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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Study Source A</th>
<th>What is the message of this cartoon? Use details of the source and your own knowledge to explain your answer.</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Study Source A</td>
<td><strong>What is the message of this cartoon? Use details of the source and your own knowledge to explain your answer.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 0</td>
<td>No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Description of surface detail / general assertion eg</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• People are eating less bread</td>
<td><strong>Alternative Level 1</strong> Misinterpretation of the cartoon eg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The rich are doing their bit People should eat less bread</td>
<td><strong>Level 2</strong> Commentary on content of source but fails to explicitly identify or explain any message eg</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• This cartoon shows how the war affected different groups. The poor are shown as thin and pale and they are being told to eat less bread while the rich are well fed and are not suffering from the war at all.</td>
<td><strong>Level 3</strong> Secondary message of cartoon</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The cartoon is saying that bread is in short supply</td>
<td>• The message of the cartoon is that some people are going hungry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The message of the cartoon is that the rich are selfish and don’t care about others.</td>
<td>• The cartoon is saying there is a big divide between rich and poor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The cartoon is saying there is a big divide between rich and poor. Top mark for supported / developed answer</td>
<td><strong>Level 4</strong> Main message of cartoon – criticism of the rich in relation to war effort eg</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The cartoon is saying that the rich people in Britain are not contributing properly to the war effort.</td>
<td><strong>Level 5</strong> Main message of cartoon – criticism of the rich in relation to war effort- with development from source or contextual knowledge or cross reference eg</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The cartoon is saying that the rich people in Britain are not contributing properly to the war effort. They are telling everyone else to eat less bread but they look very well fed.</td>
<td>• The cartoon is saying that the rich people in Britain are not contributing properly to the war effort. Before the war there were tensions between different classes and the war made these tensions worse.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The cartoon is saying that the rich people in Britain are not contributing properly to the war effort. They are telling everyone else to eat less bread but they look very well fed. In 1917 Britain was suffering from severe shortages caused by German U-boats destroying merchant ships so some people were going hungry.</td>
<td><strong>Level 6</strong> Main message of cartoon – criticism of the rich - developed with two from: source; context; cross reference eg</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Number</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Sources B and C. Which source do you trust more about the experiences of women working in the munitions industry? Use details of the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 0</td>
<td>No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level 1         | General assertion OR summary of source(s) eg
| • I trust Source C more because it shows what it was like. | 1 |
| Level 2         | Selects relevant points and simply asserts reliability / unreliability of sources OR fails to address issue of trust eg
| • I trust Source B more because we know it was dangerous with things like explosions.
| • I trust B because the tone is more balanced, it talks about positive and negative things.
| • I trust C more because women did work in the munitions factories like it shows. NOTE: Answers must make some selection from source(s) | 2-3 |
| Alternative Level 2 | Answers based on undeveloped generalised comments (ie could refer to almost any source) about provenance eg
| • I trust Source B because she was a worker from the time.
| • I do not trust Source C it is just a drawing. NOTE: Both sources for top mark | |
| Level 3         | Answers based on undeveloped specific comments (ie are unmistakeably focused on B and C) about provenance eg
| • I trust Source B as it was written by someone who was a munitions worker.
| • I do not trust Source C as it is a government poster. | 4 |
| Level 4         | Explains why they trust or do not trust source by evaluating one source. Evaluation could be based on tone / language / purpose, cross reference or contextual knowledge eg
| • We cannot really trust Source C. It is a government poster and it is trying to get women to sign up and work in the munitions factories. So it's making the work look nice. The woman looks confident and happy and she also looks very clean.
| • Source B can be trusted because we know working in these factories was unhealthy and dangerous. We know that the phosphorous used in shells caused women’s skin to turn yellow. NOTE: Award within level for development | 5-6 |
| Level 5         | As L4 but evaluates both sources | 7 |
| Level 6         | As Level 5 but with genuine conclusion (as opposed to restating previous points) which addresses which source is more trustworthy eg
<p>| • So overall, source B is a much more trustworthy source than source C. To begin with, it is actually about conditions in the industry and unlike C it is a realistic portrayal rather than a propaganda tool to get women to join the factories. NOTE: This ‘conclusion’ might well be found at the start of the answer! | 8 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Mark Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3              | Study Source D  
How far are you surprised by this source?  
Use details of the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. |
| Level 0        | No evidence submitted or response does not address the question | 0 |
| Level 1        | General assertion or summarises eg  
• Yes, they went on strike. | 1 |
| Level 2        | Everyday empathy – comments which treat source content as though it could be any period, including present ie not rooted in the First World War eg  
• I am not surprised they went on strike as they wanted more money.  
• I am surprised the man volunteered and they turned him down.  
