



General Certificate of Secondary Education

GCSE History 3041/6/1 *Specification A*

Paper 1 Medicine Through Time

Mark Scheme

June examination - 2008 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

Copyright © 2008 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.

GENERAL CERTIFICATE OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

HISTORY SPECIFICATION A

A: *INTRODUCTION*

- **Consistency of Marking**

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a choice of specifications and a choice of options within them. It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply this marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of all the other History specifications and options offered by the AQA.

- **The Assessment Objectives**

The revised specifications have addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages all candidates, but particularly the more able, to make judgements grounded in evidence and information. For this reason, assessment objective 6.1 (recall, select and deploy knowledge) underpins candidate attainment in the other two objectives, 6.2 and 6.3.

The schemes of marking for the revised specifications reflect these underlying principles.

- **Levels of Response Marking Schemes**

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. All candidates take a common examination paper – there is no tiering. Consequently, it is reasonable to expect to encounter the full range of attainment and this marking scheme has been designed to differentiate candidates' attainment by **outcome** and to reward **positively** what the candidates know, understand and can do.

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 and in deciding on a mark within that particular level.

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. This mark scheme provides the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in a subject like History, which in part relies upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content.

B: QUESTION TARGETS & LEVELS OF RESPONSE

- **Question Targets**

The mark scheme for each question is prefaced by an assessment objective 'target'. This is an indication of the skill which it is expected candidates will use in answering the question and is directly based on the relevant assessment objectives. However, it does not mean that other answers which have merit will not be rewarded.

- **Identification of Levels of Response**

There are several ways in which any question can be answered – in a simple way by less able candidates and in more sophisticated ways by candidates of greater ability. In the marking scheme different types of answers will be identified and will be arranged in a series of levels of response.

Levels of response have been identified on the basis that the full range of candidates entered for the GCSE examination will be able to respond positively. Each 'level' therefore represents a stage in the development of the candidate's **quality of thinking**, and, as such, recognition by the assistant examiner of the relative differences between each level descriptor is of paramount importance.

- **Placing an answer within a Level**

When marking each part of each question, examiners must first place the answer in a particular level and then, and only then, decide on the actual mark within the level, which should be recorded in the margin. **The level of response attained should also be indicated at the end of each answer.** In most cases, it will be helpful to annotate the answer by noting in the margin where a particular level has been reached, e.g. Level 1 may have been reached on line 1, L3 on line 5 and L1 again on line 7. When the whole answer has been read and annotated in this way, the highest of the Levels **clearly attained** and **sustained** should be awarded. Remember that it is often possible to reach the highest level **without** going through the lower levels. Marks are **not cumulative** for any question. There should be no 'totting up' of points made which are then converted into marks. Examiners should feel free to comment on part of any answer if it explains why a particular level has been awarded rather than one lower or higher. Such comments can be of assistance when the script is looked at later in the awarding process.

If an answer seems to fit into two or more levels, award the higher or highest level.

- **What is a sustained response?**

By a **sustained response**, we mean that the candidate has **applied** the appropriate level of thought to the **particular issues** in the sub-question.

A response does not necessarily have to be sustained throughout the whole answer, but an answer in which merely a few words seem to show a fleeting recognition of historical complexity is not sufficient to attain a higher level.

In some cases, as you read an answer to a sub-question, it will be clear that particular levels have been reached at certain points in the answer. If so, remember

to identify them in the margin as you proceed. At the end of the sub-question, award the highest level that has been sustained.

In other cases you may reach the end of the sub-question without having been able to pinpoint a level. In such cases, simply record the level awarded at the end of the sub-question.

C: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

A particular level of response may cover a range of marks. Therefore, 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 that level covers more than two marks. If the range covers an even number of marks, start at the higher mark, e.g. start at 3 in a 4-mark range, or at 2 in a 2-mark range. Comparison with other candidates' responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making decisions away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment. The more positive the answers, 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. At all times, therefore, examiners should be prepared to use **the full range of marks** available for a particular level and for a particular question. Remember – mark **positively** at all times.

Move up or down from this mid-range mark by considering whether the answer is:

- precise in its use of supporting factual information.
- appropriately detailed.
- factually accurate.
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others.
- set in the historical context as appropriate to the question.
- displaying appropriate **written communication skills** (see Section D).

