

OCR

Medicine Investigations

COLIN SHEPHARD
ROSEMARY REES

MARK SCHEMES
For the Source Investigations

JOHN MURRAY

Contents

SOURCE INVESTIGATION 1 Were Hippocrates' ideas about medicine important?	4
SOURCE INVESTIGATION 2 Did the Romans simply copy the Greeks' medical ideas and methods?	11
SOURCE INVESTIGATION 3 What did people in the Middle Ages believe about disease?	17
SOURCE INVESTIGATION 4 How far were medieval attempts to prevent the plague a waste of time?	24
SOURCE INVESTIGATION 5 Ambrose Paré: why did he make his discoveries when he did?	30
SOURCE INVESTIGATION 6 Were quacks any worse than doctors?	37
SOURCE INVESTIGATION 7 Why did so many people oppose vaccination?	44
SOURCE INVESTIGATION 8 The body-snatchers	51
SOURCE INVESTIGATION 9 How important was John Snow in the fight against cholera?	57
SOURCE INVESTIGATION 10 Why did some people oppose public health reforms?	64
SOURCE INVESTIGATION 11 Who was the real 'Angel of the Crimea'?	70
SOURCE INVESTIGATION 12 Did patients immediately benefit from Simpson's work on anaesthetics?	76
SOURCE INVESTIGATION 13 How important was Pasteur's germ theory of disease?	83
SOURCE INVESTIGATION 14 Penicillin: who can claim the credit?	91
SOURCE INVESTIGATION 15 Was the National Health Service welcomed?	98
SOURCE INVESTIGATION 16 Women in medicine: have attitudes changed?	104
SOURCE INVESTIGATION 17 Hospitals through pictures	111

© John Murray (Publishers) Ltd, a member of the Hodder Headline Group
338 Euston Road
London NW1 3BH

All rights reserved. This material is copyright but permission is given to teachers to download and/or make limited copies for classroom distribution only to students within their own school or educational institution. This material may not be copied onwards or sold to third parties. If you wish to use the material in any other way then you must apply in writing to the Publisher at the above address.

ISBN 0 7195 7746 2

SOURCE INVESTIGATION 1

WERE HIPPOCRATES' IDEAS ABOUT MEDICINE IMPORTANT?

1 Study Source A.

What can we learn about medicine in ancient Greece from this source?

Use the source to explain your answer.

(5 marks)

Level 1 Extraction of information from the source (1–2)

Answers at this level will copy from the source and/or paraphrase it.

e.g. A man went to the Asclepion with an abscess in his belly. He dreamed that the god Asclepios cut it out. When the man woke up he walked out of the Temple and there was a lot of blood left behind on the floor. A woman called Ambrosia was blind and the god Asclepius cured her because she gave him a silver pig.

Level 2 Unsupported inference(s) from the source (3)

Answers at this level will make a correct inference(s) from the source but they will not be supported by direct reference to the relevant phrases in the source, nor by reference to what the source describes.

e.g. People in ancient Greece believed the gods could make people better. Medicine in ancient Greece was based on people's beliefs about what cured them.

Level 3 Supported inference(s) from the source (4–5)

Answers at this level will make a correct inference(s) from the source and they will be supported by direct reference to relevant phrases in the source or to what the source describes.

e.g. The source shows us that medicine in ancient Greece was very much based on people's belief in magic and the work of the gods. The source tells us about a man with an abscess in his belly and a blind woman. The man's friends took him to the temple of Asclepius where the god 'cut into his belly' and 'removed the abscess'. The woman didn't believe in Asclepius' cure. But she dreamed about him saying he would cure her if she gave a silver pig to the Asclepion. She did and he 'cut into her diseased eyeball' and she could see again. The important thing is that people believed the god could cure them and so cures happened.

2 Study Sources A and B.

Sources A and B agree about Asclepius. Does this mean they can be trusted?

Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (6 marks)

Level 1 Agreement/disagreement with proposition using content (1–2)

Answers at this level will use the content of the sources to agree/disagree with the proposition. Where own knowledge is used, it will be generalised and provide support.

e.g. Both sources show the god Asclepius at work curing people. From my own knowledge I know that there were several temples to Asclepius and many people believed that the god and his daughters cured sick people. So, yes, I'd say the sources can be trusted to tell us what people at the time believed about what cures sickness.

Level 2 Agreement/disagreement with proposition using provenance (3–4)

Answers at this level will use the provenance of the sources to agree/disagree with the proposition. Where own knowledge is used it will probably be generalised and will provide support.

e.g. No, I don't think the sources can be trusted to tell us about Greek medicine. Just because there are two carvings, one of a picture and one of writing, telling us that the god Asclepius cured people doesn't mean that he did. There are carvings of Hippocrates and that doesn't mean the four humours are right, either.

Level 3 Balanced argument focusing on proposition in question (5–6)

Answers at this level will focus on 'trusted' and will ask, either implicitly or explicitly what 'trusted' means in this context.

e.g. It all depends. I think the sources both can and can't be trusted. Some people believed that the god Asclepius cured people and so they carved in words and pictures what he had done. I know that there are other writings and carvings about Asclepius so belief in him and his cures was widespread in ancient Greece. These sources can be trusted to tell us what some people in ancient Greece believed cured diseases. But they can't be trusted to tell us all about Greek medicine. From my own knowledge I know that Hippocrates was working at the same time. Many people preferred to follow Hippocrates' ideas about the four humours and his natural cures. So these sources can be trusted only to tell us part of the story.

- 3 Study Source C.**
Plays are written to entertain people. Does this mean that this source is no use to historians?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1 Generalised answers with no support from the source (1)**
 Answers at this level will be the sort of responses that could be written any time about almost any historical source.
e.g. All sources are useful to the historian. Plays tell you a lot about the time they were written in.
- Level 2 Generalised answers with support from the source (2)**
 Answers at this level will use the source, probably to write a generalised but supported response.
e.g. This play would be useful to historians because it would tell them how the ancient Greeks thought the gods cured diseases.
- Level 3 Focus on utility – general historical context (3–4)**
 Answers at this level focus on the historical context of the play as being useful to historians.
e.g. Plays are written to entertain people and this particular play would be useful to historians because it tells them a lot about Greek society at the time. Aristophanes wouldn't have wasted his time writing a play about a man being cured in an Asclepion if people weren't going to be interested enough to go and watch it or read it. From my own knowledge I know that Greeks loved going to watch plays being performed and so this source would tell a historian that people liked being entertained by this sort of play. The fact that it survived means it must have been pretty important and so people probably enjoyed it a lot.
- Level 4 Focus on utility – medicine context (5–6)**
 Answers at this level focus on the ways in which the play contributes to an understanding of the history of medicine.
e.g. The source would be very useful to historians. It would tell a historian a lot about the sort of medicine that went on at the time. Although some plays have a lot of imaginary things in them, this story of Plautus being cured by Asclepius and his daughter must have meant something to the audiences otherwise they wouldn't have bothered going to see it. It tells the historian exactly how people went about taking someone to an Asclepion, and what happened there. It's useful for a historian to know this kind of play was being performed at a time when Hippocrates was teaching about more practical, scientific medicine.
- Level 5 Focus on utility – general historical and medicine (7)**
 Answers at this level combine Levels 3 and 4.

- 4 Study Source D.**
Why do you think Hippocrates wrote this?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1 Focus on extraction of information from source (1–2)**
Answers at this level will paraphrase and/or copy extracts from the source.
e.g. Hippocrates wrote this to tell people they had to consider the effects of each season of the year and they had to take note of the winds, cool or warm.
- Level 2 Focus on Hippocrates' theories (3–4)**
Answers at this level will place the source within the context of Hippocrates' theories.
e.g. Hippocrates worked out the theory of four humours. The four humours were phlegm, blood, yellow bile and black bile. If the humours stayed in balance, a person would be healthy. He said that people got ill when their humours were unbalanced. He wrote this to explain about his theory.
- Level 3 Focus on purpose of source (5)**
Answers at this level will focus on the purpose to which the source was to be put.
e.g. Hippocrates' theory of the four humours influenced the way Greek doctors treated their patients. They tried to understand what caused disease by careful observation of people. Hippocrates wrote this to instruct doctors as to what they should look out for when they were treating patients so they would know how to give them the proper cures.
- Level 4 Focus on contextualising source (6–7)**
Answers at this level will combine Levels 2 and 3.
Mark at the top of the level those answers that point out that Hippocrates' writings made doctors much more important.

- 5 Study Sources E and F.**
Would all Greeks be able to benefit from Hippocratic medicine?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1 Generalised answers (1)**
 Answers at this level will provide generalised, non-specific responses.
 e.g. *Yes, they would all have benefited because Hippocrates had written to tell everyone about his ideas.*
No, because not everyone in Greece would have been able to read.
- Level 2 Focus on different beliefs (2)**
 Answers at this level will consider the attitude of people in ancient Greece.
 e.g. *No, not everyone would have benefited from Hippocrates' ideas. Some people wouldn't believe in them and would go on visiting Asclepians and believing that the gods would cure them.*
- Level 3 Focus on content of sources and cross-referencing (3–4)**
 Answers at this level will use the content of the sources and cross-reference between them to ask whether all Greeks would be able to follow the instructions contained in them.
 e.g. *Not all Greeks could benefit from Hippocratic medicine because they wouldn't all be able to afford food like roast meats. But everyone could wash in water and clean their nose and ears.*
- Level 4 Focus on provenance of sources and cross-referencing (4–5)**
 Answers at this level will consider the provenance of the source and cross-reference between them to ask whether all Greeks would be able to follow the instructions contained in them.
 e.g. *Diocles Carystus seems to be suggesting much more ordinary things that most people could do to keep healthy. Maybe he's a Greek doctor who is used to working with people who aren't always too rich. Hippocrates, however, seems to be writing for richer people because he is talking about wine and roast meat and barley cakes. So maybe only rich people could do what Hippocrates himself said, but the doctor had adapted Hippocrates' ideas so that more people could use them.*
- Level 5 Focus on contextualising source (6–7)**
 Answers at this level will consider both the content and the provenance and put the sources in the context of ancient Greek society.
 e.g. As above, plus: *While richer people might very well have used Hippocratic medicine, it is certain that the poor couldn't afford it. Women at home – wives and mothers – used herbs and remedies handed down for hundreds of years. So the poor would be treated at home, Not all the rich would follow Hippocrates, either. Some went to Asclepians because they still believed in magic cures.*

- 6 Study Source G.**
Are you surprised that the Hippocratic oath refers to the gods?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (8 marks)
- Level 1 Generalised answers (1–2)**
 Answers at this level will either express surprise/no surprise in general terms not specifically tied in to the source or specific contextual knowledge.
 e.g. *No, I'm not surprised because they believed in gods in those days.*
- Level 2 Focus on content of source (3–4)**
 Answers at this level will focus on the content of the source to explain their surprise/lack of surprise.
 e.g. *Yes, I am surprised because the rest of the source is pretty sensible and factual and you wouldn't expect this to be combined with magic.*
- Level 3 Focus on content of source cross-referenced to own knowledge (5–6)**
 Answers at this level will focus on the content of the source and use their own knowledge to develop their response.
 e.g. *Yes, I am surprised. Hippocrates developed a scientific approach to medicine, observing patients carefully and working out a treatment that was right for that person. This was the theory of the Four Humours: everything had to be in balance for a person to keep well. This is nothing like blaming illness on the spirits and expecting the gods to cure them. So it's odd that Hippocrates included the gods in his oath.*
- Level 3 Focus on purpose of source (7–8)**
 Answers at this level will show an appreciation that the source is an oath, and will look to the purpose of that oath as a justification for including the gods in it.
 e.g. *No, I am not surprised. This source is part of the Hippocratic oath. It's a promise sworn by doctors and they swore on the gods' names to show how serious they were. Hippocrates had a very scientific approach to medicine, but it was sensible to include the gods in the oath. Some doctors probably believed in the existence of the gods – they didn't have to believe they cured people. It didn't stop them being good Hippocratic doctors. It persuaded the Greeks they were treating that they were serious about what they were doing and could be trusted.*

7 Study all the sources
‘Hippocrates’ ideas about medicine were not important because the Greeks carried on believing that the gods caused and cured illnesses.’
How far do the sources support this statement?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (10 marks)

Level 1 Generalised answers: no source use (1–2)
Answers at this level will be reasonably accurate but will make no reference, either implicit or explicit, to the given sources.
e.g. I disagree. It takes a long time for new ideas to be accepted by everyone. Just because some Greeks carried on believing the gods caused and cured illnesses doesn’t mean that Hippocrates’ ideas weren’t important.

Level 2 Generalised source use (3–4)
Answers at this level will demonstrate that the given sources have been used, but no direct reference to specific sources will appear. These answers are characterised by phrases such as ‘The sources tell us...’ and ‘I know from the sources that...’.

Level 3 Answers that use sources to support OR to disagree with the statement (5–7)

Level 4 Answers that use the sources to support AND to disagree with the statement (8–10)

Bonus of up to 2 marks (1 per source) for any consideration of the reliability of a source at any level.

N.B. This does not have to be developed discussions of reliability.

SOURCE INVESTIGATION 2

DID THE ROMANS SIMPLY COPY THE GREEKS' MEDICAL IDEAS AND METHODS?

1 Study Sources A and B.

What can you learn from these sources about the ways in which Romans treated sick people?

Use the sources to explain your answer. (7 marks)

Level 1 Extraction of information from the source(s) (1–2)

Answers at this level will copy from the sources and/or paraphrase them.

e.g. *They used eggs to help heal wounds.*

Level 2 Unsupported inference(s) from the source(s) (3–4)

Answers at this level will make a correct inference(s) from the sources but they will NOT be supported by direct reference to the relevant phrases in the source, nor by reference to what the source describes.

e.g. *The Romans believed in magical treatments.*

Level 3 Supported inference(s) from the source(s) (5–7)

Answers at this level will make a correct inference(s) from the sources and they will be supported by direct reference to relevant phrases or images in the sources.

e.g. *Source A shows that the Romans believed in natural cures. For example, they used dog grease to remove nits from people's hair. On the other hand, the coin in Source B shows that they believed in magical cures too, because it shows different stages in treatments under the goddess Salus.*

2 Study Sources C and D.
Do these sources prove that Greek ideas about medicine were used in the Roman Empire?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)

Level 1 Agreement/disagreement with proposition focusing on content (1–2)
Answers at this level will use the content of the sources to agree/disagree with the proposition. Where own knowledge is used, it will be generalised and provide support.
e.g. I agree. The sources show Asclepians and the Greeks used Asclepians when they were sick.

Level 2 Agreement/disagreement with proposition focusing on provenance (3–4)
Answers at this level will use the provenance of the sources to agree/disagree with the proposition. Where own knowledge is used it will probably be generalised and will provide support.
e.g. I agree. The altar and the inscriptions were both found in England and I know that England was part of the Roman empire so, yes, Greek ideas about medicine were used in the Roman Empire.

Level 3 Balanced argument focusing on both provenance and content (5–7)
Answers at this level will combine the Level 1 and 2 responses to create a balanced answer.
Mark at the top of the level answers that additionally focus on ‘prove’ in this context.

N.B. Answers that assert that two sources by themselves prove nothing should be marked at Level 1 UNLESS there is a good supporting, contextual argument, in which case Level 3 would be appropriate.

