



**GCSE**

**History B (Schools history project)**

Unit **J411/12**: The People's Health, c.1250 to present with  
The Elizabethans, 1580-1603

General Certificate of Secondary Education

**Mark Scheme for June 2018**

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 2018

**Annotations**

<b>Stamp</b>	<b>Annotation Name</b>	<b>Description</b>
 <b>1</b>	Tick 1	Level 1
 <b>2</b>	Tick 2	Level 2
 <b>3</b>	Tick 3	Level 3
 <b>4</b>	Tick 4	Level 4
 <b>5</b>	Tick 5	Level 5
 <b>6</b>	Tick 6	Level 6
	SEEN	Noted but no credit given
	NAQ	Not answered question
	Wavy Line	Development / Evidence / Support of valid point
	BP	Blank page

## Section A: The People's Health, c.1250 to present

**Question 1–3 marks**

(a) Give one example of what medieval people thought caused the Black Death.

(b) Name one response of the government to the gin craze in the period 1660–1751.

(c) Name one individual who had a positive impact on public health in the nineteenth century.

Guidance	Indicative content
1(a) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)	For 1(a), likely valid responses include: punishment from God; movement of planets; miasma; eye contact; humours out of balance
1(b) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)	For 1(b), likely valid responses include: banned imports of gin; Gin Acts passed (1729, 1736, 1743, 1751); distillers had to pay a tax; sellers had to buy a licence; restricted sale of gin to only alehouses; imprisonment; whipping; transportation
1(c) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)	<p>For 1(c) likely valid responses include: Edwin Chadwick; Dr. John Snow; Joseph Bazalgette; Louis Pasteur; Dr. Robert Baker; William Farr; Disraeli; John Simon</p> <p>Any other historically valid response is acceptable and should be credited.</p>

**NOTES**

1a Important to stress that question asks about what medieval people thought so 'modern' explanations not valid

1b To consider - *imprisonment; whipping; transportation* – are these specific to the gin craze?

1c Make clear that name only is required – also need to be consistent eg is 'Chadwick' acceptable?

<b>Question 2–9 marks</b> <b>Write a clear and organised summary that analyses people's lifestyles since 1900. Support your summary with examples.</b>	
<b>Levels</b> <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 6 marks</b> <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 3 marks</b>	<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> <p>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).</p> <p>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>	<i>Answers should show connections in the situation defined in the question and use these to organise the answer logically.</i> <i>Answers could consider aspects of one or more of: effects of the depression in the 30s; rationing and effect on diet during WW2; changes in lifestyles: inactivity caused by cars and transport, TV and tablets, remote controls, watching rather than doing sport, robots used in factories; quality of air affected by cars and exhaust fumes; improved standards of housing; changes in food and eating habits – tinning, supermarkets, refrigeration, foreign food, microwave food, processed food, less fresh food.</i> <i>Use of conceptual understanding to organise the response might in this case involve change, cause and consequence or consider different aspects of lifestyles in order to structure the response</i>
<b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b> <p>Demonstrates a range of knowledge of characteristic features that are relevant to the question, in ways that show understanding of them (AO1).</p> <p>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>	<i>Answers may show use of second order concepts such as change and continuity; cause and consequence and significance</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 the topic in the question.</i>
<b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b> <p>Demonstrates some knowledge of characteristic features with some relevance to the question, in ways that show some limited understanding of them (AO1).</p> <p>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>	
<b>0 marks</b> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	

<b>Question 2–9 marks</b> <b>Write a clear and organised summary that analyses people's lifestyles since 1900. Support your summary with examples.</b>	
<b>Guidance and indicative content</b> <b>General Note: No requirement to write a narrative which covers the 20<sup>th</sup> century comprehensively</b>	
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b>	<p>Answers at L3 will typically be organised around a second order concept such as causes, effects, change/continuity, significance. Answers will be supported with <b>three</b> or more valid examples eg</p> <p>[Change]  <i>Since 1900 people's lifestyles have become more unhealthy in some ways. For example, they do less physical activity; they travel in vehicles rather than walking and tend to watch sport rather than playing. The jobs that people do now also tend to be more office based with hard physical jobs around the house being done by machinery. Food in some ways has also become unhealthy as people eat more processed and convenience food which isn't as fresh.</i>  [candidates may equally argue for positive change, or a mixture or both]</p> <p>[Cause and consequence]  <i>Since 1900 people have become more unhealthy. Technology has been a big reason for this. For example, many physical jobs like farming have been taken over by machinery and household appliances have become more affordable. This means that many tasks are now less physically demanding and people get less exercise. In addition, the invention of the microwave has led to over-reliance on convenience meals, leading to poor nutrition. The invention of the TV means that more people's leisure time is spent on their sofas.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Summary based on second order concept(s) with three or more valid supporting examples</b>  Other areas to consider: improvements or otherwise in lifestyles relating to: housing; pollution; food and eating habits ; technology – see MS on previous page]</p>
<b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b>	<p>Answers at L2 will typically be organised around a second order concept, supported with <b>two</b> valid examples eg</p> <p>[Change]  <i>Since 1900 people's lifestyles have become more unhealthy in some ways. For example, they do less physical activity; they travel in vehicles rather than walking and tend to watch sport rather than playing. Food in some ways has also become unhealthy as people eat more processed and convenience food which isn't as fresh.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Summary based on a second order concept with two valid supporting examples</b></p>
<b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b>	<p>Answers at L1 will typically be organised around a second order concept, supported with <b>one</b> valid example eg</p> <p>[Change]  <i>Since 1900 people's lifestyles have become more unhealthy in some ways. For example, food has become unhealthy as people eat more processed and convenience food.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Summary based on a second order concept with one valid supporting example</b></p> <p>Alternatively, answers at L1 will list or describe relevant events or developments without organisation eg  <i>In the wars there was rationing. Lots of people used cars. In the 1990s there was a BSE scare.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: List of events / developments with no organising concept.</b></p>
<b>0 marks</b>	

<b>Question 3–10 marks</b> <b>Why were the authorities slow in reforming public health in Industrial Britain? Explain your answer.</b> <b>Support your answer with examples.</b>	
<b>Levels</b>	<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b> <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b>	
<b>Level 5 (9–10 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show sophisticated understanding of one or more second order concepts in a fully sustained and very well-supported explanation (AO2).	<i>Explanations could consider: laissez-faire policy of government; lack of understanding of what caused disease prior to germ theory in 1861; cost of reform; ruling classes weren't affected immediately</i>
<b>Level 4 (7–8 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show strong understanding of one or more second order concepts in a sustained and well-supported explanation (AO2).	<i>Explanations are most likely to show understanding of the second order concept of causation and consequence but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i> <i>Answers which simply describe some of the features of Industrial Britain cannot reach beyond Level 1.</i>
<b>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show sound understanding of one or more second order concepts in a generally coherent and organised explanation (AO2).	
<b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show some understanding of one or more second order concepts in a loosely organised explanation (AO2).	
<b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Uses these to show some basic understanding of one or more second order concepts, although the overall response may lack structure and coherence (AO2).	
<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.	