Note about Indicative Content.

The mark scheme provides **examples of historical content** (indicative content) which candidates may deploy in support of an answer within a particular level. Do bear in mind that these are **only examples**; exhaustive lists of content are not provided so examiners might expect some candidates to deploy alternative information to support their answers.

This indicative content must **not** however determine the level into which an answer is placed; **the candidate's level of critical thinking determines this**. Remember that the **number** of points made by a candidate may be taken into account only **after** a decision has been taken about the quality (level) of the response.

- **Some things to remember**

Mark positively at all times.

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from that lowest point.

This will depress marks for the question paper as a whole and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification or with those of other specifications.

Do **not** be afraid to award maximum marks within a level where it is possible to do so. Do not fail to give a maximum mark to an appropriate answer because you can think of something (or the marking scheme indicates something) that **might** be included but which is missing from the particular response.

Do **not** think in terms of a model answer to the question. Every question should be marked on its merits.

As a general rule, give credit for what is accurate, correct or valid.

Obviously, **errors can be given no credit** but, at the same time, the existence of an error should not prejudice you against the rest of what could be a perfectly valid answer.

It is important, therefore, to use the full range of marks where appropriate.

Do not use half marks.

D: QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION SKILLS

There is no longer a separate mark to be awarded to the candidate for accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar. Instead, as outlined in Section C above, the candidate's quality of written communication skills will be one of the factors influencing the actual mark within a level of response the examiner will award an answer – particularly a more extended one. In reading an extended response the examiner should therefore consider if it is cogently and coherently written, i.e. is the answer:

- **presenting relevant information in a form that suits the purpose**
- **legible, with accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar**
- **in an appropriate style with a suitable structure?**

E: SOME PRACTICAL POINTS

- **Answers in note form**

Answers in note form to any question should be credited in so far as the candidate's meaning is communicated. You must not try to read things into what has been written.

- **Diagrams, etc**

Credit should be given for information provided by the candidates in diagrams, tables, maps etc., provided that it has not already been credited in another form.

- **Answers which run on to another sub-section**

If a candidate starts to answer the next sub-section in an earlier one, by simply running the answer on, give credit for that material in the appropriate sub-section.

- **Answers which do not fit the marking scheme**

Inevitably, some answers will not fit the marking scheme but may legitimately be seen as worthy of credit. Assess such answers in terms of the difficulty/sophistication of the thought involved. If it is believed that the “thought level” equates with one of the levels in the marking scheme, award it a corresponding mark.

Make sure you identify such cases with an A (for alternative) in your sub-total, e.g. as B2A/3. Also write a brief comment to explain why this alternative has been awarded.

If in doubt, **always** telephone your Team Leader for advice.

F: THE PRE-STANDARDISING AND STANDARDISING MEETING

- **The review of the mark scheme between the examination and standardising meeting**

After the examination but before the main Standardising Meeting, the Principal Examiner and the Team Leaders will have met to discuss the mark scheme in the light of candidates’ actual responses and re-draft where necessary. The re-draft of the mark scheme will be made available to Assistant Examiners at the Standardising Meeting. Through this *post-hoc review procedure* the marks will have been allocated in the expectation that candidates will achieve all the levels identified and no others. Adjustments will have been made to cater for candidates reaching higher levels than those provided for, to remove marks allocated to levels which candidates have not reached, or to enhance discrimination in cases where large numbers of candidates are bunched at the same level.

- **Prior Marking**

It is important that all examiners scrutinise at least 25 scripts before the main standardising meeting and note such things as: alternative interpretations of questions made by candidates; answers which do not fit into the mark scheme; levels which are not reached by the candidates; additional levels which have not been included in the mark scheme, etc. To familiarise themselves with a variety of responses, examiners should sample the range of questions, scripts from several centres and across the full range of ability in so far as practicable. Any preliminary marking **must** be completed in pencil and reviewed following the standardising meeting in the light of the revised mark scheme and advice given.

- **The Final Mark Scheme**

The final mark scheme will be decided at the standardising meeting after full discussion of both the mark scheme and the scripts selected by the Principal Examiner for marking at the standardising meeting. At all stages, care will be taken to ensure that all candidates are treated fairly and rewarded for their positive achievements on the paper.