- 3 Study Source E.**
‘This source shows that Galen had no new ideas about the causes or the treatment of disease.’
Use the source and your knowledge to explain whether or not you agree with this statement. (8 marks)
- Level 1 Generalised answers focusing on source (1–2)**
 Answers at this level will paraphrase or extract information from the source with no focus on the question.
e.g. Galen said that the Emperor had too much cold food in his stomach and that it had turned into slimy excrement.
- Level 2 Generalised answers focusing on own knowledge (3–4)**
 Answers at this level will ignore the source and write in general terms about Galen from outside knowledge.
e.g. Galen believed in Hippocrates’ theory of the four humours but he believed in using opposites to put the humours back in balance. He dissected human bodies in Alexandria to increase his knowledge of how the body works.
- Level 3 Focus on Galen’s ideas as described in the source (5)**
 Answers at this level will show how the source shows Galen’s ideas.
e.g. Galen used opposites to put the humours back in balance and so make the person well again. We can see this in the source. Galen diagnosed the Emperor’s problem as having eaten too much cold food. In order to get things back in balance, he prescribed wine with a little pepper because this would be a hot spicy drink.
- Level 4 Focus on whether or not Galen’s ideas were new (6–8)**
 Answers at this level will combine the content of the source with own knowledge to address the proposition in the question.
e.g. Galen believed in Hippocrates’ ideas about the four humours, but he built on this with his theory of opposites. He believed that, in order to get the humours back in balance, you had to use opposites. So, because the Emperor had eaten too much cold food, Galen prescribed wine with pepper in it. As this would taste hot, it was the opposite of the coldness that was in the Emperor’s stomach and so would cure the Emperor of his problem. So we can see that Galen built on Hippocrates’ ideas with new ideas of his own.

- 4 Study Sources E, F and G.**
Are you surprised by what Pliny says in Source G?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (8 marks)
- Level 1 Generalised answers (1–2)**
 Answers at this level will either express surprise or no surprise in general terms not specifically tied to the source or specific contextual knowledge.
e.g. No, I'm not surprised. Pliny was a Roman, so what would you expect? They never liked the Greeks.
- Level 2 Focus on content of the sources (3–4)**
 Answers at this level will focus on the content of the sources to explain their surprise/lack of surprise.
e.g. No, I'm not surprised. Sources E and F both show that Galen was a good doctor. He found out what was wrong with the Emperor and gave him a different sort of cure. In Source F it says that he put Hippocrates' ideas into action. Pliny was probably jealous of all these achievements.
- Level 3 Focus on provenance of the sources (5–6)**
 Answers at this level will focus on the provenance of the sources to explain their surprise/lack of surprise.
e.g. No, I'm not surprised. Pliny was writing about a hundred years before Galen burst upon the medical scene. He'd probably heard and maybe experienced bad things at the hands of Greek doctors. It wasn't until Galen that Hippocrates' ideas really worked, and so Pliny was quite reasonable in being suspicious.
- Level 4 Focus on content and provenance (7–8)**
 Answers at this level will combine Levels 2 and 3 in order to explain whether or not they are surprised by what Pliny says in Source G.

- 5 Study Source H.**
What does this source tell you about Roman attitudes towards medicine?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (8 marks)
- Level 1 Extraction of information from source (1–2)**
 Answers at this level will provide information from the source.
e.g. In Rome there were lots of baths, a sewer and an aqueduct. The sewer runs into the river.
- Level 2 Unsupported inference(s) from the source/own knowledge (3–4)**
 Answers at this level will make correct inference(s) from the source but they will not be supported by direct reference to features on the map.
 OR
 They will be assertions of outside knowledge.
e.g. The Romans were pretty clean people. They insisted on bathing a lot, using lavatories and generally using a lot of water to keep clean and healthy.
- Level 3 Supported inferences from the source/own knowledge (5–6)**
 Answers at this level will make correct inference(s) from the source and they will be supported by direct reference to specific features on the map.
 OR
 They will rely on outside, supported, knowledge.
e.g. The Romans were pretty clean people. The map shows nine baths of different sizes and aqueducts bringing water into the city. There's a sewer running through the city to take human waste away. The Romans clearly thought that it was very important to keep clean and that this kept them healthy.
- Level 4 Supported inferences from source supported and developed by cross-referencing to own knowledge (7–8)**
 Answers at this level will combine both elements of Level 3 to address the question.

**6 Study all the sources.
'The Romans simply copied Greek medical ideas and methods.'
How far do the sources convince you that this statement is right?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (12 marks)**

Level 1 Generalised answers: no source use (1–2)
Answers at this level will be reasonably accurate but will make no reference, either implicit or explicit, to the given sources.

Level 2 Generalised source use (3–4)
Answers at this level will demonstrate that the given sources have been used, but no direct reference to specific sources will appear. These answers are characterised by phrases such as 'The sources tell us...'; 'I know from the sources that...'.
(3–4)

Level 3 Answers that use the sources to show the statement is right or wrong (5–8)

Level 4 Answers that use the sources to show that the statement is partly right and partly wrong (9–12)

Bonus of up to 2 marks (1 per source) for any consideration of the reliability of a source at any level.

N.B. This does not have to be developed discussions of reliability.

SOURCE INVESTIGATION 3

WHAT DID PEOPLE IN THE MIDDLE AGES BELIEVE ABOUT DISEASE?

- 1 Study Source A.**
How far does this source show that people in the Middle Ages realised the importance of public health?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (6 marks)
- Level 1** **Answers that copy/describe the source** (1)
e.g. *The Abbey is very large. It had toilet, a warming house, a refectory and a large church.*
OR
Unsupported inferences
OR
Answers that ignore the source and write about medieval public health
- Level 2** **Identifies relevant points in the source to make inference but no explanation** (2)
e.g. *This source does show that they realised the importance of public health because they had toilets.*
OR
States that an abbey/monastery is not representative – not explained
- Level 3** **Uses knowledge to explain relevant points in the source to make an inference** (3–4)
e.g. *The source shows they did realise the importance of public health because they had toilets and washrooms. The toilets are over the river. This meant that all the waste would be swept away leaving the Abbey clean with no heaps of waste to spread disease.*
OR
Uses knowledge to explain limitations of source – only an abbey
- Level 4** **Both types of Level 3** (5–6)
e.g. Adds to first Level 3 answer: *However, monasteries like this one were probably the cleanest places in the country. They had the writings of people like Galen and knew that it was important to keep clean. They had the money to build toilets and washrooms. Most people did not live in monasteries and they had no idea why public health was important. The towns at this time were filthy.*

- 2 Study Source B.**
Why did people use treatments like this one in the Middle Ages?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (6 marks)
- Level 1** **Answers based on evidence in the source** **(1–2)**
e.g. Because it says the pain will stop. Because it is a treatment from a leading doctor.
- Level 2** **States they used this treatment because they had no proper treatments, they did not understand much, it is based on God, undeveloped, no explanation** **(3–4)**
e.g. They used this treatment because it was based on God and they were very religious in those days. They used it because they did not know much about medicine in those days.
- Level 3** **Uses knowledge to explain why religious treatments were used** **(5)**
 Explanations might be about the importance of religion or about the lack of medical knowledge at the time.
e.g. People used treatments like this because they believed that disease was caused by God and could only be cured by God. They did not know about natural causes. They thought that only prayers and religious charms like this one would work because illness was a punishment from God. This was the belief of the Christian Church.
- Level 4** **Uses knowledge to explain why religion was important and about the lack of medical knowledge** **(6)**

- 3 Study Sources C, D and E.**
How similar are the ideas in these three sources?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (8 marks)
- Level 1** **Answers that describe/compare surface details of the sources (1–2)**
e.g. These sources are completely different. One shows someone being sick while another shows the King touching people. This means they are about different things and have nothing to do with each other.
- Level 2** **Identifies the fact that C and E are natural or based on the Four Humours while D is supernatural – not explained (2–5)**
- Level 3** **Explains the ideas behind the sources without directly comparing natural/supernatural (5–6)**
e.g. Source C is based on the Four Humours. The idea was that studying the blood would tell the doctor whether the humours in the body had got out of balance. Source D is based on the idea that the King had powers from God to cure people. The disease he was meant to be able to cure was scrofula which was called the King’s evil. Source E shows a doctor making a patient vomit to get the humours in the body back in balance. They believed that if the humours were out of balance you would be ill.
- Level 4** **Compares and explains the ideas (7–8)**
e.g. Sources C and E are natural ideas based on the Theory of the Four Humours while Source D is a supernatural idea. In D they think that disease is caused and cured by God. God was meant to have given kings powers to cure disease like scrofula. In Sources C and D they have natural beliefs. They think someone is ill because the humours in the body have got out of balance. Making someone sick would help get the balance right because it would get rid of lots of the excess humour.

- 4 Study Source F.**
Are you surprised to see Hippocrates being shown as a medieval doctor?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1** **Unsupported but valid assertions** **(1–2)**
e.g. that Hippocrates did not live in the Middle Ages, that Hippocrates was a doctor.
- Level 2** **Knowledge used to explain the examples in Level 1** **(3–4)**
e.g. *Yes, I am very surprised because Hippocrates did not live in the Middle Ages. He was a Greek and lived a long time before. So I do not know why they have him dressed looking as if he lived in the Middle Ages.*
- Level 3** **Answers based on the fact that Hippocrates' ideas were the basis of medicine in the Middle Ages** **(5–7)**
e.g. *No, I am not surprised because Hippocrates was respected in the Middle Ages and they followed his medical ideas. (5)*
I am not at all surprised. All the medical ideas in the Middle Ages were based on the writings of Hippocrates and Galen. Treatments were based on the Theory of the Four Humours and this was Hippocrates' ideas. His ideas were greatly respected and the training of doctors was based on his teachings. So it is not surprising that they show him as a doctor in the drawing.

- 5 Study Sources G and H.**
What can you learn from these two sources about medieval medicine?
Use the sources to explain your answer. (6 marks)
- Level 1** **Answers based on the surface information of the sources** **(1–2)**
e.g. *These sources show that they did not let lepers go into churches and they were not allowed to touch infants. They also show you that they had pharmacies.*
- Level 2** **Unsupported but valid inferences about medicine** **(3–4)**
e.g. *Source G shows belief in natural causes, shows belief that disease was spread by food, by touch, by water, by intercourse; Source H shows they were advanced to have a pharmacy, shows they were using natural treatments.*
- Level 3** **Valid inferences supported by evidence from sources** **(5–6)**
e.g. *Source G shows that they believed in natural causes of disease. Otherwise they would not have bothered issuing all these regulations about lepers. They banned lepers from mixing with people because they thought this might spread the disease to other people. This meant they thought that it was spread by touch or breathing and these are natural not supernatural ways of spreading disease.*

- 6 Study Source I.**
If blood-letters were so bad why was bloodletting so popular in the Middle Ages?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1** **Answers based on the content of the source** **(1–2)**
e.g. I know they were popular because people kept going back to see him again. There were hundreds outside the house of the blood-letter.
- Level 2** **Claims it was used because they had few other treatments available to them – not explained** **(3)**
e.g. It was popular because it was just about the only treatment they had. Everyone used it.
- Level 3** **Mentions but does not explain link with Greeks or the Theory of the Four Humours** **(4–5)**
- Level 4** **Uses knowledge to explain valid reason for its popularity** **(6–7)**
e.g. Bloodletting was popular because it had been used a lot by Galen. He said it helped to get the humours back in balance according to his theory of opposites. If someone was ill because they had too much blood then blood-letting would make them better.

- 7 Which one of these three statements is best supported by these sources?
‘In the Middle Ages they had supernatural beliefs about the causes and cures of disease.’
‘In the Middle Ages they believed disease had natural causes and cures.’
‘In the Middle Ages natural and supernatural beliefs about medicine existed side by side.’
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (10 marks)

N.B. Sources must be referred to by letter or direct quote.

Level 1	Answers which do not use the sources	(1–2)
Level 2	Answers which make reference to the sources/some sources, but have no direct source use	(2)
Level 3	Answers which use sources to support Statement 1 or 2	(3–6)
Level 4	Answers which use sources to support Statement 3	(6–8)
Level 5	Answers which use sources to support Statement 3 and also to explain how Statement 1 or 2 is not completely correct	(9–10)

Bonus of up to 2 marks (1 per source) for any consideration of the reliability of a source at any level.

N.B. This does not have to be developed discussions of reliability.

SOURCE INVESTIGATION 4

HOW FAR WERE MEDIEVAL ATTEMPTS TO PREVENT THE PLAGUE A WASTE OF TIME?

1 Study Source A.

What can you learn from Source A about public health in the 1300s?

Use the source to explain your answer.

(6 marks)

Level 1 Extraction of information from the source (1–2)

Answers at this level will copy from the source and/or paraphrase it.
e.g. *Human waste was lying around in the streets.*

Level 2 Unsupported inference(s) from the source (3–4)

Answers at this level will make a correct inference(s) from the sources but they will NOT be supported by direct reference to the relevant phrases in the source, nor by reference to what the source describes.
e.g. *The level of filth in the streets was so bad that people were getting ill.*

Level 3 Supported inference(s) from the source(s) (5–6)

Answers at this level will make a correct inference(s) from the sources and they will be supported by direct reference to relevant phrases or images in the sources.
e.g. *King Edward III is ordering filth to be removed from the city of London. He clearly connects this with illness because he says 'the city and suburbs are so full of filth from out of the houses that by day and night that the air is infected and the city poisoned'. But the city authorities probably didn't understand this, or didn't care, because they have clearly allowed rotting stuff to accumulate in the first place.*

2 Study Sources B and C.
How far does Source C prove that Source B was an accurate description of the flagellants?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (8 marks)

Level 1 Agreement/disagreement focusing on content (1–2)
Answers at this level will use the content of the sources to agree/disagree with the proposition. Where own knowledge is used, it will be generalised and provide support.
e.g. The painting shows flagellants whipping themselves and the source describes what flagellants did.

Level 2 Agreement/disagreement focusing on provenance (3–4)
Answers at this level will use the provenance of the sources to agree/disagree with the proposition. Where own knowledge is used it will probably be generalised and will provide support.
e.g. We don't know who painted the picture so we can't be sure he knew much about flagellants. But Robert of Avesbury lived in London and actually watched flagellants so we can be pretty sure his description is accurate. So, no, Source C doesn't prove anything about Source B.

Level 3 Balanced argument focusing on both provenance and content (5–7)
Answers at this level will combine the Level 1 and 2 responses to create a balanced answer.

Level 4 Balanced argument using content and provenance to focus on 'how far' and 'prove' (8)
Answers at this level will be a development of Level 3 and will additionally address the 'how far' and 'prove' in the question.

N.B. Answers that assert that two sources by themselves prove nothing should be marked at Level 1 UNLESS there is a good supporting, contextual argument, in which case Level 3 would be appropriate.

3 Study Sources D and E.
How far do these two sources agree about the causes of the plague?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (8 marks)

Level 1 Generalised answers (1–2)

Answers at this level will consider the sources in generalised terms only.

e.g. Both the sources tell us how awful the plague was.

Level 2 Answers focusing on the content of the sources (3–4)

Answers at this level will copy or paraphrase the sources to demonstrate agreement/disagreement. Where own knowledge is used, it will be limited.

e.g. They don't agree at all. Source D says that God allows plagues and Source E says the plague was caused by the state of the body.

Level 3 Answers focusing on making inferences from the sources (5–6)

Answers at this level will make inferences from the sources in order to demonstrate agreement/disagreement and will be supported by own knowledge.

e.g. The Middle Ages was a time when people hadn't discovered a lot about the causes of diseases but sometimes the cures they hit upon really did work because they started with the symptoms and tried to put those right. These were natural cures. When they really hadn't a clue they blamed magic. In these sources we can see that the monks aren't actually saying that God caused the plague but that he just went along with it as a punishment for men's sins. In Source E we can see that Guy de Chauliac is being very clever and linking natural and magical causes.

Level 4 Balanced answers making inferences from the sources, to address 'how far' (7–8)

Answers at this level will combine inferences from the sources with own knowledge to address the proposition in the question.

- 4 Study Source F.**
Are you surprised by the methods being used in Source F?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (8 marks)
- Level 1 Generalised answers (1–2)**
Answers at this level will either express surprise/no surprise in general terms not specifically tied to the source or specific contextual knowledge.
e.g. No, I'm not surprised because people then didn't know what caused diseases so they'd try anything.
- Level 2 Focus on content of the source (3–4)**
Answers at this level will focus on the content of the sources to explain their surprise/lack of surprise.
e.g. Yes, I am surprised because the source talks about opposites and getting things back in balance which was a very, very old idea.
- Level 3 Focus on provenance of the source (5–6)**
Answers at this level will focus on the provenance of the source to explain their surprise/lack of surprise.
e.g. No, I'm not surprised. John of Burgundy was writing one of the first books on the plague and so he would be bound to use old ideas about cause and cure.
- Level 4 Focus on content and provenance (7–8)**
Answers at this level will combine Levels 2 and 3 in order to explain whether or not they are surprised by what John of Burgundy says in Source F.

