (as opposed to responses to plague) = MAX 1 MARK OR Typically, statement(s) based on second order concept with EITHER no valid specific examples OR development, e.g. (Continuity) <i>In the medieval period, people prayed to God and this continued right through to 1670. [2]</i> (Diversity) <i>The village of Eyam quarantined itself but most places didn't do that. [1]</i>
0 marks	

Question 3–10 marks Why did the gin craze become a significant public health issue during the period 1660 to 1751? Explain your answer.	
Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 5 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 5 marks	Notes and guidance specific to the question set <i>Explanations could consider:</i>
Level 5 (9–10 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show sophisticated understanding of one or more second order concepts in a fully sustained and very well-supported explanation (AO2).	Reasons why the ‘gin craze’ developed during this period (e.g. gin became a much cheaper alternative, as a result of government encouragement of the spirit as an alternative to French brandy; government reduced taxes on the distillation of spirits; taxes on ale and beer went up; gin could be made in England, just from corn, which was also cheap; distillers didn’t require a license to make gin, so they could use smaller and more simple workshops).
Level 4 (7–8 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show strong understanding of one or more second order concepts in a sustained and well-supported explanation (AO2).	Reasons why the ‘gin craze’ was a significant public health issue (e.g. thousands of small gin shops opened in cellars, attics and back rooms in London, meaning it was very easy to buy and hundreds of thousands became addicted; by the 1720s it had become a serious problem in the capital because crime increased, families were being ruined, babies were harmed because mothers were drinking gin whilst pregnant, and there was a big increase in the death rate caused by alcohol related deaths).
Level 3 (5–6 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show sound understanding of one or more second order concepts in a generally coherent and organised explanation (AO2).	Reasons why the government found it difficult to deal with (e.g. lack of enforcement of legislation introduced to tackle the problem, i.e. tax and licenses to control the sales did not solve the problem because people just ignored the law and opened up illegal dram shops. The craze did not get under control until it made punishments really severe).
Level 2 (3–4 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show some understanding of one or more second order concepts in a loosely organised explanation (AO2).	<i>Explanations are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of causation and consequence but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i>
Level 1 (1–2 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Uses these to show some basic understanding of one or more second order concepts, although the overall response may lack structure and coherence (AO2).	<i>Answers which simply describe some of the features of the Gin Craze cannot reach beyond Level 1.</i>
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	

Question 3–10 marks Why did the gin craze become a significant public health issue during the period 1660 to 1751? Explain your answer.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 5 (9-10 marks)	Typically, two or more reasons why the ‘gin craze’ became a significant public health issue identified and fully explained e.g. <i>One reason that the ‘gin craze’ became a significant public health issue was because it created a whole range of social and health problems in London. For example, crime increased, families were being ruined, babies were harmed because mothers were drinking gin whilst pregnant, and there was a big increase in alcohol-related deaths. This was a public health issue because gin was so popular that it was a widespread problem amongst the poorer sections in the capital.</i> <i>Another reason was that the government’s attempts to deal with the problem were just ignored. They introduced several ‘Gin Acts’ in the 1700s which introduced taxes for distillers and licences for those who sold it. However, these early acts were not very effective because they weren’t properly enforced. There were so many small gin shops which they couldn’t control, so it was too easy for them to hide from the authorities, and the problem continued. [10]</i>
Level 4 (7-8 marks)	Typically, one reason why the ‘gin craze’ became a significant public health issue identified and fully explained e.g. • <i>One reason was because gin became a much cheaper alternative to beer or ale in this period so more people were drinking it. This was because the government reduced taxes on the distillation of spirits. Meanwhile, taxes on ale and beer went up. This meant that thousands of small ‘gin shops’ opened in cellars and back rooms. This became a significant public health issue as there was a huge increase in drinking gin by the poor. [8]</i> • <i>The gin craze began as a result of government policies that made gin cheap and easy to produce. Taxes on ale and beer increased, while taxes on spirits were reduced to encourage gin over imported French brandy. Gin could be made from cheap corn and didn’t require a license, so small, local distillers could produce it easily and affordably. This meant that gin quickly became widely available to the public. [8]</i> • <i>One reason why the ‘gin craze’ became a significant public health issue was because drinking gin was so cheap. It was so cheap that the gin shops advertised ‘drunk for a penny, dead drunk for two pence.’ This meant that gin was widely available even to the poor and consumption was widespread. [THRESHOLD – 7 MARKS]</i> Explained points must: • identify a valid reason • provide precise evidence • use this to address the question
Level 3 (5-6 marks)	Typically, identifies a reason(s) and uses this to address question (but does not provide precise evidence), e.g. • <i>Gin became much cheaper in this period. As a result, there was a huge increase in drinking gin by the poor. This led to big social and health problems.</i> • <i>The gin craze was a big issue because when the government tried to deal with it by bringing in new laws, people just ignored the legislation, so it didn’t have much effect.</i> OR Typically, identifies a reason(s) and gives precise evidence (but does not go on to say how that answers the question), e.g. • <i>Gin became a much cheaper alternative to beer or ale in this period so more people were drinking it. This was because the government reduced taxes on the distillation of spirits. Meanwhile, taxes on ale and beer went up.</i> • <i>Gin became a significant public health issue because it became very cheap. Lots of ‘dram shops’ opened selling gin from cellars, attics and back rooms.</i> NOTE: One L3 = 5–6 marks Two L3s = 6 marks

Level 2 (3-4 marks)	Typically, describes the gin craze or related events/ developments, e.g. • <i>During the Gin Craze, thousands of small gin shops opened in cellars, attics and back rooms in London. (3 marks)</i> • <i>The government tried to deal with the gin problem by passing Gin Acts. For example, the 1729 Act introduced taxes for distillers. (4 marks)</i> • <i>Puritans worried that gin led people away from God. They published pamphlets attacking the 'demon drink'. (4 marks)</i> OR Typically, identifies one or more reason but with <u>neither</u> of the following: • support from precise evidence • explaining why the reason meant the gin craze was a significant public health issue, e.g. • <i>Gin was very cheap.</i> • <i>It was causing lots of deaths and crime.</i> NOTE: One L2 identification = 3 marks Two L2 identifications = 4 marks
Level 1 (1-2 marks)	Typically, valid but general assertion(s), e.g. • <i>People were very poor and their lives were bad so they turned to gin as a way of escaping misery.</i> • <i>People were addicted to alcohol and they were fighting in the streets.</i>
0 marks	

Question 4*–18 marks 'Government action was not effective in improving public health between 1750 and 1900.' How far do you agree? Give reasons for your answer.	
Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 6 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 12 marks	Notes and guidance specific to the question set <i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the level description. BUT to achieve the two highest levels, answers must consider both reasons to agree and disagree with the statement.</i>
Level 6 (16–18 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show very secure and thorough understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation and reaching a very well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concept of consequence but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i>
Level 5 (13–15 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows very strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and convincing explanation and reaching a well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	Grounds for agreeing include: Early responses to cholera (e.g. local boards of health took action to get rid of miasma, such as clearing waste from streets, burning barrels of tar and adding chloride of lime to sewers; some imposed a quarantine; they advised people to open windows and avoid alcohol).
Level 4 (10–12 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation to reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i>	The 1848 Public Health Act was limited in improving public health issues caused by poor living conditions (e.g. it was permissive; the Act did not apply to London or Scotland; by 1853, only 163 places had set up a Board of Health).
Level 3 (7–9 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas and reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>	The 1875 Artisans' Dwelling Act was ineffective because only 10 towns had used their powers by 1881.
Level 2 (4–6 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas and reach a loosely supported judgment about the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i>	Grounds for disagreeing include: 1751 Gin Act: Built upon earlier legislation to control the Gin Craze which was causing a range of public health and social problems (i.e. tougher punishments for selling gin illegally – imprisonment for a first offence; whipping for a second; and transportation for a third). Effective because it greatly reduced gin drinking.
Level 1 (1–3 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) but any attempt to explain	1848 Public Health Act was partly effective in tackling public health issues caused by poor living conditions (e.g. it set up the General Board of Health and allowed areas to set up a local Board of Health, and increase rates, if there was support from 10 per cent of rate payers; it did force towns to set up a Board of Health where the death rate was high (23 per 1000); the Act allowed boards of health to take command of all sewers and gave them the power to supply water if a private company would not. They had the responsibility for cleaning the streets; by 1853, 163 places had set up a Board of Health).

