

GCSE (9–1)

History B (Schools History Project)

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

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for November 2020

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 2020

Annotations

Stamp	Annotation Name	Description
	Tick 1	Level 1
	Tick 2	Level 2
	Tick 3	Level 3
	Tick 4	Level 4
	Tick 5	Level 5
	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

Mark Scheme

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

Question 1 – 3 marks <p>a) Give one example of approaches to public health in monasteries during the period 1250-15.</p> <p>b) Name one way in which people in towns dealt with the waste they produced in the period 1500-1750.</p> <p>c) Name one individual whose work led to government action to improve the people's health in the twentieth century.</p>	
Guidance	Indicative content
1(a) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)	<i>For 1(a), likely and valid responses include: supply of fresh water, infirmaries for the sick, rivers used to flush waste from latrines</i> <i>For 1(b), likely valid responses include, collected by scavengers, dunghills, jakes over rivers, cesspits,</i> <i>For 1(c) likely valid responses include: Rowntree, Booth, Beveridge, Niven, Bevan</i> Any other historically valid response is acceptable and should be credited.
1(b) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)	
1(c) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)	

Question 2 – 9 marks	
Write a clear and organised summary that analyses responses to the HIV/AIDS epidemic since 1980. Support your summary with examples.	
Levels	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 6 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 3 marks	
Level 3 (7–9 marks) Demonstrates a well-selected range of valid knowledge of characteristic features that are fully relevant to the question, in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). The way the summary is organised shows sustained logical coherence, demonstrating clear use of at least one second order concept in finding connections and providing a logical chain of reasoning to summarise the historical situation in the question (AO2).	<i>Answers should show connections in the situation defined in the question and use these to organise the answer logically.</i> Answers could consider aspects of one or more of the following: <i>AIDS - growing awareness, media response, popular reaction, Terrence Higgins Trust, Issues over blood donation, growing alarm - vilification of gay people and drug addicts 'gay plague' 'God's punishment' fear – government actions and acceptance, adverts, blood screening, TV programmes, myth busting, Princess Di's actions, safe sex advice, medical research and anti-retroviral drugs and PrEP, complacency.</i>
Level 2 (4–6 marks) Demonstrates a range of knowledge of characteristic features that are relevant to the question, in ways that show understanding of them (AO1). The way the summary is organised shows some logical coherence, demonstrating use of at least one second order concept in finding connections and providing a logical chain of reasoning to summarise the historical situation in the question (AO2).	<i>Use of conceptual understanding/ second order concepts to organise the response might in this case involve organisation by:</i> cause and consequence , e.g. media, prejudice, religious beliefs, lack of understanding
Level 1 (1–3 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of characteristic features with some relevance to the question, in ways that show some limited understanding of them (AO1). The summary shows a very basic logical coherence, demonstrating limited use of at least one second order concept in attempting to find connections and to provide a logical chain of reasoning to summarise the historical situation in the question (AO2).	change e.g. recognition that responses changed with greater scientific understanding and media/ celebrity reactions
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	diversity , e.g. gay community's response, heterosexual response, attempts to protect drug users
<i>Explanations are most likely to show understanding of these second order concepts but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i> <i>Please note that answers do not need to name the second order concepts being used to organise their answer, but the concepts do need to be apparent from the connections and chains of reasoning in the summary in order to meet the AO2 descriptors (see levels descriptors).</i> <i>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that is unrelated to the topic in the question.</i>	
Question 2–9 marks	
Write a clear and organised summary that analyses responses to the HIV/AIDS epidemic since 1980. Support your summary with examples.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 3 (7–9)	Answers at L3 will typically be organised around a second order concept such as causes/ consequences, change/continuity, diversity. Answers will be supported with two or more valid examples e.g.

marks)	<p><i>[Change]</i> <i>People's responses to AIDS changed over time. To begin with, in the early 1980s, there was lots of ignorance about how the disease was spread and people over-reacted. For example, some Fire Service staff stopped giving mouth-to-mouth resuscitation out of fear of infection. But by the late 1980s there was more understanding and more helpful responses. For example, charity groups provided clean needles to drug addicts to reduce transmission. The government also started screening all blood donations so blood transfusions were safe.</i></p> <p><i>[Causation/consequence]</i> <i>In 1996 scientists developed drugs called 'antiretrovirals' that delayed the onset of AIDS in people infected with HIV. Although this was good it had the unexpected consequences. Firstly, it has led to complacency because the government relaxed its campaigns about AIDS and HIV, and many people believe these anti-retrovirals are a 'cure' for AIDS. This has meant that cases of HIV infection have actually risen in recent years.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Summary based on second order concept(s) with two or more valid supporting examples <i>Other valid areas might include: Causation – reasons why people over-reacted or took incorrect action (media, prejudice, religion); Causation – why responses improved, e.g. Eastenders storyline, Princess Diana, government public information campaign; diversity in response, e.g. helpful responses, harmful responses, responses from Church leaders, gay community, etc.</i></p>
Level 2 (4–6 marks)	<p>Answers at L2 will typically be organised around a second order concept, supported with a valid example e.g.</p> <p><i>[Causation]</i> <i>Responses to AIDS improved after Princess Diana was photographed visiting an AIDS clinic and shaking hands with someone who was suffering from AIDS. This reassured people that AIDS could not be passed on by simple contact and it meant that people's prejudices towards AIDS victims started to fade.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Summary based on a second order concept with one valid supporting example</p>
Level 1 (1–3 marks)	<p>Answers at L1 will typically list or describe relevant events or developments with no clear organisation around a second order concept e.g. <i>The government organised an AIDS prevention campaign. It sent a leaflet called 'Don't die of ignorance' to every home in Britain and ran advertisements on television on how to avoid contracting AIDS.</i> OR <i>To begin with there was lots of ignorance and prejudice against gay people.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: List of events / developments with no clear organising concept.</p>
0 marks	

