



Oxford Cambridge and RSA

GCSE (9–1)

History B (Schools History Project)

J411/51: The People's Health, c.1250 to present

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for Autumn 2021

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 2021

1. Annotations

| Annotation | Meaning |
|---|---------------------------------|
|  1 | Level 1 |
|  2 | Level 2 |
|  3 | Level 3 |
|  4 | Level 4 |
|  5 | Level 5 |
|  6 | Level 6 |
|  SEEN | Noted but no credit given |
|  NAQ | Not answered question |
|  | Extendable horizontal wavy line |

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:

- the specification, especially the assessment objectives
- the question paper and its rubrics
- 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.

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

The People's Health c. 1250 to present

| Question 1 – 3 marks | |
|---|---|
| a) | Name one way in which medieval town authorities tried to improve public health between 1250 and 1500. |
| b) | Give one example of the living conditions in towns that contributed to the public health crisis of the early nineteenth century. |
| c) | Name one response to Spanish Influenza in the years 1918 and 1919. |
| 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 and valid responses include: moving dunghills /lepers/prostitutes to the outskirts of towns, laws to clean streets, public shaming of people who polluted waterways, guilds checks on meat quality, piped water supply in Exeter.</i> |
| 1(b) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1) | <i>For 1(b), likely valid responses include: filthy and overcrowded housing, no ventilation, poor diet, lack of food, adulterated food, lack of fresh, clean water, no sewers, use of privies and cesspools.</i> |
| 1(c) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1) | <i>For 1(c) likely valid responses include: keeping detailed records of cases, advice published in newspapers, wearing face masks, closing schools, showing a film about the flu, appointing extra grave diggers.</i> |
| | Any other historically valid response is acceptable and should be credited. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Question 2 – 9 marks Write a clear and organised summary that analyses the gin craze in the period 1660 to 1751.</p> | |
| <p>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</p> | <p>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</p> |
| <p>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).</p> | <p><i>Answers should show connections in the situation defined in the question and use these to organise the answer logically.</i></p> <p>Answers could consider aspects of one or more of the following: In response to growth in gin shops and drinking of gin In 1689 Parliament banned imports of gin to encourage local distillers but gin became cheap and led to large increase in gin shops and gin consumption. In response to this and the rise in crime the Gin Act of 1729 was passed taxing gin distillers. Gin sellers had to buy an annual licence. The Act could not be enforced because there were too many gin shops. This led to the harsher Gin Act of 1736 (harsher licences and tax increased). It could still not be enforced. The government tried a new approach in the 1743 Gin Act by restricting sale of gin alehouses which already sold beer and wine - but still ineffective and the problem grew worse. The 1751 Gin Act was tougher with much harsher punishments e.g. transportation, and was more effective.</p> <p><i>Use of conceptual understanding to organise the response might in this case involve organisation by:</i> cause and consequence, e.g. reasons for increase in gin consumption, reasons for Acts of Parliament, reasons for their failure and eventual success.</p> <p>change e.g. changes in government response.s</p> <p><i>Explanations are most likely to show understanding of these second order concepts but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i> <i>Please note that answers do not need to name the second order concepts being used to organise their 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</i></p> |
| <p>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).</p> | |
| <p>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).</p> | |
| <p>0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.</p> | |

