

GCSE

History A (Schools History Project)

Unit **A955A/21**: Historical Source Investigation: A Study in British History: Public Health in Britain 1800-1914

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for June 2016

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 will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2016

Assessment Objectives (AOs)

Candidates are expected to demonstrate their ability to:

AO1	Recall, select, use and communicate their knowledge and understanding of history.
AO2	Demonstrate their understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• key concepts: causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context• key features and characteristics of the periods studied and the relationships between them.
AO3	Understand, analyse and evaluate: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• a range of source material as part of an historical enquiry• how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways as part of an historical enquiry.

Annotations

The annotations which will be used for June 2016 will be:

1		+	Similarity/Agree/ Useful
2		-	Difference/Disagree/ Not Useful
3		Eval	Evaluation / Purpose
4		CONT	Contextual knowledge
5		L1	Level 1
6		L2	Level 2
7		L3	Level 3
8		L4	Level 4
9		L5	Level 5
10		NAQ	Not answered question. Knowledge is wrong
11		S	Support
12		SEEN	Noted but no credit given
13		I	Inference
14		XSS	Cross-reference

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
		8	
	<p>Q1: Study Source A. What can you learn from this source about public health at this time? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 4 (7-8 marks) Candidates demonstrate a sophisticated understanding of the source and knowledge and understanding of public health in the 1830s. They make supported inferences about attitudes to the outbreak of diseases and measures taken to prevent their spread. They recognise that the source only deals with limited aspects of public health at this time and they produce a fully developed response to explain its limitations.</p> <p>Level 3 (5-6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound understanding of the source and knowledge and understanding of public health in the 1830s. They make supported inferences about attitudes to the outbreak of diseases and measures taken to prevent their spread. They produce a sound response to explain what can be learned from this source.</p> <p>Level 2 (3-4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and knowledge and understanding of public health in the 1830s. They make unsupported inferences about public health. They produce a basic response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1-2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of public health in the 1830s. They interpret the source and lift a few details from it to produce a simple response OR candidates copy or paraphrase the source and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	8	<p>Use '+' for 'can learn', '-for not 'cannot learn/limitations', 'S' for support from source, 'CONT' for relevant contextual knowledge and CONT+NAQ for irrelevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p>+ and - using knowledge and/or source.</p> <p>+ or - using knowledge and source.</p> <p>+ or – using knowledge or source..</p> <p>Essays on cholera or public health not directly related to source. Copying or paraphrasing.</p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
			<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance, demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>Source A is from Parliament in 1832. It is a useful source because by this time, cholera had arrived in London. I know that a Central Board of Health had been established and a number of measures had been taken, including imposing quarantine on shipping. This MP was not impressed by these measures. He probably represented the interests of traders and shipping merchants. He generally plays down the harmful nature of the disease. He wants the trade ban to be lifted and he makes a plea for the setting up of a Select Committee since he thinks the Board of Health should be made up mainly of the rich and vested interests he represents. He says there are too many medical men on the Board, yet these medical men have witnessed first-hand what cholera can do in other places. However, the source is of limited use only. There is nothing in the source about problems of overcrowding and poor sanitation in towns. There is no description of general living conditions. The source is only really useful if you want to find out about the outbreak of cholera in the 1830s, and even then, it only really tells us about one city and the views of one MP.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Q2: Study Sources B and C. How similar are these two sources? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (8-9 marks) Candidates demonstrate a sophisticated understanding of the sources and knowledge and understanding of the work of Chadwick and Snow. They interpret the sources in context and produce a fully developed response to evaluate similarities and differences between them.</p> <p>Level 4 (6-7 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound understanding of the sources and knowledge and understanding of attitudes of the work of Chadwick and Snow. However, one source is interpreted less satisfactorily. They produce a sound response to explain similarities and differences between them.</p> <p>Level 3 (4-5 marks) Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the sources and knowledge and understanding of the work of Chadwick and Snow. They produce a basic response by comparing the attitudes of the two sources.</p> <p>Level 2 (2-3 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the work of Chadwick and Snow. They interpret the source(s) and produce a simple response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1 mark) Candidates describe the sources and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	9	<p>Use '+' for similarity, '-' for difference, 'S' for source support, CONT for relevant contextual knowledge and CONT+NAQ for irrelevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p>Similarity and difference explained by knowledge and sources.</p> <p>Similarity and difference explained and supported by knowledge or sources. One side (i.e. similarity or difference) may be implied rather than supported directly from knowledge or sources).</p> <p>Similarity OR difference explained and supported by knowledge and/or sources.</p> <p>Describes one source, then the other and says 'so they are similar/different'.</p> <p>Copying or paraphrasing. Essays on Chadwick or Snow that do not address question. Comparisons based on simple provenance.</p> <p>NB. Comparisons must be based on the sources and not just potted histories of the work of Chadwick or Snow.</p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
