

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 2017

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 2017

Annotations

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
1	<p>Q: Study Source A. How useful is this source as evidence about public health in the first half of the nineteenth 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 first 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 first 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 first 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 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.</p> <p>Useful and not useful for information (and lack of it) about public health, using S and CONT</p> <p>Useful and not useful for information or lack of it, with S or CONT S for MINUS can be around typicality (eg only Manchester/only 1832 etc)</p> <p>Useful or not useful for information or lack of it, with S and/or CONT</p> <p>Essays on public health in the first half of the nineteenth century not related to source. Copying or paraphrasing. Simple provenance.</p> <p>NB If candidates make cross-reference to Source B, credit as CONT</p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1			<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 poor the living conditions were at that time. Kay talks about unpaved and narrow streets. The houses sound dreadful; overcrowded, poorly ventilated and containing piles of refuse. They must have been dark and dingy places to live in. This was probably as a result of the rapid growth in population in Manchester at this time. The doctor makes a connection between dirt and disease, even before Chadwick's report in 1842 gave extensive details of dirt and disease. In that sense, this source is radical in its findings. However, the doctor also puts some of the blame for these conditions on the bad habits of the people living there. This is quite typical of attitudes at that time. The source has its limitations however. It does not tell us about the living conditions in other towns and cities in the first half of the nineteenth century. It only tells us about one city (Manchester) in 1832. As such, it only covers one part of the country, and only the first third of the century. There is no mention of Chadwick, or the 1848 Public Health Act. The source does not cover living conditions for people who were not cotton workers, or people who lived in the countryside. Finally, it does not even mention cholera, yet cholera had struck Britain in 1831-2.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2		8	
	<p>Q: Study Sources B and C. Do these sources prove that there had been no progress in public health in Britain between 1844 and 1863? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 4 (7-8 marks) Candidates demonstrate a sophisticated understanding of the sources and knowledge and understanding of government intervention in the middle of the nineteenth century. They interpret the sources in context and produce a fully developed response to evaluate how far the sources support the view that public health had not improved.</p> <p>Level 3 (5-6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound understanding of the sources and knowledge and understanding of government intervention in the middle of the nineteenth century. They produce a sound response to explain how far the sources support the view that public health had not improved.</p> <p>Level 2 (3-4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the sources and knowledge and understanding of government intervention in the middle of the nineteenth century. They produce a basic response about how far the sources support the view that public health had not improved.</p> <p>Level 1 (1-2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of government intervention in the middle of the nineteenth century. They interpret the source(s) and produce a simple response.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	8	<p>Use '+' for agree, '-' for disagree, S for source use, CONT for valid contextual knowledge, CONT+NAQ for invalid contextual knowledge. (See below for indicative contextual knowledge.)</p> <p>Balanced answer. Uses S and CONT. + and - S and CONT</p> <p>Agrees or disagrees. Uses S and CONT. + OR -, S and CONT</p> <p>OR Agrees and disagrees, using S only. + and -, S</p> <p>Agrees or disagrees. Uses S only. + or -, S</p> <p>Simple provenance/reliability. Or simply describes source content. Or answers that do not use the sources.</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>In some respects, these sources do suggest that public health had not improved. Source B shows that ratepayers were more concerned about keeping down the costs of sewerage, so there were major flaws with the new system that was built. Source C also seems to suggest that there is little improvement. The writer says that the Council have the power and resources to improve the drainage and sanitation in Leeds, but he doubts that they will do anything, because those on the Council who have the power are also the same people who would have to pay for the changes. Thus, the sources suggest that there has been little progress. However, these are isolated sources about an individual town at different times during the period as a whole. They are both about Leeds. They do not prove that there had been no progress throughout the whole of Britain. From my own knowledge, Chadwick had published a report in 1842 which drew attention to the terrible conditions in which people lived. This, and the various outbreaks of cholera, prompted the Government to act, and in 1848 a Public Health Act was passed. As a result, local Boards of Health were set up which had the power to improve the living conditions. Although the Act was not compulsory, local Boards in some towns and cities went to some length to reform public health. Source B and C are examples of the debates which probably took place in a number of Boards and Councils in Britain. However, as cholera disappeared, the general Board of Health faced opposition and Chadwick was forced out of office. Pasteur's germ theory was not yet universally accepted, and therefore progress on public health improvements was slow.</i></p> <p>VALID CK MUST COME FROM 1844-1863. Most likely to include: 1848 PH Act, 1854 John Snow/Chadwick sacked, 1856 Bazalgette, 1858 Great Stink/Board of Health disbanded, 1861 Pasteur, belief in 'laissez faire' throughout period.</p>