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| | <i>the topic in the question.</i> |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Question 2–9 marks Write a clear and organised summary that analyses the gin craze in the period 1660 to 1751. Support your summary with examples.</p> | |
| <p>Guidance and indicative content</p> | |
| <p>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</p> | <p>Summary based on second order concept(s) with two or more valid supporting examples, e.g.</p> <p>[Consequence] <i>By the 1720s the ‘gin craze’ had become a serious problem. It had a terrible impact on people’s lives and health. For example, 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. Lots of people were also very concerned about the impact on society as a whole. For example, crime increased and families were falling apart.</i></p> <p>[Change] <i>In the 1660s, gin drinking started to become a big problem. Addiction to cheap gin meant there were thousands of small gin shops in cellars, attics and back rooms in London. Crime and alcohol-related deaths increased. However, by 1751, gin drinking was being successfully tackled by the tougher 1751 Gin Act which introduced harsh punishments for those selling gin illegally. This led to a reduction in gin drinking.</i></p> |
| <p>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</p> | <p>Summary based on a second order concept with one valid supporting example, e.g.</p> <p>[Causation] <i>After 1660, many poorer people started to drink spirits, particularly gin. This was mainly because gin became a much cheaper alternative to beer. For example, the government reduced taxes on the distillation of spirits. Meanwhile, taxes on ale and beer went up.</i></p> |
| <p>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</p> | <p>List of events / developments with no organising concept, e.g.</p> <p><i>People got addicted to gin. There were thousands of small gin shops opened in cellars, attics and back rooms in London. There was one woman who strangled her daughter to sell her clothes to buy gin. The government didn’t do enough until the 1751 Gin Act.</i></p> |
| <p>0 marks</p> | |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Question 3 – 10 marks</p> <p>Why were attempts to deal with the Black Death not effective in Medieval Britain (1250-1500)? Explain your answer.</p> | |
| <p>Levels</p> <p>AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 5 marks</p> <p>AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 5 marks</p> | <p>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</p> |
| <p>Level 5 (9–10 marks)</p> <p>Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1).</p> <p>Uses these to show sophisticated understanding of one or more second order concepts in a fully sustained and very well supported explanation (AO2).</p> | <p><i>Explanations could consider what the attempts were and explain their lack of impact.</i></p> <p><i>Reasons – lack of knowledge /understanding of what caused it</i></p> <p><i>Dependence on supernatural ‘cures’, scapegoats, religious explanations and reliance on advice from the church. Processions organised by priests to confess nations sins and flagellants wandering around often had opposite effect. Even when trying to be scientific reliance on Greek and Roman ideas was wrong. Actions of scared people exacerbated problem.</i></p> <p><i>Explanations are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of causation /consequence but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i></p> <p><i>Answers which simply describe some features of Black Death cannot reach beyond Level 1</i></p> |
| <p>Level 4 (7–8 marks)</p> <p>Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1).</p> <p>Uses these to show strong understanding of one or more second order concepts in a sustained and well-supported explanation (AO2).</p> | |
| <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</p> <p>Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1).</p> <p>Uses these to show sound understanding of one or more second order concepts in a generally coherent and organised explanation (AO2).</p> | |
| <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</p> <p>Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1).</p> <p>Uses these to show some understanding of one or more second order concepts in a loosely organised explanation (AO2).</p> | |
| <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</p> <p>Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1).</p> <p>Uses these to show some basic understanding of one or more second order concepts, although the overall response may lack structure and coherence (AO2).</p> | |
| <p>0 marks</p> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p> | |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Question 3–10 marks Why were attempts to deal with the Black Death not effective in Medieval Britain (1250-1500)? Explain your answer.</p> | |