ideas and reach a judgment on the issue in the question is unclear or lacks historical validity (AO2). <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i>	Building of London's sewers after 1859 was effective in tackling cholera (e.g. 82 miles of underground main sewers, and over 1000 miles of street sewers, were laid; pumping stations took waste eastwards where it was dumped far downstream of the city; London had far fewer deaths from cholera during the next epidemic of 1865–66). The 1875 Public Health Act was effective in tackling public health issues caused by poor living conditions (e.g. All local authorities had to: appoint medical officers and sanitary inspectors; take responsibility for sewers, water supplies, rubbish collection, public toilets and public parks; ensure all new houses had piped water, proper toilets, drains and sewers; inspect slaughterhouses and shops). The 1875 Artisans' Dwelling Act was partly effective in tackling public health issues caused by poor housing (it gave local councils the powers to buy up slum areas to clear and rebuild them; they could borrow money from the government in order to do this. 10 towns had used their powers by 1881). 1875 Sale of Food and Drugs Act was effective in tackling problems with food (set basic standards for the quality of food and introduced harsh punishments for those who sold adulterated or contaminated food). <i>[Allow references to earlier legislation, e.g. 1860 Pure Food Act]</i> Various local initiatives were effective in tackling public health issues caused by poor living conditions (e.g. Rochdale's town council use of 'pail privies' from 1869; in 1875, the Mayor of Birmingham, Joseph Chamberlain, improved the quality of water and organised slum clearance; in 1875, the Manchester authorities also organised slum clearance and built grand buildings in their place, providing residents with clean, shared facilities like laundries and rubbish chutes. They also organised the building of a dam on Lake Thirlmere in the Lake District, and constructed a 96-mile aqueduct to carry the water to Manchester.) NOTES: 1. Focus of question is impact of government action, rather than why public health improved. So at L3+, do not allow answers which explain why other factors led to improvement. 2. Answers at L3+ must deal with government action taken, and its impact. Do not reward answers which explain why more wasn't done (e.g. laissez-faire). 3. Answers at L3+ must at least identify a public health 'issue' which was being tackled by government action.
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	

Question 4* – 18 marks	
'Government action was not effective in improving public health between 1750 and 1900.' How far do you agree? Give reasons for your answer.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 6 (16-18 marks)	Typically, a balanced argument; two valid explained points on each side OR three on one side and one on the other (2–2 or 3–1). Clinching argument = 18 marks , e.g. <i>In some ways I agree. At the beginning of this period, poor living conditions in urban areas resulted in serious public health issues. Diseases like TB were caused by overcrowding and poor ventilation. Typhoid and cholera were caused by contaminated water. In 1848, the government passed a Public Health Act in response to the crisis. However, this was mainly ineffective. It allowed areas to set up a Board of Health, and to take command of all sewers and water supplies. However, the act was permissive and by 1853 only 163 places had set up a board of health. This meant government action did not improve living conditions in most areas.</i> <i>Additionally, there were serious outbreaks of cholera in 1831 and 1848. Cholera was spread through contaminated water. Local government responses to the 1831–32 epidemic were largely ineffective. For example, some local boards of health, believing the disease was spread through miasma, burned barrels of tar and added chloride of lime to the sewers. These responses did not work as over 30,000 people died in the 1831–32 epidemic.</i> <i>However, other government action was more effective in dealing with these issues. For example, in 1858, after the 'Great Stink', the government ordered the building of thousands of miles of new sewers in London. Pumping stations took waste eastwards where it was dumped far downstream of the city. Even though this was based on the belief that bad air from the river was causing illness, it was still highly effective because London had far fewer deaths from cholera during the next epidemic of 1865–66.</i> <i>Furthermore, in 1875 the government passed another Public Health Act. This meant that all local authorities were forced to appoint medical officers and sanitary inspectors; and they had to take responsibility for sewers, water supplies and rubbish collection. All new houses had to be provided with piped water, proper toilets, drains and sewers. This was very effective in dealing with diseases caused by poor water supply and inadequate sanitation.</i> <i>On the whole, the statement is not true for the whole period. They were ineffective at the start of this period, because of a laissez faire attitude, and also because they didn't have the scientific advances to deal effectively with outbreaks of cholera. However, by the end of the period, governments were much more willing to get involved and they had the scientific knowledge to understand what needed to be done, so their actions were then very effective.</i>
Level 5 (13-15 marks)	Typically, a balanced argument; three valid explained points (i.e. two on one side and one on the other) (2–1) e.g. <i>I agree. At the beginning of this period, poor living conditions in urban areas resulted in serious public health issues. Diseases like TB were caused by overcrowding and poor ventilation. Typhoid and cholera were caused by contaminated water. In 1848, the government passed a Public Health Act in response to the crisis. However, this was mainly ineffective. It allowed areas to set up a Board of Health, and to take command of all sewers and water supplies. However, the act was permissive and by 1853 only 163 places had set up a board of health. This meant government action did not improve living conditions in most areas.</i> <i>Additionally, there were serious outbreaks of cholera in 1831 and 1848. Cholera was spread through contaminated water. Local government responses to the 1831–32 epidemic were largely ineffective. For example, some local boards of health, believing the disease was spread through miasma, burned barrels of tar and added chloride of lime to the sewers. These responses did not work as over 30,000 people died in the 1831–32 epidemic.</i> <i>However, other government action was more effective in dealing with these issues. For example, in 1858, after the 'Great Stink', the government ordered the building of thousands of miles of new sewers in London. Pumping stations took waste eastwards where it was dumped far downstream of the city. Even though this was based on the belief that bad air from the river was causing illness, it was still highly effective because London had far fewer deaths from cholera during the next epidemic of 1865–66.</i>