Alternative Level 2  
Valid comments but fails to explain surprised or not surprised eg  
• When war broke out in 1914 there was a massive propaganda effort and huge support for the war. Thousands of men volunteered to join up and they were still joining up in 1915.  
NOTE: Award at this level even if answer which fails to address surprise is well informed and developed. | 2-3 |
| Level 3        | Surprised or not surprised by internal contradictions/consistencies eg  
• The man supported the war and even wanted to join up so it is surprising that he then went on strike.  
• I am not surprised he changed his mind and admitted the strike was worth it because they got an extra 2 shillings a week.  
Alternative Level 3  
Uses limited or generalised contextual knowledge to identify element(s) of source which are surprising or not surprising eg  
• I am surprised that a man who volunteered for war at this time was turned down. The army needed more troops.  
• I am not surprised they went on strike. The war brought hard times. | 4 |
| Level 4        | Uses specific context of First World War to explain why event(s) described in source other than the strike are surprising and/or not surprising eg  
• I am surprised the man was turned down when he volunteered. The army needed more troops and there was a huge propaganda campaign with posters and parades to get men to volunteer for the war.  
• I am not surprised he was turned down for the army because coal mining was a reserved occupation as coal was needed for the war effort. | 5 |
| Level 5        | Uses specific context of First World War to explain why events described in source relating to the strike are surprising or not surprising eg  
• I am surprised he was allowed to go on strike. When the war started in 1914 the government brought in DORA. This took over important industries like coal and put them under government control.  
• I am not surprised that he ended up going on strike. During the war there were thousands of strikes because wages were so low and food prices went up because of U-boat attacks. | 6 |
| Level 6        | Explains surprised and not surprised eg  
• Surprised and not surprised examples from Levels 4 or 5. At least one must be L5 (ie about the strike).  
Alternative L6  
Addresses both sides but concludes in favour of one side (at least one example must be about strike) eg  
• Script B | 7 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Mark Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4               | Study Source E  
Why did the government publish this poster in 1916? 
Use details of the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. |
| Level 0         | No evidence submitted or response does not address the question  
0 |
| Level 1         | General assertion or describes surface detail  
• To tell people to watch out for the Kaiser  
1 |
| Level 2         | Focus on context of source with no direct comment on message or purpose  
• The government published the poster because in 1916 there were food shortages in Britain  
because German U-boats were sinking all the ships bringing in supplies.  
2-3 |
| Alternative Level 2 | Commentary on source without explicitly answering question  
• The poster is showing that people are wasting food even though it is wartime. We can see  
people who are well dressed, eating and smoking cigars.  |
| Level 3         | Secondary message of source  
• The government published the poster to show that some people were still wasting food.  
4 |
| Level 4         | Main message of source (ie people who are extravagant are being disloyal to war effort)  
• The source was published because the government wanted to give the message that people  
who ate and drank too much were traitors. The poster says they are in league with the Kaiser.  
NOTE: Two key elements needed here – extravagance and disloyalty / helping enemy  
5 |
| Alternative Level 4 | Asserts purpose (getting people to save or stop wasting food) with no development  
• The poster was published to get people to save food.  |
| Level 5         | Explains purpose (saving or not wasting food) using detail or context deployed relevantly  
• The government published this poster to stop people wasting food. It says that if you waste  
food and use extravagant luxuries then you are in league with the Kaiser.  
• The government published this poster in 1916 because it wanted all groups in society to do  
their bit. It was worried the rich were not doing their bit for the war effort and it was trying to  
get them to save food like everyone else had to by shaming them and saying they were the  
Kaiser’s friends.  
• The government published this poster to stop people wasting food and spending money on  
luxuries when they should have been supporting the war effort. In 1916 British troops were  
fighting a huge Battle on the Somme and Britain needed all the resources it could get for the  
war effort.  
• Could allow sensible comments on submarine warfare and or the munitions crisis of  
1915. Could also use cross reference to explain context eg Sources D and H re inequality of  
hardships.  
6-7 |
| Level 6         | Explains purpose (saving or not wasting food) using detail and context deployed relevantly  
• The government published this poster to stop people wasting food and spending money on  
luxuries when they should have been supporting the war effort. In 1916 British troops were  
fighting a huge Battle on the Somme and Britain needed all the resources it could get for the  
war effort. The poster tries to shame extravagant people by saying that they are in league with  
the Kaiser and are betraying the war effort.  