Question 3–10 marks Why were the authorities slow in reforming public health in Industrial Britain? Explain your answer. Guidance and indicative content	
<b>Level 5 (9–10 marks)</b>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically identify at least <b>three</b> reasons why reform was slow and explain them fully e.g.</p> <p><i>There were several reasons why public health reform was slow in industrial Britain. One reason was that disease was not well understood until the after the 1860s with the work of Louis Pasteur. Before this it was believed that disease was carried in smells or miasmas. This meant the actions to reform health could sometimes take the wrong approach such as barrels of acid to clear smells and not focus on important measures such as providing clean water which would have improved health. Another reason was that for much of the industrial period there was a strong belief in the idea of laissez faire. This meant that people believed it was not the responsibility of the government to provide clean water, good housing etc; it was the responsibility of individuals to stay clean and avoid disease. As a result governments were reluctant to take measures to improve health. Finally, no working class people had the vote until 1867 so politicians listened more to richer middle and upper class men who would vote them out of power. Richer people were not as affected by overcrowding and lack of clean water like the poor were.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Three or more reasons identified with explanation of how each meant that reform was slow</b></p>
<b>Level 4 (7–8 marks)</b>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically identify at least two reasons why reform was slow and explain them fully e.g.</p> <p><i>One reason was that disease was not well understood until the after the 1860s with the work of Louis Pasteur. Before this it was believed that disease was carried in smells or miasmas. This meant the actions to reform health could sometimes take the wrong approach such as barrels of acid to clear smells and not focus on important measures such as providing clean water which would have improved health. Another reason was that for much of the industrial period there was a strong belief in the idea of laissez faire. This meant that people believed it was not the responsibility of the government to provide clean water, good housing etc; it was the responsibility of individuals to stay clean and avoid disease. As a result governments were reluctant to take measures to improve health.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Two reasons identified with explanation of how they meant that reform was slow</b></p> <p><b>NOTE</b> Answers at L4 will often identify and describe several reasons but only fully explain two of them.</p>
<b>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</b>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically identify and fully explain one reason why reform was slow <b>AND</b> identify/describe another reason(s) without full explanation e.g.</p> <p><i>One reason was that disease was not well understood until the after the 1860s with the work of Louis Pasteur. Before this it was believed that disease was carried in smells or miasmas. This meant the actions to reform health could sometimes take the wrong approach such as barrels of acid to clear smells and not focus on important measures such as providing clean water which would have improved health. Also, there was a strong belief in laissez-faire which means they didn't think the government should interfere in people's lives.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: One reason identified with explanation of how it meant that reform was slow PLUS at least one more identified/described</b></p>
<b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically identify and fully explain one reason why reform was slow e.g.</p> <p><i>One reason was that disease was not well understood until the after the 1860s with the work of Louis Pasteur. Before this it was believed that disease was carried in smells or miasmas. This meant the actions to reform health could sometimes take the wrong approach such as barrels of acid to clear smells and not focus on important measures such as providing clean water which would have improved health.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: One reason identified with explanation of how it meant that reform was slow</b></p>
<b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically identify/describe reason(s) why reform was slow without full explanation e.g.</p> <p><i>There was a strong belief in laissez-faire.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Identification/description of reason(s) without full explanation</b></p> <p>Alternatively, L1 answers will contain correct description of conditions at the time or actions of the authorities e.g.</p> <p><i>The towns were really dirty. Local councils flushed rubbish and waste into the river. In 1875 the Public Health Act was passed.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Describes conditions or actions of authorities or other relevant events</b></p>
<b>0 marks</b>	

<b>Question 4*–18 marks</b> <b>'The creation of the NHS was the most significant improvement in public health in the twentieth century.' How far do you agree? Give reasons for your answer.</b>	
<b>Levels</b>	<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 6 marks</b> <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 12 marks</b>	
<b>Level 6 (16–18 marks)</b> 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>	Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate knowledge of public health in any period. <i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the level description. To reach the top two levels answers must consider other improvements in public health as well as the NHS.</i>
<b>Level 5 (13–15 marks)</b> 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>	Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of similarity and difference and significance but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.
<b>Level 4 (10–12 marks)</b> 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>	<i>Grounds for agreeing include: it was a marked improvement on what had gone before – the comparison between before and after; free medical care for everyone; no distinction between rich and poor; improved life expectancy; immediacy of impact (particularly compared with things like anti-smoking campaigns);</i>
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> 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>	<i>Grounds for disagreeing include: Liberal Welfare reforms started the ball rolling; improvements to living conditions, particularly in first half of century made vast improvements; immunisation programme started in 1940; Clean Air Act; healthy living campaigns</i>
<b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b> 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>	
<b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b> 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>	
<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.	

<b>Question 4*–18 marks</b> <b>'The creation of the NHS was the most significant improvement in public health in the twentieth century.' How far do you agree? Give reasons for your answer.</b>	
<b>Guidance and indicative content</b>	
<b>Level 6 (16-18 marks)</b>	<p>Level 6 answers will typically set out a balanced argument with each side of the argument explicitly supported by at least two valid examples (or three on one side and two on the other) and a <b>clinching argument</b> e.g.</p> <p><i>Overall I agree with the statement. First of all the NHS was so significant because it was such a huge improvement on what had been available before for most people. Until 1948, about 8 million people had never seen a doctor because they could not afford it. By making health care free to all the NHS massively improved life for thousands of people. Another way in which it was significant is the range of services it provided – not just doctors. The NHS gave things such hospital care, family doctors, vaccinations and maternity care to everyone for free. This had had a big impact on increasing life expectancy, particularly in reducing the numbers of women dying after childbirth.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand it could be argued that other developments were more important. For example the introduction of Old Age Pensions in 1909 transformed the lives of thousands of pensioners by giving them a regular income after the age of 70. For many of them they would have had to go to the workhouse if not for pensions. Another factor which could be seen as more significant than the NHS is the government's housebuilding programmes after the First and Second World Wars. These programmes took thousands of people out of unhealthy inner city slums and gave them homes on housing estates with proper heating, ventilation, water and sanitation.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, however, I believe that the NHS was the most significant development because of its immediate and comprehensive nature. The pensions were a good first step but the amount paid was quite low, and the housebuilding programmes also had negative consequences such as people living in tower blocks. The sheer number of people and range of services that the NHS provides who would otherwise have not been helped makes it the most significant development.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell</b> <b>Balanced argument, two valid supporting examples each side (or three on one side and one on the other), plus a clinching argument</b>  <b>NOTE: It is unlikely but candidates could focus entirely on the NHS i.e. ways in which it was / was not significant.</b></p>
<b>Level 5 (13-15 marks)</b>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically set out a balanced argument with each side of the argument explicitly supported by at least two valid examples (or three on one side and two on the other) e.g.</p> <p><i>[As Level 6 but without clinching argument, or with a summary/assertion instead e.g. Overall, I think the NHS was more of a significant development because it helped so many people who otherwise could not have afforded medical care.]</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument with two explained points on each side (or three on one side and one on the other)</b>  <b>NOTE: It is likely that candidates at this level will attempt a clinching argument but this will be more of a summary or assertion/repetition of earlier arguments.</b></p>
<b>Level 4 (10-12 marks)</b>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically construct a one-sided answer explicitly supported by three valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>I disagree with the statement because it could be argued that other developments were more important. For example the introduction of Old Age Pensions in 1909 transformed the lives of thousands of pensioners by giving them a regular income after the age of 70. For many of them they would have had to go to the workhouse if not for pensions. Another factor which could be seen as more significant than the NHS is the government's housebuilding programmes after the First and Second World Wars. These programmes took thousands of people out of unhealthy inner city slums and gave them homes on housing estates with proper heating, ventilation, water and sanitation. Alternatively, the Clean Air Act of 1956 was really important. Burning coal led to thick blankets of smog in cities like London. The smog of 1952 killed about 12,000 people in London, The Clean Air Act required factories and homes in specified areas to burn special types of 'smokeless' fuel. Slowly these smokeless zones grew and by the 1980s smog from coal was no longer a problem.</i></p>