Level 4 (10-12 marks)	Typically, a one-sided argument, two explained points of support (2-0), e.g. <i>In some ways I agree. At the beginning of this period, poor living conditions in urban areas resulted in serious public health issues. Diseases like TB were caused by overcrowding and poor ventilation. Typhoid and cholera were caused by contaminated water. In 1848, the government passed a Public Health Act in response to the crisis. However, this was mainly ineffective. It allowed areas to set up a Board of Health, and to take command of all sewers and water supplies. However, the act was permissive and by 1853 only 163 places had set up a board of health. This meant government action did not improve living conditions in most areas.</i> <i>Additionally, there were serious outbreaks of cholera in 1831 and 1848. Cholera was spread through contaminated water. Local government responses to the 1831–32 epidemic were largely ineffective. For example, some local boards of health, believing the disease was spread through miasma, burned barrels of tar and added chloride of lime to the sewers. These responses did not work as over 30,000 people died in the 1831–32 epidemic.</i> Alternatively, and typically, a balanced argument; one explained point on each side (1-1), e.g. <i>In some ways I agree. At the beginning of this period, poor living conditions in urban areas resulted in serious public health issues. Diseases like TB were caused by overcrowding and poor ventilation. Typhoid and cholera were caused by contaminated water. In 1848, the government passed a Public Health Act in response to the crisis. However, this was mainly ineffective. It allowed areas to set up a Board of Health, and to take command of all sewers and water supplies. However, the act was permissive and by 1853 only 163 places had set up a board of health. This meant government action did not improve living conditions in most areas.</i> <i>However, other government action was more effective in dealing with these issues. For example, in 1858, after the ‘Great Stink’, the government ordered the building of thousands of miles of new sewers in London. Pumping stations took waste eastwards where it was dumped far downstream of the city. Even though this was based on the belief that bad air from the river was causing illness, it was still highly effective because London had far fewer deaths from cholera during the next epidemic of 1865–66.</i>
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	Typically, a one-sided argument; one explained point of support (1-0), e.g. <i>I disagree. In 1875 the government passed an effective Public Health Act. This meant that all local authorities were forced to appoint medical officers and sanitary inspectors; and they had to take responsibility for sewers, water supplies and rubbish collection. All new houses had to be provided with piped water, proper toilets, drains and sewers. This was very effective in dealing with diseases caused by poor water supply and inadequate sanitation.</i> Explained points must: • identify a valid claim/ argument • offer specific evidence to support the argument • show how their evidence answers the question
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	Typically, identification of reason(s) /actions to support or challenge without full explanation, e.g. • <i>I agree because the 1848 Public Health Act was permissive and didn’t force local councils to take action.</i> • <i>I disagree because the government ordered Joseph Bazalgette to build sewers in London after the Great Stink and these were effective.</i> 1 identifications = 4-5 marks 2 identifications = 5-6 marks 3+ identifications = 6 marks Alternatively, and typically, description of relevant government action or public health issues (allow descriptions of laissez-faire), e.g. <i>There was little government action to tackle public health issues. Governments had a laissez-faire attitude which meant they were unwilling to bring in laws which would interfere with people’s lives or the way businesses behaved, so there were no laws to ensure decent housing or to deal with the issue of water supply and waste.</i>
Level 1 (1-3 marks)	Typically, valid but general assertion(s) <i>I disagree because they did pass laws and start to clean up towns.</i>

0 marks	
---------	--

Question 5*–18 marks 'Since c.1900, changes in living conditions and lifestyles in Britain have improved people's health.' How far do you agree? Give reasons for your answer.	
Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 6 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 12 marks	Notes and guidance specific to the question set <i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the level description. BUT to achieve the two highest levels, answers must consider both reasons to agree and disagree with the statement.</i>
Level 6 (16–18 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show very secure and thorough understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation and reaching a very well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of change and continuity; and cause and consequence, but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i> Grounds for agreeing include: Housing: improvements in housing (e.g. 1909, 1919 and 1930 Housing Acts; council housing with improved standards; slum clearance) Food: impact of canned food, refrigeration, new methods of grinding grain and opening of supermarket chains on food quality/ availability; impact of Free School Meals on children's diets after 1906; diets improving in WWI and WWII with rationing; increased wealth after 1950s meant more families could afford fridges; impact of government campaigns such as 'Change4Life' on diets. Air quality: impact of Clean Air Act 1956 and smoking ban 2007. Smoking: Impact of government education/ information on the harmful effects of smoking (e.g. funding of nicotine replacement therapies). Activity: During World War Two, the nation became more active again as people worked longer hours; food was rationed so people worked in their gardens and allotments, growing vegetables; petrol was also rationed so people walked more; impact of government campaigns such as 'Change4Life' on physical activity.
Level 5 (13–15 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows very strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and convincing explanation and reaching a well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	
Level 4 (10–12 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation to reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i>	
Level 3 (7–9 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas and reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>	

Level 2 (4–6 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas and reach a loosely supported judgment about the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i>	Grounds for disagreeing include: Housing: decline of council housing in 1980s; impact of privately-rented accommodation on standards. Food: rationing in the wars disrupted food supply; convenience food/ invention of the microwave led to diets becoming less healthy; BSE scare in 1990s; diets now contain more calories, sugar and saturated fats, leading to obesity and other health problems; concerns about impact of modern farming methods (antibiotics, chemicals) on food quality; cases of rickets found to be rising again, possibly caused by too much processed food. Air quality: health problems caused by burning of coal (e.g. Great Smog) and increase in car ownership. Smoking: By 1950, 80 per cent of men and 40 per cent of women smoked, meaning people were more likely to get lung cancer. Inactivity: impact of car ownership/ technology (e.g. labour-saving devices, tablets, computers, TVs, etc.) / job types (more desk jobs) on exercise levels at home and work; cases of rickets found to be rising again, possibly caused by children spending too much time indoors.
Level 1 (1–3 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) but any attempt to explain ideas and reach a judgment on the issue in the question is unclear or lacks historical validity (AO2). <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i>	
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	

Question 5*–18 marks

'Since c.1900, changes in living conditions and lifestyles in Britain have improved people's health.' How far do you agree? Give reasons for your answer.

Guidance and indicative content

**Level 6
(16-18
marks)**

Typically, a balanced argument; two valid explained points on each side OR three on one side and one on the other (2–2 or 3–1). Clinching argument = 18 marks , e.g.

*To some extent I agree with the statement. Firstly, **changes in housing have definitely improved health**. For example, the **1919 Housing Act** ordered councils to become landlords for the poor by building new, rented housing for working-class people in their area, funded by taxpayers' money. **250,000 new homes** were built which made a **big difference to health** because **there were set standards for space, water supply and drainage**.*

*I also agree because **air quality has improved, resulting in better health**. In 1900, the burning of coal was a big problem in cities. Sometimes, the **weather trapped the smoke under fog and it would settle at a low level causing 'smog'**. The sulphur caused **bronchitis and pneumonia**. However, in **1956, the government passed the Clean Air Act**, which created 'smokeless' zones where only 'smokeless' fuel could be burned. This meant that **health problems from smog were reduced** by the 1980s.*

*However, in other ways, changes in lifestyles have not improved health. For instance, **in 1900, work was carried out by manual labour**. People also spent much of their free time **physically active**, playing sport or working on an allotment. However, **by the late 1900s, lifestyles were more sedentary**. People use devices like **TVs and consoles** for entertainment, and more jobs are carried out by sitting at desks. This means that **people have less physical exercise and aren't as healthy**.*

*Furthermore, **changes in diet have not necessarily improved health**. The invention of the **microwave** led to more families eating **convenience food**, which contains lots of additives. People's **diets now contain more calories, sugar and saturated fats**. In 2013, almost 25% population were classified as obese. This is not an improvement because obesity can cause **serious health problems like diabetes and heart disease**.*

In conclusion, changes in lifestyle have depended very much on wealth: poorer people in society have tended to be less active and their diets have also tended to be more reliant on processed food, which is cheaper than fresh food. However, when it comes to living conditions, the better housing of poorer sections of society has vastly improved health because the quality of working class housing before 1900 was so terrible that new government legislation made a massive difference.

**Level 5
(13-15
marks)**

Typically, a balanced argument; three valid explained points (i.e. two on one side and one on the other) (2–1) e.g.

To some extent I agree with the statement. Firstly, changes in housing have definitely improved health. For example, the 1919 Housing Act ordered councils to become landlords for the poor by building new, rented housing for working-class people in their area, funded by taxpayers' money. 250,000 new homes were built which made a big difference to health because there were set standards for space, water supply and drainage.

I also agree because air quality has improved, resulting in better health. In 1900, the burning of coal was a big problem in cities. Sometimes, the weather trapped the smoke under fog and it would settle at a low level causing 'smog'. The sulphur caused bronchitis and pneumonia. However, in 1956, the government passed the Clean Air Act, which created 'smokeless' zones where only 'smokeless' fuel could be burned. This meant that health problems from smog were reduced by the 1980s.

However, in other ways, changes in lifestyles have not improved health. For instance, in 1900, work was carried out by manual labour. People also spent much of their free time physically active, playing sport or working on an allotment. However, by the late 1900s, lifestyles were more sedentary. People use devices like TVs and consoles for entertainment, and more jobs are carried out by sitting at desks. This means that people have less physical exercise and aren't as healthy.