Question 3 – 10 marks	
Why were there attempts to improve public health in towns in the nineteenth century (1800-1900)? Support your answer with examples?	
Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 5 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 5 marks	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
Level 5 (9–10 marks) 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- urbanisation, growing population and so pollution, epidemics/killer diseases, Impact on richer areas, failure of laissez faire, pressure from reformers, epidemiology/charting epidemics, advances in scientific understanding</i> Reward other historically valid points <i>Explanations are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of causation / consequence but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i> <i>Answers which simply describe some features of nineteenth century Britain cannot reach beyond Level 1</i>
Level 4 (7–8 marks) 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).	
Level 3 (5–6 marks) 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).	
Level 2 (3–4 marks) 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).	
Level 1 (1–2 marks) 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).	
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	
Question 3–10 marks Question 3–10 marks Why were there attempts to improve public health in towns in the nineteenth century (1800-1900)? Support your answer with examples.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 5 (9-10 marks)	Level 5 answers will typically identify at least two reasons why there were attempts to improve public health in towns in the nineteenth century and explain them fully e.g.

	<p>One reason was because of the action of individuals like Edwin Chadwick. In 1842, Chadwick wrote a report for the Poor law Commission. It was based on detailed evidence from doctors and contained shocking details of the public health crisis. It recommended that towns should be forced to provide clean water and sewerage systems. His report was very influential and many politicians supported Chadwick. This led to the passing of the 1848 Public Health Act.</p> <p>Another reason was because of 'The Great Stink' in 1858 when, during a hot summer, the River Thames dried up so much that the smell of sewage from the river became unbearable. It became impossible for MPs to continue with their debates and they decided to take action. The government ordered Joseph Bazalgette to build 1300 miles of new sewers across London.</p> <p>Nutshell: Two or more reasons identified and explained.</p>
Level 4 (7-8 marks)	<p>Level 4 answers will typically identify at least 1 reason why there were attempts to improve public health in towns in the nineteenth century and explain it fully e.g.</p> <p><i>There were attempts because of the action of individuals like Edwin Chadwick. In 1842, Chadwick wrote a report for the Poor law Commission. It was based on detailed evidence from doctors and contained shocking details of the public health crisis. It recommended that towns should be forced to provide clean water and sewerage systems. His report was very influential and many politicians supported Chadwick. This led to the passing of the 1848 Public Health Act.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: One reason identified and explained.</p>
Level 3 (5-6 marks)	<p>Level 3 answers will typically identify at least one valid, specific reason e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>There were attempts to improve public health because in 1861 Louis Pasteur had proven that germs were the cause of disease.</i> • <i>One reason was the action of individuals like Benjamin Disraeli who pushed through the 1875 Public Health Act.</i> • <i>One reason was that something needed to be done in response to cholera epidemics.</i> <p>Nutshell: Identifies one or more valid reason(s) but no supporting evidence NOTE: 5 marks for one reason identified; 6 marks for two or more</p>
Level 2 (3-4 marks)	<p>Level 2 answers will typically contain correct descriptions of poor conditions OR descriptions of public health improvements in towns, without linking these to the question, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The 1875 Public Health Act said that all local authorities had to appoint a medical officer and a sanitary inspector. They had to take responsibility for sewers and water supplies.</i> • <i>They made attempts because conditions were terrible. Many people lived in back-to-back housing with poor ventilation. There were killer diseases like TB and Typhoid.</i> <p>Nutshell: Describes conditions in towns or public health improvements</p>
Level 1 (1-2 marks)	<p>Level 1 answers will typically contain general points, or generalised/ unsupported assertions e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>They had to make attempts because the conditions in towns were really bad.</i> • <i>There were two public health acts during this period.</i> • <i>Individuals played a big role.</i> <p>Nutshell: Assertion(s)</p>
0 marks	

Question 4* – 18 marks 'Little was done to improve public health in medieval Britain (1250-1500).' How far do you agree with this statement? Give reasons for your answer	
Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 6 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 12 marks	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
Level 6 (16–18 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show very secure and thorough understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation and reaching a very well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate knowledge of public health in the MA.</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. BUT to achieve the two highest levels, answers must consider both sides of the argument before reaching a conclusion</i>
Level 5 (13–15 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows very strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and convincing explanation and reaching a well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of continuity and change and diversity but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i>
Level 4 (10–12 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation to reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i>	Grounds for agreeing include: <i>Little understanding of what caused disease so any measures were often futile. Reliance on ancient ideas or religious explanations. Unregulated trades /work processes (fulling mills/ tanners etc. causing pollution of streams) Unplanned urbanization leading to more waste and pollution. Housing issues, weak enforcement of regulations</i>
Level 3 (7–9 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas and reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>	Reasons for disagreeing <i>Some positive actions, church actions, butchers moved to outskirts of towns, dung heaps moved out, checks from guild halls on quality of meat etc. Public shaming for polluting waterways in Norwich, permission to raise money from wealthier citizens to pave roads in Shrewsbury, wardens appointed etc.</i>
Level 2 (4–6 marks) 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>	
Level 1 (1–3 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) but any attempt to explain ideas and reach a judgment on the issue in the question is unclear or lacks historical validity (AO2). <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i>	
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	Reward other historically valid points