Guidance and indicative content	
	<p><b>Nutshell One sided argument; three explained points of support</b></p> <p><b>Alternatively</b>, Level 4 answers will construct a balanced argument with two explained points on one side and one explained point on the other side e.g.</p> <p><i>Overall I agree with the statement. First of all the NHS was so significant because it was such a huge improvement on what had been available before for most people. Until 1948, about 8 million people had never seen a doctor because they could not afford it. By making health care free to all the NHS massively improved life for thousands of people. Another way in which it was significant is the range of services it provided – not just doctors. The NHS gave things such hospital care, family doctors, vaccinations and maternity care to everyone for free. This had had a big impact on increasing life expectancy, particularly in reducing the numbers of women dying after childbirth. However, the introduction of Old Age Pensions in 1909 also transformed the lives of thousands of pensioners by giving them a regular income after the age of 70. For many of them they would have had to go to the workhouse if not for pensions.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; two explained point on one side and one explained point on the other side.</b></p>
<b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-sided answer explicitly supported by two valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree with the statement. First of all the NHS was so significant because it was such a huge improvement on what had been available before for most people. Until 1948, about 8 million people had never seen a doctor because they could not afford it. By making health care free to all the NHS massively improved life for thousands of people. Another way in which it was significant is the range of services it provided – not just doctors. The NHS gave things such hospital care, family doctors, vaccinations and maternity care to everyone for free. This had had a big impact on increasing life expectancy, particularly in reducing the numbers of women dying after childbirth.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell One sided argument; two explained points of support</b></p> <p>Alternatively, Level 3 answers will construct a balanced argument with each side explicitly supported by one example, e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree the NHS was so significant because it was such a huge improvement on what had been available before for most people. Until 1948, about 8 million people had never seen a doctor because they could not afford it. By making health care free to all the NHS massively improved life for thousands of people. However, the introduction of Old Age Pensions in 1909 also transformed the lives of thousands of pensioners by giving them a regular income after the age of 70. For many of them they would have had to go to the workhouse if not for pensions.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; one explained point on each side</b></p>
<b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument explicitly supported by one valid example e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree the NHS was so significant because it was such a huge improvement on what had been available before for most people. Until 1948, about 8 million people had never seen a doctor because they could not afford it. By making health care free to all the NHS massively improved life for thousands of people.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: One sided argument; one explained point of support</b></p>
<b>Level 1 (1-3 marks)</b>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically identify improvements brought by the NHS <b>OR</b> identify other significant improvements without full explanation, e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree because the NHS gave people free medical care <b>OR</b> I disagree because actually Old Age Pensions was a more significant improvement.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Identification of NHS improvements or other significant improvements without explanation</b></p> <p>Alternatively, Level 1 answers will typically describe relevant events or make general, unsupported assertions, e.g.</p> <p><i>The NHS was set up by the Labour government in 1948. / I agree the NHS was the most significant because so many people benefitted.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Description of relevant events or developments with no explanation <b>OR</b> general assertions</b></p>
<b>0 marks</b>	

**NOTE: At each level, many candidates will attempt to more explained points, but only fully/successfully explained points should be credited. eg at L2, many answers will attempt a balanced answer but only achieve one valid explanation.**

Question 5*-18 marks How far do you agree that living conditions in towns during the Early Modern period (1500-1750) were no better than during the Middle Ages? Give reasons for your answer.		Notes and guidance specific to the question set
<b>Levels</b> AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 6 marks</b> AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 12 marks</b>		
<b>Level 6 (16-18 marks)</b> 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>		Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate any knowledge of public health during these periods. 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. Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of similarity and difference and causation but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.
<b>Level 5 (13-15 marks)</b> 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>		
<b>Level 4 (10-12 marks)</b> 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>		Grounds for agreeing include: streets were still unpaved and dirty in lots of towns; animal excrement still a problem; overhanging houses made it dark; in towns where some improvements were made, poorer neighbourhoods were not improved; cleanliness of water still a problem; link between dirt and disease still not made
<b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b> 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>		Grounds for disagreeing include: towards the end of the period local authorities made big improvements such as paved streets, squares with terraced houses etc although often these changes only benefitted the wealthy; oil burning street lamps were introduced; after the end of the plague epidemics towns were able to concentrate on improving living conditions; by 1750 in London there were several water companies that would pipe water into homes of those who could afford it
<b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b> 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>		
<b>Level 1 (1-3 marks)</b> 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>		
<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.		