Level 4 (10-12 marks)	Typically, a one-sided argument, two explained points of support (2–0), e.g. <i>I agree because changes in housing have definitely improved health. For example, the 1919 Housing Act ordered councils to become landlords for the poor by building new, rented housing for working-class people in their area, funded by taxpayers' money. 250,000 new homes were built which made a big difference to health because there were set standards for space, water supply and drainage.</i> <i>I also agree because air quality has improved, resulting in better health. In 1900, the burning of coal was a big problem in cities. Sometimes, the weather trapped the smoke under fog and it would settle at a low level causing 'smog'. The sulphur caused bronchitis and pneumonia. However, in 1956, the government passed the Clean Air Act, which created 'smokeless' zones where only 'smokeless' fuel could be burned. This meant that health problems from smog were reduced by the 1980s.</i> Alternatively, and typically, a balanced argument; one explained point on each side (1–1), e.g. <i>To some extent I agree with the statement. Firstly, changes in housing have definitely improved health. For example, the 1919 Housing Act ordered councils to become landlords for the poor by building new, rented housing for working-class people in their area, funded by taxpayers' money. 250,000 new homes were built which made a big difference to health because there were set standards for space, water supply and drainage.</i> <i>However, in other ways, changes in lifestyles have not improved health. For instance, in 1900, work was carried out by manual labour. People also spent much of their free time physically active, playing sport or working on an allotment. However, by the late 1900s, lifestyles were more sedentary. People use devices like TVs and consoles for entertainment, and more jobs are carried out by sitting at desks. This means that people have less physical exercise and aren't as healthy.</i>
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	Typically, a one-sided argument; one explained point of support (1–0), e.g. <i>I agree because changes in housing have definitely improved health. For example, the 1919 Housing Act ordered councils to become landlords for the poor by building new, rented housing for working-class people in their area, funded by taxpayers' money. 250,000 new homes were built which made a big difference to health because there were set standards for space, water supply and drainage.</i> Explained points must: • identify a valid claim/ argument • offer specific evidence to support the argument • show how their evidence answers the question
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	Typically, identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation, e.g. • <i>I disagree because people are less active than they used to be and that is unhealthy.</i> • <i>I agree because fewer people smoke and they don't have coal fires anymore which means fewer breathing problems.</i> 1 identifications = 4-5 marks 2 identifications = 5-6 marks 3+ identifications = 6 marks Alternatively, and typically, description of living conditions/ lifestyles since 1900 or related events, e.g. <i>More people work on computers now and use tablets and computers for their leisure time. By 1980, 80% of men and 40% of women smoked.</i>
Level 1 (1-3 marks)	Typically, valid but general assertion(s), e.g. <i>I agree because housing has got better and there is more food available now.</i>
0 marks	

Section B: Britain in Peace and War, 1900–1918

Question 6a – 3 marks

In Interpretation A, the historian tries to show the strength of the support for the Boer War in some parts of Britain. Identify and explain one way in which he does this.

Notes and guidance specific to the question set

Points marking (AO4): 1+1+1. 1 mark for identification of a relevant and appropriate way in which the historian tries to get across the strength of the support for the Boer War in some parts of Britain + 1 mark for a basic explanation of this + 1 mark for development of this explanation.

Reminder – This question does not seek evaluation of the given interpretation, just selection of relevant material and analysis of this in relation to the issue in the question. The explanation of how the historian tries to get across the strength of the support for the Boer War in some parts of Britain may analyse the interpretation or aspects of the interpretation by using the candidate's knowledge of the historical situation portrayed and / or to the method or approach used by the website. Knowledge and understanding of historical context must be intrinsically linked to the analysis of the interpretation in order to be credited. Marks must not be awarded for the demonstration of knowledge or understanding in isolation.

The following answers are indicative. Other appropriate ways and appropriate, accurate explanation should also be credited:

NOTE: Typically, for three marks, candidates may either:

Start with a very specific feature (1) and then make two points of development (2) about their feature, e.g.

- *He says that David Lloyd George was 'overwhelmed with a torrent of missiles - cans, bottles and bricks wrapped with barbed wire'. (1) This suggests that the crowd was incredibly violent and trying to physically hurt Lloyd George. (1) This gets across the strength of their feeling because it shows they were prepared to be arrested for their support for the war. (1).*

OR

Begin with a more general point (1), then go on to give an example of this (1), and then say how this gets across the nationalistic feeling and strength of support for the Boer War in some parts of Britain (1), e.g.

- *He gets across the strength of support for the war by emphasising how nationalistic the crowd were. (1) For example, he describes how the crowd were 'waving Union Jacks, blowing trumpets or whistles, shouting, chanting and singing.' (1) This shows how the people at the meeting viewed Lloyd George as unpatriotic for not supporting the war. (1)*
- *He gets across the strength of feeling by building up a picture of the noisy, rowdy crowd. (1) For instance, he says things like 'the incredible noise' and mentions how the crowd of 'seven thousand' were 'blowing trumpets or whistles, shouting, chanting and singing'. (1) This gets across the crowd's support for the war by showing how intimidating it must have been for the anti-war speakers like Lloyd George. (1)*
- *He gets across the strength of feeling by pointing out that the authorities were expecting trouble at the meeting. (1) For example, there was a 'group of policemen' hidden underneath the stage. (1) This shows how the police knew that Lloyd George's anti-war speech would attract criticism and even violence. (1)*
- *He makes us feel fearful for the safety of Lloyd George against the mob. (1) For instance, he lists all the different things being thrown at him, such as 'missiles, cans, bottles and bricks wrapped with barbed wire.' (1) This gives impression the crowd are just so stirred up by jingoism they don't care about the law or the speakers. (1)*

Question 6b – 5 marks If you were asked to do further research on one aspect of Interpretation A, what would you choose to investigate? Explain how this would help us to analyse and understand attitudes in Britain towards the Boer War.	
Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 2 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 3 marks Please note that that while the weightings of AO1 to AO2 are equal in levels 1 and 2, AO2 carries greater weight in level 3.	Notes and guidance specific to the question set <i>Answers may choose to put forward lines of investigation by framing specific enquiry questions, but it is possible to achieve full marks without doing this.</i> <i>Suggested lines of enquiry / areas for research may be into matters of specific detail or into broader themes but must involve use of second order concepts rather than mere discovery of new information if AO2 marks are to be awarded.</i> <i>Examples of areas for further research include:</i> <i>Reasons for support for/ opposition to the war (causation); whether all groups/ areas supported the war equally (diversity); the impact the war had on attitudes towards Empire (consequence); the impact of the war on the Liberal Party (consequence); whether support for the war remained steady throughout its course (change/ continuity); the impact of the Liberals' and others' opposition on public opinion (consequence).</i>
Level 3 (5 marks) The response shows knowledge and understanding of relevant key features and characteristics (AO1). It uses a strong understanding of second order historical concept(s) to explain clearly how further research on the chosen aspect would improve our understanding of the event or situation (AO2).	
Level 2 (3–4 marks) The response shows knowledge and understanding of relevant key features and characteristics (AO1). It uses a general understanding of second order historical concept(s) to explain how further research on the chosen aspect would improve our understanding of the event or situation (AO2).	
Level 1 (1–2 mark) The response shows knowledge of features and characteristics (AO1). It shows a basic understanding of second order historical concept(s) and attempts to link these to explanation of how further research on the chosen aspect would improve our understanding of the event or situation (AO2).	
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	