			<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance, demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>I think that they are similar. Source B talks about how the disease was caused by human waste and even excrement. Source C also mentions the excreta from cholera victims as a cause of death. However, they are also different. Chadwick seems to think that the disease is caused by bad air. He based his Report on detailed investigations into the sanitary conditions in towns and cities all over Britain. The Report contained the factual evidence collected from hundreds of visits, employing dozens of people to carry out those visits. However, his conclusions came before the publication of the Germ Theory, so Chadwick still did not understand the true causes of disease. Whilst he recognised the crucial part played by bad sanitation, he still believed in miasmas. He talks about 'impurities in the air' and 'death caused by filth and bad ventilation.' Snow on the other hand believed the people were drinking contaminated water. He based his conclusions on a detailed study of cases of cholera and the incidence of deaths around the Broad Street water pump in London. He recorded the details of the locations of those who died and found that those who drew their water from that pump died in the largest numbers. Brewery workers living nearby, who drank beer and never drank water from the pump, had better chances of survival. To prove his point, he removed the handle from the pump and the death rate was reduced. He concluded that the old and the young, the rich and the poor, were dying as a result of drinking the water infected by the sewage of London. Whilst they both believed in the systematic collection of evidence and natural theories about the cause of disease, they differed in their conclusions.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Q3: Study Source D. How useful is this source as evidence about public health in the second half of the 19th century? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 4 (7-8 marks) Candidates demonstrate sophisticated understanding of the source and knowledge and understanding of public health in the second half of the nineteenth century. They make inferences from the source in context and produce a fully developed response to evaluate the source for utility. They also explain ways in which the source has limitations.</p> <p>Level 3 (5-6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound understanding of the source and knowledge and understanding of public health in the second half of the nineteenth century. They make inferences from the source in context and produce a fully developed response to evaluate the source for utility.</p> <p>Level 2 (3-4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and knowledge and understanding of public health in the second half of the nineteenth century. They use some knowledge of public health in the nineteenth century and surface information in the source to evaluate the use or limitations of the source.</p> <p>Level 1 (1-2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited understanding of the source and knowledge and understanding of public health in the second half of the nineteenth century to make assertions about the usefulness of isolated parts of the source. OR candidates describe the source and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	8	<p>Use '+' for useful, '-' for not useful/limitations, 'S' for support from source, 'CONT' for relevant contextual knowledge and CONT+NAQ for irrelevant contextual knowledge. Annotations are key to distinguishing between levels 2, 3 and 4.</p> <p>Useful and not useful using S and CONT on at least one side and S or CONT on the other. If candidates use S and CONT on both sides, award 8 marks.</p> <p>Useful and not useful using CONT or S OR useful and not useful using S on one side and CONT on the other.</p> <p>Useful or not useful. 4 marks for + or – with S and CONT 3 marks for + or – with S or CONT</p> <p>Essays on public health in the second half of the nineteenth century not directly related to source. Copying or paraphrasing. Simple provenance.</p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
			<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance, demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>This source is very useful. It shows how Lord Shaftesbury raised his concerns about the impact of overcrowding on public health in 1884-5. It is very detailed. Lord Shaftesbury had witnessed for himself the cramped conditions in which working class people in London were living. He describes how whole families had to occupy a single bed in a single room without ventilation. He was clearly shocked by this. The source is especially useful because it demonstrates that, despite the Public Health Act of 1875 and the Artisans Dwelling Act in the same year, further reform was necessary, and the poor state of public health amongst the working class had continued. At least the fact that his evidence is before a Royal Commission shows that the Government was taking the issue seriously. However, the source only describes conditions in parts of London, which was a heavily over-populated city. We do not know from this source whether conditions in other towns and cities were as bad as this. I know that Joseph Chamberlain transformed housing in Birmingham and if you went to Port Sunlight, you would not find conditions like these. Nor does the source tell us about the drainage and sanitary systems provided in these houses. It just describes the overcrowding. It also describes conditions in 1884-5 and does not mention any of the improvements made in public health before or after that time.