5 Study Sources G and H.
‘These two sources show people did not have any understanding of the causes of the plague.’ How far do you agree with this statement?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (8 marks)

Level 1 Generalised answers focusing on the source (1–2)

Answers at this level will paraphrase or extract information from the sources with no focus on the question.

e.g. People burned Jews and fired canons into the air.

Level 2 Generalised answers focusing on own knowledge (3–4)

Answers at this level will ignore the sources and write in general terms about what people thought caused the plague.

e.g. People didn't know much about what caused the plague. Some blamed the gods and magic, others blamed filth and muck in the streets.

Level 3 Focus on content of sources (5–6)

Answers at this level will focus on the content of the sources as evidence of what people thought caused the plague.

e.g. I agree, Source G shows that some people blamed the Jews for spreading the plague. It was pretty common in medieval times to blame the Jews for a lot of what went wrong and the plague was just one more thing they could get blamed for.

Level 4 Focus on inference(s) from sources (7–8)

Answers at this level will support inferences made from the sources by cross-referencing to their own knowledge.

e.g. I disagree. People in Source H clearly thought that the plague was somehow passed from person to person in the air. They hadn't got as far as knowing about germs and the things they did to stop the plague spreading were pretty futile, but the basic idea was there.

N.B. Mark at the top level those responses that additionally focus on ‘how far’.

6 Study all the sources.
‘Medieval attempts to stop the plague spreading were useless.’ How far do the sources support this view?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (12 marks)

Level 1 Generalised answers: no source use (1–2)

Answers at this level will be reasonably accurate but will make no reference, either implicit or explicit, to the given sources.

e.g. Medieval people didn't know what caused the plague so their attempts to stop it were useless.

Level 2 Generalised source use (3–4)

Answers at this level will demonstrate that the given sources have been used, but no direct reference to specific sources will appear.

e.g. I know from the sources that medieval people tried to stop the plague spreading. They fired cannon balls into the air and burned Jews, but these were pretty useless ideas and because the plague went on spreading all over Europe, they didn't work.

Level 3 Answers that focus on the use of the sources to show that medieval attempts to stop the plague were/were not useless (5–8)

Level 4 Answers that use the sources to show how they both support and do not support this view (9–12)

Bonus of up to 2 marks (1 per source) for any consideration of the reliability of a source at any level.

N.B. This does not have to be developed discussions of reliability.

SOURCE INVESTIGATION 5

AMBROISE PARÉ: WHY DID HE MAKE HIS DISCOVERIES WHEN HE DID?

1 Study Source A.

What did the artist of Source A think of barber surgeons?

Use the source to explain your answer.

(6 marks)

- Level 1** **Extraction of information from the source** (1–2)
Answers at this level will describe scenes in the source.
e.g. *Barber surgeons took people's teeth out.*
- Level 2** **Unsupported inference(s) from the source** (3–4)
Answers at this level will make a correct inference(s) from the source but they will NOT be supported by direct reference to the relevant scenes in the source, nor by reference to what the source shows.
e.g. *The artist thought barber surgeons were busy people who did a wide range of jobs curing people from all sorts of sicknesses and physical ailments.*
- Level 3** **Supported inference(s) from the source** (5–6)
Answers at this level will make a correct inference(s) from the source and they will be supported by direct reference to relevant images in the source.
e.g. *The artist clearly thought that barber surgeons attempted a wide range of medical work, but he's not always supportive of what they do. You can see this by looking at...*

- 2 Study Sources B and C.**
How similar are these two accounts?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (6 marks)
- Level 1 Focus on content (1–2)**
Answers at this level will compare the content of the two sources. Where own knowledge is used it will probably be generalised and will provide support.
e.g. They're not at all similar. Source A talks about using ointment on wounds and Source C is about tying up veins and arteries.
- Level 2 Focus on provenance and purpose (3–4)**
Answers at this level will note the provenance of the sources and use this to consider its purpose. Where own knowledge is used it will be mainly accurate and will provide support.
e.g. Both the sources are written by Paré himself and so we should expect them to be pretty similar. He didn't change his mind about the treatment of wounds and wrote a lot to try to convince people that his way was best.
- Level 3 Balanced argument using content, provenance and purpose to focus on 'how similar?' (5–6)**
Answers at this level will combine the Level 1 and 2 responses to create a balanced answer reaching a judgement on 'how similar?'
e.g. As above, plus: Source A is describing the first 'experiment' where he found that a mixture of egg yolks, oil of roses and turpentine helped wounds heal more quickly than cauterising them. Source C develops this idea but also says what has to be done in addition, such as tying off veins and arteries as quickly as possible. So the sources are similar: Paré is trying to persuade people that his way is best.

- 3 Study Sources C and D.**
Which source would be the more useful to a historian investigating Paré's work?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1 Focus on type of source (1–2)**
Answers at this level will focus on the type of source and will maintain that one type of source is more useful than another.
e.g. Source D is pictures of artificial hands and noses and because you can see what they looked like without having to read lots of words, it is much more useful.
- Level 2 Focus on content of the sources (3–4)**
Answers at this level will consider the content of the sources and will maintain that a source is useful because of what it tells us. Where own knowledge is used, it will be limited.
e.g. Source C explains what should be done in an amputation operation, and why it should be done in that way. Source D is just a picture and doesn't really tell you anything. So Source C would be much more useful to a historian than Source D.
- Level 3 Focus on the provenance of the sources (5–6)**
Answers at this level will focus on the provenance of the sources and will maintain that a source is useful if it is reliable. Where own knowledge is used, it will be mainly accurate and supportive.
e.g. Source C is written by Paré himself and so it must tell the truth about his work. It describes what should be done during an amputation on order to get the best results, and says how this is at the cutting edge of surgery. Source D is by Paré as well, but is less reliable about his work because it just shows artificial hands and noses that he used. So while both sources would be reliable, Source C is better because it is reliable about his work, not just about what he used.
- Level 4 Balanced answers using content, provenance and type (7)**
Answers at this level will combine the previous three levels to create a balanced response making/not making a choice with support from own knowledge.

- 4 Study Source E.**
Are you surprised Paré wrote this?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1 Generalised answers (1–2)**
Answers at this level will either express surprise/no surprise in general terms not specifically tied to the source or specific contextual knowledge.
e.g. Yes, I am surprised because he sounds pretty cross and I would expect surgeons like Pare to be calm otherwise they couldn't do their job.
- Level 2 Focus on content of the source (3–4)**
Answers at this level will focus on the content of the sources to explain their surprise/lack of surprise.
e.g. Yes, I am surprised. Paré says that surgery is learned by the eye and the hands. But it's not because he showed that you also had to experiment and take chances.
- Level 3 Focus on provenance of the source (5–6)**
Answers at this level will focus on the provenance of the source to explain their surprise/lack of surprise.
e.g. Paré is writing to the Head of the Faculty of Physicians in Paris and is pretty cross. I am not surprised he's writing like this – Paré was a great surgeon who was a pioneer in the art of amputation and didn't need anyone's permission to publish his work.
- Level 4 Focus on content and provenance (7–8)**
Answers at this level will combine Levels 2 and 3 in order to explain whether or not they are surprised by what Paré wrote in Source E.

- 5 Study Sources F and G.**
Was it complete chance that Paré and Vesalius were making discoveries at the same time?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1 Generalised answers focusing on the sources (1–2)**
 Answers at this level will paraphrase or extract information from the sources with no focus on the question.
e.g. No, it's not surprising because everyone was making all sorts of discoveries.
- Level 2 Generalised answers focusing on own knowledge (3–4)**
 Answers at this level will ignore the sources and write about what they know of the discoveries of Vesalius and Paré.
e.g. Paré found out how to treat gunshot wounds and how to do amputations safely and well. He wrote a lot about his work and was supported by the French king, Henri II. Vesalius found out about human anatomy by dissecting bodies. He wrote a book called 'The Fabric of the Human Body' which consisted of lots of accurate pictures, putting right Galen's mistakes.
- Level 3 Focus on content of sources (5–6)**
 Answers at this level will focus on the content of the sources as evidence of what people were doing at the time.
e.g. The sources show us that this was an age of enquiry and investigation. Leonardo da Vinci was drawing detailed pictures of people's insides, like this one of a baby in the womb. Vesalius is telling us that the study of anatomy is reviving. So things were on the up and up and no, I'm not surprised that Paré and Vesalius were making discoveries at the same time.
- Level 4 Focus on inference(s) from sources (7)**
 Answers at this level will support inferences made from the sources by cross-referencing to their own knowledge.
e.g. Both these sources are examples of what was happening during the Renaissance. Vesalius is aware of new ideas in anatomy coming to the fore and da Vinci is drawing things, like the foetus, that in previous years would have been thought of as shocking. It was a time of exploration and discovery in all fields and we should expect to find people like Vesalius and Paré making discoveries in medicine.

- 6 Study Sources H and I.**
‘One of these two sources must be wrong.’ Do you agree?
Use the sources and your own knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1 Generalised answers (1–2)**
Answers at this level will copy from the sources and or paraphrase them in order to agree/disagree.
e.g. Source H says that Paré was the greatest surgeon of his time. Source I says that within twenty years of Paré’s death, surgeons had gone back to their old ways.
- Level 2 Focus on content of sources (3–4)**
Answers at this level will use the content of the sources to agree/disagree with the proposition.
- Level 3 Focus on provenance of sources (5)**
Answers at this level will use the provenance of the source to agree/disagree.
e.g. Both the sources are written a long time after Paré’s death and they reach different conclusions about his work. This doesn’t mean that one of them must be wrong, just that they have reached different conclusions from the evidence they used.
- Level 4 Balanced answers focusing on the proposition in the question (6–7)**
Answers at this level will focus on the proposition, combining Levels 2 and 3 with own knowledge to create a balanced answer.

7 Study all the sources.
How far do these sources convince you that Paré's discoveries were made only because of his own skill?
Use the sources and your own knowledge to explain your answer.
(10 marks)

- Level 1 Generalised answers: no source use (1–2)**
- Level 2 Generalised source use (3–4)**
There will be no direct reference to specific sources although sources will have been used in a general way.
- Level 3 Answers that focus on the use of the sources to show that Paré's discoveries were/were not only because of his own skill (5–7)**
- Level 4 Balanced answers that use the sources to show both sides of the argument (8–10)**

Bonus of up to 2 marks (1 per source) for any consideration of the reliability of a source at any level.

N.B. This does not have to be developed discussions of reliability.

SOURCE INVESTIGATION 6

WERE QUACKS ANY WORSE THAN DOCTORS?

- 1 Study Sources A, B and C.
How far do these sources agree about quacks?
Use the sources to explain your answer. (7 marks)**
- Level 1** **Answers that write about the sources but fail to compare them** **(1–2)**
- Level 2** **Identifies things in one source that are not in another – not explained** **(2–3)**
- Level 3** **Valid similarities but not supported** **(2–4)**
Answers might range from general, e.g. they all criticise quacks to particular points of agreement, such as they are out to make money, they claim their medicines will cure anything.
- Level 4** **Valid similarities identified and also identifies things in one source and not in another** **(4–5)**
e.g. They all agree that quacks cannot be trusted but Sources A and B say they claim their medicine can cure anything; C does not say this.
- Level 5** **Uses evidence in sources to explain similarities** **(4–6)**
e.g. The sources agree about quacks. They all agree that they cannot be trusted. Source A says don't believe them when they say their medicine will cure anything while Source B says their advertisements are full of lies and they are 'ignorant fellows'. Source C agrees they cannot be trusted because they claim to be free but when it comes down to it they really want to be paid.
- Level 6** **As for Level 5 but in addition notes that some sources make criticisms that other sources do not make** **(7)**
e.g. Explains how all the sources criticise quacks but A and B suggest quacks are fools or are ignorant, C does not.

- 2 Study Source D.**
Do you think the author of Source D approved of quacks?
Use the source to explain your answer. (6 marks)
- Level 1** **Unsupported assertions** (1)
e.g. *No, the author of Source D did not approve of quacks.*
- Level 2** **Copies or paraphrases information in source without using it as evidence to support an argument** (1–2)
- Level 3** **Uses evidence in source to claim he did approve** (2–3)
e.g. *He did approve because he calls what he did was to perform wonders and he tells us that his wife went to see him.*
- Level 4** **Uses evidence in the source to show how he did not approve** (4–6)
e.g. *I don't think he approved of quacks because he says in the source that the people that visit quacks are 'poor deluded creatures' and that the quacks swindle them. This shows he doesn't like quacks. He would not call the people who went to quacks fools if he thought they were any good. He thinks people are wasting their time going to quacks.*

- 3 Study Sources C and E.**
Do you trust the description of John Taylor in Source E?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1** **Answers based on source type – not developed** (1)
 e.g. *Yes, I do trust this description because it was written by someone who had met John Taylor so it will be right.*
- Level 2** **Answers which confuse utility with reliability** (2)
 e.g. *Yes, it tells me lots about John Taylor like the fact that he did his operations with great skill.*
- Level 3** **Answers based on typicality of description in Source E** (3)
 e.g. *No, I don't really trust it. He might be giving an accurate description of Taylor at that moment but he only saw him once and it doesn't mean he was like that all the time.*
OR
Identifies the fact that the description is very different from that in Source C – not explained
 e.g. *No, I do not trust it. He was biased. Look at the description of Taylor in Source C – it tells us something completely different.*
- Level 4** **Answers which compare the descriptions in Sources C and E** (4–5)
 e.g. *No, I don't trust the description in Source E. He is saying that Taylor was a good doctor. He says that he performed operations with skill and that he understood how the eye worked. This is completely different from Source C where it says that he was tricking people and all he wanted was to make a lot of money. They cannot both be right.*
OR
Answers that try and reconcile the two accounts
 e.g. This might be done by explaining that E says he is a good surgeon and C might suggest this because he has lots of people desperate to see him.
- Level 5** **Answers based on the fact that doctors usually criticised quacks – this makes E more likely to be true** (6)
 These answers must be based on the fact that doctors disapproved of quacks because they lost business to them.
OR
Uses knowledge of quacks to pass judgement on Source E
 Explains what most quacks were like – so E not reliable.
- Level 6** **Uses knowledge of quacks or cross-references to other sources to explain why one source more likely to be right** (7)
 e.g. Explains how C and E differ and then uses knowledge of what most quacks were really like, or of the attitudes of doctors towards quacks, to explain why one source was more likely to be reliable.