Question 4* – 18 marks 'Little was done to improve public health in medieval Britain (1250-1500).' How far do you agree with this statement? Give reasons for your answer.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 6 (16-18 marks)	<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). For 18 marks, candidates must present a valid clinching argument e.g.</p> <p><i>There is lots of evidence to support this statement. For example, there was a lack of regulation surrounding waste, which was a real problem. Many toilets had no lining and excrement leaked into other houses' cellars and some gongfermers simply emptied waste into the stream so disease was common. In addition, when there was a major outbreak of plague in 1349, the only action taken by King Edward III was writing a letter to the Mayor of London ordering him to clean the streets. This was not effective in preventing the spread of plague because it was based on the incorrect belief that the Plague was caused by miasma.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, the statement is not completely true because efforts were made to keep towns clean. For example, most towns fined householders if they left rubbish on the street for more than four days, and they employed rakers to remove it. Also, there are many example of town authorities making public health improvements by 1500. For example, in London, in 1488, the butchers' guild built an expensive underground passage to carry waste from the shambles (where animals were slaughtered) to the Thames, which helped to keep waste off the streets.</i></p> <p><i>On the whole I do agree with the statement. Even though there were some improvements by 1500, these were only the end of the period and many were only superficial changes and were not implemented across the whole country. The huge problems of safe water and waste disposal that affected the majority of the population were not improved during this period.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Balanced argument, two valid supporting examples each side (or three on one side and one on the other). Clinching argument = 18 marks</p>
Level 5 (13-15 marks)	<p>Level 5 answers will typically set out a balanced argument, explicitly supported by at least three valid examples (i.e. two on one side and one on the other), e.g.</p> <p><i>There is lots of evidence to support this statement. For example, there was a lack of regulation surrounding waste, which was a real problem. Many toilets had no lining and excrement leaked into other houses' cellars and some gongfermers simply emptied waste into the stream so disease was common. In addition, when there was a major outbreak of plague in 1349, the only action taken by King Edward III was writing a letter to the Mayor of London ordering him to clean the streets. This was not effective in preventing the spread of plague because it was based on the incorrect belief that the Plague was caused by miasma.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, the statement is not completely true because efforts were made to keep towns clean. For example, most towns fined householders if they left rubbish on the street for more than four days, and they employed rakers to remove it.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Balanced argument supported by three valid supporting examples (i.e. two on one side and one on the other)</p>
Level 4 (10-12 marks)	<p>Level 4 answers will typically set out a one-sided argument, explicitly supported by two valid examples, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is lots of evidence to support this statement. For example, there was a lack of regulation surrounding waste, which was a real problem. Many toilets had no lining and excrement leaked into other houses' cellars and some gongfermers simply emptied waste into the stream so disease was common. In addition, when there was a major outbreak of plague in 1349, the only action taken by King Edward III was writing a letter to the Mayor of London ordering him to clean the streets. This was not effective in preventing the spread of plague because it was based on the incorrect belief that the Plague was caused by miasma.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: One sided argument, supported by two examples</p> <p>Alternatively, Level 4 answers will typically set out a balanced argument, with each side explicitly supported by one valid example, e.g.</p>

	<p><i>There is lots of evidence to support this statement. For example, there was a lack of regulation surrounding waste, which was a real problem. Many toilets had no lining and excrement leaked into other houses' cellars and some gongfarmers simply emptied waste into the stream so disease was common. On the other hand, the statement is not completely true because efforts were made to keep towns clean. For example, most towns fined householders if they left rubbish on the street for more than four days, and they employed rakers to remove it..</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Balanced argument, supported by one example on each side</p>
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	<p>Level 3 answers will typically set out a one-sided argument, explicitly supported by one valid example from that period, e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree. For example, there was a lack of regulation surrounding waste, which was a real problem. Many toilets had no lining and excrement leaked into other houses' cellars and some gongfarmers simply emptied waste into the stream so disease was common.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: One sided argument, supported by one example</p>
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	<p>Level 2 answers will typically identify valid reason(s) to support and/or challenge the statement but without full explanation or supporting evidence, e.g.</p> <p><i>Yes, I agree because there were problems with waste infecting the water supply throughout the period and little was done about this.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation</p> <p>Alternatively, Level 2 answers will typically describe public health conditions/improvements/ relevant events without linking these to the question, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Conditions in medieval towns were bad. At the end of a market day, the streets were full of waste from food and animals.</i> • <i>People threw waste out of windows into open gutters.</i> <p>Nutshell: Description of public health conditions/improvements/ related events without linking this to the question or without full explanation.</p>
Level 1 (1-3 marks)	<p>Level 1 answers will typically make general and unsupported assertions eg</p> <p><i>Yes, disease was really common in this period because of poor public health.</i> <i>No, some attempts were made to clean up towns by 1500.</i></p> <p>Nutshell General/ unsupported assertion(s)</p>
0 marks	

Question 5*– 18 marks How far do you agree that the problems of public health were the same in both the Early Modern Period (1500-1750) and in the twentieth century (1900-2000)? Give reasons for your answer.	
Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 6 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 12 marks	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
Level 6 (16–18 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show very secure and thorough understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation and reaching a very well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate any knowledge of public health in the relevant time periods</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>BUT, to achieve the two highest levels, answers must consider both sides of the argument before reaching a conclusion.</i> <i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concept of change and continuity, but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i> Grounds for agreeing include: <i>Epidemics and inability to explain them. Great Plague and Spanish Flu/ AIDS. Urbanisation caused more PH issues in both periods e.g. pollution and housing, e.g.s of reluctance to regulate in both periods. Substance abuse e.g. alcohol/ drugs caused problems in both periods. Still some resistance to PH measures on religious grounds or distrust of science (e.g. MMR)</i>
Level 5 (13–15 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows very strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and convincing explanation and reaching a well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	
Level 4 (10–12 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation to reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i>	
Level 3 (7–9 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas and reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>	
Level 2 (4–6 marks) 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>	
Level 1 (1–3 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) but any attempt to explain ideas and reach a judgment on the issue in the question is unclear or lacks historical validity (AO2). <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i>	Grounds for disagreeing include: <i>scientific/ technological developments helped solve many problems in 20thC. Communication of PH messages – press /TV/ internet in 20thC. Growth of democracy and pressure for reform in 20th C. Role of increasing wealth enabling research and building etc...Move away from laissez faire towards welfare state which prevented many PH problems in 20th (candidates might draw distinctions between beginning and end of 20thC)</i>
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	