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Q4: Study Source E. Why was this source published at that time? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (8-9 marks) Candidates demonstrate a sophisticated understanding of the source and knowledge and understanding of the policies of the Liberal Government between 1906 and 1912. They evaluate the purpose (in terms of intended impact) for it being published and they use their knowledge of the political context at the time to explain why it was published then.</p> <p>Level 4 (6-7 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound understanding of the source and knowledge and understanding of the policies of the Liberal Government between 1906 and 1912. They explain the purpose (in terms of intended impact) for it being published.</p> <p>Level 3 (4-5 marks) Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and knowledge and understanding of the policies of the Liberal Government between 1906 and 1912 to explain the message of the source.</p> <p>Level 2 (2-3 marks) Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and limited knowledge and understanding of the policies of the Liberal Government between 1906 and 1912. They explain some context but fail to explain the message or purpose of the source or they explain the message or purpose of the source without setting it in context.</p> <p>Level 1 (1 marks) Candidates describe the source and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	9	<p>Use L5 for purpose and context, L4 for message and purpose, L3 for message and L2 for detail/topic.</p> <p>Purpose and context. The context must be about the debate that was going on in 1908. Purpose may include 'stop the reforms', 'stop the taxes' 'persuade people to oppose Lloyd George' etc.</p> <p>Message and purpose. Message = what the source tells us. Purpose = what the author intended the impact to be. (<i>'This source shows LG robbing the rich to pay the poor (message). The author wanted people to oppose the bill (purpose).'</i>)</p> <p>Message</p> <p>Detail/topic</p> <p>Description</p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
		9	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance, demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>This was published to encourage people to oppose Lloyd George's pension reforms. Between 1906 and 1912, as the Liberal Government introduced a series of measures to help the sick and the poor, 'Punch' magazine ran a series of cartoons opposing the changes. This was one of these cartoons. This cartoon shows Lloyd George. He is holding a pistol in his right hand. He is carrying a collection box which says 'Old Age Pension Fund'. He is described as a 'Philanthropic Highwayman'. He is robbing from the rich to pay for the poor. In the background, a car is approaching. This represents the rich people who had to pay a tax on fuel to help pay for the introduction of old age pensions by Lloyd George and the Liberals in 1908. The idea of providing old age pensions was not accepted by all, and debate continued for some time about 'the deserving poor' and the 'undeserving poor'. The question of who should be entitled to a pension was debated by MPs. The cartoon was published to support the opposition of the rich to pensions for all. Lloyd George is quoted as saying, 'I'll make 'em pity the aged poor'. The rich objected to being forced to pay. Despite cartoons like these, Lloyd George continued to tax the rich in his budget of 1909, to help finance further reforms introduced by the Liberals.</i></p> <p><u>NB The alternative interpretation of this cartoon that it was published to support Lloyd George, is equally as valid as the interpretation given above.</u></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 		19 (16+3)	 This question also carries 3 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 17 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p>Q5: 'The reason little was done to improve public health in Britain until the early 20th century was because of the lack of understanding about the cause of disease.' How far do you agree with this interpretation? Use your knowledge of British Public Health 1800-1914 and the sources to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 6 (15–16 marks) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of public health 1800–1914 to produce a fully developed response that evaluates effectively the interpretation. They make sophisticated use of a range of sources to support their response. Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 5 (12–14 marks) Candidates demonstrate good knowledge and understanding of public health 1800–1914 to produce a developed response that evaluates effectively the interpretation. They make good use of several of the sources to support their response. Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 (9–11 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of public health 1800–1914 to produce a developed response that either effectively supports or challenges the interpretation. They make sound use of several of the sources to support their response. Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p>	16	<p>Use '+' for agree, '-' for disagree, 'S' for source support, CONT for relevant contextual knowledge, Use L5+ for L6.</p> <p>Level 6 answers are characterised by an argument that is clear from the start – you know where they are going – a coherent answer with a 'clinching argument'. The candidate gives their opinion and supports it by accurate use of knowledge and uses the sources as support for both sides throughout the answer. OR candidates adopt a forensic approach to one side of the argument, tackled in different ways.</p> <p>Level 5 answers may consider both sides of the argument well, but the conclusion can feel 'bolted-on'. <u>To reach level 5 or 6 candidates will have done both sides well with both accurate deployment of knowledge and valid use of the sources to support their argument. We expect to see a minimum of 3 sources used critically for these levels.