- 4 Study Source F.**
Why do you think this cartoon was published?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1** **Answers based on information in the source (1–2)**
e.g. This cartoon was published to tell people about John St John and his cures. It tells you that he prevented consumption and could cure all diseases.
- Level 2** **Answers which assume it is an advertisement for John St John and his cures (2–3)**
e.g. This cartoon was published to advertise John St John’s cures. It is trying to get people to buy them.
OR
Claims it was published because there were lots of quacks around at this time
- Level 3** **Answers that understand the cartoon was published to criticise John St John – not explained (4)**
- Level 4** **Answers that use the cartoon to explain how the cartoon is criticising John St John/trying to persuade people not to use him (5–6)**
e.g. This cartoon was published because it is trying to tell people what a waste of time quacks are. It does this by saying ‘come and be killed’ and by having the drawings of the skulls that represent death. This is saying if you go to this quack you will die.
- Level 5** **Level 4 answers that are placed in the context of the time – explains the problem of quack doctors at that time (7)**

- 5 Study Source G.**
Does this source provide reliable historical evidence?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (6 marks)
- Level 1** **Answers based on source type or date** **(1)**
e.g. No because it is a cartoon, yes because it is from the time.
- Level 2** **Answers which confuse utility with reliability** **(2)**
e.g. *Yes, it is reliable because it tells me what happened to people who took these pills.*
- Level 3** **Answers which attempt to evaluate the source by simplistic reference to quacks generally** **(3)**
e.g. *This source is reliable because quacks and their cures were no good and this is what this source is showing.*
OR
This source is unreliable because it is saying that the pills worked but the pills given out by quacks were usually useless.
- Level 4** **Answers that explains how the cartoon is biased against quacks or explains how the message is so silly as to be unreliable** **(4–5)**
e.g. *No, this cartoon is not reliable because it is against quacks. It says that taking the pills made the man rich and well-dressed. This is obviously nonsense and is making fun of quacks. This means it cannot be trusted.*
OR
This cartoon is saying that if you take these pills you will become rich and well-dressed. This is silly and makes the cartoon unreliable.
- Level 5** **Answers which use cross-reference or knowledge of quacks to explain how claims in the source are wrong** **(5)**
- Level 6** **Answers which use the source as evidence that people at the time were suspicious of quacks and this is why it is useful** **(6)**
e.g. *This source provides reliable evidence that people at the time did not take quacks very seriously. It is making fun of quacks by saying that if you take the quack pills you will become rich and prosperous. This is obviously silly but it is done to show how silly the claims made by quacks were. So the cartoon tells us that there people at the time criticising quacks.*

- 6 Study Sources H, I and J.**
Would the author of Source I or the author of Source J have agreed with the cartoon (Source H)?
Use the sources to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1 Generalised answers with no support from the sources (1)**
- Level 2 Answers which explain Source I and J but make no valid comparisons between I/J and H or misunderstand H (2–3)**
e.g. Source I is saying that doctors were much better than quacks. It says that doctors knew what they were doing, but quacks were ignorant and claimed that they would always be successful. Source J is criticising doctors. It is saying that doctors kill people.
- Level 3 Answers that explain the meaning of Source H but fail to make direct comparison with messages of I and J (4–5)**
e.g. Source H is saying that quacks and doctors are as bad as each other. It calls them all undertakers and talks about them as the images of death. So it is saying that quacks and doctors kill people. Source I tells us what is wrong with quacks. It says they are ignorant and they claims they will have total success – when of course they won't.
- Level 4 Compares the message of Source H with that of I and/or J (6–7)**
6 marks for comparing H with one, 7 marks for comparing with both
e.g. The author of Source J would have agreed with Source H. This is because they are both saying that quacks and doctors are as bad as each other. Source H calls them all undertakers and Source J says that doctors and quacks are enemies of good health. So they agree. The author of Source I would not have agreed with them because it says doctors are good – they are careful and cautious and it is only quacks that are dangerous.

- 7 Study all the sources.
Do these sources show that quacks were worse than doctors?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (10 marks)**

N.B. Sources must be referred to by letter or direct quote.

- | | | |
|----------------|--|---------------|
| Level 1 | Answers which do not use the sources | (1–2) |
| Level 2 | Answers which make reference to ‘the sources/some sources’ etc but have no direct source use | (3–4) |
| Level 3 | Answers which use sources to show quacks were worse than doctors OR that they were not worse than doctors | (5–7) |
| Level 4 | Both parts of Level 3 | (8–10) |

Bonus of up to 2 marks (1 per source) for any consideration of the reliability of a source at any level.

N.B. This does not have to be developed discussions of reliability.

SOURCE INVESTIGATION 7

WHY DID SO MANY PEOPLE OPPOSE VACCINATION?

1 Study Source A.

Why do you think Lady Mary Wortley Montague wrote this letter in 1717?

Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (5 marks)

Level 1 Focus on content of the source (1–2)

Answers at this level will focus on the content of the source and any purpose will be implied or form a minor part of the answer.

e.g. *The letter is describing how children were given a small amount of smallpox pus so they would catch smallpox slightly and then never get it again.*

Level 2 Focus on provenance of the source (3–4)

Answers at this level will focus on the provenance of the source in order to determine purpose.

e.g. *Lady Mary was writing from Turkey in the early eighteenth century. She lived there and knew how smallpox parties worked and so she described it to one of her friends. Such things did not happen in England.*

Level 3 Focus on the purpose of the source (5)

Answers at this level will combine Levels 1 and 2 and take this further in order to consider purpose.

e.g. Level 1 and Level 2 and additionally: *Lady Mary says that she doesn't know any doctors in England who would take up the idea of inoculation as it was carried out in Turkey. So she's really complaining that English doctors are too timid, or don't know as much as Turkish ones. Perhaps, too, she wants her friend to spread the idea.*

2 Study Sources A and B.
How similar are the methods described in Sources A and B?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)

Level 1 Focus on content (1–3)

Answers at this level will compare the content of the two sources to establish similarity/difference. Where own knowledge is used, it will probably be generalised and will provide support.

e.g. Source A describes smallpox parties where a woman comes and puts smallpox pus into children's veins. Source B is similar because it describes the same method of putting cowpox into people's veins.

Level 2 Focus on provenance (4–5)

Answers at this level will focus on the provenance of the sources and will use outside knowledge about inoculation and vaccination to establish similarity and/or difference.

e.g. Edward Jenner wrote Source B and he discovered vaccination. This is where you put some cowpox into a person and they get protected from smallpox. Lady Mary Wortley Montague is writing about inoculation which is where a person gets a small dose of the smallpox itself and this protects from the disease. So the sources are similar because they're about protecting from disease using the same method but different because they're using different pus.

Level 3 Balanced argument focusing on both content and inference (6–7)

Answers at this level will combine the Level 1 and 2 responses to create a balanced answer.

- 3 Study Sources C and D.**
Would James Woodforde and the Suttons have reacted to Jenner's vaccination in the same way?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (6 marks)
- Level 1 Generalised answers (1)**
 Answers at this level will consider the sources in generalised terms only.
e.g. They're both about inoculation so they wouldn't have been bothered with vaccination.
- Level 2 Focus on the content of the sources (2–3)**
 Answers at this level will use the content of the sources to address the question. Where own knowledge is used, it will be limited.
e.g. Smallpox is spreading fast in James Woodforde's parish so they'd probably be pleased to have some vaccination.
- Level 3 Focusing on inference(s) from the sources (4–5)**
 Answers at this level will make inferences from the sources in order to address and will be supported by own knowledge
e.g. It's not very likely the Suttons would be pleased to hear about Jenner's vaccination because they were making a great deal of money from inoculation and their profits would disappear over night if people suddenly turned to vaccination. On the other hand, James Woodforde might welcome vaccination, especially if it was free or at least cheaper than inoculation. He says it's a shame not all the poor were inoculated.
- Level 4 Balanced answers using content and inferences (6)**
 Answers at this level will combine Levels 2 and 3 with own knowledge to reach a balanced, supported judgement.

4 Study Sources E and F.
Does Source F prove that the fears described in Source E were overcome?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)

Level 1 Agreement/disagreement focusing on content (1–2)

Answers at this level will use the content of the sources to agree/disagree with the proposition. Where own knowledge is used, it will be generalised and provide support.

e.g. No, not really. Source E tells about people being scared because the vaccinations didn't always work. Source F says they everyone in a village was vaccinated and the smallpox stopped spreading. That could just have been good luck.

Level 2 Agreement/disagreement focusing on provenance (3)

Answers at this level will focus on the content of the sources to agree/disagree with the proposition.

e.g. Both the sources come from secondary books about Jenner. It all depends on where the authors got their information and how careful they were about checking. Source F could have got it wrong: it only says the smallpox didn't spread. It doesn't say whether people were afraid or even whether anyone got smallpox.

Level 3 Agreement/disagreement focusing on making inferences from the sources (4–5)

Answers at this level will focus on making inferences from the content of the sources to agree/disagree with the proposition.

e.g. People were very scared because they didn't know why vaccination worked and so they thought they had caught smallpox itself when they came out in boils and bumps. Source F doesn't prove that people in general weren't still scared. It just shows they had to put up with it when their bosses said they had to be vaccinated.

Level 4 Balanced argument (6–7)

Answers at this level will combine Levels 2 and 3 in order to reach a balanced judgement supported by own knowledge.

N.B. Answers that assert that two sources by themselves prove nothing should be marked at Level 1 UNLESS there is a good supporting contextual argument, in which case Level 3 would be appropriate.

- 5 Study Source G.**
Why was this cartoon published in 1802?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1 Generalised answers focusing on content (1–2)**
Answers at this level will extract information from the source with no focus on the question.
e.g. The source shows people with cows and things coming out of their arms because they have been vaccinated with Jenner’s cowpox.
- Level 2 Focus on provenance of source (3–4)**
Answers at this level will focus on the provenance of the source. There may be some cross-referencing to Source E and/or Source F.
- Level 3 Focus on purpose of source (5–6)**
Answers at this level will begin to ask why the source was drawn – and why drawn in 1802.
e.g. The cartoon was drawn in 1802 to poke fun at the people who were scared of vaccination. Cows had never sprouted out of anyone’s arms. This was one of the rumours going round and many people believed then. So the cartoon was published to poke fun and to support vaccination.
- Level 4 Balanced answers focusing on provenance and purpose (7)**
Answers at this level will combine elements of Levels 2 and 3 to address ‘why’ and ‘why then’.

6 Study Source H.
Is it more surprising that people were opposing vaccination in 1899 than in 1799?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (8 marks)

Level 1 Generalised answers (1–2)

Answers at this level will either express surprise/no surprise in general terms not specifically tied to the source or specific contextual knowledge.

e.g. *Yes, it is surprising because vaccination had been around for a long time and people should have got used to it.*

Level 2 Focus on content of the source (3–4)

Answers at this level will focus on the content of the source to explain the surprise/lack of surprise. Knowledge will be specific.

e.g. *The envelope shows a mother holding her baby. On one side is a policeman holding a piece of paper saying Vaccination Act and on the other there is a skeleton. Skeletons usually mean death. The policeman is probably trying to make the mother have her child vaccinated as a result of the 1871 Vaccination Act and the poor mother is thinking that her baby might die. So, no, I'm not surprised.*

Level 3 Focus on provenance of the source (5–6)

Answers at this level will focus on the provenance of the source to explain their surprise/lack of surprise. Knowledge will be accurate and specific.

e.g. *No, I'm not surprised. There was a smallpox epidemic in 1870–3 and as a result the government passed a Vaccination Act in 1871. By making vaccination compulsory the government generated a lot of opposition. The Anti-Vaccination Society, which was part of this opposition, produced this envelope to try to persuade people in a very graphic way not to have their children vaccinated. So opposition was more organised in 1899 than it had been 100 years earlier.*

Level 4 Focus on content and provenance (7–8)

Answers at this level will combine Levels 2 and 3 in a balanced answer to express surprise/lack of surprise.

7 Study all the sources.
‘People opposed vaccination because they thought inoculation was safer.’
How far do the sources support this view?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (10 marks)

Level 1 Generalised answers: no source use (1–2)
Answers at this level will be reasonably accurate but will make no reference, either implicit or explicit, to the given sources.

Level 2 Generalised source use (3–4)
Answers at this level will demonstrate that the given sources have been used, but no direct reference to specific sources will appear. These answers are characterised by phrases such as ‘The sources tell us...’ ‘I know from the sources that...’.

Level 3 Answers that use sources to agree OR disagree with the statement (5–7)

Level 4 Answers that use the sources to agree AND disagree with the statement (8–10)

Bonus of up to 2 marks (1 per source) for any consideration of the reliability of a source at any level.

N.B. This does not have to be developed discussions of reliability.

SOURCE INVESTIGATION 8

THE BODY-SNATCHERS

1 Study Source A.

What did the artist of Source A think about dissection?

Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)

- Level 1** Any answers based on the misunderstanding that the source shows an operation, or torture (1)
- Level 2** **Description of the surface details of the source** (2–3)
e.g. *The artist has drawn a body being dissected. It shows people gathered around cutting the body to pieces. It is not a very nice scene. There is a dog eating the innards of the body.*
- Level 2** **Unsupported but valid inferences** (4)
e.g. *The artist did not approve of dissection. The artist thought dissection was a terrible thing to happen to you. The artist thought dissection was degrading.*
- Level 3** **Inferences supported by details in the source OR by knowledge** (5–6)
e.g. *The artist thinks that dissections are degrading. This is why he has shown a dog eating the corpse's heart and one of the doctors gouging out the eye of the corpse. He has drawn it this way to show how awful it would be to be dissected.*
- Level 4** **Inferences supported by details in the source AND by knowledge** (7)

- 2 Study Source B.**
Source B was written hundreds of years after Vesalius started to dissect bodies. Are you surprised by the attitude towards dissection shown in this source?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (9 marks)
- Level 1** **Unsupported assertions** **(1)**
- Level 2** **Answers based on everyday empathy – supported from Source B (2–3)**
 e.g. *No, I am not surprised. It is a horrible thing to have your body cut up into little pieces. I am not surprised it says they shudder at the idea of their wife’s body being cut up in front of hundreds of people.*
- Level 3** **Answers based on cross-reference to Source A OR to knowledge to explain surprise or lack of surprise** **(4–7)**
 e.g. *Yes, I am very surprised. Vesalius starting dissecting bodies in the 1500s. You would have thought people would have got used to the idea. The dissecting of bodies was very important. It helped Vesalius to find out a lot more about the structure of the body. He published all this in his book ‘The Fabric of the Human Body’. This put the mistakes of Galen right and helped many doctors. Dissections were also very important for the training of new doctors. So I am surprised that people were still against dissections.*
- Level 4** **Answers based on cross-reference to Source A OR to knowledge to explain reasons for being both surprised and not surprised** **(8–9)**

- 3 Study Sources C and D.**
How far do these two sources agree about body-snatchers?
Use the sources to explain your answer. (8 marks)
- Level 1 Unsupported answers (1)**
e.g. These sources do agree about body-snatchers. They say exactly the same things about them.
- Level 2 Describes one or both sources but no explicit comparison (2)**
- Level 3 Valid but unsupported impressions of body-snatchers (3)**
e.g. They do agree, they both make out the body-snatchers to be horrible.
- Level 4 Answers based on information that is in one source but not in the other (3–4)**
e.g. the exact time, before the police started their rounds, the time it took – all in C. In D – what the men looked like, how many of them there were, the fact that they were drinking.
- Level 5 Compares sources for similarities OR differences in information about body-snatchers (4–6)**
- Level 6 Compares sources for similarities AND for differences of surface detail (7)**
 At this level allow information that is in one source and not in the other as a difference.
- Level 7 Compares the impression of the body-snatchers given by the two sources – support from sources (8)**
e.g. The sources give different impressions of the body-snatchers. Source D shows them to be horrible. It shows them as really ugly and frightening figures. They have been drawn to look nasty and the fact they are drinking makes them look worse. But Source C shows them to be clever and to have planned the whole thing very carefully. This is shown by the fact that they choose their time carefully – between when the watch and the police come round. They are careful not to make much noise by using wooden spades and using sacking. This is a very different impression from the stupid- looking men in Source D.

- 4 Study Source E.**
What does this source tell you about body-snatchers?
Use the source to explain your answer. (8 marks)
- Level 1** **Simply repeats information in source** **(1–2)**
- Level 2** **Makes inference(s) about them as a group** **(3–4)**
e.g. They had jobs connected to dead bodies – hospitals, grave digging;
they were mostly criminals; they were failures.
- Level 3** **Supports one valid inference about them as a group** **(5–6)**
e.g. *It tells me why they got into body-snatching. Nearly all of them
had jobs that would have brought them into contact with corpses. One
was a porter in a dissecting room, while others were grave-diggers or
worked in hospitals. This would have given them the opportunity to
snatch bodies.*
- Level 4** **Supports two valid inferences about them as a group** **(7–8)**

- 5 Study Sources F and G.**
Do you think Burke was lying in Source F?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (8 marks)
- Level 1 Unsupported assertions (1)**
- Level 2 Answers based on the provenance of the sources (2–3)**
 e.g. Burke would lie because he was trying to get himself off; Burke was there so he would know; you cannot trust newspapers.
- Level 3 Answers based on the unlikely nature of Burke’s story or on the fact that the newspaper gets the name of the woman wrong (4–6)**
 e.g. *I think Burke was lying because his story is a bit odd. The chances of someone giving him a box with a dead body in it to leave in his house are pretty small. If he was innocent why didn’t he go and tell the police about the body. Who would leave it under their bed? And why did he think the body in the Police Office was the one under his bed – when it was still under his bed? So how could it be in the Police Office?*
OR
Answers based on the differences in detail of the stories of the two sources
- Level 4 Answers that combine both types of Level 3 OR use Burke’s possible motive with one type of Level 3 (7–8)**

- 6 Study Sources H and I.**
Would the author of Source I have approved of the events in Source H?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (10 marks)
- Level 1** **Answers based on everyday empathy** **(1)**
 e.g. What was happening in Source H was so horrible that nobody would approve.
- Level 2** **Answers based on the fact that he was a doctor – no knowledge about dissections demonstrated** **(2–3)**
 e.g. *I think he would not have liked what was happening in Source H because he was a doctor and he would not like such horrible things like those in Source H.*
- Level 3** **Claims he would have disapproved because of similarities in the sources** **(4–6)**
 e.g. *I think he would not have approved of what was happening in Source H. They were fighting over the men who were arrested and attacked them. In Source I the surgeon seems to disapprove of the fighting over the body between the relatives and the students. It's a similar kind of event to that in Source H. So if he didn't approve of what was happening in Source I he would not have approved of what was happening in Source H.*
- Level 4** **Claims he would have disapproved because Source I tells us he thought dissections were important** **(7–8)**
- Level 5** **Uses knowledge of the role/importance of dissections to explain that the surgeon might/might not have approved** **(9–10)**

SOURCE INVESTIGATION 9

HOW IMPORTANT WAS JOHN SNOW IN THE FIGHT AGAINST CHOLERA?