Question 5* – 18 marks How far do you agree that the problems of public health were the same in both the Early Modern Period (1500-1750) and in the twentieth century (1900-2000)? Give reasons for your answer.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 6 (16-18 marks)	<p>Level 6 answers will typically set out a balanced argument which covers both change and continuity across both periods. Arguments will be explicitly supported by at least 4 valid examples (at least one from each period). For 18 marks, candidates must present a valid clinching argument e.g.</p> <p><i>In some ways, there were public health problems that continued throughout both periods. One example would be problems caused by pollution. In the Early Modern period, coal mines began to produce more coal. When the price of coal dropped, more people began to burn it on their fires. The dust, soot and smoke caused respiratory diseases. This problem had not disappeared by the twentieth century. In 1950, Britain consumed around 200 million tons of coal each year. Big cities like Manchester and London were often filled a 'smog' that lasted for days. In 1952, a smog killed about 12,000 Londoners.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, public health problems caused by food had changed across these two periods. In the Early Modern period, although famine was rare, hunger was common, and this weakened people's resistance. When bad weather ruined the harvest, the price of grain would go up and labouring families struggled to buy bread. However, by the twentieth century, problems with food had led to different problems. For example, the invention of the microwave led to an increase in people eating convenience and processed food. This can lead to malnutrition and even rickets disease because of a lack of Vitamin D.</i></p> <p><i>On the whole, I don't agree with the statement. The problems linked to food are of a completely different nature to the problems of the Early Modern period because so many more people were affected by hunger, which was a much worse problem than convenience food. In addition, even though pollution caused problems in both periods, the problem was addressed relatively quickly with the Clean Air Act, which means the issues was much shorter lived in the twentieth century.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Change and continuity both covered; two valid supporting examples from each period OR three from one period and one on the other. Clinching argument = 18 marks</p> <p>NOTE 1: Allow answers which explain how Early Modern problems were 'solved' by / in 20th Century (i.e. that do not cover remaining 20th C problems) NOTE 2: Allow answers which assert that changes occurred in the 19th Century and therefore solved problems by 20th Century (e.g. 1875 Public Health Act)</p>
Level 5 (13-15 marks)	<p>Level 5 answers will typically set out a balanced argument which covers both change and continuity across both periods. Arguments will be explicitly supported by at least 3 valid examples (at least one from each period), e.g.</p> <p><i>In some ways, there were public health problems that continued throughout both periods. One example would be problems caused by pollution. In the Early Modern period, coal mines began to produce more coal. When the price of coal dropped in the seventeenth century, more people began to burn it on their fires. The dust, soot and smoke caused respiratory diseases. This problem had not disappeared by the twentieth century. In 1950, Britain consumed around 200 million tons of coal each year. Big cities like Manchester and London were often filled a 'smog' that lasted for days. In 1952, a smog killed about 12,000 Londoners.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, public health problems caused by food had changed across these two periods. In the Early Modern period, although famine was rare, hunger was common, and this weakened people's resistance. When bad weather ruined the harvest, the price of grain would go up and labouring families struggled to buy bread. However, this had all changed by the twentieth century and this problem was solved.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Change and continuity both covered; three valid supporting examples (i.e. two from one period and one from the other)</p>
Level 4 (10-12 marks)	<p>Level 4 answers will typically set out a one-sided argument which covers either change OR continuity across both periods. Arguments will be explicitly supported by at least 2 valid examples (at least one from each period), e.g.</p> <p><i>In some ways, there were public health problems that continued throughout both periods. One example would be problems caused by pollution. In the Early Modern period, coal mines began to produce more coal. When the price of coal dropped in the seventeenth century, more people began to burn it on their fires. The dust, soot and</i></p>

	<p><i>smoke caused respiratory diseases. This problem had not disappeared by the twentieth century. In 1950, Britain consumed around 200 million tons of coal each year. Big cities like Manchester and London were often filled a 'smog' that lasted for days. In 1952, a smog killed about 12,000 Londoners.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Change OR continuity covered; two valid supporting examples (i.e. two from one period and one from the other)</p> <p>Alternatively, Level 4 answers will typically describe public health problems in one period only, supported by two valid examples from that period. They will assert change/ continuity without a specific and valid example from the other period. e.g.</p> <p><i>In some ways, there were public health problems that continued throughout both periods. One example would be problems caused by pollution. In the Early Modern period, coal mines began to produce more coal. When the price of coal dropped in the seventeenth century, more people began to burn it on their fires. The dust, soot and smoke caused respiratory diseases. This problem had not disappeared by the twentieth century as there is still pollution today. On the other hand, public health problems caused by food had changed across these two periods. In the Early Modern period, although famine was rare, hunger was common, and this weakened people's resistance. However, this had all changed by the twentieth century and this problem was solved.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Public health problems in one period explained, supported by two valid examples from that period. Change/ continuity asserted.</p>
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	<p>Level 3 answers will typically describe public health problems in one period only, supported by one valid example from that period. They will assert change or continuity without a valid example from the other period, e.g.</p> <p><i>In some ways, there were public health problems that continued throughout both periods. One example would be problems caused by pollution. In the Early Modern period, coal mines began to produce more coal. When the price of coal dropped in the seventeenth century, more people began to burn it on their fires. The dust, soot and smoke caused respiratory diseases. This problem had not disappeared by the twentieth century as there is still pollution today.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Public health problems in one period explained, supported by one valid example from that period. Change/ continuity asserted.</p>
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	<p>Level 2 answers will typically identify valid change(s)/ continuity(ies) without full explanation or supporting evidence, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, I agree because there was pollution in both periods. • No, I don't agree. In the Early Modern period problems were more linked to sanitation but by the twentieth century they were more linked to inactivity. • Yes, in both periods there were public health problems linked to epidemics like the Plague and Spanish Flu. • No, in the Early Modern period governments did little to help with public health but during the twentieth century the welfare state was set up. <p>Nutshell: Identification of change(s)/ continuity(ies) without full explanation or supporting evidence</p> <p>Alternatively, Level 2 answers will typically describe public health problems in one or both periods without addressing the question of change / continuity, e.g.</p> <p><i>In the Early Modern period there were regular outbreaks of plague. Nobody knew how this was spread but Henry VIII introduced the policy of isolation in 1518. In the worst outbreaks the death rate could be up to a third of the population. In the twentieth century there was the Spanish Flu. This began in the trenches and soldiers on leave brought it back to Britain. It killed over 200,000 people in Britain.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Description of public health problems in one/both periods without explicit comparison.</p>
Level 1 (1-3 marks)	<p>Level 1 answers will typically make general and unsupported assertions eg</p> <p><i>No, there were problems that were the same in both periods like bad housing.</i></p> <p>Nutshell General/ unsupported assertion(s)</p>
0 marks	

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

In Interpretation A, the film makers portray Elizabeth as a powerful queen. Identify and explain one way in which they do 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 which the illustrator portrays wealth and comfort + 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 film makers portray Elizabeth as a powerful queen 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 film makers. 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:

The film makers show Elizabeth as a strong leader (1). For example, there are soldiers behind her and looking up at her (1). This makes her look like a military hero, leading troops into battle (1).