| <p>Guidance and indicative content</p> | |
| <p>Level 5 (9-10 marks)</p> | <p>Two or more reasons that attempts to deal with the Black Death in Medieval Britain were not effective fully explained, e.g.</p> <p><i>Firstly, attempts to deal with the Black Death were not effective because there was a lack of understanding about the real causes. The disease was spread by fleas living on black rats but people didn't know that at the time. They thought that it was spread by miasma or that it was God punishing people for sinning. So their attempts to deal with it, such as prayer and carrying sweet-smelling herbs, were based on incorrect beliefs and didn't work.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason was that the response from authorities was inadequate. Edward III ordered London streets to be cleaned in 1349, and the church ordered parades of priests in England's cities, but otherwise government did very little. These measure were ineffective because they didn't stop the movement of people and prevent the rapid spread of the disease.</i></p> <p>NB: Answers at L2+ must deal with what <u>was</u> done (i.e. attempts), and why these was ineffective. They cannot simply relate to what was <u>not</u> done.</p> |
| <p>Level 4 (7-8 marks)</p> | <p>One reason that attempts to deal with the Black Death in Medieval Britain were not effective fully explained, e.g.</p> <p><i>Attempts to deal with the Black Death were not effective because there was a lack of understanding about the real causes. The disease was spread by fleas living on black rats but people didn't know that at the time. They thought that it was spread by miasma or that it was God punishing people for sinning. So their attempts to deal with it, such as prayer and carrying sweet-smelling herbs, were based on incorrect beliefs and didn't work.</i></p> |
| <p>Level 3 (5-6 marks)</p> | <p>Identifies one or more valid reason(s) but no supporting evidence OR no full explanation of why it was not effective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>People thought it was miasma or caused by God but this was wrong.</i> • <i>People didn't know the real cause was the plague germ carried by rats and fleas so they couldn't stop it spreading.</i> <p>NOTE: 5 marks for one reason identified; 6 marks for two or more</p> |
| <p>Level 2 (3-4 marks)</p> | <p>Describes responses/ beliefs/ attempts to deal with of the Black Death (without direct focus on Q of why attempts were not effective not effective)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>All Edward III did was order the streets of London to be cleaned.</i> • <i>People thought that God had sent the Black Death to punish people for sinning.</i> |
| <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</p> | <p>Valid but general assertion(s)</p> <p><i>They were ineffective because they didn't understand how to deal with it properly.</i></p> |
| <p>0 marks</p> | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Question 4* – 18 marks</p> <p>How far do you agree that the response to epidemics in the 1800s was better than the response to epidemics in the Early Modern Period (1500-1750)? Give reasons for your answer.</p> | |
| <p>Levels</p> <p>AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 6 marks</p> <p>AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 12 marks</p> | <p>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</p> |
| <p>Level 6 (16–18 marks)</p> <p>Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show very secure and thorough understanding of them (AO1).</p> <p>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).</p> <p><i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i></p> | <p><i>Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate knowledge of the epidemics in either period</i></p> <p><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 sides of the argument before reaching a conclusion</i></p> <p><i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of similarity and difference but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i></p> <p>Grounds for agreeing include:</p> <p><i>Greater government intervention in later 1800s, greater scientific understanding based on work of Snow and Pasteur, the Public Health Acts of 1848 and 1875 move away from religious explanations, money for sewers and provision of fresh water, work of Bazalgette, public pressure on government to act.</i></p> <p><i>Lack of understanding and appropriate responses in 16th and 17th centuries, religious explanations, belief in miasma.</i></p> <p>Reasons for disagreeing</p> <p><i>Some positive actions in 1600s re. plague e.g. national plague orders, isolation, pesthouses, use of watchmen, cleaning streets.</i></p> <p><i>Still ignorance in early 1800s and laissez faire still strong - so little action, still religious explanations and still miasma theory. Most actions voluntary not compulsory. Plague orders arguably stronger than early 19th C directions</i></p> |