<b>Question 5*–18 marks</b> <b>How far do you agree that living conditions in towns during the Early Modern period (1500-1750) were no better than during the Middle Ages? Give reasons for your answer.</b>	
<b>Guidance and indicative content</b>	
<b>Level 6 (16-18 marks)</b>	<p>Level 6 answers will typically set out an argument which compares the conditions in both periods. Arguments will be explicitly supported by at least two examples of living conditions from each of the two periods (or three from one period and one from the other), plus a <b>clinching argument</b> e.g.</p> <p><i>Overall I think that the statement is correct. Living conditions in towns in the medieval period were very poor for most people. Waste was a real problem. At the end of a market day, the streets were full of waste from food and animals. Many toilets had no lining and excrement leaked into other houses' cellars. Another problem was the lack of a clean water supply. No-one had pipes to bring clean water to their house and some gongfermers simply emptied waste into the stream so living conditions were very unhealthy and disease was common.</i></p> <p><i>There were some improvements in the early modern period. By the 1700s, towns were improving. For example, many towns also introduced oil-burning lamps on the streets and footways for pedestrians. There was some better quality terraced housing and some streets were paved with stone. By 1750 in London there were several water companies that would pipe water into homes of those who could afford it.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, even though there were some improvements in the 1700s this was only the end of the period and many were only superficial changes such as lighting. The changes which were more substantial like clean water only affected the wealthy, so I would say that for the majority of people and most of the period the statement is correct.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell</b> Valid comparison of periods; two explained points each period (or three from one period and one from the other) plus a clinching argument  <b>NOTE:</b> The 2 different periods must be covered but it would be possible for candidates to agree/disagree entirely with the statement (eg 2 points on poor conditions in medieval towns plus 2 points on continuation of poor conditions in EM towns)</p>
<b>Level 5 (13-15 marks)</b>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically set out a an argument which compares the two periods, supported by at least two examples of living conditions from each of the two periods (or three from one period and one from the other) e.g.</p> <p><i>[As Level 6 but without clinching argument, or with a summary/assertion instead eg Overall, I think that the statement is true because there were still lots of problems which remained in the Early Modern period and not much had changed at all.]</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell:</b> Valid comparison of periods; two explained points for each period (or three from one period and one from the other)  <b>NOTE:</b> It is likely that candidates at this level will attempt a clinching argument but this will be more of a summary or assertion/repetition of earlier arguments.</p>
<b>Level 4 (10-12 marks)</b>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically set out an argument based on living conditions in only one period, supported by three examples of living conditions in that period, e.g.</p> <p><i>I don't agree because there were some improvements in the early modern period. In the 1500s, towns like York were already makes efforts to clean up the town – for example, they fined people for throwing urine and excrement into the street at night. By the 1700s, towns were improving more. For example, many towns introduced oil-burning lamps on the streets and footways for pedestrians. There was some better quality terraced housing and some streets were paved with stone. By 1750 in London there were several water companies that would pipe water into homes of those who could afford it.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell</b> One period explained, supported by three examples</p>

Guidance and indicative content	
	<p>Alternatively, Level 4 answers will typically set out an argument based on living conditions in both periods, supported by two examples of living conditions in one period and one example from the other period, e.g.</p> <p><i>I think the statement is correct. Living conditions in towns in the medieval period were very poor for most people. Waste was a real problem. At the end of a market day, the streets were full of waste from food and animals. Many toilets had no lining and excrement leaked into other houses' cellars. Another problem was the lack of a clean water supply. No-one had pipes to bring clean water to their house and some gongfermers simply emptied waste into the stream so living conditions were very unhealthy and disease was common. However, there were some improvements in the early modern period. By the 1700s, towns were improving. For example, many towns also introduced oil-burning lamps on the streets and footways for pedestrians.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Both periods explained, supported by two examples from one period and one from the other period</b></p>
<b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically set out an argument based on living conditions in only one period, supported by two examples of living conditions in that period eg</p> <p><i>I think the statement is correct. Living conditions in towns in the medieval period were very poor for most people. Waste was a real problem. At the end of a market day, the streets were full of waste from food and animals. Many toilets had no lining and excrement leaked into other houses' cellars. Another problem was the lack of a clean water supply. No-one had pipes to bring clean water to their house and some gongfermers simply emptied waste into the stream so living conditions were very unhealthy and disease was common</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: One period explained, supported by two examples</b></p> <p>Alternatively, Level 3 answers will set out an argument based on living conditions in both periods, supported by one example from each period, e.g.</p> <p><i>I think the statement is correct. Living conditions in towns in the medieval period were very poor for most people. Waste was a real problem. At the end of a market day, the streets were full of waste from food and animals. Many toilets had no lining and excrement leaked into other houses' cellars. However, there were some improvements in the early modern period. By the 1700s, towns were improving. For example, many towns also introduced oil-burning lamps on the streets and footways for pedestrians.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Both period explained, supported by one example from each period</b></p>
<b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically set out an argument based on living conditions in only one period, supported by one examples of living conditions in that period eg</p> <p><i>I think the statement is correct. Living conditions in towns in the medieval period were very poor for most people. Waste was a real problem. At the end of a market day, the streets were full of waste from food and animals. Many toilets had no lining and excrement leaked into other houses' cellars.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: One period explained, supported by one example</b></p>
<b>Level 1 (1-3 marks)</b>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically describe living conditions in one or both periods without full explanation, e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree because people still didn't have clean water in 1750.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Identification of living conditions without explanation</b></p> <p>Alternatively, Level 1 answers will typically describe relevant events or make general, unsupported assertions,, e.g.</p> <p><i>In the medieval period there was the problem of plague in towns./ I agree because the level of hygiene was just the same in both periods.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Description of relevant events or developments with no explanation OR general assertions</b></p>
<b>0 marks</b>	

NOTE: At each level, many candidates will attempt to more explained points, but only fully/successfully explained points should be credited. eg at L2, many answers will attempt a balanced answer but only achieve one valid explanation.

**Section B: The Elizabethans, 1580–1603****Question 6a – 3 marks**

In Interpretation A, the historian argues that most people in Elizabethan England did not share the views of the Puritans about dancing. Identify and explain one way in which she does this.

**Notes and guidance specific to the question set**

Points marking (AO4): 1+1+1. 1 mark for identification of a relevant and appropriate way in the historian argues that most people in Elizabethan England did not share the views of the Puritans about dancing + 1 mark for a basic explanation of this + 1 mark for development of this explanation.