The film makers show Elizabeth as being like a knight (1). For example, she is wearing armour and riding on horseback (1). This makes her seem physically strong (1).

The film makers use perspective well (1). We are looking up at Elizabeth and the troops are behind her in the distance (1). This suggests her importance and strong leadership (1).

The film makers show Elizabeth as regal and rich (1). For example, she's on a magnificent horse which is highly decorated (1). This shows she has wealth and respect (1).

Question 6b – 5 marks 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 the power of Queen Elizabeth.	
Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 2 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 3 marks 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.	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
Level 3 (5 marks) 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.</i> <i>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: whether Elizabeth's power/authority changed across the period of her reign (change/continuity); reasons for Elizabeth's power / how much was dependent on her use of propaganda and image (causation); whether all of Elizabeth's subjects saw her as powerful – how much opposition there was from various groups such as parliament (diversity/ similarity & difference); impact of Elizabeth's power, eg on those who opposed her policy (consequence).</i>
Level 2 (3–4 marks) 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).	
Level 1 (1–2 mark) 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).	
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	

Question 6b – 5 marks 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 the power of Queen Elizabeth.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 3 (5 marks)	<p>Answers at L3 will typically explicitly identify an impression given in Interpretation A and suggest a valid line of enquiry based on a second order concept into this area. They will explain how this enquiry would increase understanding of how the Normans ruled England to 1087, e.g.</p> <p><i>[Causation]</i> <i>Interpretation A suggests that Elizabeth was very good and using propaganda and speeches to give off a powerful image of herself. I would investigate whether this was why she was well respected, or whether there were other reasons as well, such as harsh punishments for opponents. This would help us to understand where her authority came from and whether it was genuine.</i></p> <p><i>[Change]</i> <i>Interpretation A suggests that Elizabeth was a very powerful and respected queen and leader in England. I would investigate whether this was the case across the whole of her rule, or whether her power increased or diminished at any point. This would help us to understand how much opposition there was to Elizabeth's reign and from which groups of people.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Valid line of enquiry based on second order concept to compare to an <u>impression</u> given by Interpretation A. Indication of how this would improve understanding of the power of Queen Elizabeth.</p>
Level 2 (3-4 marks)	<p>Answers at L2 will typically identify one or more valid lines of enquiry based on a second order concept.</p> <p><i>[Diversity]</i> <i>I would investigate whether everybody respected and admired the queen or whether there were groups of people who were opposed to her reign. This would allow us to see how much support she had from her parliaments and subjects. (4)</i></p> <p><i>[Change]</i> <i>I would investigate whether Elizabeth was always powerful and respected throughout her reign or whether he lost power as time went on. (3)</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Valid line of enquiry based on second order concept NB: Max 3 marks if there is no indication of how the enquiry would increase understanding of the power of Queen Elizabeth.</p>
Level 1 (1-2 marks)	<p>Answers at L1 will identify details from Interpretation A and suggest further investigation into them (1-2 marks), e.g.</p> <p><i>I would like to know whether Elizabeth has less power because she was a queen rather than a king.</i> <i>I would investigate what event is being shown and what Elizabeth was saying to the soldiers.</i></p> <p>Alternatively, answers at L1 will identify details from Interpretation A and ask if they are accurate (1 mark), e.g.</p> <p><i>Interpretation A shows Elizabeth wearing armour I would like to know if that really did happen.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Find out more about people / events / objects in Interpretation A – not based on second-order concept</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?	
Levels AO4 Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations (including how and why interpretations may differ) in the context of historical events studied. Maximum 12 marks	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
Level 4 (10–12 marks) 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).	<p><i>Answers could consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (L1) Comparison of provenance and source type alone, eg B is from a government handbook, C is an author's blog; they are both modern sources. • (L1) Undeveloped reasons for differences based on simplistic provenance, eg B was written by the government but C is not biased. • (L2) Individual points of similarity/difference in content: Both sources mention that Drake was the first to sail around the globe; B says the Elizabethan adventurers were the first to colonise the east coast of America and C also says they were the founders of the British Empire; C says Drake was a 'menace' to the Spanish but B says he expanded trade to Spanish colonies. • (L3) Differences in the overall portrayal of the Elizabethan adventurers: B depicts Drake and others as British heroes, saying it was a time of 'growing patriotism' and Britain's 'naval tradition.' It mentions only positive achievements such as circumnavigation and increasing trade. However, C depicts the adventurers in a more negative way, saying it is 'quite right' that they are not portrayed as 'heroes'. The author calls Drake a 'pirate' and draws attention to his involvement in slavery which is completely absent from B. • (L4) Comparison as L3, plus developed reasons for differences – purpose/audience of Interpretation B, eg the handbook is designed to give new arrivals in Britain information about British History in order to pass a citizenship test. It's therefore more likely to try to foster feelings of pride in the readers and give a good impression of British History. • (L4) Comparison as L3, plus developed reasons for differences – less likely but candidates may point out that the author of C has matured so that as a child, he naively accepted the swashbuckling accounts of Drake but now he recognises that this is a bit idealistic. <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</p>
Level 3 (7–9 marks) 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).	
Level 2 (4–6 marks) 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).	
Level 1 (1–3 marks) 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).	
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	