Question 6b – 5 marks If you were asked to do further research on one aspect of Interpretation A, what would you choose to investigate? Explain how this would help us to analyse and understand attitudes in Britain towards the Boer War.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 3 (5 marks)	Typically, a valid line of enquiry based on second order concept with <u>clear explanation</u> of how the enquiry would improve understanding of attitudes in Britain towards the Boer War, e.g. <i>[Change / consequence]</i> <i>I would like to investigate whether support for the war dwindled as it went on or whether support remained constant throughout. This would help us to understand whether there was a specific turning point during war that had a big impact on public opinion.</i> Alternatively, and typically, a valid line of enquiry based on second order concept to compare to an <u>impression</u> given by Interpretation A. Indication of how this would improve understanding of attitudes in Britain towards the Boer War, e.g. <i>[Diversity]</i> <i>Interpretation A gives us the impression that opposition to the Boer War was a minority view and ordinary people jingoistically supported it. I would like to compare different areas of the country and different groups of people to see if support for the war varied in any way. This would help us to understand whether factors like class, gender, or geography had much influence over how nationalistic the British people were.</i>
Level 2 (3-4 marks)	Typically, a valid line of enquiry based on second order concept, with no clear indication of how the enquiry would improve understanding of attitudes in Britain towards the Boer War, e.g. <i>[Consequence]</i> <i>I would investigate the impact of Liberal opposition to the war. [3] For instance, did it mean that they got fewer votes in the next election? [4]</i> <i>[Causation]</i> <i>I would like to find out why David Lloyd opposed the Boer War. [3]</i> <i>I would like to find out why the crowd feel so strongly about this as to use violence against Lloyd George. [3]</i> <i>[Consequence]</i> <i>I would look at whether the experience of and attitudes towards the Boer War had any impact on attitudes about the Empire more generally. [3]</i> <i>[Causation]</i> <i>I would look for more information about the content of the speech that Lloyd George was making in Birmingham. [L1] Then we might know why Liberals like him opposed the Boer War. [L2, 4 marks]</i>
Level 1 (1-2 marks)	Typically, an investigation based around finding out more about people / events / objects in Interpretation A – not based on second-order concept (1-2 marks), e.g. <i>I would look for more information about whether anyone was hurt at this meeting in Birmingham. [1]</i> Alternatively, and typically, an investigation based on identifying details from Interpretation A and finding out if they are accurate/ typical (MAX 1 mark), e.g. <i>It suggests that most people supported the war, but I would find out if this really was the case.</i> NOTE 1: Credit at L1 ONLY questions which use the language of second order concepts, but are clearly not a valid historical enquiry, e.g. <i>I want to know <u>why</u> the policemen chose to hide beneath the stage, rather than hiding in the next room or outside.</i> NOTE 2: Mark at L1, 2 MARKS the question, 'Why are the crowd against Lloyd George?' (as the interpretation answers this)

	NOTE 3: No credit for answers which do not identify a question or something they would like to find out, e.g. <i>I would investigate the hammers and knives.</i> (NAQ)
0 marks	

Question 7–12 marks Interpretations B and C both focus on the campaign for women's suffrage. How far do they differ and what might explain any differences?	
Levels AO4 Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations (including how and why interpretations may differ) in the context of historical events studied. Maximum 12 marks	Notes and guidance specific to the question set <i>Answers could consider:</i> • Comparison of provenance and source type alone (L1), e.g. B is on a website but C is in a newspaper; B is bound to place more emphasis on the NUWSS because it was written by the Fawcett Society. C is biased towards Pankhurst because she wrote her biography. • Individual points of similarity/difference in content: B likes the idea of the statue of Millicent Fawcett but C disagrees; B says Fawcett's statue is an 'important moment' but the author of C says she 'won't rejoice' about it; B mentions the 'peaceful campaign' of the suffragists and C agrees that they 'adopted legal tactics'; B only talks about the suffragists but C talks about the suffragettes. • Differences in the overall message about the relative importance/ effectiveness/ portrayal of the NUWSS/ WSPU and/or their leaders e.g B emphasises the significance of the role of Fawcett and NUWSS. The article praises Fawcett for leading a powerful campaign and underlines how important the NUWSS was, mentioning its '50,000 members' and how it was 'significant' in securing the extension of suffrage to women. • However, C is quite dismissive of the work of the NUWSS and attaches greater importance to the role of the WSPU, praising the bravery of Pankhurst for going on 'hunger, thirst and sleep strike'. Purvis condemns Fawcett for 'loudly criticising' the 'militant suffragettes' and she is rather bitter about Fawcett's statue, saying that 'few people' have heard of her and that the names of suffragettes 'do not belong under Fawcett's feet'. • Developed reasons for differences: B emphasises role of the NUWSS because it was published on the website of the Fawcett Society. Their charity was originally part of this organisation and it's therefore not surprising that they want to highlight Fawcett's importance because they wish to promote and celebrate their founder. • C is quite scornful about Fawcett because she wrote the biography of Emmeline Pankhurst, someone often considered Fawcett's rival. This means that she has almost personal attachment to Pankhurst. So she's writing more because she's angry that Pankhurst was not chosen for the statue, and doesn't want her contribution to be forgotten, which leads her to be quite hostile to Fawcett. <i>Marks for relevant knowledge and understanding should be awarded for the clarity and confidence with which candidates discuss features, events or issues mentioned or implied in the interpretations. Candidates who introduce extra relevant knowledge or show understanding of related historical issues can be rewarded for this, but it is not a target of the question.</i> <i>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that is unrelated to the topic in the</i>
Level 4 (10–12 marks) Analyses the interpretations and identifies some features appropriate to the task. Offers a very detailed analysis of similarities and/or differences between the interpretations and gives a convincing and valid explanation of reasons why they may differ. There is a convincing and well-substantiated judgment of how far they differ, in terms of detail or in overall message, style or purpose (AO4).	
Level 3 (7–9 marks) Analyses the interpretations and identifies some features appropriate to the task. Offers a detailed analysis of similarities and/or differences between the interpretations and gives a valid explanation of reasons why they may differ. There is a generally valid and clear judgment about how far they differ, in terms of detail or in overall message, style or purpose (AO4).	
Level 2 (4–6 marks) Analyses the interpretations and identifies some features appropriate to the task. Offers some valid analysis of differences and/or similarities between the interpretations and gives a reasonable explanation of at least one reason why they may differ, and a basic judgement about how far they differ, in terms of detail or in overall message, style or purpose (AO4).	
Level 1 (1–3 marks) Analyses the interpretations and identifies some features appropriate to the task. Identifies some differences and/or similarities between the interpretations and makes a limited attempt to explain why they may differ. There is either no attempt to assess how far they differ, or there is an assertion about this but it is completely unsupported (AO4).	
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	

	question.
--	-----------

Question 7–12 marks	
Interpretations B and C both focus on the campaign for women's suffrage. How far do they differ and what might explain any differences?	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 4 (10-12 marks)	Typically, a valid comparison of message/portrayal/ impression in B and C. Difference <u>explained</u> with specific purpose/ perspective of B and/or C, e.g. As L3, plus: <i>I think the reason that B emphasises the role of the NUWSS is because it was published on the website of the Fawcett Society and this charity has links to the NUWSS. [not L4 yet] So it's not surprising that they want to highlight Fawcett's importance because they wish to celebrate their founder. [10]</i> <i>I think the reason that C is quite scornful about Fawcett is because she wrote the biography of Emmeline Pankhurst. [not L4 yet], so this means that she has almost a personal attachment to Pankhurst. [10] So she's writing more because she's angry that Pankhurst (often considered Fawcett's rival) was not chosen for the statue, and doesn't want her contribution to be forgotten, which leads her to be quite hostile to Fawcett. [11]</i> NOTES: - Award 10–11 marks for candidates who use the purpose/focus of <u>one</u> interpretation to explain difference in portrayals. - Award 11–12 marks for candidates which use the purpose/focus of <u>both</u> interpretations to explain difference in portrayals. - Do NOT allow <u>undeveloped</u> comments about provenance at this level, e.g. <i>B is bound to place more emphasis on the NUWSS because it was written by the Fawcett Society</i> OR <i>C is biased towards Pankhurst because she wrote her biography.</i>
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	Typically, comparison of the overall message/ portrayal/ impression of B and C (based on inference), e.g. <i>B is emphasising the significance of the role of Millicent Fawcett and the NUWSS in the campaign for women's suffrage. The article praises Fawcett for leading a 'powerful campaign' and underlines how important the NUWSS was, drawing attention to its '50,000 members' and how it was 'significant' in securing the extension of suffrage to women.</i> <i>However, C is quite dismissive of the work of the NUWSS and attaches greater importance to the role of the WSPU, praising the bravery of Pankhurst for going on 'hunger, thirst and sleep strike'. Purvis condemns Fawcett for 'loudly criticising' the 'militant suffragettes' and she is rather bitter about Fawcett's statue, saying that 'few people' have heard of her and that the names of suffragettes 'do not belong under Fawcett's feet'. [9]</i> NOTE: Answers with no support from either interpretation = 7 marks, e.g. <i>Interpretation B suggests that the NUWSS was very important in securing women's suffrage. But C thinks the WSPU deserve more recognition.</i>