</u></p> <p>Candidates deploy knowledge accurately and make valid use of some sources to support their answer, but one side of the argument is done better than the other.</p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 	<p>Level 3 (6–8 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of public health 1800–1914 to produce a response. They assert which sources support the interpretation and which sources disagree with the interpretation. Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 2 (4–5 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of public health 1800–1914 and produce a basic response that makes little valid use of sources. Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–3 marks) Candidates demonstrate very limited knowledge of public health 1800–1914 or make little use of sources. A very limited response is produced. Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p>Candidates deploy knowledge accurately and make valid use of some sources, but they only address one side of the argument.</p> <p><u>Answers which fail to use either knowledge or sources means that any candidate cannot score above level 2 / 5 marks. It is not enough to simply 'refer to the sources by letter' - this is not using them critically and, where candidates write 'as in source C' this would only be a level 2 response (at most)</u></p> <p><u>You must mark any blank pages with the annotation BP before you can submit a 100% marked response.</u></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
			<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance, demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>I only agree with this statement to a certain extent. It is true that the lack of understanding of the causes of disease played its part in holding back developments in public health in the nineteenth century. People like the MP in Source A dismissed the work of doctors and tried to protect the interests of merchants. Chadwick (Source B) also struggled to convince people about the recommendations in his report and one reason for this was because he mistakenly believed in the miasma theory of how disease was caused. He believed 'that the various forms of epidemic disease amongst the labouring classes are caused by damp and filth, overcrowded dwellings and by impurities in the air which are produced by decaying animal and vegetable substances'. Partly as a result of this, the work of the General Board of Health was largely overlooked and the terms of the 1848 Public Health Act, which were only voluntary, were mostly ineffective. Even though John Snow (Source C) understood the link between water and cholera, he did not have the resources to develop a convincing explanation of germs and disease. However, I believe that there were other, more important reasons why it took so long to improve public health. Most significantly, there were powerful vested interests that were opposed to change. Many in local councils argued that it would be too expensive to spend ratepayers' money to provide proper sewerage systems. They argued that the poor should look after themselves; that it would weaken the character of individuals if they came to depend on the rich to solve their problems for them. In Source A, John Johnstone is quite prepared to overlook the medical evidence in order to protect the interests of those he represents. When he calls for a Select Committee to investigate cholera, all he really wants is for quarantine to be lifted so that trade could flow again. He said that the London Board of Health should have had more 'noblemen and gentlemen of the country' on it. These are the very people he represents, and he knows they will benefit from the lifting of quarantine. If the lack of understanding about the cause of disease was such a crucial factor, you would have expected things to improve rapidly after 1861, when Pasteur published his germ theory, finally providing a conclusive explanation of the cause of disease. Surely now, people would see the need for public health to be sorted out. Whilst there were some improvements, like the 1875 Public Health Act for example, Source D proves that there were still major areas of neglect leading to hardship. Shaftesbury's description of the overcrowding in London was shocking, even more so because it came eight years after the</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
			<p><i>Artisans Dwelling Act, which was supposed to have put an end to problems like these. Despite the work of people like Seebohm Rowntree and Charles Booth in exposing the depths of poverty in towns and cities, there were still those who opposed making any improvements to Public Health. Even in 1906-1912, Punch magazine ran a series of cartoons which opposed the Liberal Reforms. Source E is typical of them, showing Lloyd George as a highwayman, robbing from the rich to pay for the poor. So, in conclusion, I think the delays in introducing proper systems of public health had much more to do with the impact of these vested interests than whether they understood the causes of disease or not.</i></p>

Spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPaG) assessment grid***High performance 3 marks***

Candidates spell, punctuate and use rules of grammar with consistent accuracy and effective control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, they use a wide range of specialist terms adeptly and with precision.

Intermediate performance 2 marks

Candidates spell, punctuate and use rules of grammar with considerable accuracy and general control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, they use a good range of specialist terms with facility.

Threshold performance 1 mark

Candidates spell, punctuate and use rules of grammar with reasonable accuracy in the context of the demands of the question. Any errors do not hinder meaning in the response. Where required, they use a limited range of specialist terms appropriately.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2016

