



## **General Certificate in Education**

# **A2 History 6041**

## **Alternative S Unit 6W**

# **Mark Scheme**

*2007 examination – June series*

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

## **CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**

### **A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS**

#### **General Guidance for Examiners**

---

#### **A: INTRODUCTION**

The AQA's A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specification. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by A2 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section C).

**B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS**

The relationship between the Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1.1, 1.2 and 2 and the Levels of Response.

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in AO 1.1, by writing a narrative or descriptive response, will restrict themselves to a maximum of 6 out of 20 marks by performing at Level 1. Those candidates going on to provide more explanation (AO 1.2), supported by the relevant selection of material (AO1.1), will have access to approximately 6 more marks, performing at Level 2 and low Level 3, depending on how implicit or partial their judgements prove to be. Candidates providing explanation with evaluation and judgement, supported by the selection of appropriate information and exemplification, will clearly be operating in all 3 AOs (AO 2, AO1.2 and AO1.1) and will therefore have access to the highest levels and the full range of 20 marks by performing in Levels 3, 4 and 5.

**Level 1:*****Either***

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly narrative.

***Or***

Answer implies analysis but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such answers will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Narrative responses will have the following characteristic: they

- will lack direction and any clear links to the analytical demands of the question
- will, therefore, offer a relevant but outline-only description in response to the question
- will be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

- lack any significant corroboration
- be generalised and poorly focused
- demonstrate limited appreciation of specific content
- be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

IT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THIS TYPE OF RESPONSE AND THOSE WHICH ARE SUCCINCT AND UNDEVELOPED BUT FOCUSED AND VALID (appropriate for Level 2 or above).

---

**Level 2:*****Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but lack weight and balance.

***Or***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

- understanding of some but not all of the issues
- some direction and focus demonstrated largely through introductions or conclusions
- some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of the language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

- arguments which have some focus and relevance
- an awareness of the specific context
- some accurate but limited factual support
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

**Level 3:**

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

- the approach will be generally analytical but may include some narrative passages which will be limited and controlled
- analysis will be focused and substantiated, although a complete balance of treatment of issues is not to be expected at this level nor is full supporting material
- there will be a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed, not fully convincing or which may occasionally digress into narrative
- there will be relevant supporting material, although not necessarily comprehensive, which might include reference to interpretations
- effective use of language, appropriate historical terminology and coherence of style.

**Level 4:**

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

- sustained analysis, explicitly supported by relevant and accurate evidence
- little or no narrative, usually in the form of exemplification
- coverage of all the major issues, although there may not be balance of treatment
- an attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or summary
- effective skills of communication through the use of accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

**Level 5:**

As Level 4 but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Level 5 will be differentiated from Level 4 in that there will be:

- a consistently analytical approach
- consistent corroboration by reference to selected evidence
- a clear and consistent attempt to reach judgements
- some evidence of independence of thought, but not necessarily of originality
- a good conceptual understanding
- strong and effective communication skills, grammatically accurate and demonstrating coherence and clarity of thought.

---

**C: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL**

***These principles are applicable to both the Advanced Subsidiary examination and to the A level (A2) examination.***

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: "What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?". Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates' responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid "bunching" of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills:**
  - generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
- well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid "double jeopardy". Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

---

**June 2007**

**Alternative S: British Economic and Social History, c1750–1914**

**A2 Unit 6: Public Health: Problems and Policies, 1830–1914**

(a) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.

Assess the validity of Wohl's view about the reasons why the development of, and improvement to, the water supply were erratic. (10 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- |     |  |             |
|-----|--|-------------|
| L1: | Summarises the content of the extract and the interpretation it contains.  | <b>1-2</b>  |
| L2: | Demonstrates understanding of the interpretation and relates to own knowledge.   | <b>3-5</b>  |
| L3: | As L2, and evaluation of the interpretation is partial.  | <b>6-8</b>  |
| L4: | Understands and evaluates the interpretation and relates to own knowledge to reach a sustained and well-supported judgement on its validity. | <b>9-10</b> |

**Indicative content**

Answers at Level 1 will be based entirely on the extract, e.g. that the interpretation is valid as it was a period when local vested interests often held up improvements in public health and that control of the water supply was often vital. Level 2 answers will link the problems in Leeds with those of other areas, such as London. There is also the general point that central government was reluctant to intervene and local communities often had little power. Level 3 answers will analyse the interpretation and discuss its possible shortcomings, e.g. debating whether this was true for most parts of the country and when the situation changed. Level 4 answers will consider why water supply and sewerage were linked in the fight against disease and will show some depth of research. Other issues should be discussed, such as local and national powers, the reluctance of middle-class ratepayers to finance schemes of water supply and drainage to the poor and the powers of the water companies, with their influence in their area. A clear judgement will be made, based on the source and own knowledge. Some evidence of wider research in order to challenge Wohl's view is necessary for the top level.