	<p><i>knowledge or show understanding of related historical issues can be rewarded for this, but it is not a target of the question.</i></p> <p><i>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that is unrelated to the topic in the question.</i></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	
Level 4 (10-12 marks)	<p>Answers at L3 will typically compare the overall portrayal of the Elizabethan adventurers. They will support this with relevant reference to the content of the interpretations. They will use the purpose of B or the context of C to explain reasons for different portrayals, e.g.</p> <p><i>As L3, plus:</i> <i>I think Interpretation B is so positive is because the handbook is designed to give new arrivals in Britain information about British History in order pass a citizenship test. It's therefore more likely to try to foster feelings of pride in the readers and give a good impression of British History. [12 marks]</i></p> <p><i>OR (less likely)</i> <i>I think that the author of C has matured so that as a child, he naively accepted the swashbuckling accounts of Drake but now he recognises that this a bit idealistic given how much more focus there is now on the dark side of British history and its involvement in the slave trade. [12 marks]</i></p> <p>NOTE: Do NOT allow undeveloped comments about provenance at this level, e.g. B is positive because it was written by the UK government so will support Drake.</p> <p>Nutshell: Valid comparison of portrayals in B and C, with support. Difference explained with specific purpose of B or C</p>
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	<p>Answers at L3 will typically compare the overall portrayal of the impact of the Elizabethan adventurers. They will 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>Interpretation B depicts Drake and others as British heroes, saying it was a time of 'growing patriotism' and Britain's 'naval tradition.' It mentions only positive achievements such as circumnavigation and increasing trade. However, C depicts the adventurers in a more negative way, saying it is 'quite right' that they are not portrayed as 'heroes'. The author calls Drake a 'pirate' and draws attention to his involvement in slavery which is completely absent from B.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Valid comparison of portrayals in B and C with support from one or both interpretations. NOTE: Answers with support from only one interpretation award 7 marks</p>
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	<p>Answers at L2 will typically use the content of the interpretations to compare individual points of similarity and/or difference e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both sources mention that Drake was the first to sail around the globe. B says the Elizabethan adventurers were the first to colonise the east coast of America and C also says they were the founders of the British Empire. C says Drake was a 'menace' to the Spanish but B says he expanded trade to Spanish colonies. <p>Nutshell: Selects individual points of similarity or difference</p> <p>Answers at L2 will typically make a valid comparison of the overall portrayal of the Elizabethan adventurers but fail to develop this with relevant support, e.g. <i>Interpretation B depicts the adventurers and daring explorers and heroes but C gives a much more negative impression overall.</i> Nutshell: Valid comparison of portrayals with no support</p> <p>Alternatively, L2 answers will use the purpose of one interpretation to explain its portrayal of the Elizabethan adventurers but fail to compare to the other interpretation, e.g. <i>I think the reason B is so positive about the adventurers is because the handbook is designed to give new arrivals in Britain information about British History in order pass a citizenship test. It's therefore more likely to try to foster feelings of pride in the readers and give a good impression of British History.</i> Nutshell: Purpose of one interpretation used to explain its portrayal – no comparison.</p>
Level 1	Answers at L1 will typically make simplistic comments about provenance e.g.

1 (1–3 marks)	<p><i>They are different because B is from a government handbook who would be biased towards people in British history whereas C is by a writer who has done lots of research and wants to show both sides.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Comparison of simplistic provenance</p> <p>Alternatively, answers will explain or paraphrase details from/ portrayal in one/ both interpretations with no valid comparison between them e.g. <i>B says that Drake was the first person to circumnavigate the globe. He defeated the Spanish Armada. In C, it says the adventurers founded the British Empire and were also pirates.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Summary / Portrayal from one/both interpretations with no valid comparison</p>
0 marks	

Question 8*–20 marks In her book Elizabeth I and Religion 1558-1603, published in 1993, historian Susan Doran argued that ‘the danger from English Catholics was exaggerated.’ How far do you agree with this view of the nature and extent of the Catholic threat in England between 1580 and 1603?	
Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 5 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 5 marks AO4 Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations in the context of historical events studied. Maximum 10 marks	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
Level 5 (17–20 marks) 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 Catholic threat in Elizabethan England.</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. To reach Levels 4 and 5, this must involve evidence to both support and challenge the interpretation.</i>
Level 4 (13–16 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation (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>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of causation and consequence (how Catholics did or did not threaten the nation); change and continuity (eg how the nature and extent of the threat changed across the period); and similarity and difference (diversity of nature of Catholicism across England) but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i>
Level 3 (9–12 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas (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 agreeing include: the loyalty of the Church Papists, eg most Catholics attended Protestant church services and a large number chose to drop Catholic faith after 1580; very few English Catholics were actually plotters; the impact of spy network/ tighter controls on Catholics by 1603; the limited success of the Jesuits and seminary priests; most English priests who refused to accept Protestant Church left the country and worked in universities abroad.</i>
Level 2 (5–8 marks) 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: Number of recusants began to grow after 1580; the danger presented by Mary Queen of Scots until 1587; the power of the Papacy – plotters/ some recusants</i>
Level 1 (1–4 marks)	

<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>loyal to him rather than Queen ('Bloody Question' revealed many priests to be traitors); the danger presented by Spain, France, Scotland and Ireland; the activities of the Jesuits and seminary priests; the plots against the Queen.</i></p>
<p>0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	