- **Post Standardising Meeting**

After the examiners' standardising meeting, examiners may encounter answers which do not fit the agreed mark scheme but which are worthy of credit. These should be discussed with the Team Leader over the telephone. Such answers should be assessed in terms of the difficulty/sophistication of the thought involved. If it is believed that the "thought level" equates with one of the levels in the mark scheme, it must be awarded a corresponding mark, with a brief note provided on the script to explain why.

Paper 1: Medicine Through Time

Section A

Question 1

(a) What does **Source A** suggest about the Theory of the Four Humours? **5**

Target: Analysing an historical source (AO 6.2)

Level 1: Answer that selects detail **1-2**
 e.g. a runny nose was caused by too much phlegm.

OR

Answer that makes generalised statements about the drawing as evidence
 e.g. it's only a cartoon and we shouldn't necessarily take what it says as accurate.

Level 2: Answer that draws a simple inference from the source **3-4**
 e.g. the theory was based on observation and a logical diagnosis/conclusion.

Level 3: Answer that develops a complex inference from the source **5**
 e.g. Source A shows that the theory was part of a wider view of the world which linked the seasons to illness. In this case the runny nose is linked to water and then to winter. It shows the theory was well thought out.

-
- (b)** How much can you learn from **Source B** about the development of the Theory of the Four Humours in the Ancient World? **6**
 Explain your answer using the evidence in **Source B** and **your own knowledge**
- Target: Analysing the sufficiency of a source in context (AO 6.1 and AO 6.2)**
- Level 1: Answer that describes the content or makes simple inferences** **1-2**
 e.g. I can learn from Source B that the theory has been used to decide on treatment for the illness. This is development because there is nothing about this in Source A.
- Level 2: Decision supported by simple reasoning for sufficiency** **3-4**
 Answers might develop out of Level 1 or might be based upon or include some simple evaluation about the trust-worthiness of Galen's own account of his own actions.
 e.g. I can learn something. Nearly 600 years later the theory was still used to treat illness. Source B shows it had developed into the theory of opposites but here it is only being used by Galen so it might not be widespread.
- Level 3: Decision supported by developed reasoning for sufficiency** **5-6**
 e.g. Source B does show the theory of the four humours had been developed into the theory of opposites which Galen says he is using to treat the emperor. However the extract comes from Galen's own writings and he liked to boast about his skills in medicine and so we can't be sure from just Source B whether the theory of opposites was in widespread use at the time.
- Such answers might develop an argument out of Level 2 based on by explaining reference to provenance (Galen's character) and/or tone and language (self-congratulatory) and/or generability (Galen only one doctor.)
- In the assessment grid, 2 out of the 6 marks are allocated to knowledge (AO 6.1) This is reflected in the mark scheme with up to 2 marks given for historical knowledge in each of levels 2 and 3.
-

(c) **Source C** states that the Theory of the Four Humours was a good theory and changed the way illnesses were treated. **9**

Source D states that the theory hindered the development of medicine.

Why do you think these two interpretations disagree about the impact of the Theory of the Four Humours?

Explain your answer using **Sources C** and **D** and **your own knowledge**.

Target: Explaining differences between two interpretations (AO 6.1 and AO 6.3)

Level 1: Answer that describes the content or generalised answer 1-3

e.g. Source C says that the theory was a more natural medicine which was a new idea and it lasted for over a thousand years, because it was so good. Source D says it did not help the development of medicine, because it was too simple.

Level 2: Answer based on simple reasoning for the disagreement/differences 4-6

e.g. these sources disagree because Source C is writing about the development of medicine through time and stresses how the theory of the four humours affected medical thinking for a long time.

Source D is more interested in its scientific nature and because the theory was later shown to be incorrect scientifically, Source D has a negative interpretation of its impact.

Level 3: Answer based on developed reasoning for the disagreement/differences 7-9

Such answers might consider the context of Source C emphasising the break with earlier supernatural explanations, e.g. the anger of the gods and treatment at an Asklepion, with Source D which emphasises its later use, and how it then had a negative impact on later scientific approaches to medicine because it held medicine back.

In the assessment grid, 2 out of the 9 marks are allocated to knowledge (AO 6.1) This is reflected in the mark scheme with up to 2 marks given for historical knowledge in each of levels 2 and 3.