| <p>Level 5 (13–15 marks)</p> <p>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).</p> <p><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i></p> | |
| <p>Level 4 (10–12 marks)</p> <p>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).</p> <p><i>There is a developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i></p> | |
| <p>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</p> <p>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).</p> <p><i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i></p> | |
| <p>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</p> <p>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).</p> <p><i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i></p> | |
| <p>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</p> <p>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).</p> | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i> | |
| 0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Question 4* – 18 marks | |
| How far do you agree that the response to epidemics in the 1800s was better than the response to epidemics in the Early Modern Period (1500-1750)? Give reasons for your answer. | |
| Guidance and indicative content | |
| Level 6 (16-18 marks) | <p>Balanced argument; two valid supporting examples from each period OR three from one period and one from the other. Clinching argument = 18 marks, e.g.</p> <p><i>I don't fully agree with this statement. Government responses to plague after 1500 did have some impact. For example, in 1518 Henry VIII introduced the policy of isolation which caused houses infected with plague to be identified clearly. Mayors in all English towns followed this example and shut up infected houses. This was effective because pneumonic plague spread by coughing. Elizabeth's Plague Orders of 1578 also continued to enforce isolation, although they also took some ineffective measures, such as ordering special prayers to be said in church and the burning of barrels of tar in the streets. These were less effective as still nobody understood how rats and fleas spread bubonic plague.</i></p> <p><i>In the 1800s, responses weren't necessarily any better because at the start of the period, the cause of diseases like cholera was still unknown. For example, during the 1831-32 epidemic, some boards of health took action to get rid of miasma, such as adding chloride of lime to the sewers to improve the smell. This was not a better response because cholera is spread through dirty water. However, there were some better responses. For example, in London in 1854, John Snow carried out a study of cholera cases near his surgery and mapped them out. He managed to show that the victims were all sharing the same water pump so he removed the handle. This was a better response because although his theory was not widely accepted, there were no further cases from that pump, and it showed him trying to understand the causes scientifically.</i></p> <p><i>On the whole, I only agree with the statement in relation to the late 1800s because in both periods there was lots of misunderstanding and therefore ineffective action. Even when John Snow made his case, it was not widely accepted and by 1865 over 100,000 people had died from cholera. Responses to epidemics only really became better after the development of germ theory.</i></p> |
| Level 5 (13-15 marks) | <p>Balanced argument supported by three valid supporting examples (i.e. two from one period and one from the other), e.g.</p> <p><i>I don't fully agree with this statement. Government responses to plague after 1500 did have some impact. For example, in 1518 Henry VIII introduced the policy of isolation which caused houses infected with plague to be identified clearly. Mayors in all English towns followed this example and shut up infected houses. This was effective because pneumonic plague spread by coughing. Elizabeth's Plague Orders of 1578 also continued to enforce isolation, although they also took some ineffective measures, such as ordering special prayers to be said in church and the burning of barrels of tar in the streets. These were less effective as still nobody understood how rats and fleas spread bubonic plague.</i></p> <p><i>In the 1800s, responses weren't necessarily any better because at the start of the period, the cause of diseases like cholera was still unknown. For example, during the 1831-32 epidemic, some boards of health took action to get rid of miasma, such as adding chloride of lime to the sewers to improve the smell. This was not effective because cholera is spread through dirty water.</i></p> |