3	9	
<p>Q: Study Sources D and E. Why do these two sources disagree? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 4 (7–9 marks) Candidates demonstrate sophisticated understanding of the sources and knowledge and understanding of attitudes towards public health and poverty in the early twentieth century. They produce a good response to explain the message of the two sources and why they differ.</p> <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the sources and knowledge and understanding of attitudes towards public health and poverty in the early twentieth century. They produce a basic response by comparing the detail of the two sources.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of attitudes towards public health and poverty in the early twentieth century. They interpret the source(s) and produce a simple response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) 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>	<p>9</p>	<p>Use S for source use and CONT for knowledge. Use '-' for disagree.</p> <p>Understands <u>specific</u> 1901 context and growing debate between those who believed in 'self-help' and those who wanted greater state intervention. May mention new Labour Party, Boer War etc. GOES BEYOND SOURCES eg discussion of intended audience for D (aimed at the government to bring about change) use CONT for beyond the source</p> <p>Uses source attributions and source detail to explain why they disagree by arguing the Times has an agenda or Rowntree did a study.</p> <p>Attempts to explain why they differ but argument is based on internal source information only. Compares sources and explains how they are different, not why.</p> <p>Describes one source, then the other and concludes 'they disagree'. OR simply describes/lifts/paraphrases source(s)</p>

			<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>These two sources are different because they were written for different purposes. There was still great poverty and hardship in Britain's towns and cities. Rowntree carried out a major survey of poverty in York at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. (Source D.) He gathered evidence from first hand visits and eye-witness accounts. He and his team found that poverty was greater than people had previously thought. He tried to identify a 'poverty line', by working out the essential and non-essential items in weekly household budgets. He was passionate about his work and his religious conscience (he was a Quaker) probably led him to seek changes. He writes in a very dramatic and persuasive style. His conclusions about the death rate were intended to shock his intended audience, the wealthier classes. He is trying to shock his audience into doing something about the problem. Source E is an extract from 'The Times'. This newspaper often represented the interests of the wealthier sections of society, the people who had the power to bring about the sort of reforms Rowntree was hoping for. The extract dismisses what Rowntree has to say. It claims that some of the people Rowntree described in his report should not be considered as living in poverty because, it says, they wasted their money on gambling and drinking. In the York survey, Rowntree did discover some gambling, yet that was not, in his view, the cause of their poverty. The newspaper uses this fact to put across an argument that suggests that some poor people deserved to be poor because they had bad habits. Putting the blame on them was one way of getting out of paying for changes to eliminate poverty. The sources are written by people whose views about poverty are different.</i></p>

<p>Q4: Study Source F. Why was this source published? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (9 marks) Candidates demonstrate a sophisticated understanding of the source and knowledge and understanding of public health measures in the early twentieth century. They evaluate the purpose (in terms of intended impact) for it being published and they use their knowledge of the Liberal reforms at the time to explain why it was published then.</p> <p>Level 4 (7-8 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound understanding of the source and knowledge and understanding of public health in the early twentieth century. They explain the purpose (in terms of intended impact) for it being published.</p> <p>Level 3 (5-6 marks) Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and knowledge and understanding of public health in the early twentieth century to explain the message of the source.</p> <p>Level 2 (3-4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and limited knowledge and understanding of public health in the early twentieth century. 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 (1-2 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>	<p>9</p>	<p>Use L5 for purpose and context, L4 for message and purpose, L3 for message and L2 for detail/topic. Use I for purpose in L2, L4 and L5</p> <p>Purpose and context. The context must be about the debate that was going on in 1911-12. (Opposition to NI from Conservative Party; Labour Party; Old Liberals; workers etc*.) Purpose may include 'stop the reforms', 'step up the pressure on the Liberals' 'persuade people to oppose Lloyd George' etc. * This must focus on specific groups and reasons</p> <p>Message and purpose. Message = what the source tells us. Purpose = what the author intended the impact to be. (<i>'This source shows the poor trying to pay their contributions to National Insurance and the impact it is having on them. They doubt that they will ever get any benefit.(message).'</i> L4</p> <p>Message L3</p> <p>Unsubstantiated purpose/message</p> <p>Description/detail/topic</p> <p>I = intended outcome</p>
--	-----------------	---

This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance, demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.