- (d) Was the Theory of the Four Humours important in the development of medicine before 1700? **15**
 You should use the evidence in **Sources A to D and your knowledge** to answer this question.
- Target: Using the sources and own knowledge to analyse a key feature (AO 6.1 and AO 6.2/6.3)**
- Level 1: Basic answer that extracts or uses information from the source(s) and/or provides general or simple statements from own knowledge to reach a decision** **1-3**
 e.g. it was very important because Sources C and D and say it was in use for over a thousand years.
 e.g. it was important because it was the first real attempt to look at illness naturally.
 Mark at the top of the level answers which use both the source(s) and own knowledge.
- Level 2: Answer that develops an argument using the source(s) or own knowledge to reach a decision** **4-8**
 e.g. it was an important theory for explaining illness because it was based on actual observation of symptoms as shown in Source A, and then it was modified by Galen about 500 years later and was used to treat an emperor, as shown in Source B. Source C thinks it was an important theory because it lasted a thousand years and changed the way illnesses were treated. Even Source D thinks it must have been important because it held back medicine for 1000 years.
 e.g. the theory of the four humours was very important as it was a better theory than the Egyptians' theory of blocked channels because it was based upon careful observation and linked illness to four liquids which could be seen coming from the body. Even in 1685 King Charles II was treated by his doctors who were still following parts of the theory, by bleeding and raising blisters. Any theory lasting such a long time must be important in the development of medicine.
- Level 3: Answer that develops an argument using the source(s) and own knowledge to reach a decision** **9-12**
 e.g. both level 2 examples in the same answer.
- Level 4: As Level 3 but with an explicit supported judgement** **13-15**
 Such answers might explicitly evaluate/cross-reference the sources as evidence, e.g. Sources C and D both agree on its importance but for positive and negative reasons, before reaching a decision and/or explicitly explain how the theory never replaced supernatural thinking, e.g. Asklepiion, flagellants during the Black Death.
- N.B. In the assessment grid, 8 out of the 15 marks are allocated to AO6.2/6.3. This is reflected in the mark scheme with credit given for the use of sources and interpretations provided in the question.

Question 2

- (a) What does **Source E** tell you about how medieval surgeons tried to put a patient to sleep before an operation? **3**

Target: Comprehension and inference from an historical source (AO 6.2)

Level 1: Answer that selects detail **1-3**
Any three ingredients/methods
1 mark for each valid example described.

Level 2: Answer that draws a simple inference from the source **3**
e.g. it shows that surgeons were not sure how to put a patient to sleep as there are so many ingredients/ it must have been dangerous for the patient.

- (b) Surgeons tried to put patients to sleep before an operation. **12**
Was this the only reason surgery in the Middle Ages and Renaissance was dangerous?
Support your answer with reasons and examples.

Target: Analysing key issues in medieval surgery (AO 6.1)

Level 1: Generalised answer **1-3**
e.g. Yes because the patient could still die.
Mark here answers which use Source E only.

Level 2: Answer that describes the dangers of medieval operations **4-6**
e.g. yes. It was dangerous to put people to sleep for an operation because the anaesthetic could kill the patient.

Level 3: Answer that explains other factors making medieval surgery dangerous **7-9**
e.g. trying to put a patient to sleep was an important reason why surgery was often dangerous, because the drink could kill the patient, even if the operation seemed a success. However, there were other reasons, especially the lack of training of surgeons, many of whom were only barber-surgeons who had little knowledge. Even trained surgeons knew little as they had learnt about the body from the writings of Galen, which were believed to be correct. So putting the patient to sleep was not the only problem for doctors and patients in the Middle Ages.

Level 4: As Level 3 but with an explicit supported judgement **10-12**
Such answers will emerge from Level 3 and might e.g. argue a most important reason or consider how different reasons when added together made surgery even more dangerous.