Level 2 (4-6 marks)	Typically, selects individual points of similarity or difference, e.g. • <i>B likes the idea of the statue of Millicent Fawcett but C disagrees.</i> • <i>B says Fawcett's statue is an 'important moment', but the author of C says she 'won't rejoice' about it.</i> • <i>B mentions the 'moderate campaign' of the suffragists and C agrees that they 'adopted peaceful, legal tactics'.</i> • <i>B only talks about the suffragists but C talks about the suffragists and also the suffragettes.</i> Alternatively, and typically, purpose of one interpretation used to explain its portrayal – no comparison, e.g. <i>B really stresses the importance of Millicent Fawcett and the WSPU. I think this is probably because it was published on the website of the Fawcett Society. Their charity was originally part of this organisation and it's therefore not surprising that they want to highlight Fawcett's importance because they wish to promote and celebrate their founder.</i>
Level 1 (1-3 marks)	Typically, comparison of simplistic provenance (or language, tone, etc. in isolation) e.g. • <i>B is on a website but C is in a newspaper.</i> • <i>B is bound to place more emphasis on the NUWSS because it was written by the Fawcett Society. C is biased towards Pankhurst because she wrote her biography.</i> • <i>B sounds quite happy and joyful but C sounds quite cross and angry. [Does not give any indication of content of either interpretation]</i> Alternatively, and typically, summary / portrayal from one/both interpretations with no valid comparison, e.g. <i>B is about Millicent Fawcett and the NUWSS which was the 'largest organisation campaigning for female suffrage'.</i> <i>C says that Emmeline Pankhurst 'endured 13 imprisonments during the suffrage campaign' and talks about her hunger strikes.</i> Alternatively, and typically, valid but general assertions (1 mark), e.g. <i>B is more positive on Fawcett than C.</i>
0 marks	

Question 8*–20 marks The website ‘historictimes.com’ argues that there was a ‘significant change’ in people’s attitudes towards social class, wealth and poverty in Edwardian Britain. How far do you agree with this view of Britain between 1900 and 1914? Give reasons for your answer.	
Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 5 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 5 marks AO4 Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations in the context of historical events studied. Maximum 10 marks	Notes and guidance specific to the question set <i>Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate any knowledge of social class, wealth or poverty in Edwardian Britain.</i> <i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the Level description. To reach Level 5, this must involve considering both reasons to agree and reasons to disagree with the interpretation.</i> <i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of change and continuity (in attitudes) but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i> Grounds for agreeing include: - Rowntree’s investigations into poverty in York, and the impact that this had on those in power, shows a significant shift in attitude towards poverty and its causes. - The Liberal government brought in series of welfare reforms after 1906 to improve the lives of the poor and elderly – by 1914 there were things like Free School Meals, National Insurance and Old Age Pensions. These reflected a shift in attitude towards government involvement to support those living in poverty. They were influenced by a ‘New Liberalism’ which was a ‘significant change’ in attitude, and different to the previous laissez-faire attitude of governments. - To pay for the reforms Lloyd George introduced the ‘People’s Budget’ in 1909 which marked a significant increase in various taxes, which were aimed at the rich upper classes which shows a ‘significant change’ in attitudes towards the wealthy. - Rise of Labour Party, e.g. 29 MPs after 1906 election, and 40 MPs in 1910, showing more support and therefore changing attitudes/ rising concern for working class/ poor. - Response of / alarm of politicians (especially Liberals) to the poor state of Boer War recruits shows that concerns about the state of the nation’s army and workforce were growing. - Passing of Parliament Act of 1911 shows a growing acceptance that inherited wealth/ title alone should not be the basis for political power or influence in a
Level 5 (17–20 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing evaluation reaching a well-substantiated judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	
Level 4 (13–16 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a sustained and generally convincing evaluation reaching a substantiated judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i>	
Level 3 (9–12 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a partial evaluation with some explanation of ideas reaching a supported judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>	
Level 2 (5–8 marks)	

Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Attempts a basic evaluation with some limited explanation of ideas and a loosely supported judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i>	<i>modern democracy.</i> Grounds for disagreeing include: <i>Limited nature of the Liberals' reforms reflected the continuing value of encouraging thrift and self-reliance, e.g. the NI payments were not enough to support a working man and his family and pensioners had to be 'of good character' to qualify which reflect lingering 'deserving poor' attitudes.</i> <i>The 1909 'People's Budget' was as much about money for Dreadnoughts as for pensions which does not show a break from past actions or attitudes.</i> <i>The reforms were hugely controversial and met with enormous opposition which shows how many people in power (especially in the Lords) were resistant to such a change and therefore did not share in the 'significant change' in attitude.</i> <i>Despite things like the Liberal Reforms, the class structure was still fairly rigid by 1914, e.g. there was a tiny elite of aristocrats and industrialists (around 1% of the population) who held most of the political power. This shows that there was not a 'significant change' in attitudes towards social class.</i> <i>Taff Vale Railway decision 1901 showed that attitudes were still firmly in favour of keeping power away from Trade Unions (i.e. working class). Only overturned by 1906 Trade Disputes Act.</i> <i>Government's militant action against strikes/unrest (e.g. Naval gunboats were sent to the River Mersey and mounted soldiers were sent into the city) in this period shows a desire to maintain the status quo.</i> NOTE: There is no expectation that candidates will deal with all of the areas (social class, wealth and poverty) and it will be an acceptable approach to deal with them together as a package, or separately.
Level 1 (1–4 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) involved in the issue (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. (AO4) There is either no attempt to evaluate and reach a judgment about the interpretation, or there is an assertion about the interpretation but this lacks any support or historical validity. <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i>	
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	