1 Study Sources A and B.

Were these two sources produced for the same reason?

Use the details of the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.

(6 marks)

Level 1 Focus on the content of the sources (1–2)

Answers at this level will use the content of the sources to decide whether or not they have been produced for the same reason.

e.g. *Yes, they were produced for the same reason because Source B is complaining about poor conditions and Source A is showing you what they were* (plus extracts from the sources).

Level 2 Focus on the provenance of the sources (3–4)

Answers will use the provenance of the sources to decide whether or not they have been produced for the same reason.

e.g. *Source B is a letter to a newspaper published in 1849 and Source A is a cartoon published three years later. Because both sources were published those who wrote/drew them must have wanted to bring poor living conditions to the attention of the sorts of people who read Punch and The Times and who could change things. So, yes, they were both produced for the same reason: to draw people's attention to rotten living conditions in the hope that something would be done about it.*

Level 3 Balanced answer (4–6)

Answers at this level will combine elements of Levels 1 and 2 to produce a balanced answer about whether or not the two sources were produced for the same reason.

- 2 Study Source C.**
‘John Snow knew why so many people living in Soho caught cholera.’
Do you agree with this statement?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (6 marks)
- Level 1 Agreement/disagreement with proposition using provenance (1–2)**
Answers at this level will use the provenance of the sources to agree/disagree with the proposition. Where own knowledge is used it will probably be generalised and will provide support.
e.g. John Snow was a doctor and he wouldn't have written a report called 'The Causes of Cholera' if he hadn't known what he was talking about. So, yes, he did know what caused cholera.
- Level 2 Agreement/disagreement with proposition using content (3–4)**
Answers at this level will use the content of the sources to agree/disagree with the proposition. Where own knowledge is used, it will provide support.
e.g. No, not really. John Snow is simply writing about who caught cholera and which pump they had been drinking from. He only says that human waste might be amongst the impurities found in the water. He doesn't say that it was and he doesn't say that the water from the Broad Street pump caused cholera. We are left to draw our own conclusions. But from my own knowledge I know that people did catch cholera from infected water and the Broad Street pump was the source of the outbreak. So John Snow's best guess was right.
- Level 3 Balanced argument focusing on proposition in question (5–6)**
Answers at this level will combine elements of Levels 1 and 2 to create a balanced response based on both content and provenance. Answers at this level will show an understanding of the fact that John Snow thought he knew – and in fact he did ‘know’ – but couldn't prove it.

- 3 Study Sources C and D.**
Which of these sources is the more useful to a historian studying the cholera outbreak in 1854?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1 Focus on type of source (1–2)**
 Answers at this level will focus on the type of source and will assert utility on the basis of source type.
e.g. Source B is just a map and can't give a historian the detailed information that a written source can.
- Level 2 Focus on the content of the sources (3–4)**
 Answers at this level will consider the content of the sources and will maintain that a source is more, or less, useful because of what it tells us.
e.g. Source C is more useful because it tells us which people actually took water from the pump in Broad Street and how many deaths occurred. It also tells us that fewer deaths happened to people taking water from other pumps (plus, possibly, quotes and/or paraphrases from source).
- Level 3 Focus on provenance of the sources (5–6)**
 Answers at this level focus on the provenance of the sources and will probably maintain that a source is useful because it is reliable.
e.g. John Snow wrote Source C and drew the lines showing deaths on Source D, so would be in a position to know who died where. So both sources would be reliable sources of evidence for a historian.
- Level 4 Balanced answers (7)**
 Answers at this level combine the previous three levels to create a balanced response, making/not making a choice with support from own knowledge.

- 4 Study Source E.**
Why did most people at the time agree with the ideas in Source E rather than with Snow's ideas?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1 Generalised answers (1–2)**
Answers at this level will give a reason that could be accurate but that lack specific referencing.
e.g. Because the old ideas had been around for a long time and people didn't like change.
- Level 2 Focus on content (3–4)**
Answers at this level will use the content of the source to determine why people preferred the miasma theory to Snow's. Own knowledge will be accurate and will be used in support.
e.g. Because the report itself is very clear that on the evidence the geographical distribution of cholera in London belongs more to the air than to the water. People thought that John Snow was coming up with one more theory. The miasma theory of disease was very popular at the time. Most people believed that disease was spread through bad air and so they would go along with the report rather than something new.
- Level 3 Focus on provenance (5–6)**
Answers at this level will focus on the provenance of the source to determine why people were likely to prefer the miasma theory to Snow's. Knowledge will be accurate and used in support.
e.g. Because Source E is part of an official report from a committee that had conducted a scientific enquiry into the recent cholera outbreak. People tend to believe official reports because they are authoritative. In any case, the miasma theory of disease was very popular at the time. Most people believed that disease was spread through bad air and so they would go along with the report rather than something new.
- Level 4 Focus on contextualising source (7)**
Answers at this level will combine Levels 2 and 3 with accurate knowledge.

5 Study Source F.
Are you surprised that this cartoon was published in 1866?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)

Level 1 Generalised answers (1–2)

Answers at this level will provide generalised, non-specific responses
e.g. *No, I'm not surprised because people were very worried about dying and some people though death had something to do with bad water.*

Level 2 Focus on content of source (3–4)

Answers at this level will consider the content of the source in order to determine surprise/no surprise. Own knowledge will be accurate and will support.
e.g. *Yes, I am surprised. The cartoon shows men, women and children drinking water from a water pump, with death working the handle of the pump. So clearly, in the artist's mind, there is a link between death and drinking water. But John Snow's ideas about cholera being carried in the water weren't officially accepted until later.*

Level 3 Focus on provenance of source (5–6)

Answers at this level will use the provenance of the source in order to determine surprise/no surprise. Own knowledge will be accurate and will support.
e.g. *No, I'm not really surprised. The cartoon is called 'Death's Dispensary' showing death dispensing poor quality water to the poor. It was published in 1866 when most middle-class people had piped water in their houses. We know that the companies that owned the water pumps didn't always have them turned on all the time and people often had to queue for hours for a bucketful. So they didn't keep themselves clean and used the same dirty water over and over again. So water pumps could well be thought of as being death's dispensary. The artist is making this point and asking for clean water for all.*

Level 4 Focus on content and provenance (7)

Answers at this level will combine Levels 2 and 3 in order to explain whether or not they are surprised by the cartoon. Own knowledge will be comprehensive and will support the argument in the answer.

6 Study Sources G and H.
Does Source G prove that the work of Koch was not important?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)

Level 1 Agreement/disagreement with proposition focusing on provenance (1–2)

Answers at this level will focus on the provenance of the sources to agree/ disagree with the proposition. Where own knowledge is used, it will be selective and focused.

e.g. This source is part of the report written by John Simon, the Chief Medical Officer of Health so it has authority. Because he is sure that cholera was carried in the water, and the government backed him because they let the official report be published, there was no need for the work of Koch.

Level 2 Agreement/disagreement with proposition focusing on content (3–4)

Answers at this level will use the content of the source to agree/disagree with the proposition. Where own knowledge is used, it will be generalised and provide support.

e.g. No, it doesn't, because the source says that before 1858 experiments established as 'almost certain' that John Snow's guess about cholera being in the water was correct. So we still needed the experiments of Koch to prove finally and absolutely that cholera was in the drinking water.

Level 3 Balanced answer focusing on both content and provenance (5–7)

Answers at this level will combine the Level 1 and 2 responses to create a balanced answer. Mark at the top of the level answers that additionally focus on 'prove' in this context.

N.B. Answers that assert that two sources by themselves prove nothing should be marked at Level 1 UNLESS there is good supporting, contextual argument, in which case Level 3 would be appropriate.

7 Study all the sources.
‘The work of John Snow was the most important development in the fight against cholera.’ How far do the sources support this view?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (10 marks)

Level 1 Generalised answers: no source use (1–2)
Answers at this level will be reasonably accurate but will make no reference, either implicit or explicit, to the given sources.

Level 2 Generalised source use (3–4)
Answers at this level will demonstrate that the given sources have been used, but no direct reference to specific sources will appear. These answers are characterised by phrases such as ‘The sources tell us...’; ‘I know from the sources that...’.

Level 3 Answers that use the sources to support OR to disagree with this view (5–7)

Level 4 Answers that use the sources to support AND to disagree with this view (8–10)

Bonus of up to 2 marks (1 per source) for any consideration of the reliability of a source at any level.

N.B. This does not have to be developed discussions of reliability.

SOURCE INVESTIGATION 10

WHY DID SOME PEOPLE OPPOSE PUBLIC HEALTH REFORMS?

1 Study Sources A and B.

Does Source A make what the people are doing in Source B surprising?

Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (8 marks)

- Level 1** **Claims it does not because cannot see any connection between the sources** (1)
- Level 2** **Answers based on Source B – everyday empathy** (2)
e.g. *No, what they are doing in Source B is not surprising. If the person has died of cholera they would want to wash their clothes to stop it spreading.*
- Level 3** **Answers based on Source B – supported by knowledge** (3–5)
e.g. *I am not surprised by what they are doing in Source B because they did not know that cholera was spread by water and so by washing the clothes they will be spreading the disease to other people who use the water. They did not know this so I am not surprised they are washing the clothes.*
- Level 4** **Uses Source A to express surprise about Source C** (6–7)
e.g. *Yes. In Source A it shows that they know that dirty water is not good for you. It shows lots of nasty creatures swimming around in it. This suggests that they know that water spreads disease but in Source B they are washing the clothes in water before they are used by someone – this will spread disease. So Source A does make me surprised by what they are doing in Source B.*
- Level 5** **Uses knowledge to explain why Source A should not lead to surprise about Source B** (8)
e.g. *No, Source A does not make me surprised. Although Source A shows that they have some idea that dirty water is unhealthy they did not know that germs cause disease. This is why they are still washing the clothes in water in Source B. They did not realise that cholera was spread by germs in the water.*

- 2 Study Source C.**
Why were these cigars so popular at this time?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1** **Everyday empathy** (1)
e.g. They were popular because people like smoking cigars. They had such terrible lives that the cigars gave them a little pleasure.
- Level 2** **Answers based on the information in the source** (2–3)
e.g. They were popular because they prevented people from catching cholera.
- Level 3** **Answers set in the context of 1831 (outbreak of cholera) OR based on their lack of knowledge of what causes disease** (4–5)
e.g. These cigars were popular at that time because they were meant to prevent cholera and cholera was very bad in 1831 with lots of people dying. So the cigars would be popular.
- Level 4** **Combines both types of Level 3** (6–7)

- 3 Study Sources D and E.**
Does Source D show that John Snow's investigations were not important?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (8 marks)
- Level 1 Unsupported assertions (1)**
e.g. No, of course it doesn't. John Snow's work was very important and there would have been no progress without him.
- Level 2 Ignores sources and explains John Snow's importance (2)**
- Level 3 Answers based on Source E (3-4)**
e.g. No, it doesn't. Source E shows why Snow's work was important. It shows that he was able to show that cholera was spread by water and that it was the water from one water company that was responsible. This led to clean water being provided for people so that cholera was not spread.
- Level 4 Answers based on the fact that what Snow shows in Source E was already known in Source D – so he is not important (5-6)**
e.g. Source D shows that the poor state of the water from Southwark Water Company was already known about so Snow did not find out anything new.
- Level 5 Explains how Snow in Source E understood more than was understood in Source D (7-8)**
e.g. No, Source D does not show that John Snow's investigations were not important. In Source D they had a suspicion that dirty water was not good for you. They are complaining that the water was polluted with human waste. However, a lot of people did not accept that diseases like cholera were spread by water and so nothing was done about the state of water. Snow provided proof that cholera was linked to the water people were drinking and so it must be spread by water. This convinced people and led to clean water being provided.

- 4 Study Sources F, G and H.**
Would the cartoonist (Source F) have agreed with Source G or Source H?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (8 marks)
- Level 1 Unsupported assertions (1)**
e.g. I think the cartoonist would have agreed with Source G. He would not have liked Source H at all.
- Level 2 Answers that demonstrate understanding of Source F but fail to make valid comparison with G or H (2–3)**
e.g. The cartoonist is criticising the filthy water and the fact that people were not willing to pay more rates to get the state of the water improved. This is why he says ‘Your money or your life’ – if they don’t pay more rates they will die from disease. He would have liked Source G but not Source H.
- Level 3 Answers that generally claim cartoonist will agree with G because it is trying to get things cleaned up (4)**
- Level 4 Answers that explain why cartoonist would have agreed with Source G, because both show a belief in bad air as the cause of disease or would not have agreed because he though dirty water spread disease while G believes it is bad air (5–6)**
e.g. The cartoonist would have agreed with Source G because it talks about rotting animals and vegetables spreading disease through bad air. It is saying that there should be a big clean-up to prevent disease spreading. The cartoonist in his cartoon shows the same thing – dead animals floating in the water and creating bad air. You can tell he is against this because of the title ‘The Silent Highwayman’.
OR
Answers that explain why the cartoonist would have disagreed with the saving of money or the pumping of sewerage into the water in H.
- Level 5 Both types of Level 4 – covering Sources G and H (7–8)**

- 5 Study Source I.**
Is Source I a joke, or is the author serious?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1 Unsupported assertions (1)**
e.g. I think this is a joke, it doesn't make sense and is stupid.
- Level 2 Uses content of source to explain why it is a joke (2–3)**
e.g. This must be a joke. He says that people hated being clean and that he would rather have cholera than be clean. This is either stupid or it is a joke.
- Level 3 States that he is opposing public health reform so understands it is not a joke but knowledge not used to explain answer (4)**
- Level 4 Uses knowledge to explain why it is not a joke (5–6)**
e.g. This is not a joke. The author of the letter is supporting the idea of laissez-faire. This was the idea that people should look after themselves and keep themselves clean and local councils and governments should not interfere. The writer is against councils having the power to charge rates to pay for the cleaning up of towns.
- Level 5 As for Level 4 but also uses knowledge of Chadwick and his reforms to explain the answer (7)**

- 6 Study all the sources.**
‘There was opposition to public health reforms because people did not understand that filthy conditions and dirty water helped spread disease.’
How far do the sources support this statement?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (12 marks)

N.B. Sources must be referred to by letter or direct quote.

- | | | |
|----------------|---|---------------|
| Level 1 | Answers which do not use the sources | (1–3) |
| Level 2 | Answers which make reference to ‘the sources/some sources’ etc but have no direct source use | (4–5) |
| Level 3 | Answers which use sources to show how sources do or do not support the statement | (6–7) |
| Level 4 | Both parts of Level 3 | (8–10) |

Bonus of up to two marks (1 per source) for any consideration of the reliability of a source at any level.

N.B. This does not have to be developed discussions of reliability.

SOURCE INVESTIGATION 11

WHO WAS THE REAL 'ANGEL OF THE CRIMEA'?