Question 3

- (a) What does **Source F** tell you about the work of Louis Pasteur? **3**
- Target: Comprehension and inference from an historical source (AO 6.2)**
- Level 1: Answer that selects detail** **1-3**
 Any three relevant items shown in the picture
 1 mark for each valid detail described
 e.g. he worked in a laboratory. He used a microscope. He had a lot of equipment. He set out his equipment on his bench. He used a machine with a belt.
- Level 2: Answer that draws a simple inference from the source** **3**
 e.g. Source F shows that Pasteur was a careful investigator as he worked in a well-equipped laboratory.
- (b) The work of key individuals was one factor in the fight against infection and disease after 1700. **12**
 Choose **one** individual who fought infection and disease after 1700.
 Was individual brilliance the only factor that made their work successful?
 You may write about Pasteur or any other key individual you have studied.
 Explain your choice with reasons and examples.
- Target: Analysing the role of the individual in fighting infection and disease (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: Generalised or simple answer** **1-3**
 e.g. yes. It was Pasteur's brilliant experiments which showed it is the germs in the air which cause infection.
 Mark here answers which use Source F only.
- Level 2: Answer that describes the work of a chosen individual and/or other factors** **4-6**
 Such answers might recount that role of the brilliant individual in discoveries by Jenner in the eighteenth century, Pasteur/Koch/Nightingale/Lister in the nineteenth century, Ehrlich/Fleming/Florey/Chain in the twentieth century.
- Level 3: Answer that explicitly explains the role of other factors** **7-9**
 e.g. Jenner (science), Pasteur (chance and war), Koch (science and war), Nightingale (religion and war), Lister (science), Ehrlich (science), Fleming (chance), Florey and Chain (war and government), Lister (science).
- Level 4: As Level 3 but with an explicit supported judgement** **10-12**
 These answers might explicitly show how the factors were not of equal importance, or were interlinked in order to bring about the discovery.

Question 4

- (a) Explain **two** reasons why the government provided good public health in Roman Britain. **4+4**

Target: Understanding motives (AO 6.1)

Level 1: Generalised answer **1-2**
e.g. the keep the population healthy/to keep them happy.

Level 2: Simple answer **3**
e.g. to make Britain feel part of the Roman empire; to keep people healthy as there was a distrust of doctors; to keep the army fit for fighting; to keep away bad smells which they thought carried 'the invisible seeds of disease'.

Level 3: Developed answer **4**
e.g. it was important to the government that the Roman army in Britain remained fit to fight against native tribes. Many bath houses and latrines were built to keep the army healthy, as people linked bad smells to illness. The army was ordered to avoid wet and marshy places when the soldiers made their camps.

N.B. Mark scheme to be applied twice.

- (b)** What can you learn from **Source G** about the effectiveness of the government of towns and cities in providing good public health in the Middle Ages? **5**
 Explain your answer using the evidence in **Source G and your own knowledge.**

Target: Analysing a source in context (AO 6.1 and AO 6.2)

Level 1: Answer that selects detail from the source **1**
 e.g. it shows local government wasn't very effective because the king is telling the city of York that it must clean the streets.

Level 2: Answer that draws a simple inference from the source **2-3**
 e.g. I have learnt that if the situation in York has become this bad, then the local government can't have had much control over what people had been doing before the letter was sent. So it shows local government was not effective.

Answers might make simple statements to evaluate the evidence of the letter
 e.g. the king hadn't been to York yet, so how did he know that this was the situation?

Level 3: Answer that develops a complex inference from the source **4-5**
 e.g. the letter says that York is the worst city in the kingdom for filth. This suggests that the local government in other cities was more effective in providing better public health. In the Middle Ages there were no national laws to control public health.

Answers might develop statements about the letter as evidence
 e.g. King Edward might have exaggerated the problem in York to make sure the mayor cleaned up before he arrived. So the letter is not proper evidence for the effectiveness of the government.

In the assessment grid, 2 out of the 5 marks are allocated to knowledge (AO 6.1) This is reflected in the mark scheme with one mark given for historical knowledge in each of levels 2 and 3.

-
- (c) Since 1750 governments have always tried to improve the health of people in Britain. Do you agree or disagree? Support your answer with reasons and examples. **12**
- Target: Understanding key developments and characteristics of a period (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: Generalised answer** **1-3**
e.g. yes. People today are healthier than in 1750 because they live longer as a result of government acts like the NHS.
- Level 2: Answer based on describing government measures or lack of them** **4-6**
e.g. yes. The government passed the 1875 Public Health Act to force towns and cities to provide better water supply and sewers and refuse collections. Towns were forced to appoint a Medical Officer of Health to make sure this was done.