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Level 4 (10-12 marks) | <p>One period explained, supported by two examples, e.g.</p> <p><i>I don't fully agree with this statement. Government responses to plague after 1500 did have some impact. For example, in 1518 Henry VIII introduced the policy of isolation which caused houses infected with plague to be identified clearly. Mayors in all English towns followed this example and shut up infected houses. This was effective because pneumonic plague spread by coughing. Elizabeth's Plague Orders of 1578 also continued to enforce isolation, although they also took some ineffective measures, such as ordering special prayers to be said in church and the burning of barrels of tar in the streets. These were less effective as still nobody understood how rats and fleas spread bubonic plague.</i></p> <p>Alternatively, both periods explained, supported by one example from each period, e.g.</p> <p><i>I don't agree with this statement. Government responses to plague after 1500 did have some impact. For example, in 1518 Henry VIII introduced the policy of isolation which caused houses infected with plague to be identified clearly. Mayors in all English towns followed this example and shut up infected houses. This was effective because pneumonic plague spread by coughing. Whereas in the 1800s, responses weren't necessarily any better because at the start of the period, the cause of diseases like cholera was still unknown. For example, during the 1831-32 epidemic, some boards of health took action to get rid of miasma, such as adding chloride of lime to the sewers to improve the smell. This was not effective because cholera is spread through dirty water.</i></p> |
| Level 3 (7-9 marks) | <p>One period explained, supported by one example, e.g.</p> <p><i>I don't agree because in the 1800s, responses weren't necessarily any better because at the start of the period, the cause of diseases like cholera was still unknown. For example, during the 1831-32 epidemic, some boards of health took action to get rid of miasma, such as adding chloride of lime to the sewers to improve the smell. This was not effective because cholera is spread through dirty water.</i></p> |
| Level 2 (4-6 marks) | <p>Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>I don't agree because Henry VIII's policy of isolation was effective.</i> • <i>I agree because in the 1800s John Snow showed during a cholera epidemic that the disease was spread through dirty water.</i> <p>Alternatively, description of responses/ related events without linking this to the question or without full explanation, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Henry VIII introduced isolation. This meant shutting up houses where there was plague.</i> • <i>In Leeds, Dr. Baker to investigate the spread of cholera in 1831. He mapped out the dirty areas of town and found there was a high concentration of cases in these places. Baker believed that miasma, caused by dunghills and cesspits, was spreading cholera.</i> |
| Level 1 (1-3 marks) | <p>Valid but general assertion(s)</p> <p><i>Yes because people knew the causes of epidemics by the 1800s</i></p> |
| 0 marks | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Question 5*– 18 marks Advances in public health since 1900 have mainly been because of actions to improve housing. How far do you agree? Give reasons for your answer.</p> | |
| <p>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</p> | <p>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</p> |
| <p>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></p> | <p><i>Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate any knowledge of public health 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 sides of the argument before reaching a conclusion.</i></p> |
| <p>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></p> | <p><i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of similarity and difference and cause and consequence, but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i></p> |
| <p>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></p> | <p>Grounds for agreeing include: <i>1909 banning back-to-back building led to an improvement in privately owned housing. Housing act of 1919- council housing/set standards for space/water supply/drainage etc. 1930 Housing Act forced landlords to sell houses in slums to councils. Slum clearances. Streets in the air. Council building after the war and impact.</i></p> |
| <p>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></p> | <p>Grounds for disagreeing include: <i>reasons why housing wasn't always good (slums still existed after 1919 Act). Private landlords unwilling to build homes for the poor – depression in high rise flats. AND/OR other factors Scientific understanding / liberal reforms e.g. free school meals/ food regulations/impact of war/impact of wealth/regulations on air quality/ NHS/</i></p> |
| <p>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</p> | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>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></p> | <p><i>advice and government healthy living campaigns e.g. anti-smoking and impact of these factors</i></p> |
| <p>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></p> | |
| <p>0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.</p> | |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Question 5* – 18 marks Advances in public health since 1900 have mainly been because of actions to improve housing. How far do you agree? Give reasons for your answer.</p> | |
| <p>Guidance and indicative content</p> | |