*Reminder – This question does not seek evaluation of the given interpretation, just selection of relevant material and analysis of this in relation to the issue in the question. The explanation of how the historian argues that most people in Elizabethan England did not share the views of the Puritans about dancing may analyse the interpretation or aspects of the interpretation by using the candidate's knowledge of the historical situation portrayed and / or to the method or approach used by the author. Knowledge and understanding of historical context must be intrinsically linked to the analysis of the interpretation in order to be credited. Marks must not be awarded for the demonstration of knowledge or understanding in isolation.*

*The following answers are indicative. Other appropriate ways and appropriate and accurate explanation should also be credited:*

*For example:*

- *The historian makes it clear that dancing was very popular, calling it a mania (1). It is clear that all classes in society and all ages are taken with dancing (1) showing that they did not agree with the views of Puritans (1) She goes on to show how Puritans disliked dancing by mentioning that they thought it was moral threat and led to lost work (1).*
- *The historian emphasises that dancing was very popular (1). She cites a foreign observer who comments on how good the English are at dancing and music (1). She then makes the point that by criticising it, Puritans were bound to be unpopular (1).*

<b>Question 6b – 5 marks</b> <b>If you were asked to do further research on one aspect of Interpretation A, what would you choose to investigate? Explain how this would help us to analyse and understand popular culture in Elizabethan England.</b>	
<b>Levels</b> <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 2 marks</b> <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 3 marks</b> <b>Please note that that while the weightings of AO1 to AO2 are equal in levels 1 and 2, AO2 carries greater weight in level 3.</b>	<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>Level 3 (5 marks)</b> The response shows knowledge and understanding of relevant key features and characteristics (AO1). It uses a strong understanding of second order historical concept(s) to explain clearly how further research on the chosen aspect would improve our understanding of the event or situation (AO2).	<i>Answers may choose to put forward lines of investigation by framing specific enquiry questions but it is possible to achieve full marks without doing this. Suggested lines of enquiry / areas for research may be into matters of specific detail or into broader themes but must involve use of second order concepts rather than mere discovery of new information if AO2 marks are to be awarded.</i> <i>Examples of areas for further research include: reasons for Puritan attacks on Elizabethan pastimes (causation); impact of Puritan attacks on people's activities (consequence); comparison of impact of Puritan beliefs across different areas of the country or within different groups, rich/poor, etc. (diversity, ie similarity &amp; difference); how far Elizabethan pastimes changed within the period 1580-1603 (change and continuity); how far the other ideas of the Puritans were shared by the rest of the country (diversity).</i>
<b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b> The response shows knowledge and understanding of relevant key features and characteristics (AO1). It uses a general understanding of second order historical concept(s) to explain how further research on the chosen aspect would improve our understanding of the event or situation (AO2).	
<b>Level 1 (1–2 mark)</b> The response shows knowledge of features and characteristics (AO1). It shows a basic understanding of second order historical concept(s) and attempts to link these to explanation of how further research on the chosen aspect would improve our understanding of the event or situation (AO2).	
<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.	

<b>Question 6b – 5 marks</b> <b>If you were asked to do further research on one aspect of Interpretation A, what would you choose to investigate? Explain how this would help us to analyse and understand popular culture in Elizabethan England.</b>	
<b>Guidance and indicative content</b>	
<b>Level 3 (5 marks)</b>	<p>Answers at L3 will typically identify one or more valid lines of enquiry based on a second order concept and explain specifically how this enquiry would increase understanding of a specific aspect of Interpretation A e.g.</p> <p><i>[Diversity]</i>  <i>I would investigate the types of dances there were apart from 'morris dances and jigs' and what other pastimes people had, such as theatres. This would allow us to understand more about popular culture in Elizabethan England.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Valid line of enquiry with explanation of how this would improve understanding, using Interpretation A</b></p>
<b>Level 2 (3-4 marks)</b>	<p>Answers at L2 will typically identify one or more valid lines of enquiry based on a second order concept and explain how this enquiry would increase understanding of some aspect(s) of the topic / issue e.g.</p> <p><i>[Diversity]</i>  <i>I would investigate the types of dances there were and what other pastimes people had, such as theatres. This would allow us to understand more about popular culture in Elizabethan England.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Valid line of enquiry with explanation of how this would improve understanding</b></p>
<b>Level 1 (1-2 marks)</b>	<p>Answers at L1 will identify a valid line of enquiry based on a second order concept (2 marks) eg</p> <p><i>I would the differences between rich and poor dances.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Valid line of enquiry</b></p> <p>Alternatively, L1 answers may identify details from Interpretation A and suggest further investigation into them (1-2 marks) eg</p> <p><i>I would find out what kind of dancing they are doing.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Find out more about people / events / objects in Interpretation A</b></p>
<b>0 marks</b>	

<b>Question 7–12 marks</b> <b>Interpretations B and C both focus on Elizabethan adventurers. How far do they differ and what might explain any differences?</b>	
<b>Levels</b> <b>AO4</b> Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations (including how and why interpretations may differ) in the context of historical events studied. <b>Maximum 12 marks</b>	<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>Level 4 (10–12 marks)</b> Analyses the interpretations and identifies some features appropriate to the task. Offers a very detailed analysis of similarities and/or differences between the interpretations and gives a convincing and valid explanation of reasons why they may differ. There is a convincing and well-substantiated judgment of how far they differ, in terms of detail or in overall message, style or purpose (AO4).	<b>Answers could consider:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comparison provenance and source type alone, eg B is from 2006, C from 2015; B is from a local news website, C is from an online article for international readers.</li> <li>Individual points of similarity/difference in content: both acknowledge Raleigh's role in bringing back tobacco to England; both acknowledge the fame of explorers (B calls Raleigh a 'famous explorer' and C quotes the Prime Minister saying 'great explorers'). B mentions Raleigh's knighthood; C doesn't. C discusses Raleigh's colonisation of Virginia; B doesn't.</li> <li>Differences in the overall message about or portrayal of the adventurers: B is a very positive portrayal of Raleigh as a hero or glorifies his contribution (expensive statue dedicated to him; MP calls him 'local hero' and says he is 'delighted'; unveiling given royal ceremony) whereas C portrays the adventurers in a very negative light as 'pirates' and pillagers; it emphasises the violence involved in their activities and is sarcastic about the achievements, eg tobacco.</li> <li>Developed reasons for differences – purpose / audience, eg B was written to commemorate Raleigh's contributions and for a local audience who are proud that someone so famous was born in the village. It is unlikely to say anything too negative about Raleigh. C's purpose is to persuade readers that British people are too 'rosey-eyed' and nostalgic about famous figures from history and aims to focus only on the damaging evidence. C is also using the adventurers to criticise the Prime Minister.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> Analyses the interpretations and identifies some features appropriate to the task. Offers a detailed analysis of similarities and/or differences between the interpretations and gives a valid explanation of reasons why they may differ. There is a generally valid and clear judgment about how far they differ, in terms of detail or in overall message, style or purpose (AO4).	
<b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b> Analyses the interpretations and identifies some features appropriate to the task. Offers some valid analysis of differences and/or similarities between the interpretations and gives a reasonable explanation of at least one reason why they may differ, and a basic judgement about how far they differ, in terms of detail or in overall message, style or purpose (AO4).	
<b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b> Analyses the interpretations and identifies some features appropriate to the task. Identifies some differences and/or similarities between the interpretations and makes a limited attempt to explain why they may differ. There is either no attempt to assess how far they differ, or there is an assertion about this but it is completely unsupported (AO4).	
<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.	<p>Marks for relevant knowledge and understanding should be awarded for the clarity and confidence with which candidates discuss features, events or issues mentioned or implied in the interpretations. Candidates who introduce extra relevant knowledge or show understanding of related historical issues can be rewarded for this, but it is not a target of the question.</p> <p>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that is unrelated to the topic in the question.</p>