This source was published to try and convince people that the National Insurance Act (1911) had been a mistake. It was published in 1912, so it was too late to prevent the passage of the Act, but there was continued opposition to the Act after it had been passed. This cartoon was part of that opposition, and it was probably the intention to keep up the pressure on the Liberal Government to try and bring about change. The Liberals had introduced National Insurance to help provide for people who could not work. Free medical care was provided for the sick. The cartoon shows a man being fed well at the expense of a woman and her daughter. The woman explains to her daughter that keeping him well fed might mean he will look after them if they become ill themselves. The man represents the National Insurance Act (as seen by the writing on his hat). The message is that the Act is unfair on women who have to pay a National Insurance contribution to the Government just in case they become too ill to work and support themselves. The cartoonist thinks that the Government is getting all the benefits from people who look as if they can hardly afford to pay. The cartoonist portrays the man as fat and greedy and the woman and her daughter as poor and needy. The reader is being encouraged to take pity on the poor woman and her child.

NOTE This cartoon was actually part of a by-election campaign by the Labour Party in Bow and Bromley in London's East End. Lansbury, the sitting Labour MP was also a supporter of womens' suffrage. The cartoon was by Will Dyson, cartoonist in the Daily Herald which was published from 1912. He usually represented capitalists as fat men wearing top hats.

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 12 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p>Q: Study all the sources, A-F. ‘The reason why it took so long to improve people’s health between 1800 and 1914, was because the people who had the power to improve it blamed the problems on the poor themselves.’ 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. (Remember, minimum of 4 sources.)</p> <p>Level 5 answers 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 4 sources used critically for these levels.</u></p> <p>Attempts a balanced answer using S and CONT. Candidates deploy knowledge accurately and make valid use of some sources to support their answer, but they do not use enough sources to reach Level 5. In addition, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>S and CONT. Candidates deploy knowledge accurately and make valid use of some sources, but they only address one side of the argument. To reach L3 candidates must address one side of the argument.</p> <p>Limited answer. Cannot go higher than L2 if S or CONT but not both. <u>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>A very weak and limited response.</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 interpretation of why public health reforms were slow is too simplistic. There were a number of reasons why this was the case, including lack of understanding about the cause of disease and beliefs about the role of Government, as well as attitudes to the poor. All of these factors are linked and they all played their part in holding back progress towards improving the nation's health.</i></p> <p><i>It is true that some people looked down upon the poor and did not see the problem of poverty as their own responsibility. They believed they were lazy and undeserving of help. Source E questions the validity of Rowntree's investigation into poverty and claims that some that are described as poor should not be classed as such, because they waste money on gambling and drinking. Even Source A claims the poor had 'very bad habits' and these were contributing to their own problems. Part of the problem was that no-one really understood what caused disease. When Chadwick issued his report into living conditions in 1842, he linked dirt and disease, but the fact that he could not explain the true cause of disease led some to dismiss his findings. Even Snow, who showed the importance of clean water in preventing the spread of disease, could not explain why. Pasteur did not prove his germ theory until 1864, so until that time, such public health improvements as were made were not totally effective. Even when the germ theory was established in 1864, subsequent improvements in health and hygiene were slow in coming. By the turn of the century, attempts were made to measure and define poverty, but they were not universally accepted. Booth's survey of poverty in London had little effect on actual living conditions. Rowntree (Source D) concluded that the poor were poor because they fell below a 'poverty line' and had no spare money which they could spend to improve their lives. As we have seen, such ideas were attacked by publications like 'The Times'. Source F is an interpretation of the 1911 National Insurance Act. This Act attempted to provide support for workers who had fallen on hard times due to sickness. It was based partly on the idea of self-help, as workers had to contribute to the scheme. Even this measure was opposed by some, who felt that the Government was interfering too much in the lives of ordinary people. In conclusion, the slow progress in public health reform between 1800 and 1914 was due to a more complex web of factors than simply a negative attitude towards the poor.</i></p>

Spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPaG) assessment grid

<i>High performance 3 marks</i>
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.
<i>Intermediate performance 2 marks</i>
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.
<i>Threshold performance 1 mark</i>
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.

Assessment Objectives (AO) Grid(Includes Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar )

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	SPaG	Total
1	3	1	4		8
2	3	1	4		8
3	3	2	4		9
4	3	2	4		9
5 	8	4	4	3	19
Totals	20	10	20	3	53

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 2017