8 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Mark Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Study Sources F and G.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is one of these sources more useful than the other to an historian?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use details of the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 0</strong></td>
<td>No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1</strong></td>
<td>General assertion or summaries eg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Source F because it gives figures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2</strong></td>
<td>Answers which simply assert usefulness of content eg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Source F is useful because it shows that 425 people were killed in an air raid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE: Top marks only if both sources considered – applies to L2 and Alt L2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative Level 2</strong></td>
<td>Commentary on source(s) which fails to address question of usefulness eg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Source F is very detailed so it can be trusted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Source F is a police report so its only purpose is to inform and so it can be trusted whereas Source B has too much of a positive spin and it is trying to reassure the public that Britain’s air defences are effective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 3</strong></td>
<td>Answers based on specific but undeveloped comments about provenance eg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Source F is useful because a police report would show what the officers on the ground actually saw after an air raid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Source G is useful because it is by a government minister who would know what was happening.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 4</strong></td>
<td>Inference(s) about why content of source(s) is useful eg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Source F is useful because it shows us how much damage was done by an air raid. It tells us 25 bombs were dropped, killing 85 people and injuring 425.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Source F would be useful because it would be the result of a detailed police investigation which would reveal a lot of information a historian would find useful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Source G is useful because it shows the measures the government took and how they were successful. Only one zeppelin got through.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative Level 4</strong></td>
<td>Addresses issue of ‘useful for what?’ but takes content at face value eg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Source F is useful to a historian if he is investigating how many people got killed in air raids.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Source G is more useful if you are trying to find out how many zeppelins got through to bomb London.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 5</strong></td>
<td>Evaluates usefulness or limitations of source(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answers may comment on typicality, language or use knowledge or cross reference, purpose eg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Source F is more useful than Source G because F is more believable about the effects of air raids. Source F gives the facts whereas Source G is a piece of propaganda. It is trying to reassure the people that the government is taking effective action and the air defences are working well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Source G is useful because it shows the measures the government took and how they were successful. Only one zeppelin got through. On the other hand Source G may be a bit too positive. It is trying to reassure people that zeppelins are not a threat, when it says ‘only one got through’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 6</strong></td>
<td>Understands value of source(s) as evidence about people / organisations which created it eg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I think Source F is useful because it shows us that the police took on a wide range of roles during the war, not just the normal jobs of catching criminals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I think Source G is actually useful because it is biased. It is trying to reassure people that everything is all right. This is useful evidence showing how the government was trying to present itself and its actions to the people in a good light.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question Number** | **Mark**  
--- | ---  
6 |  
**6 Study all the sources.**  
‘The First World War made life worse for civilians in Britain’.  
How far do the sources in this paper support this statement? Use details from the sources and your own knowledge to explain your answer. Remember to identify the sources you use.  
| **Level 0** | **Level 1** | **Level 2** | **Level 3** | **Level 4** |  
| | No evidence submitted or response does not address the question | General answers unsupported from the sources eg  
- Agree, civilians did suffer  
**NOTE:** Answers based exclusively on factual knowledge with no reference to sources to be marked at this level.  
| | | | One sided answer with explanation of how the sources support OR oppose the statement eg  
- The statement is true – Source B shows that people had to do dangerous work in munitions and even got blown up. Source E says wages went up about 40% but prices went up more so that agrees with the statement because people were worse off.  
**NOTE** Mark at bottom of level if only one source used.  
| | | | Balanced answer with explanation of how the sources support AND oppose the statement eg L2 example plus  
- Some sources say the statement is wrong. Source C shows a woman doing her bit for the war effort and it looks as though her working conditions are really good. In Source D the miner had a successful strike and got more money so this disagrees. In Source H some workers got big pay rises so they did not suffer.  
**NOTE** – Use the range of sources employed and the quality of the development to determine the mark within the range. Small number of sources may be as worthy as a large number treated lightly.  
| | | | Allow up to 2 additional marks for effective evaluation of sources within the answer. This might be tackled on the basis of  
- effective evaluation of the sources used which could be based on evaluation of tone/language/purpose  
- OR cross reference  
- OR knowledge  
| | | | High Level 3 (9-10) plus some consideration of how far the sources support / oppose the statement. This might be tackled on the basis of  
- evaluation of the sources used eg ‘Yes’ side more believable overall  
- eg the pro sources are a stronger collection when taken together.  

---  

| **Source A** | Yes (looking ragged / inequality)  
No (rich look well fed)  
| **Source E** | Yes (inequality)  
No (rich filling their faces)  
| **Source B** | Yes (dangerous conditions)  
No (enjoyed the work)  
| **Source F** | Yes (casualties)  
| **Source C** | No (munitions work is great)  
May argue yes on basis that this is propaganda  
| **Source G** | Yes (casualties)  
| **Source D** | Yes (forced to go on strike)  
No (strike was successful)  
| **Source H** | Yes (wages vs prices)  
No (some workers did well)  
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