Question 8*–20 marks	
The website 'historictimes.com' argues that there was a 'significant change' in people's attitudes towards social class, wealth and poverty in Edwardian Britain. How far do you agree with this view of Britain between 1900 and 1914? Give reasons for your answer.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 5 (17-20 marks)	Typically, a balanced argument; two valid explained points on each side OR three on one side and one on the other (2–2 or 3–1). Clinching argument = 20 marks, e.g. <i>There is plenty of evidence to support this. In 1900, a commonly held view was that if people were poor, it was because they were lazy or spent their wages in the pub. However, Rowntree's investigations into poverty in York showed that poverty was usually caused by low wages, old age, illness and trade slumps. Research such as this had a big impact on people's attitudes towards the poor, and helped to influence the Liberals to bring in their reforms such as old age pensions.</i> <i>Furthermore, to pay for the reforms Lloyd George introduced the 'People's Budget' in 1909 which marked a significant increase in taxes on income and unearned income, which were aimed at the rich upper classes. This was definitely a 'significant shift' in attitude towards wealth because it was a further move away from a laissez-faire attitude and reflected the view that the rich should be taxed more heavily to support the poor.</i> <i>However, the limited nature of the Liberals' reforms reflected the continuing value of encouraging thrift and self-reliance. For example, their National Insurance payments were deliberately not enough to support a working man and his family, showing how governments didn't want to encourage people to be 'reliant' on the state. Pensioners had to be 'of good character' to qualify for the pension, reflecting lingering 'deserving poor' attitudes rather than a 'significant change'.</i> <i>Finally, despite the Liberal Reforms, the class structure was still fairly rigid by 1914, especially at the top of the hierarchy. A tiny elite of aristocrats and industrialists (only around 1 per cent of the population) held most of the political power. This group conformed rigidly to social norms and expectations. For example, things like country house parties and debutante balls reinforced social distinctions and helped maintain social connections, showing a continuation in attitudes towards class.</i> <i>Overall, I agree with the statement with respect to wealth and poverty. Though clearly attitudes were not revolutionised, there was nevertheless a 'significant change' given the starting point and the tangible changes which followed as a result. However, attitudes towards social class would take longer to change and there was little change in attitude in this respect by 1914.</i>
Level 4 (13-16 marks)	Typically, a balanced or one-sided argument; three explained points of support (2–1 or 3–0), e.g. <i>There is plenty of evidence to support this. In 1900, a commonly held view was that if people were poor, it was because they were lazy or spent their wages in the pub. However, Rowntree's investigations into poverty in York showed that poverty was usually caused by low wages, old age, illness and trade slumps. Research such as this had a big impact on people's attitudes towards the poor, and helped to influence the Liberals to bring in their reforms such as old age pensions.</i> <i>Furthermore, to pay for the reforms Lloyd George introduced the 'People's Budget' in 1909 which marked a significant increase in taxes on income and unearned income, which were aimed at the rich upper classes. This was definitely a 'significant change' in attitude towards wealth because it was a further move away from a laissez-faire attitude and reflected the view that the rich should be taxed more heavily to support the poor.</i> <i>However, the limited nature of the Liberals' reforms reflected the continuing value of encouraging thrift and self-reliance. For example, their National Insurance payments were deliberately not enough to support a working man and his family, showing how governments didn't want to encourage people to be 'reliant' on the state. Pensioners had to be 'of good character' to qualify for the pension, reflecting lingering 'deserving poor' attitudes rather than a 'significant change'.</i>

Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Typically, a one-sided argument, two explained points of support (2–0), e.g. <i>I agree. Firstly, in 1900, a commonly held view was that if people were poor, it was because they were lazy or spent their wages in the pub. However, Rowntree's investigations into poverty in York showed that poverty was usually caused by low wages, old age, illness and trade slumps. Research such as this had a big impact on people's attitudes towards the poor, and helped to influence the Liberals to bring in their reforms such as old age pensions.</i> <i>Furthermore, to pay for the reforms Lloyd George introduced the 'People's Budget' in 1909 which marked a significant increase in taxes on income and unearned income, which were aimed at the rich upper classes. This was definitely a 'significant change' in attitude towards wealth because it was a further move away from a laissez-faire attitude and reflected the view that the rich should be taxed more heavily to support the poor.</i> Alternatively, and typically, a balanced argument; one explained point on each side (1–1), e.g. <i>There is plenty of evidence to support this. In 1900, a commonly held view was that if people were poor, it was because they were lazy or spent their wages in the pub. However, Rowntree's investigations into poverty in York showed that poverty was usually caused by low wages, old age, illness and trade slumps. Research such as this had a big impact on people's attitudes towards the poor, and helped to influence the Liberals to bring in their reforms such as old age pensions.</i> <i>However, the limited nature of the Liberals' reforms reflected the continuing value of encouraging thrift and self-reliance. For example, their National Insurance payments were deliberately not enough to support a working man and his family, showing how governments didn't want to encourage people to be 'reliant' on the state. Pensioners had to be 'of good character' to qualify for the pension, reflecting lingering 'deserving poor' attitudes rather than a 'significant change'.</i>
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Typically, a one-sided argument; one explained point of support (1–0), e.g. <i>I agree. In 1900, a commonly held view was that if people were poor, it was because they were lazy or spent their wages in the pub. However, Rowntree's investigations into poverty in York showed that poverty was usually caused by low wages, old age, illness and trade slumps. Research such as this had a big impact on people's attitudes towards the poor, and helped to influence the Liberals to bring in their reforms such as old age pensions.</i> Explained points must: • identify a valid claim/ argument • offer specific evidence to support the argument • show how their evidence answers the question
Level 1 (1-4 marks)	Typically, identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation (2–4 marks), e.g. • Yes, I agree because attitudes were changing, away from laissez-faire and towards it being the government's responsibility to supporting those in poverty. (2) • No, attitudes did not completely change as shown by how the House of Lords tried to block the People's Budget. Also, not all trades were covered by National Insurance. (3) 1 identifications = 2-3 marks 2 identifications = 3-4 marks 3+ identifications = 4 marks Alternatively, and typically, description of wealth/poverty/social class/ related events (2–4 marks), e.g. • The House of Lords refused to pass the Liberals' budget. (2) Eventually, the government passed the Parliament Act of 1911 to reduce the Lords' powers. (3) • At the upper end of the middle class were higher professionals, like lawyers and doctors. (2) They earned up to £5000 a year. (3) At the lower end were teachers, clerks and police sergeants, on about £100 a year. (4)

	Alternatively, and typically, valid but general assertions (Max 1 mark), e.g. <i>Yes, there were lots of reforms introduced that tackled poverty.</i>
0 marks	

Question 9*–20 marks The website of the National Army Museum claims that the British public ‘supported’ the war effort for the First World War with ‘enthusiasm’. How far do you agree with this view of men and women’s responses to the First World War (1914–1918)? Give reasons for your answer.	
Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 5 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 5 marks AO4 Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations in the context of historical events studied. Maximum 10 marks	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
Level 5 (17–20 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing evaluation reaching a well-substantiated judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate any knowledge of responses to total war.</i> <i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the Level description. To reach Level 5, this must involve considering both reasons to agree and reasons to disagree with the interpretation.</i> <i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of diversity (similarity / difference in responses to war and/or support for war from various individuals/ groups of people) and change/continuity (how support for war changed between 1914 and 1918) but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i>
Level 4 (13–16 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a sustained and generally convincing evaluation reaching a substantiated judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i>	Grounds for agreeing include: 750,000 volunteers for army within first 8 weeks; only a tiny proportion (around 16,000 out of 8 million) of eligible men refused to fight after conscription introduced in 1916; the press censored themselves and stayed in solid support of the war; few people publicly criticised the war and those that did (eg George Bernard Shaw) were generally viewed as traitors; socialists and pacifists received little sympathy from public; Ramsay Macdonald forced to resign as Labour leader because he did not support the war; conscientious objectors treated as shirkers; even towards the end of the war, most of those who questioned the war’s leadership were still in favour of fighting for a victory; NUWSS and WSPU suspended campaigns; hundreds of thousands of women joined VAD, WLA and other organisations or took on men’s jobs.
Level 3 (9–12 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a partial evaluation with some explanation of ideas reaching a supported judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>	
Level 2 (5–8 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the	

interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Attempts a basic evaluation with some limited explanation of ideas and a loosely supported judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i>	Grounds for disagreeing include: Conscription had to be introduced in 1916; socialists and pacifists opposed the war (including Sylvia Pankhurst by this stage); Bernard Shaw's anti-war pamphlet sold 25,000 copies; the mood in Britain changed between 1914 and 1918 from enthusiasm to grim determination; Battle of the Somme was a turning point and government faced serious criticism as people questioned the way the war was fought; food riots in east London in March 1917; voluntary rationing was unsuccessful and compulsory rationing introduced; Lloyd George's criticism of 'business as usual'; coal strike 1915; presence of DORA (e.g. dealing with censorship/ alcohol) suggests support was fragile or that some people did not take the war effort as seriously as government wanted.
Level 1 (1–4 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) involved in the issue (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. (AO4) There is either no attempt to evaluate and reach a judgment about the interpretation, or there is an assertion about the interpretation but this lacks any support or historical validity. <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i>	
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	