Question 7–12 marks Interpretations B and C both focus on Elizabethan adventurers. How far do they differ and what might explain any differences? Guidance and indicative content	
<b>Level 4 (10-12 marks)</b>	<p>Answers at L4 will typically compare the overall portrayal of Elizabethan adventurers and support this with relevant reference to the content of the interpretations. They will use the <b>purpose/audience</b> of one or both of the interpretations to explain reasons for different portrayals, e.g.</p> <p><i>B is a very positive portrayal of Raleigh as a hero and glorifies his contribution. He has had an expensive statue dedicated to him and the MP calls him a 'local hero' whereas C portrays the adventurers in a very negative light as 'pirates' and pillagers. It emphasises the violence involved in their activities and is sarcastic about the achievements, like the tobacco. I think the reason that B is more positive is because B was written to commemorate Raleigh's contributions and for a local audience who are proud that someone so famous was born in the village. It is unlikely to say anything too negative about Raleigh.</i></p> <p><b>[Other possible lines of argument might include: Devon Tourism / BAT promotion in Interpretation B, C's purpose is to persuade readers that British people are too 'rosey-eyed' and nostalgic about famous figures from history and aims to focus only on the damaging evidence. C is also using the adventurers to criticise the Prime Minister.]</b></p> <p><b>Nutshell:</b> Valid comparison of portrayals in B and C, with support. Difference explained with specific purpose of B or C</p> <p><b>NOTE:</b> Award 10-11 marks for candidates who use the purpose of <u>one</u> interpretation to explain difference in portrayals. Award 12 marks for candidates which use the purpose of <u>both</u> interpretations to explain difference in portrayals.</p>
<b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b>	<p>Answers at L3 will typically compare the message/overall portrayal of Elizabethan adventurers and support this with relevant reference to the content of the interpretations. Answers at this level may attempt to explain differences using undeveloped comments about provenance e.g.</p> <p><i>B is a very positive portrayal of Raleigh as a hero and glorifies his contribution. He had had an expensive statue dedicated to him and the MP calls him 'local hero' whereas C portrays the adventurers in a very negative light as 'pirates' and pillagers. It emphasises the violence involved in their activities and is sarcastic about the achievements, like the tobacco.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell:</b> Valid comparison of portrayals in B and C with support from one or both interpretations.</p> <p><b>NOTE:</b> Answers with support from only one interpretation award 7 marks</p>
<b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b>	<p>Answers at L2 will typically use the content of the interpretations to compare individual points of similarity and/or difference e.g.</p> <p><i>Both acknowledge Raleigh's role in bringing back tobacco to England.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell:</b> Selects individual points of similarity or difference</p> <p>Answers at L2 will typically make a valid comparison of the message/overall portrayal of Elizabethan adventurers but fail to develop this with relevant support, e.g.</p> <p><i>Interpretation B suggests that Raleigh is a real hero but C is very negative about him.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell:</b> Valid comparison of portrayals with no support</p>
<b>Level 1 (1-3 marks)</b>	<p>Answers at L1 will typically make simplistic comments about provenance e.g.</p> <p><i>They are different because they were written at different times / they are similar because they are both from websites.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell:</b> Comparison of simplistic provenance</p> <p>Alternatively, answers will explain or paraphrase the portrayal of Elizabethan adventurers in one interpretation only, with no valid comparison e.g.</p> <p><i>Interpretation B is a very positive portrayal of Raleigh as a hero.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell:</b> Portrayal of adventurers in one interpretation explained with no valid comparison</p>
<b>0 marks</b>	

<b>Question 8*–20 marks</b> In his 1956 book, 'A History of the English-Speaking Peoples', former Prime Minister and historian Winston Churchill argued that there was 'harmony' between Elizabeth and Parliament during her reign. How far do you agree with this view?	
<b>Levels</b>	<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b> <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b> <b>AO4</b> Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations in the context of historical events studied. <b>Maximum 10 marks</b>	
<b>Level 5 (17–20 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing evaluation reaching a well-substantiated judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate any knowledge of Elizabeth and her parliaments.</i> <i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the Level description.</i> <i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of causation and consequence (why there was opposition from Parliament or why agreements were reached) and similarity and difference (diversity of experience among different groups within Parliament, eg Puritan opposition) but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i> <i>Grounds for agreeing include: Elizabeth set strict limits on what Parliament could discuss so debate on her marriage and the succession was limited; Elizabeth used Parliament less than other Tudor monarchs so again opportunity for discord was limited; Elizabeth's usual solution to disagreement was to compromise, eg over monopolies; the vast majority of MPs could be relied upon to vote as Elizabeth wished; most of the day-to day business in Parliament passed without difficulty or opposition. Candidates may cite views of revisionist historians like Elton and Graves, although this is not necessary.</i>
<b>Level 4 (13–16 marks)</b> 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 (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a sustained and generally convincing evaluation reaching a substantiated judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i>	
<b>Level 3 (9–12 marks)</b> 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 (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a partial evaluation with some explanation of ideas reaching a supported judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>	
<b>Level 2 (5–8 marks)</b> 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 (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Attempts a basic evaluation with some limited explanation of ideas and a loosely supported judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i>	<i>Grounds for disagreeing include: 'Harmony' covers up the fact that Parliament's powers were limited, eg Elizabeth imprisoned Wentworth for pressing her name a Protestant successor; there was much debate on foreign policy and the succession stirred up by Walsingham and Cecil; there was opposition from Puritans like Stubbes who criticised the Queen despite</i>

	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
<p><b>Level 1 (1–4 marks)</b></p> <p>Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1).</p> <p>Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) involved in the issue (AO2).</p> <p>Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. (AO4) There is either no attempt to evaluate and reach a judgment about the interpretation, or there is an assertion about the interpretation but this lacks any support or historical validity.</p> <p><i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i></p>	<p><i>brutal punishment; there was opposition from MPs over monopolies. Candidates may cite views of historians like Neale, although this is not necessary.</i></p>
<p><b>0 marks</b></p> <p>No response worthy of credit.</p>	