1 Study Sources A and B.

How far did Florence Nightingale and Mary Seacole react in similar ways when they first got to the Crimea?

Use the sources to explain your answer.

(7 marks)

- Level 1 Unsupported assertions (1)**
e.g. They went about things in a completely different way when they got to the Crimea.
- Level 2 Describes one or two of the sources but not explicit comparison (2)**
- Level 3 Valid but unsupported inferences about them (3–4)**
e.g. Mary Seacole seems prepared to get her hands dirty but Florence is more of an organiser.
- Level 4 Answers based on information that is one source but not in the other (3–4)**
e.g. Florence spent her time organising things like socks, shirts, forks and provisions for the men. Mary Seacole does not say anything about kind of thing.
- Level 5 Compares surface details of what they did (4–5)**
- Level 6 Compares inferences about both – inferences are supported by detail from the sources (6–7)**
e.g. Mary Seacole seems much more willing to actually nurse the men while Florence is much more of an organiser. She arranges for things like soap and knives and forks and food but she does not actually nurse the men or look after their wounds. Mary is different. She holds the soldiers hands and actually looks after them like a nurse.

- 2 Study Sources B and C.**
Why do you think these two sources differ in their descriptions of conditions in the hospital at Scutari?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (8 marks)
- Level 1 Unsupported assertions (1–2)**
 e.g. *I think they differ because they are written by different people with different views.*
- Level 2 Describes the differences rather than explaining them (2–3)**
- Level 3 Explains that they describe the hospital at different times – so they will be different (4)**
 e.g. *These descriptions differ because Source C is describing the hospital before Florence arrived. Source B describes the hospital a month later. The hospital could have changed over this period.*
- Level 4 Explains the motives of Nightingale or of Hall (5–6)**
 e.g. *These descriptions differ because Dr John Hall was in charge of the hospitals in the Crimea. In Source C he is writing to his boss. He will not want him to know how awful the conditions in the hospital are because he will get sacked. This is why he says that everything is satisfactory when as Source B shows the hospital was in a terrible state.*
- Level 5 Explains the motives of both Nightingale and Hall (7)**
- Level 6 Explains these are different perceptions (8)**
 These answers will explain that the sources differ because Nightingale and Hall have different perceptions/expectations.
 e.g. *Hall did not want soldiers to be pampered so he would think that these conditions were satisfactory.*

- 3 Study Sources D and E.**
Must one of these sources be wrong?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1 Unsupported assertions (1)**
e.g. *Yes, these sources disagree so one must be wrong.*
- Level 2 Explains how they differ and uses this as the reason why one must be wrong (2–3)**
e.g. *Yes, one of these sources must be wrong because they say different things about Florence Nightingale. Source D makes it sound as if she hardly let her nurses do anything at all. It says they were not allowed to come into close contact with the patients. She seems to be most worried about the men sexually attacking the nurses. On the other hand Source E says she let the nurses look after the patients properly.*
- Level 3 Cross-references to other sources or to knowledge to explain how either D or E is right/wrong (4–5)**
- Level 4 Cross-references to other sources or to knowledge to explain how both D and E are right/wrong (5–6)**
e.g. *These sources are so different that one must be wrong. Source D says that Florence did not let the nurses do anything but Source E says she let them bandage wounds and clean the wards. This is supported by Source B which says she cleaned the wards and looked after the soldiers. So I think that Source E is right and Source D is wrong.*
- Level 5 Cross-references to other sources or to knowledge to explain that these are different interpretations and neither is necessarily wrong (7)**

- 4 Study Sources F and G.**
Do you trust the impressions these two pictures are trying to make?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (8 marks)
- Level 1 Unsupported assertions (1)**
- Level 2 Surface description of the pictures (2)**
e.g. Source F is good because it shows Florence Nightingale looking after a soldier. Source G shows the same kind of thing. Mary Seacole is also looking after soldiers.
- Level 3 Answers based on simple use of provenance (2–3)**
e.g. I do not trust these sources because Source G is from a magazine and Source F is trying to make her look like ‘the lady with the lamp’.
OR
Explains impressions the pictures give
- Level 4 Both types of Level 3 (4–5)**
- Level 5 Cross-references to other sources or to knowledge to evaluate one picture (6–7)**
e.g. I do trust Source G because it makes Mary Seacole look as if she is kind and is looking after the wounded soldiers. This is supported by Source A where she is doing the same thing. It says she had an impulse to look after the poor soldiers.
- Level 6 Cross-references to other sources or to knowledge to evaluate both pictures (8)**

5 Study Sources H and I.
Are you surprised by what Florence Nightingale has written in Source I?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (8 marks)

Level 1 Unsupported assertions (1)
e.g. Yes, I am surprised that Nightingale has written this because Mary Seacole did not encourage drunkenness.

Level 2 Answers based on everyday empathy (2)
e.g. Yes, I am very surprised. Mary wanted a reference for a job and you would have thought that Florence would give her one. It was not very nice of Florence to write this.

Level 3 Answers based on comparing details in I with details in H (3)

Level 4 Surprised or not surprised because of other sources (not H) or knowledge (4–5)
These answers can refer to either Seacole or Nightingale.

Level 5 Surprised and not surprised because of other sources (not H) or knowledge (6–7)
These answers can refer to either Seacole or Nightingale.

Level 6 Not surprised because Nightingale was a different kind of nurse and so would not appreciate what Seacole did (8)
e.g. I am not surprised that Florence Nightingale was not very nice about Mary Seacole. She probably did not approve of Mary. Florence was more interested in organising hospitals and making sure all the supplies that were needed were ordered. She was an administrator. Mary was much more of a hands-on nurse who simply looked after the men when they ill. Florence did not think that nurses should go near the men or actually look after them. This is why she did not think much of Mary and why she wrote her a bad reference.

OR

Answers based on the idea that Nightingale was jealous of Seacole, considers Nightingale’s purpose – refers and uses the fact that she wanted the letter burned

- 6 Study all the sources.
‘Mary Seacole and not Florence Nightingale deserves to be called “The Angel of the Crimea”.’
How far do the sources convince you that this statement is right?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (12 marks)**

N.B. Sources must be referred to by letter or direct quote.

- | | | |
|----------------|---|---------------|
| Level 1 | Answers which do not use the sources | (1–3) |
| Level 2 | Answers which make reference to ‘the sources/some sources’ etc but have no direct source use | (4–5) |
| Level 3 | Answers which use sources to show how sources do OR do not support the statement | (6–7) |
| Level 4 | Both parts of Level 3 | (8–10) |

Bonus of up to 2 marks (1 per source) for any consideration of the reliability of a source at any level.

N.B. This does not have to be developed discussions of reliability.

SOURCE INVESTIGATION 12

DID PATIENTS IMMEDIATELY BENEFIT FROM SIMPSON'S WORK ON ANAESTHETICS?

- 1 Study Source A.**
Does this source provide reliable evidence that eighteenth-century surgeons were clumsy and cruel?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (6 marks)
- Level 1** **Unsupported assertions** (1)
e.g. *Yes, this picture certainly shows that they were horrible and cruel.*
- Level 2** **Describes the drawing without answering the question** (2)
These answers will describe what is happening in the drawing but fail to use this as evidence that surgeons were/were not clumsy and cruel.
e.g. *This drawing shows the doctors cutting of someone's leg. The patient is screaming his head off and the doctors don't seem to be bothered about this.*
- Level 3** **Uses details in the drawing to support that they were clumsy and**
cruel (3–4)
- Level 4** **Uses details in the drawing to explain that the artist was anti-**
surgeon and so cannot be trusted (5)
e.g. *I do not think that this drawing provides reliable evidence that surgeons were clumsy and cruel. This is because the artist has made the surgeons look like monsters. They look ugly and horrible. They do not look as if they care about the patient and all the pain they are causing at all. This shows that the artist was biased against surgeons. He is trying to make other people against them. This means that his picture is not reliable evidence because it is an exaggeration.*
- Level 5** **Combines Levels 3 and 4** (6)
OR
Uses contextual knowledge or other sources to show drawing is accurate/not accurate

- 2 Study Source B.**
Why do you think Simpson made this speech in 1847?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (6 marks)
- Level 1 Unsupported assertions (1)**
e.g. He made this speech to tell everyone what was going on and to tell them that chloroform was great.
- Level 2 To give information – no other purpose (2)**
 Must be supported from Source B.
e.g. Simpson gave this speech to tell everyone that chloroform would help in operations a lot. He says that there will be no more pain or agonies in operations.
- Level 3 Undeveloped statement that chloroform had just been discovered (3)**
- Level 4 Purpose – to convince people that anaesthetics were beneficial and should be used – explained (4)**
e.g. Simpson made this speech to tell people that using anaesthetics like chloroform will end pain in operations. He is saying this because he wants to persuade surgeons to start using chloroform in their operations. This is why he said this at a meeting of medical people.
- Level 5 Puts his purpose in context – explains: chloroform just discovered, OR there was a lot of opposition to anaesthetics, OR the other advantages of anaesthetics (5)**
e.g. Simpson was making this speech because he has just discovered chloroform was a good anaesthetic. He discovered this in 1847, the year of the speech. He is trying to persuade people that chloroform should be used in operations because it gets rid of pain.
- Level 6 Two points from Level 5 (6)**

- 3 Study Sources C and D.**
How far does Source C support the arguments in Source D?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1 Unsupported assertions (1)**
e.g. Yes, Source C does agree with Source D. They both show that chloroform was wrong.
- Level 2 Supported answers based on general opposition (2–3)**
 These answers match the opposition to anaesthetics in D with what is described in C. Answers must refer to details in the sources.
e.g. Yes, Source C does support the arguments in Source D. They are both saying that anaesthetics are wrong. In Source C chloroform kills the patient and in D it says that it is against nature to use anaesthetics.
- Level 3 Answers that concentrate on the fact that Source C is about chloroform but D is about anaesthetics in general – so might not be against chloroform (4)**
OR
Source C is about an operation for removing a toenail but D is about childbirth
- Level 4 Answers that explain the differences between the criticisms in D with the problem described in C or explain that the doctor in C is not against chloroform whereas the people in D are (5–6)**
e.g. I do not think that Source C supports the criticisms in Source D because Source C just describes a mistake being made – probably too much chloroform being given. Source D is different because it says that using anaesthetics is actually wrong. It says that God will be against it. The person in Source C is not actually against chloroform being used.
- Level 5 Level 4 plus explains that C does still raise doubts about chloroform (7)**

- 4 Study Sources E and F.**
Are you surprised by Dr Hall's attitude towards chloroform?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1 Unsupported assertions (1)**
e.g. *Yes, I am surprised. You would think he would be pleased there was something to kill the pain.*
- Level 2 Explains surprise because of Source E (2–3)**
OR
Uses content of Source F to explain why not surprised
e.g. *No, I am not surprised that Dr Hall is against using chloroform. This is because he says that it will kill the soldiers and he obviously thinks that the soldiers should be brave enough to take the pain. He seems to think that it is cowardly to use chloroform.*
- Level 3 Both types of Level 2 (4–5)**
- Level 4 Knowledge of the period or other sources used (not E) to explain surprised/not surprised (6–7)**
e.g. *No, I am not surprised that Dr Hall was against chloroform being used. He was in charge of the army in the Crimea where the soldiers were not looked after properly until Florence Nightingale arrived. Everything there was a shambles and the soldiers were not given proper medical care. Hall was a soldier and he did not want the soldiers to be pampered. This is why he was against chloroform being used. So I am not surprised by his attitude towards chloroform. I would expect it.*

- 5 Study Source G.**
Why was this cartoon published in the 1870s?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1** **Answers based on information in the source** **(1–2)**
e.g. This cartoon was published to show people about operations. It shows that there were lots of beds in hospitals and that operations took place in front of other patients.
- Level 2** **Claims it was published because anaesthetic was beginning to be used widely** **(2–3)**
- Level 3** **Answers that understand it was published to criticise the number or type of operations being carried out – not explained** **(4)**
- Level 4** **Answers that use details in the cartoon to explain how it is criticising operations** **(5–6)**
e.g. This cartoon was published to criticise operations and the use of anaesthetics in operations. You can tell this because doctors are shown operating on someone but also shown are lots of coffins. This is to show that the doctors are killing the people they are operating on. The coffins contain all the patients who have died because of the operations.
- Level 5** **Level 4 answers that are placed in the context of the time – e.g. explains the problems caused by anaesthetics being used when antiseptics not widely used** **(7)**

- 6 Study Source H.**
How far does this source show that the use of chloroform solved the problems facing surgeons?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1 Surface information taken from source (1)**
 These answers will not comment on the use of the carbolic spray.
 e.g. *Yes, this source shows that chloroform solved the problems in operations. It shows the doctors operating on someone without any trouble.*
- OR**
Simplistic evaluation of a source (1–2)
 Not all operations were as well organised or as well equipped as this one.
- Level 2 Answers that explain the advantages of chloroform (2)**
- Level 3 Answers that identify but do not explain the carbolic spray, or that identify blood loss as a problem (3)**
- Level 4 Answers that explain the role of the carbolic spray or explain the problem of blood loss (4–5)**
 e.g. *No, this source does not show that chloroform solved all the problems. The picture shows a carbolic spray being used. This killed the germs around the patient so that they did not get infected with germs when they were being operated on. Germs killed a lot of patients and so the carbolic spray was an important development.*
- Level 5 Answers that explain how both chloroform and the antiseptics were needed for successful operations (6)**
- Level 6 Level 5 plus mentions continuing problem of blood loss (7)**

- 7 Study all the sources.**
How far do these sources show that the work of Simpson was of immediate benefit to patients?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (10 marks)

N.B. Sources must be referred to by letter or direct quote.

- | | | |
|----------------|---|---------------|
| Level 1 | Answers which do not use the sources | (1–3) |
| Level 2 | Answers which make reference to ‘the sources/some sources’ etc but have no direct source use | (4–5) |
| Level 3 | Answers which use sources to show how sources do OR do not support the statement | (6–7) |
| Level 4 | Both parts of Level 3 | (8–10) |

Bonus of up to 2 marks (1 per source) for any consideration of the reliability of a source at any level.

N.B. This does not have to be developed discussions of reliability.

SOURCE INVESTIGATION 13

HOW IMPORTANT WAS PASTEUR'S GERM THEORY OF DISEASE?

1 Study Sources A, B and C.

Do these sources show similar or different ideas about disease?

Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (6 marks)

Level 1 Surface comparisons (1)

e.g. These are all different. One is a bleeding cup while another is all about the plague and the other source is about the king curing scrofula.

Level 2 Identifies the different ideas (1–3)

Bleeding, bad air, contagion, holy or supernatural power. 1 mark for each different idea.

OR

Identifies which are natural and which are supernatural (2–4)

2 marks for one idea, 3 for two, 4 for three ideas. If just says some are natural and others are supernatural without saying which are which award 2 marks.

Level 3 Knowledge used to explain the different ideas (3–5)

e.g. These show different ideas about disease. Source A shows that people believed in the Theory of the Four Humours because they were bleeding people to make them better while Source B believes that disease is spread by bad air. They thought that clouds of bad air floated around making people ill. In Source C they think that the king has powers to cure people from scrofula – this is why it was called the King's Evil.

Level 4 Explains which are natural and which are supernatural (5–6)

e.g. These sources show different ideas. Sources A and B believe in natural causes of disease. You can see this because Source A is a bleeding cup and this shows they think an imbalance in the humours makes people ill. This was a natural belief. But in Source C they think the king has supernatural powers from God and can cure scrofula – so this is a supernatural belief.