The Liberal Social Reforms and the setting up of the NHS form other valid examples.
- Level 3: Answer based on explaining reasons for government actions or lack of them** **7-9**
Such answers might consider the impact of the 1842 report; *laissez-faire*; the influence of Booth and Rowntree; 'Homes fit for Heroes'; impact of the Beveridge report.
- Level 4: As Level 3 but with an explicit supported judgement** **10-12**
Such answers will emerge from Level 3 and might e.g. explicitly consider the statement is more valid since 1875 than before.
-

Question 5

- (a) What can you learn from **Source H** about the number of people who died in the Great Plague? **5**
 Explain your answer using the evidence in **Source H and your own knowledge.**

Target: Analysing a source in context (AO 6.1 and AO 6.2)

Level 1: Answer that selects detail from the source **1**
 e.g. there are many graves and some contain several coffins.

Level 2: Answer that draws a simple inference from the source **2-3**
 e.g. the picture shows that so many people died they couldn't be buried in separate graves.

Answers might make simple statements to evaluate the evidence of the illustration.

e.g. we can't learn much because the picture only shows a small part of London at one time. The Great Plague lasted throughout the summer of 1665.

Level 3: Answer that develops a complex inference from the source **4-5**
 e.g. there must have been a lot of deaths because there are many churches shown in the picture and their graveyards must have been full as these burials are taking place in a new graveyard outside the walls.

Answers might develop statements about the evidence of the illustration

e.g. the picture seems to have been drawn to show all the stages of burial, from the procession to covering the graves, rather than to give a picture of what actually happened on a particular occasion. So we can't rely on it for the numbers of dead. We need to see the Bills of Mortality for that.

In the assessment grid, 2 out of the 5 marks are allocated to knowledge (AO 6.1) This is reflected in the mark scheme with one mark given for historical knowledge in each of levels 2 and 3.

-
- (b) Explain **two** methods people used in 1665 to try to prevent the Great Plague from spreading. **4+4**

Target: Understanding people's attitudes and ideas (AO 6.1)

Level 1: Generalised answer **1-2**
e.g. People with the plague were locked up.

Level 2: Simple answer **3**
e.g. People with the plague were locked up in their house for 28 days; house marked with a red cross; searchers appointed to find plague victims; no burials in day-time; cats and dogs killed; theatres and inns closed; beggars banned; certificates needed to leave London; people smelt flowers and perfumes.

Level 3: Developed answer **4**
e.g. People did not know the real reasons the plague spread, so they used commonsense methods like locking victims up for 28 days. In fact this probably meant that the rest of the family would also die of the plague because they had to live with the victim.

N.B. Mark scheme to be applied twice.

-
- (c) In the nineteenth century thousands of people died during the cholera epidemics. **12**
 Does this mean public health had not improved in the years between the Great Plague and 1900?
 Support your answer with reasons and examples.
- Target: Understanding key developments and characteristics of a period (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: Generalised or simple answer** **1-3**
 e.g. yes. Poor people still lived in unhealthy conditions in large towns and cities like they had lived in London in 1665.
- Level 2: Answer based on describing nineteenth-century conditions and/or actions** **4-6**
 e.g. Cholera was carried in dirty water. In industrial towns and cities there was a lack of proper water supply and sewerage so the bacteria spread through sewage to the water people drank. It was made worse because people crowded together in cellars and back-to-back houses. So public health had not improved since 1665.
- Level 3: Answer based on explaining the problems of public health and/or attempts to improve** **7-9**
 e.g. it's difficult to compare London in 1665 with nineteenth-century industrial towns and cities because they produced new public health problems with overcrowding in cellars and back-to-back houses. There were so many people that there were big problems of water supply and sewerage. As long as people believed in miasmas they couldn't really improve public health. Only when Dr John Snow found that cholera was carried in dirty water in 1854 could anything practical be done to prevent it and improve public health, It was not until 1875 that the government passed a compulsory public health act to improve conditions for most people.
- Level 4: As Level 3 but with an explicit supported judgement** **10-12**
 There answers might explicitly consider how the continuities of belief e.g. in miasma, was balanced against the new approaches, e.g. of Chadwick and Snow, to illustrate a complex situation regarding public health.
-