Question 8*–20 marks	
In her book <i>Elizabeth I and Religion 1558-1603</i> , published in 1993, historian Susan Doran argued that ‘the danger from English Catholics was exaggerated.’ How far do you agree with this view of the nature and extent of the Catholic threat in England between 1580 and 1603?	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 5 (17-20 marks)	<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 clinching argument e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot evidence to support the interpretation. Firstly, by 1580, many English Catholics had dropped their old faith because most priests accepted Elizabeth's changes and Protestant sermons gradually altered people's beliefs. There weren't many people who could afford the fines for non-attendance at Church. Even if these people were still inwardly loyal to the Pope, Elizabeth didn't mind this and even allowed Catholics to attend her court, showing they weren't a threat. Additionally, in terms of the number of actual plotters and people who planned to replace Elizabeth with Mary I, there were probably never more than two hundred or so of these. Most Catholics were conformers or recusants and posed no real danger to the queen.</i></p> <p><i>However, there is also lots of evidence to challenge this interpretation. There were various Catholics plots. For example, in 1586, Anthony Babington and John Ballard plotted to kill Elizabeth and place Mary on the throne. They were communicating secretly with Mary but were found out by Elizabeth's spies. This shows the threat was very real. Also, from 1580 Jesuit priests were arriving in England and persuading people to return to the Catholic faith. The number of Recusants rose and Elizabeth's government certainly saw this as dangerous and threatening to the Protestant religion and to Elizabeth's power.</i></p> <p><i>Overall I disagree with the statement. Although Catholics weren't a 'danger' in the sense that we would see it today, Elizabeth viewed things differently because she saw Catholics as having divided loyalties and this was an assault on her authority. Additionally, even though Catholic plotters many have been small in number, it would only take one successful plot to kill the queen so this was very dangerous.</i></p> <p>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</p>
Level 4 (13-16 marks)	<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 a lot evidence to support the interpretation. In terms of the number of actual plotters and people who planned to replace Elizabeth with Mary I, there were probably never more than two hundred or so of these. Most Catholics were conformers or recusants and posed no real danger to the queen.</i></p> <p><i>However, there is also lots of evidence to challenge this interpretation. There were various Catholics plots. For example, in 1586, Anthony Babington and John Ballard plotted to kill Elizabeth and place Mary on the throne. They were communicating secretly with Mary but were found out by Elizabeth's spies. This shows the threat was very real. Also, from 1580 Jesuit priests were arriving in England and persuading people to return to the Catholic faith. The number of Recusants rose and Elizabeth's government certainly saw this as dangerous and threatening to the Protestant religion and to Elizabeth's power.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Balanced or one-sided argument; three explained points of support</p>
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	<p>Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-sided answer explicitly supported by two valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>I disagree with this interpretation. There were various Catholics plots. For example, in 1586, Anthony Babington and John Ballard plotted to kill Elizabeth and place Mary on the throne. They were communicating secretly with Mary but were found out by Elizabeth's spies. This shows the threat was very real. Also, from 1580 Jesuit priests were arriving in England and persuading people to return to the Catholic faith. The number of Recusants rose and Elizabeth's government certainly saw this as dangerous and threatening to the Protestant religion and to Elizabeth's power.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: One sided argument, two explained points of support</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 interpretation. For example, in terms of the number of actual plotters and people who planned to replace Elizabeth with Mary I, there were probably never more than two hundred or so of these. Most Catholics were conformers or recusants and posed no real danger to the queen. However, there is also lots of evidence to challenge this interpretation. There were various Catholics plots. For example, in 1586, Anthony Babington and John Ballard plotted to kill Elizabeth and place Mary on the throne. They were communicating secretly with Mary but were found out by Elizabeth's spies. This shows the threat was very real.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Balanced argument; one explained point on each side</p>
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	<p>Level 2 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument explicitly supported by one valid example, e.g.</p> <p><i>I disagree because there were various Catholics plots. For example, in 1586, Anthony Babington and John Ballard plotted to kill Elizabeth and place Mary on the throne. They were communicating secretly with Mary but were found out by Elizabeth's spies. This shows the threat was very real.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: One sided argument; one explained point of support</p>
Level 1 (1-4 marks)	<p>Level 1 answers will typically identify valid reason(s) to support and/or challenge the interpretation but without full explanation or supporting evidence, e.g.</p> <p><i>Yes, I agree because there were only about two hundred plotters.</i> <i>No, I don't agree because there were plots to kill Elizabeth and put the Catholic Mary Stewart on the throne.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation</p> <p>Alternatively, Level 1 answers will typically describe Catholics / religion / plots / related events <i>In 1586 Elizabeth put Mary Stewart on trial and she was executed.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Description of Anglo Saxons without linking this to the question</p> <p>Alternatively, Level 1 answers will make general, unsupported assertions e.g. <i>Yes, I agree because they were going against the Protestant religion.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: general, unsupported assertions.</p>
0 marks	

<p>Question 9*–20 marks According to the website www.enotes.com, ‘It was a good time to be English during the Elizabethan era’. How far do you agree with this view of people’s daily lives between 1580 and 1603?</p>	
<p>Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 5 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 5 marks AO4 Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations in the context of historical events studied. Maximum 10 marks</p>	<p>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</p>
<p>Level 5 (17–20 marks) 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></p>	<p><i>Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate any knowledge of Elizabethan society. 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 Levels 4 and 5, this must involve considering both evidence to support and to challenge the interpretation.</i></p> <p><i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of similarity and difference (diversity of experience across society); change and continuity (how people’s lives changed across the period); and causation and consequence (what created these experiences) but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i></p> <p><i>Grounds for agreeing include: The gentry’s daily lives could be described as ‘good’ – they lived luxurious lifestyles, had grand houses and had a plentiful supply of food and a varied diet; yeomen farmers often lived comfortable lives and some could afford to employ labourers and servants; yeomen farmers’ houses could be quite large with windows and chimneys which made them more comfortable; yeomen’s lives may not have been extravagant but could be described as ‘good’ in comparison to the labouring poor; the labouring poor’s diet improved when times were good to include cheese, fish or bacon; women from the ‘middling’ sort and labouring families were free to marry whomever they wished; the wages of yeomen farmers increased during this period; the new Poor Law of 1601 saw some improvements for the poor, eg provision of almshouses for the able-bodied poor.</i></p> <p><i>Grounds for disagreeing include: The labouring poor made up around half the population and had very hard lives – they worked all the daylight hours for yeomen and husbandmen and struggled to pay rent, buy food when they could not find a day’s work;</i></p>
<p>Level 4 (13–16 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation (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></p>	
<p>Level 3 (9–12 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas (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></p>	
<p>Level 2 (5–8 marks) 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></p>	