- 2 Study Source B.**
We now know that Bishop Aarhus' ideas about what caused disease were wrong. However, thousands of copies of his book were sold. Why do you think this was?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (5 marks)
- Level 1 Unsupported assertions (1)**
 e.g. *The book sold well because it told people what the trouble was.*
- Level 2 Answers based on evidence in Source B, or based on claims that he was a bishop and would be believed (2)**
 e.g. *This book was very popular because it told people all about the plague. It told them that it was spread by bad air and the way they could avoid catching plague was to not crowd together and to keep their houses clean. This was useful information for people.*
- Level 3 Knowledge used to explain how people did not understand the real causes of disease and so would accept the ideas in the book (3)**
 e.g. *So many people bought the book because at that time they did not know that the plague was spread by fleas and rats and so they would buy any book that claimed it knew what the causes were and what you had to do to avoid catching it.*
OR
Explains how the ideas in the book would actually help
OR
Explains how the ideas in the book matched what people believed at that time so they would believe the book
- Level 4 plague Knowledge used to explain how much people then feared the (4)**
 e.g. *This book sold so many copies because it was about how to avoid catching the plague. People in those times were terrified of the plague. It killed thousands of people at many different times. It killed whole families and sometimes whole villages. Drawings of the time show how much people were afraid of it and that they thought that it was sent from God as a punishment. So a book like this that told people how to avoid catching it would be very popular.*
- Level 5 Answers that explain any two of the ideas from Level 3 or Level 4 (5)**

- 3 Study Sources A, B, C and D.**
Does Source D show that ideas about disease were changing or staying the same?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (5 marks)
- Level 1** **Answers based on dates of sources** **(1)**
e.g. Source D comes later than the other sources like A, B and C and so the ideas would have changed by then.
OR
Answers that fail to understand Source D
e.g. Source D is very odd. The man seems to be wearing a great long pipe. This is very different from what was in the other sources.
- Level 2** **Compares Source D with Sources A and C** **(2–3)**
- Level 3** **Explains how Source D has same idea as that in Source B** **(3)**
e.g. Source D shows that ideas about disease were not changing because Source D is about bad air. The man is wearing a tube so that he can breath the fresh air further up and not breath the bad air below. This is the same idea as in Source B where the writer says that disease is spread by the bad air.
- Level 4** **Both Level 2 and 3** **(4)**
- Level 5** **Uses knowledge to explain how bad air was an old idea** **(5)**
 These answers will explain other examples of bad air being used as an explanation for disease, e.g. the Romans.

- 4 Study Sources E and F.**
How effective is Monsieur Rossignol (Source F) in destroying Pasteur's explanation in Source E?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (6 marks)
- Level 1 Unsupported assertions (1)**
 e.g. *I don't think he has destroyed Pasteur's ideas at all. What he says is just silly and does not have anything to do with Pasteur's ideas.*
- Level 2 Concentrates on details in Source F (2)**
 e.g. *I think he does destroy Pasteur's idea because he tells us that Pasteur's idea about germs is just a fashion.*
OR
Asserts that he could not have destroyed Pasteur's ideas because Pasteur's germ theory of disease is still believed today.
- Level 3 Uses knowledge to explain the sarcasm in Source F (3–4)**
 e.g. *Yes, he destroys Pasteur's ideas really well when he says 'Will you have some microbe? There is some everywhere.' This is making fun of Pasteur because he said that germs were floating in the air everywhere and yet people could not see them. Because they could not see them they did not believe Pasteur. So this is a really good way of making fun of him.*
- Level 4 Shows understanding of Pasteur's theory to explain how Rossignol does not begin to destroy it (5–6)**
 e.g. *No, Rossignol does not destroy Pasteur's ideas about germs. He makes fun of Pasteur's ideas but this is all he can do. Pasteur has shown how germs cause disease. He has shown how the liquid goes off because germs get to it through the air. This shows that the theory of spontaneous generation which said that disease caused germs was completely wrong. Rossignol has no answer to this.*

- 5 Study Source G.**
Do you agree that the cartoonist must have known about Pasteur’s germ theory?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (6 marks)
- Level 1 Unsupported assertions (1)**
e.g. I do not think he did know because this cartoon is nothing to do with germ theory.
- Level 2 Asserts he did know because he knows that dirty water made people ill (2)**
OR
Asserts he could not know because Pasteur did not publish his theory until 1861 – the cartoon is from 1858
- Level 3 Explains meaning of cartoon – uses this to support argument that he did know (3–4)**
e.g. I think the cartoonist did know about germs causing disease. This is why he has drawn disease like cholera and diphtheria coming from the River Thames. He calls them the children of the river. This shows he thinks that the dirty water is causing the disease. The water is dirty because of all the germs in it.
- Level 4 Explains meaning of cartoon – uses this to support argument that he did not know (5–6)**
e.g. No, the cartoonist does not know about germ theory. He couldn’t because it is only 1858 and the theory was not published until 1861. He knows that diseases like cholera are spread by dirty water – he shows this in the cartoon but he does not know that it is the germs in the water that are actually doing the damage.

- 6 Study Sources H, I and J.**
How far does Source J make it difficult to understand why people are still using the cures in Sources H and I?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (6 marks)
- Level 1 Unsupported assertions (1)**
 e.g. *It is very difficult to understand why people are still using cures like going to Lourdes.*
- Level 2 Concentrates on the nature of the cures in Sources H and I (2–3)**
 e.g. *I am surprised that they are still going to holy places hoping to be cured by God because this is a supernatural belief and I thought this had stopped a long time ago.*
- Level 3 Demonstrates an understanding of Source J but fails to relate it in a valid way to Sources H and I (3–4)**
 e.g. *Source J does make me surprised that the cures in H and I are still being used. Source J shows that the death rate has gone down in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and that the number of people dying from infectious diseases has gone down a lot. This shows that the drugs and medicines that have been developed have worked.*
- Level 4 Uses Source J to express surprise/non-surprise about H and I (4–5)**
- Level 5 Uses Source J and knowledge to express surprise/non-surprise about H and I (6)**
 e.g. *I am surprised that are using those cures in Source H. They are going to a holy place hoping that God will cure them. This is a supernatural belief. Source J makes this surprising because it shows how over the last 150 years Pasteur’s germ theory has led to a fall in the death rate from infectious diseases. After he discovered the germ theory drugs were developed to cure people from infectious diseases so why are they going to Lourdes looking for miracles?*

- 7 **Study Source K.**
‘These photographs show the results of penicillin, therefore they have nothing to do with Pasteur.’ Do you agree with this statement?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (6 marks)
- Level 1** **Unsupported assertions** **(1)**
- Level 2** **Uses knowledge to dismiss a connection** **(2–3)**
e.g. Pasteur developed the germ theory of disease; he did not discover penicillin. So he has nothing to do with the photographs.
- Level 3** **Uses knowledge to explain connection** **(4–6)**
e.g. These photographs do have something to do with Pasteur. If he had not developed the germ theory then Fleming would not have discovered penicillin. Fleming was looking for substances that could kill germs and he was doing this because Pasteur had shown that germs cause disease.

- 8 Study all the sources.**
‘Louis Pasteur’s germ theory was not important.’ How far do the sources support this view?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (10 marks)

N.B. Sources must be referred to by letter or direct quote.

- | | | |
|----------------|---|---------------|
| Level 1 | Answers which do not use the sources | (1–3) |
| Level 2 | Answers which make reference to ‘the sources/some sources’ etc but have no direct source use | (4–5) |
| Level 3 | Answers which use sources to show how sources do OR do not support the statement | (6–7) |
| Level 4 | Both parts of Level 3 | (8–10) |

Bonus of up to 2 marks (1 per source) for any consideration of the reliability of a source at any level.

N.B. This does not have to be developed discussions of reliability.

SOURCE INVESTIGATION 14

PENICILLIN: WHO CAN CLAIM THE CREDIT?

1 Study Sources A and B.

‘These two sources agree that Fleming’s discovery of penicillin was a complete accident.’ Do you agree?

Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (6 marks)

Level 1 Generalised answers (1–2)

Answers at this level will consider the sources in generalised terms only.

e.g. Both the sources are about penicillin and tell us something about how it was discovered.

Level 2 Answers focusing on the content of the sources (3–4)

Answers at this level will focus on the content of the sources to demonstrate agreement/disagreement with the proposition. Where own knowledge is used it will probably be generalised and will provide support.

e.g. Source B tells us that Fleming left some culture dishes lying around when he had finished with them because he was so untidy. When he went back to clear them up, he found that one had grown a mould that dissolved surrounding staphylococci germs. Source A shows us that...

Level 3 Answers focusing on making inferences from the sources (5–6)

Answers at this level will go beyond the surface features of the content to make inferences from the sources in order to demonstrate agreement/ disagreement with the proposition.

- 2 Study Source C.**
Does this source prove that Alexander Fleming did not discover penicillin?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (6 marks)
- Level 1 Agreement/disagreement with proposition using surface features of content (1–2)**
Answers at this level will use the surface features of the content to agree/disagree with the proposition. Any outside knowledge used will be generalised and probably no more than assertion.
e.g. Yes. Joseph Lister did because he treated a nurse with penicillium and her infected wound got better.
- Level 2 Agreement/disagreement with proposition using surface features of content and provenance (3–4)**
Answers at this level will be as for Level 1 but will additionally address the significance of the provenance of the source. Where outside knowledge is used it will probably be generalised and will provide support.
e.g. As above, plus: This source comes from a book published in 1984. The author would have researched his stuff, and this is where it gets tricky. The nurse is remembering in 1940 something that happened nearly 60 years earlier, and the author is writing it down forty years later. So there could have been a lot of mistakes and forgetting in that time.
- Level 3 Balanced argument focusing on proposition in question and making developed inferences from the source (5–6)**
Answers at this level will go beyond the surface features of the source to make developed inferences supported by specific own knowledge
- N.B. Answers that assert that one source by itself proves nothing should be marked at Level 1 UNLESS there is a good, supporting contextual argument, in which case Level 3 would be appropriate.**

- 3 Study Sources D, E and F.**
How far do these sources show that it was Florey, not Fleming, who was important in the development of penicillin?
Use the sources and your own knowledge to explain your answer. (8 marks)

- Level 1 Focus on knowledge (1–2)**
Answers at this level will rely on their own knowledge to answer the question. Any reference to the sources will be implicit or slight.
- Level 2 Focus on the content of the sources (3–4)**
Answers at this level will use the content of the sources to show that it was/was not Florey who was important in the development of penicillin
Own knowledge will probably be generalised and will be used in support.
e.g. Source D makes it clear that it was Fleming was the one who first used penicillin on a patient but he used it as an antiseptic, not as an injection. Sources E and F show that Florey was the one who developed the idea of using penicillin to combat infection by injecting it.
- Level 3 Focus on the provenance of the sources (5–6)**
Answers at this level will focus on the provenance of the sources to explain the content and reach a conclusion.
e.g. Florey's letter to the Medical Research Council makes it clear that he wants to prepare penicillin in its purified form and inject it. Professor Fletcher (Source F) remembers what happened when Florey did this. But these are both sources from Florey's side and they would emphasise his importance.
- Level 4 Balanced answers, using content and provenance (7–8)**
Answers at this level will combine Levels 2 and 3 with specific, relevant knowledge to create a balanced answer and reach a supported conclusion.

- 4 Study Source G.**
Are you surprised that Florey wanted to go to the USA in 1941?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1 Focus on extraction of information from source (1–2)**
Answers at this level will paraphrase and/or copy extracts from the source.
e.g. *It was the only way in which his important work on penicillin could go forward.*
- Level 2 Focus on provenance (3–4)**
Answers at this level will use the provenance of the source to explain why Florey wanted to go to the USA and express surprise/no surprise.
e.g. *Florey's boss, Professor Mellanby, suggested to Florey that he went to the USA in order to get penicillin mass-produced. He couldn't get it mass-produced in England. So, no, I'm not surprised that he wanted to go to the USA.*
- Level 3 Focus on knowledge (5)**
Answers at this level will focus on outside knowledge to explain why they are/are not surprised that Florey wanted to go to the USA. Reference to the source will be limited.
e.g. *By 1939 it became clear that penicillin could be a very powerful treatment, but only if it was mass-produced. This was becoming urgent because of Second World War casualties, but producing penicillin on this scale in Britain was going to be a problem because of bombing. So Florey went to the USA to try to interest drug companies there. When the USA entered the war in 1941 the American government gave the drug companies millions of dollars to get penicillin mass-produced. It seemed the obvious thing to do if penicillin was to take off, so I'm not surprised.*
- Level 4 Focus on contextualising source (6–7)**
Answers at this level will combine Levels 2 and 3 to give an appropriately contextualised account of why there is/is not surprise at Florey's decision to go to the USA in 1941.

- 5 Study Source H.**
‘This stained glass window is of no use to a historian investigating the story of penicillin.’ Do you agree?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (6 marks)
- Level 1 Generalised answers (1–2)**
Answers at this level will provide generalised responses with some reference to the source.
e.g. No, it’s not any real use. Windows like that can be put up anywhere by anyone.
- Level 2 Focus on utility – general historical context (3–4)**
Answers at this level will consider the historical context of the window as an artefact that might, or might not, be useful to historians.
e.g. Yes, the window would be of some use. A historian would find it interesting that people thought so much about Fleming that they were prepared to put up the money to have a stained glass window made.
- Level 3 Focus on utility – medicine context (5–6)**
Answers at this level will focus on the ways in which the window does, or does not, contribute to an understanding of the story of penicillin.
e.g. The window tells us quite a lot about the story of penicillin. A historian would find it useful because it shows us Fleming working in his laboratory and this would have to have been an accurate representation, otherwise the window wouldn’t have been put up. We don’t know who paid for the window, but whoever it was, they clearly thought very highly of Fleming’s work and a historian would find this useful information. The fact that the window is in the church next door to St Mary’s hospital would suggest to the historian that there was some sort of religious link either between the church and hospital, or to Fleming himself.

6 Study Sources I and J.
Was Florey right to be annoyed with Fleming?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)

Level 1 Generalised answers (1–2)

Answers at this level will focus on right/not right in general terms not specifically tied in to the source or specific contextual knowledge.
e.g. *Yes, he was right to be angry that Fleming was getting all the praise because he thought he had done all the work.*

Level 2 Focus on content of source (3–4)

Answers at this level will focus on the content of the sources to explain whether or not Florey was right to be annoyed with Fleming. Own knowledge will probably be generalised.
e.g. *Source J shows that Florey was angry because although Fleming had actually discovered penicillin, it was people like Florey and Chain who did all the work in developing it into a usable drug – and no one mentioned them, it was all Fleming. Florey does admit that he never gave interviews whereas Fleming was ‘interviewed without cease’. So, yes, Florey was right to be annoyed.*

Level 3 Focus on provenance of source (5–6)

Answers at this level will focus on the provenance of the sources to explain whether or not Florey was right to be annoyed with Fleming. Own knowledge will make specific points in support of the answer.
e.g. *Florey must have felt pretty angry to write a letter to the Medical Research Council, complaining at the publicity Fleming was getting. On the other hand, Sir Almoth Wright, who was Fleming’s boss at St Mary’s, sounds cross that The Times hadn’t given any credit to Fleming for the discovery of penicillin. So maybe people were confused about who should get the credit and Florey shouldn’t get angry – just explain a bit more. I’d expect Florey to get angry because Fleming wasn’t acknowledging what he had done.*

Level 4 Balanced answers using content and provenance (7)

Answers at this level will combine Levels 2 and 3 with specific and relevant own knowledge to provide a balanced answer.

7 Study all the sources.
‘These sources show that Fleming deserved no credit for penicillin.’
How far would you agree with this statement?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (10 marks)

Level 1 Generalised answers: no source use (1–2)

Level 2 Generalised source use (3–4)
Sources will have been used in a general way but there will not be any direct reference to specific sources.

Level 3 Answers that use the sources to agree OR disagree with the statement (5–7)
Answers at this level will use any or all of the given sources (and the background information) to show agreement or disagreement with the view given in the question.

Level 4 Answers that use the sources to agree AND disagree with the statement (8–10)

Bonus of up to 2 marks (1 per source) for any consideration of the reliability of a source at any level.

N.B. This does not have to be developed discussions of reliability.

SOURCE INVESTIGATION 15

WAS THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE WELCOMED?

1 Study Sources A and B.

What can you learn from these two sources about health care in the 1930s?

Use the sources to explain your answer.