| <p>Level 6 (16-18 marks)</p> | <p>Balanced argument, two valid supporting examples each side (or three on one side and one on the other). Clinching argument = 18 marks , e.g.</p> <p><i>There is plenty of evidence to support this statement. In 1900, many of Britain’s poorest families were still living in unhealthy back-to-back houses owned by private landlords who rented them out to working-class families. However, 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. This made a big difference to public health because 250,000 new homes were built which were much healthier because there were set standards for space, water supply and drainage. Furthermore, there was another Housing Act in 1930 which forced private landlords to sell their houses in the slums to the council. This was another advance in public health because councils could then clear the old, unhealthy slums and use the land to build new, clean homes. Another 700,000 were built.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand it could be argued that there were more important public health advances. For example, between 1906 and 1911, the Liberal Party passed a series of laws to tackle poverty and welfare, such as National Insurance. National Insurance gave certain workers some sickness benefit and free medical care if they became ill. This was a big advance in public health because until then, workers would have had to carry on working through illness, or get no pay, which meant they had no chance of affording medical help. Additionally, the setting up of the NHS in 1948 was incredibly important. Until then, about 8 million people had never seen a doctor because they could not afford it. The NHS gave things such hospital care, family doctors, vaccinations and maternity care to everyone for free. The NHS played an important part in increasing people’s life expectancy, particularly in reducing the numbers of women dying after childbirth, and was therefore a massive advance for public health.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, however, I believe that public health advances have mainly happened because of actions to improve housing. Living in safe, ventilated houses with good water supply and sewage facilities helped people to stay healthy and free from diseases such as cholera and TB. This would stop people from getting ill and having to see a doctor, and this would have been beneficial even before National Insurance and the NHS.</i></p> <p>NB: Responses at L3+ must explain the advance to public health, not only describe the action taken</p> |
| <p>Level 5 (13-15 marks)</p> | <p>Balanced argument supported by three valid supporting examples (i.e. two on one side and one on the other), e.g.</p> <p><i>There is plenty of evidence to support this statement. In 1900, many of Britain’s poorest families were still living in unhealthy back-to-back houses owned by private landlords who rented them out to working-class families. However, 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. This made a big difference to public health because 250,000 new homes were built which were much healthier because there were set standards for space, water supply and drainage.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand it could be argued that there were more important public health advances. For example, between 1906 and 1911, the Liberal Party introduced National Insurance. This gave certain workers some sickness benefit and free medical care if they became ill. This was a big advance in public health because until then, workers would have had to carry on working through illness, or get no pay, which meant they had no chance of affording medical help. Additionally, the setting up of the NHS in 1948 was also important. Until then, about 8 million people had never seen a doctor because they could not afford it. The NHS gave things such hospital care, family doctors, vaccinations and maternity care to everyone for free, and was therefore a massive advance for public health.</i></p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Level 4 (10-12 marks)</p> | <p>One sided argument, supported by two examples, e.g.</p> <p><i>I disagree because there were more important public health advances. For example, between 1906 and 1911, the Liberal Party introduced National Insurance. This gave certain workers some sickness benefit and free medical care if they became ill. This was a big advance in public health because until then, workers would have had to carry on working through illness, or get no pay, which meant they had no chance of affording medical help. Additionally, the setting up of the NHS in 1948 was also important. Until then, about 8 million people had never seen a doctor because they could not afford it. The NHS gave things such hospital care, family doctors, vaccinations and maternity care to everyone for free, and was therefore a massive advance for public health.</i></p> <p>Alternatively, a balanced argument, supported by one example on each side, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is some evidence to support this statement. In 1900, many of Britain's poorest families were still living in unhealthy back-to-back houses owned by private landlords who rented them out to working-class families. However, 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. This made a big difference to public health because 250,000 new homes were built which were much healthier because there were set standards for space, water supply and drainage. On the other hand, the setting up of the NHS in 1948 was also important. Until then, about 8 million people had never seen a doctor because they could not afford it. The NHS gave things such hospital care, family doctors, vaccinations and maternity care to everyone for free, and was therefore a massive advance for public health.</i></p> |
| <p>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</p> | <p>One sided argument, supported by one example, e.g.</p> <p><i>I disagree. The setting up of the NHS in 1948 was most important. Until then, about 8 million people had never seen a doctor because they could not afford it. The NHS gave things such hospital care, family doctors, vaccinations and maternity care to everyone for free, and was therefore a massive advance for public health.</i></p> |
| <p>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</p> | <p>Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>I disagree because the NHS was more important. It improved public health by giving people free medical care.</i> • <i>I agree because the 1919 Housing Act improved public health by setting higher standards for housing.</i> <p>Alternatively, description of housing/ other advances without full explanation of how the action improved public health, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>I agree. 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. This made a big difference to public health because 250,000 new homes were built.</i> |
| <p>Level 1 (1-3 marks)</p> | <p>Valid but general assertion(s), e.g.</p> <p><i>I disagree. The NHS was the most importance advancement because so many people benefitted.</i></p> |
| <p>0 marks</p> | |

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
The Triangle Building
Shaftesbury Road
Cambridge
CB2 8EA

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