<p>Level 1 (1–4 marks) 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>labourers' houses were small, dark and poorly built with no chimneys; their food was not varied and when there were bad harvests some would starve to death; lives were difficult for yeomen's wives who would often do much of the hard work around the house themselves; women from the families of gentry had little freedom and did not choose whom they married; children's lives were often very short because of poor standards of hygiene and lack of medical treatment; children from labouring families worked from a young age; the price of bread went up during this period and labourers' wages did not keep up; between 1597 and 1599 large areas suffered from famine; poverty grew in this period and in some areas the 'settled poor' made up 30% of the population; vagabonds/vagrants were punished under the Poor Law; gentlemen whose lives were comfortable only made up about 2% of the population.</i></p> <p>NB Do not allow responses that stray from 'daily lives' as per the question, eg theatres and past-times. persecution of witches, Puritans, Catholics, etc.</p>
<p>0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	

Question 9*–20 marks According to the website www.enotes.com, ‘It was a good time to be English during the Elizabethan era’. How far do you agree with this view of people’s daily lives between 1580 and 1603?	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 5 (17-20 marks)	<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 clinching argument e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot evidence to support the interpretation. Firstly, the gentry’s daily lives could be described as ‘good’– they lived luxurious lifestyles, had grand houses and had a plentiful supply of food and a varied diet. They would hold feasts with lots of different meats/ fish like swan, eel and pheasant. They drank fine wine imported from France and Italy. But it wasn’t just for the rich that life was improving. Life for the people lower down the social scale somewhat in this period to. The wages of yeomen farmers increased and the new Poor Law of 1601 saw some improvements for the very poor with the provision of almshouses.</i></p> <p><i>However, there is also lots of evidence to challenge this interpretation. The labouring poor made up around half the population and had very hard lives – they worked all the daylight hours for yeomen and often struggled to pay rent or buy food when they could not find a day’s work. Their food was not varied like the gentry’s and when there were bad harvests some would starve to death. Also, poverty grew in this period and in some areas the ‘settled poor’ made up 30% of the population. Not all poor people benefitted from the Poor Law; for example, vagabonds/vagrants were actually punished.</i></p> <p><i>Overall I would have to disagree with the statement in relation to the majority of the population for most of the time. Gentlemen whose lives were comfortable only made up about 2% of the population and most people never experienced that kind of luxury. For ordinary people, although there were small improvements in relation to poor relief or better wages, this did not necessarily mean that it ‘was a good time’ to be living.</i></p> <p>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</p> <p>NOTE: NB Do not allow responses that stray from ‘daily lives’ as per the question, eg theatres and past-times. persecution of witches, Puritans, Catholics, etc.</p>
Level 4 (13-16 marks)	<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 a lot evidence to support the interpretation. Firstly, the gentry’s daily lives could be described as ‘good’– they lived luxurious lifestyles, had grand houses and had a plentiful supply of food and a varied diet. They would hold feasts with lots of different meats/ fish like swan, eel and pheasant. They drank fine wine imported from France and Italy</i></p> <p><i>However, there is also lots of evidence to challenge this interpretation. The labouring poor made up around half the population and had very hard lives – they worked all the daylight hours for yeomen and often struggled to pay rent or buy food when they could not find a day’s work. Their food was not varied like the gentry’s and when there were bad harvests some would starve to death. Also, poverty grew in this period and in some areas the ‘settled poor’ made up 30% of the population. Not all poor people benefitted from the Poor Law; for example, vagabonds/vagrants were actually punished.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Balanced or one-sided argument; three explained points of support</p>
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	<p>Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-sided answer explicitly supported by two valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot evidence to support the interpretation. Firstly, the gentry’s daily lives could be described as ‘good’– they lived luxurious lifestyles, had grand houses and had a plentiful supply of food and a varied diet. They would hold feasts with lots of different meats/ fish like swan, eel and pheasant. They drank fine wine imported from France and Italy. But it wasn’t just for the rich that life was improving. Life for the people lower down the social scale somewhat in this period to. The wages of yeomen farmers increased and the new Poor Law of 1601 saw some improvements for the very poor with the provision of almshouses.</i></p>

	<p>Nutshell: One sided argument, two explained points of support</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 a lot evidence to support the interpretation. Firstly, the gentry's daily lives could be described as 'good' – they lived luxurious lifestyles, had grand houses and had a plentiful supply of food and a varied diet. They would hold feasts with lots of different meats/ fish like swan, eel and pheasant. They drank fine wine imported from France and Italy. However, there is also lots of evidence to challenge this interpretation. The labouring poor made up around half the population and had very hard lives – they worked all the daylight hours for yeomen and often struggled to pay rent or buy food when they could not find a day's work. Their food was not varied like the gentry's and when there were bad harvests some would starve to death.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Balanced argument; one explained point on each side</p>
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	<p>Level 2 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument explicitly supported by one valid example, e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree because the gentry's daily lives could be described as 'good' – they lived luxurious lifestyles, had grand houses and had a plentiful supply of food and a varied diet. They would hold feasts with lots of different meats/ fish like swan, eel and pheasant. They drank fine wine imported from France and Italy.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: One sided argument; one explained point of support</p>
Level 1 (1-4 marks)	<p>Level 1 answers will typically identify valid reason(s) to support and/or challenge the interpretation but without full explanation or supporting evidence, e.g.</p> <p><i>Yes, I agree because the gentry had lives of luxury with feasts and banquets. Yes, I agree because women from the 'middling' sort and labouring families were free to marry whomever they wished. No, I disagree because when there were bad harvests many people starved to death.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation</p> <p>Alternatively, Level 1 answers will typically describe daily lives</p> <p><i>Labourers made up half the population. Day labourers went from farm to farm looking for work. They often struggled to pay rent.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Description of daily lives without linking this to the question</p> <p>Alternatively, Level 1 answers will make general, unsupported assertions e.g.</p> <p><i>No, I disagree because the lives of labourers were really hard.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: general, unsupported assertions.</p>
0 marks	

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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