(b) Use **Source B** and your own knowledge.

How useful is **Source B** as evidence about approaches towards fighting disease? (10 marks)

*Target: A01.1, AO2*

- |     |   |            |
|-----|---|------------|
| L1: | Summarises the content of the extract in relation to the issue presented in the question.   | <b>1-2</b> |
| L2: | Demonstrates some appreciation either of the strengths and/or of the limitations of the content of the source in relation to its utility/reliability within the context of the issue. | <b>3-5</b> |
-



- L3: Demonstrates reasoned understanding of the strengths and limitations of the source in the context of the issue and draws conclusions about its utility/reliability. **6-8**
- L4: Evaluates the utility/reliability of the source in relation to the issue in the question to reach a sustained and well-supported judgement. **9-10**

### Indicative content

Level 1 answers will make simple statements related to content, e.g. how important it was to clean up the drains and gutters, which harboured disease. There could be a limited discussion of cholera and the miasma theory. Level 2 answers will start to use own knowledge to add to the source in showing how local attitudes in other cities such as Liverpool, Manchester and Leeds both helped and hindered the progress of sanitary reform at this time. Level 3 answers will analyse the source, discussing why it was seen to be so important to clear away filth. There should be some discussion also on the difficulties facing poorer areas in obtaining water supplies. There could be links to the work of Chadwick, who believed in flushing filth away down the sewers. A limited conclusion will be reached as to how valid the source is and whether other areas were the same. Level 4 answers will evaluate the source and its description of local problems in Oxford. There should be a discussion of the miasma theory: what impact that had, particularly in efforts to combat cholera. The fact that the author was a clergyman could lead to a discussion of the influence of the Church in matters of living conditions. A clear judgement, based on the source and own knowledge, will be made, with some evidence of other research to show the scope of the debate. In order to reach Level 4, there must be some evidence of reading/research to evaluate the source.

- (c) Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

'It was the conflict between rival vested interests over general improvements, more than any other factor, which delayed progress in public health in the years 1830 to 1914. Assess the validity of this view. **(20 marks)**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-6**
- L2: ***Either***  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.
- Or***  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

- 
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

### Indicative content

Source A refers to the difficulties in obtaining an adequate supply of water in Leeds. It was essentially a struggle between the vested interests of the Corporation and the Water Works Company. The Company was interested in profits from customers who could afford to pay, which obviously, did not include the poor. The Corporation raised rates from mostly middle-class voters and did not wish to offend them. As central control was growing, the Corporation was being obliged to act. Implicit in the source is the slow progress which was made in this matter. There were long arguments over who should pay and a stalemate often resulted. Source B is from one local community, Oxford, where the author holds that it was purely the unclean state of the town which led to the cholera outbreak. The clergyman advises the use of water to clear away filth, regardless of the difficulties there might be in obtaining such water, or the ignorance of the poor. His attitude illustrates the belief in miasma, which delayed proper sanitary reform. Although it was obviously of use to clear away rubbish, the causes of diseases like cholera were more complicated. Without further research, sanitary improvements were negligible. Candidates should be able to quote other examples in the struggle to improve health. Source C shows the general view of attempts to improve standards in public health. It was not just medical research which made progress possible, but developments in fields such as water supply, sewerage and housing. In all of these, there was conflict between local and national interests, with many groups such as private landlords, water companies and the church being involved. Candidates could refer to the work of men like Snow in the 1850s, Simon in the 1860s and Bazalgette's London sewer system, completed, despite vested interests, by 1870. They also should display knowledge of reforms in other areas. Whilst clean and plentiful water was very important, the growth of central enforcement, the removal of the miasma theory and scientific research all had a part to play. There was also the slow application of legislation, which was mostly permissive, not mandatory.

Level 1 answers will do little more than repeat the content of the sources. At Level 2 answers will clearly agree, or disagree with the thrust of the quotation. In order to reach Level 3, there will be some attempt both to analyse the sources and to make use of own knowledge in order to reach a limited conclusion. Level 4 answers will have clear analysis, with supporting evidence, reaching a limited judgement. For Level 5, the argument must be sustained with clear judgement, reached from a base of secure supporting evidence. In order to reach the top levels, clear evidence of wide reading and research must be shown, in order to demonstrate alternative views as to why progress was delayed.