Question 8*-20 marks In his 1956 book, 'A History of the English-Speaking Peoples', former Prime Minister and historian Winston Churchill argued that there was 'harmony' between Elizabeth and Parliament during her reign. How far do you agree with this view? Guidance and indicative content	
<b>Level 5 (17-20 marks)</b>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically set out a balanced argument explicitly supported by at least 4 valid examples. For 20 marks, candidates must present a valid <b>clinching argument</b> e.g.</p> <p><i>There is evidence to support the statement. Elizabeth successfully limited discord with Parliament by controlling opportunity for disagreement. She set strict limits on what Parliament could discuss, so debate on her marriage and the succession was limited. She used Parliament less than other Tudor monarchs so again opportunity for discord was limited. Also, Elizabeth was usually ready to compromise so that agreement could be reached. For example, in 1601, she accepted that she had to cancel some monopolies.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand there are numerous examples of disagreements, especially with the Puritan MPs. For example, Elizabeth imprisoned the Puritan MP Wentworth for pressing her to reassure the people and name a Protestant successor. He died in the Tower of London. Also, there were disagreements about the succession and foreign policy. William Cecil and Walsingham used their influence over MPs to stir up debate in Parliament and force the Queen's hand over things like war with Spain.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, I don't agree. If there was limited disagreement or 'harmony' much of the time, this was because Parliament's powers were limited and not because there was genuine agreement.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; two valid supporting examples each side <u>OR</u> three on one side and one on the other. Clinching argument = 20 marks</b></p>
<b>Level 4 (13-16 marks)</b>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically construct a balanced or one-sided answer explicitly supported by at least three valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>There is evidence to support the statement. Elizabeth successfully limited discord with Parliament by controlling opportunity for disagreement. She set strict limits on what Parliament could discuss, so debate on her marriage and the succession was limited. She used Parliament less than other Tudor monarchs so again opportunity for discord was limited. Also, Elizabeth was usually ready to compromise so that agreement could be reached. For example, in 1601, she accepted that she had to cancel some monopolies. On the other hand there are numerous examples of disagreements, especially with the Puritan MPs. For example, Elizabeth imprisoned the Puritan MP Wentworth for pressing her to reassure the people and name a Protestant successor. He died in the Tower of London</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced or one-sided argument; three explained points of support</b></p> <p><b>NOTE 1:</b> Answers at L4 may attempt more than three points but only provide explicit supporting evidence for three.</p> <p><b>NOTE 2:</b> It is likely that candidates at this level will attempt a clinching argument but this will be more of a summary or assertion/repetition of earlier arguments.</p>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-sided answer explicitly supported by two valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>There is evidence to support the statement. Elizabeth successfully limited discord with Parliament by controlling opportunity for disagreement. She set strict limits on what Parliament could discuss, so debate on her marriage and the succession was limited. She used Parliament less than other Tudor monarchs so again opportunity for discord was limited. Also, Elizabeth was usually ready to compromise so that agreement could be reached. For example, in 1601, she accepted that she had to cancel some monopolies.</i></p>
Guidance and indicative content	

	<p><b>Nutshell: One sided argument, two explained points of support</b></p> <p>Alternatively, Level 3 answers will construct a balanced argument with each side explicitly supported by one example, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is evidence to support the statement. Elizabeth successfully limited discord with Parliament by controlling opportunity for disagreement. She set strict limits on what Parliament could discuss, so debate on her marriage and the succession was limited. She used Parliament less than other Tudor monarchs so again opportunity for discord was limited. On the other hand there are numerous examples of disagreements, especially with the Puritan MPs. For example, Elizabeth imprisoned the Puritan MP Wentworth for pressing her to reassure the people and name a Protestant successor. He died in the Tower of London</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; one explained point on each side</b></p> <p><b>NOTE: Answers at L3 may attempt more than two points but only provide explicit supporting evidence for two</b></p>
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument explicitly supported by one valid example, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is evidence to support the statement. Elizabeth successfully limited discord with Parliament by controlling opportunity for disagreement. She set strict limits on what Parliament could discuss, so debate on her marriage and the succession was limited. She used Parliament less than other Tudor monarchs so again opportunity for discord was limited.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: One sided argument; one explained point of support</b></p> <p><b>NOTE: Answers at L2 may attempt more than one point but only provide explicit supporting evidence for one</b></p>
<b>Level 1 (1-4 marks)</b>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically identify areas of agreement and/or disagreement without full explanation, e.g.</p> <p><i>No, I don't agree because there was disagreement over the succession.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Identification of reason(s) without explanation</b></p> <p>Alternatively, Level 1 answers will typically describe actions of Elizabeth/relevant events OR make general, unsupported assertions e.g.</p> <p><i>Parliaments were not called very much under Elizabeth. Parliament wanted Elizabeth to marry. OR No, there wasn't harmony – Elizabeth controlled Parliament.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Description of Elizabeth's actions or related events without addressing the question OR general, unsupported assertions.</b></p>
<b>0 marks</b>	

<b>Question 9*–20 marks</b> <b>In her 2014 book <i>God's Traitors: Terror and Faith in Elizabethan England</i>, historian Jessie Childs argues that Elizabeth I was 'determined to kill off Catholicism in her country.'</b> <b>How far do you agree with this view?</b>	
<b>Levels</b> <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b> <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b> <b>AO4</b> Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations in the context of historical events studied. <b>Maximum 10 marks</b>	<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>Level 5 (17–20 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing evaluation reaching a well-substantiated judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate any knowledge of the nature or extent of the Catholic threat.</i> <i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the Level description.</i> <i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of change and continuity (how far Elizabeth's responses to Catholics changed across the period) and similarity and difference (diversity of responses to Catholics) but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i> <i>Grounds for agreeing include: Act of Uniformity fined Catholics for non-attendance at Protestant services; tighter control brought in after 1581, eg Act of Persuasions and Act Against Priests; Recusancy Act financially crippled Catholics; Act Restraining Recusants socially isolated them; Catholics arrested, tortured and punished, eg Campion and Clitherow; spies like Walsingham hunted down Catholics; evidence against Mary Queen of Scots was forged; MQS was then executed following the Babington plot; by 1603 almost all of England's Catholics has given up their faith or were attending Protestant church services without complaint.</i>
<b>Level 4 (13–16 marks)</b> 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 (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a sustained and generally convincing evaluation reaching a substantiated judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Grounds for agreeing include: Act of Uniformity fined Catholics for non-attendance at Protestant services; tighter control brought in after 1581, eg Act of Persuasions and Act Against Priests; Recusancy Act financially crippled Catholics; Act Restraining Recusants socially isolated them; Catholics arrested, tortured and punished, eg Campion and Clitherow; spies like Walsingham hunted down Catholics; evidence against Mary Queen of Scots was forged; MQS was then executed following the Babington plot; by 1603 almost all of England's Catholics has given up their faith or were attending Protestant church services without complaint.</i>
<b>Level 3 (9–12 marks)</b> 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 (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a partial evaluation with some explanation of ideas reaching a supported judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>	<i>Grounds for disagreeing include: Relative leniency at the start of Elizabeth's reign, eg Act of Uniformity only fined Catholics if they refused to attend Protestant services; Elizabeth allowed Catholics to attend court; Thomas Tresham made Sheriff of Northamptonshire 1573; in strong Catholic areas she did not insist that JPs strictly enforce church attendance; she believed that Catholic community would slowly die away rather than her having</i>
<b>Level 2 (5–8 marks)</b> 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 (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Attempts a basic evaluation with some limited explanation of ideas and a loosely supported judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i>	<i>Grounds for disagreeing include: Relative leniency at the start of Elizabeth's reign, eg Act of Uniformity only fined Catholics if they refused to attend Protestant services; Elizabeth allowed Catholics to attend court; Thomas Tresham made Sheriff of Northamptonshire 1573; in strong Catholic areas she did not insist that JPs strictly enforce church attendance; she believed that Catholic community would slowly die away rather than her having</i>