Question 9*–20 marks	
The website of the National Army Museum claims that the British public ‘supported’ the war effort for the First World War with ‘enthusiasm’. How far do you agree with this view of men and women’s responses to the First World War (1914–1918)? Give reasons for your answer.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 5 (17-20 marks)	Typically, a balanced argument; two valid explained points on each side <u>OR</u> three on one side and one on the other (2–2 or 3–1). Clinching argument = 20 marks, e.g. <i>There is plenty of evidence to support this interpretation. Firstly, in 1914, Britain relied solely on volunteers for its army and Lord Kitchener, the government minister for war, organised a campaign to get men to volunteer. This was responded to with great enthusiasm by British men; there were 750,000 volunteers in the first 8 weeks, and 2.5 million by 1916, showing how British men rallied around the war effort.</i> <i>Furthermore, women also supported the war effort. For example, thousands joined the Voluntary Aid Detachment (VAD) to provide nursing services in Britain and also in France. The Suffragettes and Suffragists also suspended their campaigns in order to focus on supporting the war effort. By 1918, hundreds of thousands of women were working in traditionally ‘male’ jobs like engineering. This commitment definitely shows women rallying to support the war.</i> <i>However, there is also evidence to challenge this view. When conscription was introduced in 1916, many men applied for exemption. The most well-known were the conscientious objectors, who refused to fight because of strong moral, political or religious views. Out of 14,000 CO applications, 2,600 were rejected and told they had to join the army. Those who refused were sentenced to hard labour. This shows the strength of feeling from this group who cannot be said to have shown ‘enthusiasm’ for the war.</i> <i>Furthermore, it could be said that the British public were not completely enthusiastic in their support of the war because they didn’t do much to support voluntary rationing when it was introduced in May 1917, and it failed. This meant that the shortages of things like sugar and bread continued and the government was forced to introduce compulsory rationing in 1918. So it seems that popular ‘enthusiasm’ only went so far.</i> <i>Overall, I would say that the nation did ‘support’ the war effort (thousands of conscientious objectors did contribute to the war effort through non-combatant duties). On the whole, though – especially as the war went on – this was not necessarily carried out with the same ‘enthusiasm’ as when war was first declared, especially as things like shortages began to pinch.</i>
Level 4 (13-16 marks)	Typically, a balanced or one-sided argument; three explained points of support (2–1 or 3–0), e.g. <i>There is plenty of evidence to support this interpretation. Firstly, in 1914, Britain relied solely on volunteers for its army and Lord Kitchener, the government minister for war, organised a campaign to get men to volunteer. This was responded to with great enthusiasm by British men; there were 750,000 volunteers in the first 8 weeks, and 2.5 million by 1916, showing how British men rallied around the war effort.</i> <i>Furthermore, women also supported the war effort. For example, thousands joined the Voluntary Aid Detachment (VAD) to provide nursing services in Britain and also in France. The Suffragettes and Suffragists also suspended their campaigns in order to focus on supporting the war effort. By 1918, hundreds of thousands of women were working in traditionally ‘male’ jobs like engineering. This commitment definitely shows women rallying to support the war.</i> <i>However, there is also evidence to challenge this view. When conscription was introduced in 1916, many men applied for exemption. The most well-known were the conscientious objectors, who refused to fight because of strong moral, political or religious views. Out of 14,000 CO applications, 2,600 were rejected and told they had to join the army. Those who refused were sentenced to hard labour. This shows the strength of feeling from this group who cannot be said to have shown ‘enthusiasm’ for the war.</i>

Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Typically, a one-sided argument, two explained points of support (2–0), e.g. <i>I agree. Firstly, in 1914, Britain relied solely on volunteers for its army and Lord Kitchener, the government minister for war, organised a campaign to get men to volunteer. This was responded to with great enthusiasm by British men; there were 750,000 volunteers in the first 8 weeks, and 2.5 million by 1916, showing how British men rallied around the war effort.</i> <i>Furthermore, women also supported the war effort. For example, thousands joined the Voluntary Aid Detachment (VAD) to provide nursing services in Britain and also in France. The Suffragettes and Suffragists also suspended their campaigns in order to focus on supporting the war effort. By 1918, hundreds of thousands of women were working in traditionally 'male' jobs like engineering. This commitment definitely shows women rallying to support the war.</i> Alternatively, and typically, a balanced argument; one explained point on each side (1–1), e.g. <i>There is plenty of evidence to support this interpretation. Firstly, in 1914, Britain relied solely on volunteers for its army and Lord Kitchener, the government minister for war, organised a campaign to get men to volunteer. This was responded to with great enthusiasm by British men; there were 750,000 volunteers in the first 8 weeks, and 2.5 million by 1916, showing how British men rallied around the war effort.</i> <i>However, there is also evidence to challenge this view. When conscription was introduced in 1916, many men applied for exemption. The most well-known were the conscientious objectors, who refused to fight because of strong moral, political or religious views. Out of 14,000 CO applications, 2,600 were rejected and told they had to join the army. Those who refused were sentenced to hard labour. This shows the strength of feeling from this group who cannot be said to have shown 'enthusiasm' for the war.</i>
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Typically, a one-sided argument; one explained point of support (1–0), e.g. <i>I agree because in 1914, Britain relied solely on volunteers for its army and Lord Kitchener, the government minister for war, organised a campaign to get men to volunteer. This was responded to with great enthusiasm by British men; there were 750,000 volunteers in the first 8 weeks, and 2.5 million by 1916, showing how British men rallied around the war effort.</i> Explained points must: • identify a valid claim/ argument • offer specific evidence to support the argument • show how their evidence answers the question
Level 1 (1-4 marks)	Typically, identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation (2–4 marks), e.g. • <i>No, after the Battle of the Somme, the government faced serious criticism as people questioned the way the war was fought. (2)</i> • <i>Yes, I agree because hundreds of thousands of women joined VAD, WLA and other organisations, or took on men's jobs in industries like engineering. (3)</i> 1 identifications = 2-3 marks 2 identifications = 3-4 marks 3+ identifications = 4 marks Alternatively, and typically, description of relevant events (2–4 marks), e.g. <i>When war broke out, Lord Kitchener, the government minister for war, organised the campaign to get men to volunteer for armed service. (2) Later, in 1916, the government had to introduce conscription. (3)</i>

	Alternatively, and typically, valid but general assertions (Max 1 mark), e.g. <i>I disagree because thousands of men and women supported the war effort through war work.</i>
0 marks	

Need to get in touch?

If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our customer support centre.

Call us on

01223 553998

Alternatively, you can email us on

support@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit



ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder



ocr.org.uk



Twitter/ocrextams



/ocrextams



/company/ocr



/ocrextams



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS & ASSESSMENT

OCR is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2025 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA.

Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

OCR operates academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers including A Levels, GCSEs, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals.

OCR provides resources to help you deliver our qualifications. These resources do not represent any particular teaching method we expect you to use. We update our resources regularly and aim to make sure content is accurate but please check the OCR website so that you have the most up-to-date version. OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these resources.

Though we make every effort to check our resources, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, so it is important that you always use information in the latest specification. We indicate any specification changes within the document itself, change the version number and provide a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource, please [contact us](#).

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR or are thinking about switching, you can request more information using our [Expression of Interest form](#).

Please [get in touch](#) if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support you in delivering our qualifications.