	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
<p><b>Level 1 (1–4 marks)</b></p> <p>Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1).  Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) involved in the issue (AO2).  Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. (AO4) There is either no attempt to evaluate and reach a judgment about the interpretation, or there is an assertion about the interpretation but this lacks any support or historical validity.  <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i></p>	<p><i>to 'kill it off'; Elizabeth did not technically make it illegal to hold Catholic beliefs; Elizabeth refused to sign Mary Queen of Scots' death warrant for several weeks so not necessarily 'determined' to end Catholic threat at all costs.</i></p>
<p><b>0 marks</b></p> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	

Question 9*-20 marks In her 2014 book <i>God's Traitors: Terror and Faith in Elizabethan England</i> , historian Jessie Childs argues that Elizabeth I was 'determined to kill off Catholicism in her country.' How far do you agree with this view?	
Guidance and indicative content	
<b>Level 5 (17-20 marks)</b>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically set out a balanced argument explicitly supported by at least four valid examples. For 20 marks, candidates must present a valid <b>clinching argument</b> e.g.</p> <p><i>There are several reasons to agree with the statement. Elizabeth brought in much tighter restrictions against Catholics. For example, she had passed and continued to use the Act of Uniformity in 1559 which meant that everyone had to attend a Protestant church service with the bible in English. Those who did not were made to pay a fine. Also, Elizabeth took harsh action against Catholic plotters. In 1586, Mary Queen of Scots was also executed following her involvement in a plot to kill Elizabeth; some of the evidence against her was even forged.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, Elizabeth showed relative leniency at the start of her reign. For example, the Act of Uniformity only fined Catholics if they refused to attend Protestant services. Elizabeth also allowed Catholics to attend court and hold important positions – Thomas Tresham was made Sheriff of Northamptonshire 1573.</i></p> <p><i>Overall I think that it would be unfair to say that the Elizabeth was 'determined' to 'kill off' Catholicism. She was against Catholicism but thought it more likely that it would die out by itself. Had she been 'determined' to kill it off at all costs, she would not have refused to sign Mary Queen of Scots' death warrant for several weeks.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; two valid supporting examples each side <u>OR</u> three on one side and one on the other. Clinching argument = 20 marks</b></p> <p><b>NOTE: Please see MS guidance on page above for many more valid examples.</b></p>
<b>Level 4 (13-16 marks)</b>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically construct a balanced or one-sided answer explicitly supported by three valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>There are several reasons to agree with the statement. Elizabeth brought in much tighter restrictions against Catholics. For example, she had passed and continued to use the Act of Uniformity in 1559 which meant that everyone had to attend a Protestant church service with the bible in English. Those who did not were made to pay a fine. Also, Elizabeth took harsh action against Catholic plotters. In 1586, Mary Queen of Scots was also executed following her involvement in a plot to kill Elizabeth; some of the evidence against her was even forged. On the other hand, Elizabeth showed relative leniency at the start of her reign. For example, the Act of Uniformity only fined Catholics if they refused to attend Protestant services.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced or one-sided argument; three explained points of support</b></p> <p><b>NOTE 1: Answers at L4 may attempt more than three points but only provide explicit supporting evidence for three</b></p> <p><b>NOTE 2: It is likely that candidates at this level will attempt a clinching argument but this will be more of a summary or assertion/repetition of earlier arguments.</b></p>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-sided answer explicitly supported by two valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>There are several reasons to agree with the statement. Elizabeth brought in much tighter restrictions against Catholics. For example, she had passed and continued to use the Act of Uniformity in 1559 which meant that everyone had to attend a Protestant church service with the bible in English. Those who did not were made to pay a fine. Also, Elizabeth took harsh action against Catholic plotters. In 1586, Mary Queen of Scots was also executed following her involvement in a plot to kill Elizabeth; some of the evidence against her was even forged.</i></p>

Guidance and indicative content	
	<p><b>Nutshell: One sided argument, two explained points of support</b></p> <p>Alternatively, Level 3 answers will construct a balanced argument with each side explicitly supported by one example, e.g.</p> <p><i>There are several reasons to agree with the statement. Elizabeth brought in much tighter restrictions against Catholics. For example, she had passed and continued to use the Act of Uniformity in 1559 which meant that everyone had to attend a Protestant church service with the bible in English. Those who did not were made to pay a fine. On the other hand, Elizabeth showed relative leniency at the start of her reign. For example, the Act of Uniformity only fined Catholics if they refused to attend Protestant services.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; one explained point on each side</b></p> <p><b>NOTE: Answers at L3 may attempt more than two points but only provide explicit supporting evidence for two</b></p>
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument explicitly supported by one valid example, e.g.</p> <p><i>There are several reasons to agree with the statement. Elizabeth brought in much tighter restrictions against Catholics. For example, For example, she had passed and continued to use the Act of Uniformity in 1559 which meant that everyone had to attend a Protestant church service with the bible in English. Those who did not were made to pay a fine.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: One sided argument; one explained point of support</b></p> <p><b>NOTE: Answers at L2 may attempt more than one point but only provide explicit supporting evidence for one</b></p>
<b>Level 1 (1-4 marks)</b>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically identify evidence for/against the statement without full explanation, e.g.</p> <p><i>Yes, Elizabeth passed the Act of Uniformity.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Identification of evidence without explanation.</b></p> <p>Alternatively, Level 1 answers will typically describe related events during the period but fail to explain how they address the question OR make general, unsupported assertions e.g.</p> <p><i>In 1580 the Jesuit priests arrived in England. Recusants were people who refused to attend protestant church services. OR Yes, Elizabeth was a Protestant and against Catholics.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Description of related events without consideration of Elizabeth's actions OR general, unsupported assertions</b></p>
<b>0 marks</b>	

**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](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)

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

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
**is a Company Limited by Guarantee**

**Registered in England**

**Registered Office: The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA**

**Registered Company Number: 3484466**

**OCR is an exempt Charity**

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

**© OCR 2018**