(7 marks)

- Level 1** **Extraction of information from the sources** **(1–3)**
Answers at this level will copy from the source and/or paraphrase it.
e.g. *Children had stockings put round their throats when they had measles.*
- Level 2** **Unsupported inference(s) from the sources** **(4–5)**
Answers at this level will make a correct inference(s) from the source but they will not be supported by direct reference to the relevant phrases in the source, nor by reference to what the source describes.
e.g. *People used home remedies because they couldn't afford to go to the doctor.*
- Level 3** **Supported inference(s) from the sources** **(6–7)**
Answers at this level will make a correct inference(s) from the source and they will be supported by direct reference to relevant phrases in the source or to what the source describes.
e.g. As above – but with direct reference to specific phrases in Sources A and B.

- 2 Study Sources C and D.**
Would the person who drew the cartoon (Source C) have agreed with the arguments being put forward in Source D?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (8 marks)
- Level 1 Generalised answers (1-2)**
 Answers at this level will make accurate but generalised comments that will not be supported by reference to the sources.
e.g. Yes. Doctors in general were opposed to the setting up of the National Health Service.
- Level 2 Focus on content of sources (3-4)**
 Answers at this level will focus on the content of the sources, and will be characterised by a tendency to describe the content of each source separately. Where own knowledge is used it will probably be generalised and will provide support.
e.g. Source C shows some doctors trying to trip up Aneurin Bevan. Source D says that doctors won't have any independence under the National Health Service. From my own knowledge I know that there was a lot of opposition from the doctors to the setting up of the NHS.
- Level 3 Focus on cross-referencing between the sources (5-6)**
 Answers at this level will effectively cross-reference between the sources to reach a conclusion. Own knowledge will be accurate and will be used in support.
e.g. Source C shows us that the doctors were trying to trip up Aneurin Bevan. He was the government Minister of Health, one of the people Source D says that no patient or doctor would be free from because they would always be interfering. So yes, I would agree that the artist would be agreeing with the views in Source D (plus supporting knowledge).
- Level 4 Focus on inferences from sources (7-8)**
 Answers at this level will draw inferences from the sources in order to reach a conclusion. Own knowledge will be specific, relevant and used in support.
e.g. Source C is saying that the wealthy doctors and surgeons who make a good living out of people's illnesses will try to sabotage the government's plans for a free National Health Service. This is backed by Source D which explains the doctor's attitudes, implying that they are not at all happy with the idea of setting up the NHS. I don't think the artist would have agreed with the views in Source D. I think he was criticising the doctors for trying to sabotage Bevan's plans otherwise he wouldn't have shown them sneakily hiding round a corner (plus supporting own knowledge).

- 3 Study Sources E and F.**
‘Both of these cartoons support the setting up of the National Health Service.’ Do you agree?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (8 marks)
- Level 1 Generalised answers (1–2)**
 Answers at this level will consider the sources in generalised terms only.
e.g. No, not really. They both show it isn’t working.
- Level 2 Answers focusing on the content of the sources (3–4)**
 Answers at this level will describe features of the sources to demonstrate agreement/disagreement. Understanding of the sources will probably be literal. Own knowledge will be limited.
e.g. Source E is pretty neutral. It shows Bevan handing out the NHS to doctors who don’t like it much. Source F shows the NHS is pretty popular – but for the wrong reasons. People shouldn’t be giving each other false teeth for Christmas presents. I know that many doctors were against the NHS and most ordinary people were for it.
- Level 3 Answers focusing on making inferences from the sources (5–6)**
 Answers at this level will make inferences from the sources in order to demonstrate agreement/disagreement and will be supported by own knowledge.
e.g. In Source E Bevan is shown to be forcing the doctors to accept the NHS even if they don’t like it very much; Source F is more of the sort of cartoon that makes you laugh – obviously people wouldn’t fit each other up with false teeth as Christmas presents – but it does indicate that the NHS was very popular and might find it difficult to meet the demands people were putting on it.
- Level 4 Balanced answers, focusing on the proposition (7–8)**
 Answers at this level will cross-reference developed inferences with own knowledge in order to address the proposition directly.
e.g. Yes, I think it’s pretty clear that both sources support the setting up of the NHS. Although Bevan is forcing the doctors to take on the NHS in Source E, the artist has drawn the doctors as a pretty miserable lot. If he had supported them, he would have drawn them as being brave and defiant in the face of Bevan. In a similar way, the dentist in Source F has clearly taken on a lot of National Health patients and this is obviously appreciated by a lot of people (plus own knowledge).

4 Study Sources G and H.
Does Source G prove that Bevan (in Source H) was wrong?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (8 marks)

Level 1 Agreement/disagreement with proposition focusing on content (1-2)

Answers at this level will use the content of the sources to agree/disagree with the proposition. Where own knowledge is used, it will be generalised and will provide support.

e.g. No. Source G says that people are poor because they spend money on betting and drink. Source H says that rich and poor should have treatment depending on their medical need, not their money.

Level 2 Agreement/disagreement with proposition focusing on provenance (3-4)

Answers at this level will use the provenance of the sources to agree/disagree with the proposition. Where own knowledge is used, it will relate to the provenance of the sources.

e.g. The letter to The Times was written in 1901, a long time before the NHS was proposed. It was just giving a fairly general idea, then, about what caused poverty. In Source H, Bevan is trying to persuade people to support the NHS and so he would talk about it in the best possible light. So, no, Source G doesn't prove Bevan was wrong. They're about different things.

Level 3 Agreement/disagreement focusing on inferences (5-6)

Answers at this level will make inferences from the source in order to agree/disagree with the proposition in the question. Where own knowledge is used, it will be specific and relevant to the argument.

e.g. Source G is saying that some people are poor through their own fault because they spend their money on betting and drink. In Source H, Bevan is presenting all poor people as deserving of our sympathy and the money necessary to fund a National Health Service. It doesn't prove that Bevan was wrong; to believe that poverty was a person's own fault was a common idea in the nineteenth century. By the middle of the twentieth century this had changed.

Level 4 Balanced argument (7-8)

Answers at this level will combine Levels 2 and 3 with elements of Level 1 to create a balanced argument. Own knowledge will be detailed, relevant and accurate.

N.B. Answers that assert two sources by themselves prove nothing should be marked at Level 1 UNLESS there is a good supporting, contextual argument, in which case Level 3 would probably be appropriate.

5 Study Sources I and J.
Does Source J make you surprised by what the doctors said in Source I?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)

Level 1 Generalised answers (1)

Answers at this level will provide generalised, non-specific responses.
e.g. *No, I'm not surprised because doctors always think they know better than everyone else.*

Level 2 Focus on content of source (2–3)

Answers at this level will focus on the content of the sources to explain surprise/lack of surprise. Own knowledge will probably be generalised and will be used in support of the explanation.
e.g. *In Source J, the doctors are saying that people shouldn't get something for nothing. Source J says that the Gallup poll showed that most people wanted a National Health Service. Perhaps these are the people the doctors thought wanted something for nothing.*

Level 3 Focus on provenance of source (4–5)

Answers at this level will focus on the provenance of the source to explain their surprise/lack of surprise. Own knowledge will be used to contextualise the provenance.
e.g. *Source J is from a secondary source, describing the findings of a Gallup poll. Because it's a secondary source, the author will have been able to stand back and take a broad view. On the other hand, the group of doctors reporting in 1946 couldn't take a broad view. They were concerned with looking after their own interests and I know that most doctors at first opposed the NHS. Bevan had to buy them off by offering them contracts that allowed a certain amount of private work, where the money was.*

Level 4 Balanced answers using content and provenance (6–7)

Answers at this level will use elements of Levels 2 and 3 to create balanced explanation their surprise/lack of surprise. Own knowledge will be accurate and will appropriately contextualise the explanation.

6 Study all the sources.
How far do these sources show that the National Health Service was welcomed?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (12 marks)

Level 1 Generalised answers: no source use (1–2)
Answers at this level will be reasonably accurate but will make no reference, either implicit or explicit, to the given sources.

Level 2 Generalised source use (3–4)
Answers at this level will demonstrate that the given sources have been used, but no direct reference to specific sources will appear. These answers are characterised by phrases such as ‘The sources tell us...’; ‘I know from the sources that...’.

Level 3 Answers that use the sources to show the NHS was/was not welcomed (5–8)

Level 4 Answers that use the sources to show how the NHS was and was not welcomed (9–12)
Answers at this level will use elements of Levels 3 and 4 to focus on ‘how far’ the NHS was welcomed. This will include a clear demonstration of an understanding of the ways in which different elements of British society reacted.

Bonus of up to 2 marks (1 per source) for any consideration of the reliability of a source at any level.

N.B. This does not have to be developed discussions of reliability.

SOURCE INVESTIGATION 16

WOMEN IN MEDICINE: HAVE ATTITUDES CHANGED?

1 Study Source A.

What can you learn from this source about attitudes in ancient Greece towards women in medicine?

Use the source to explain your answer.

(5 marks)

Level 1 Extraction of information from the source (1–2)

Answers at this level will copy from the source and/or paraphrase it.

e.g. *She cut her hair and put on male clothing and entrusted herself to a doctor for training.*

Level 2 Unsupported inference(s) from the source (3)

Answers at this level will make a correct inference(s) from the source but they will not be supported by direct reference to the relevant phrases in the source, nor by reference to what the source describes.

e.g. *If girls wanted to train to be doctors, they had to pretend to be boys.*

Level 3 Supported inference(s) from the source (4–5)

Answers at this level will make a correct inference(s) from the source and they will be supported by direct reference to relevant phrases in the source or to what the source describes.

e.g. *It is clear from the source that women were not allowed to train as doctors in ancient Greece. Hagnodice had to cut her hair and put on men's clothes before a doctor would train her. But it's also clear that women patients, particularly when they were in labour, preferred a woman to attend them. Hagnodice had to lift up her clothes and show them she was female and then the women would let her treat them.*

- 2 Study Sources B and C.**
Does Source C support the claims made in Source B?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1 Generalised answers (1)**
Answers at this level will state support/lack of support in general terms with no specific source references.
e.g. *No. They disagree about whether women are any good at medicine or not.*
- Level 2 Focus on content of sources (2–3)**
Answers at this level will focus on the content of the sources to show support/lack of support. Where own knowledge is used it will probably be generalised and will provide support.
e.g. *Source B makes it clear that the wrong sort of women are entering the medical profession. They make a lot of mistakes and kill their patients. Source C shows that Lady Lisle had given Lord Howe some medicine that had cured him, even though he had wet the bed. So some women were good at medicine and some women weren't. So Source C doesn't really support the claims made about women doctors in Source B, although Lady Howe might have thought so.*
- Level 3 Focus on provenance of sources (4–5)**
Answers at this level will focus on the provenance of the source to explain whether or not Source C supports the claims made in Source B. Where own knowledge is used it will be relevant and will provide support.
e.g. *No, it doesn't. Source C was written in 1535 by Lord Howe who is thanking Lady Lisle for a medicine she has given him that clearly worked. But Source B was written over a hundred years earlier when maybe women who wanted to be trained in medicine were not so good.*
- Level 4 Focus on content and provenance (6–7)**
Answers at this level will combine Levels 2 and 3 in order to explain whether or not Source C supports the claims made in Source B.

- 3 Study Sources C and D.**
Why do you think wealthy and intelligent women like these two spent their time making herbal remedies?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (6 marks)
- Level 1 Generalised answers (1)**
 Answers at this level will be the sort of responses that could be written any time about almost any rich women.
e.g. Because they were rich, didn't have to work for their living and had nothing else to do with their time.
- Level 2 Focus on treatments described in the sources (2–3)**
 Answers at this level will focus on the treatments described in the sources and will place them within the context of medical knowledge at the time. Own knowledge will be relevant.
e.g. Lady Lisle isn't using magic and spells, so she must be using natural, herbal remedies to dissolve Lord Howe's bladder stone. In the same way, Lady Mildmay used natural remedies. Doctors and women healers in towns and villages possessed a large store of knowledge about the use of herbs to treat everyday illnesses.
- Level 3 Focus on provenance of sources (4–5)**
 Answers at this level will focus on the position of wealthy women within the context of those who practised medicine. Own knowledge will be relevant.
e.g. Lady Lisle and Lady Grace Mildmay were both upper class ladies who had the money and the interest to work out medical cures and treatments. This was quite common and some of the best-known healers were women like this. They managed large households and would have had to deal with injuries and illnesses as part of their responsibilities. In the Middle Ages women could not train to become physicians.
- Level 4 Focus on full contextualising of sources (6)**
 Answers at this level will combine Levels 2 and 3 in order fully to contextualise both the treatments given and the position of wealthy women as providers or medical care in order to answer the question directly. Own knowledge will be detailed and accurate.

- 4 Study Source E.**
Would people of the time have thought that the men in this picture were wasting their time while the women were doing the important work?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1 Generalised answers with no support from the source (1)**
Answers at this level will give responses that, whilst they will be accurate, do not refer to the source.
e.g. No, they wouldn't because men ran medical matters and so anything that men did was automatically more important than anything that women did.
- Level 2 Agreement/disagreement for non-historical reasons (2–3)**
Answers at this level offer agreement or disagreement for non-historical reasons.
e.g. I'm sure people wouldn't have thought the men were wasting their time. They were just getting on with what they found interesting, which in this case happened to be astronomy. Childbirth, which is happening in the front of the source, was women's work and not the business of men.
- Level 3 Agreement/disagreement focusing on content of source (4–5)**
Answers at this level will show a clear understanding of the importance of astrology in the whole business of child-birth to draw the conclusion that people of the time would have thought that the men were doing the more important work in casting the child's horoscope.
- Level 4 Agreement/disagreement contextualising source (6–7)**
Answers at this level will be a development of Level 3 in that responses will contextualise (i) the presence of astrologers and (ii) the position of midwives in the development of the history of medicine.

- 5 Study Sources F and G.**
How far do these two sources show that women had been accepted as doctors?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (8 marks)
- Level 1 Generalised answers (1–2)**
 Answers at this level will provide generalised, non-specific responses
 e.g. *Yes, because women are giving medical services in both the sources.*
- Level 2 Focus on content (3–4)**
 Answers at this level will consider the content of the sources in order to show that women had/had not been accepted as doctors. Own knowledge will be generalised and will support.
 e.g. *Yes. It's quite clear from Source F that Isabel Warwick was a skilled surgeon and that she was going to be allowed to be a surgeon. Women couldn't become physicians but they could, in certain circumstances, work as surgeons. In Source G the widow Rugglesford and old Bess were clearly openly treating the vicar's maid and there doesn't seem to be any problem in accepting what they did. Local wise-women often did this sort of work.*
- Level 3 Focus on provenance (5–6)**
 Answers at this level will consider the provenance of the sources and cross-reference between them to ask whether women had been accepted as doctors.
 e.g. *Source F comes from the records of the City of York. This is an official record and it shows that Isabel Warwick was allowed to work as a surgeon in the city. It would be very significant if men could work as surgeons without having to be approved by the City council. But it's significant that the city elders seem to be giving her protection so perhaps she needed it and not everyone did approve of women surgeons. Source G is a different kind of source because it's not official at all, but is from a vicar's diary. He hasn't actually called a doctor, but the usual wise women from the village.*
- Level 4 Balanced answers (7–8)**
 Answers at this level will consider both the content and the provenance, combining Levels 2 and 3, and put the sources in the context of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century society.

- 6 Study Sources H and I.**
How far do these two sources agree?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1 Generalised answers (1–2)**
 Answers at this level will consider the sources in generalised terms only.
e.g. They don't agree because one is showing a woman doctor and the other is saying women shouldn't be doctors.
- Level 2 Focus on content of sources (3–4)**
 Answers at this level will focus on the content of the source to demonstrate whether or not the two sources agree. Where own knowledge is used, it will be limited.
e.g. The statement made by students (Source I) is saying they don't like the idea of women being in their classes because the lecturers won't be able to give full descriptions and in any case to have women in an operating theatre would be an outrage. In many ways this disagrees with Source H which shows a lady doctor in 1865, only four years later. She must have been trained somewhere.
- Level 3 Focus on making inferences from the sources (5–6)**
 Answers at this level will make inferences from the sources in order to demonstrate agreement/disagreement and will be supported by own knowledge.
e.g. The students in Source I are clearly against having women as medical students. They believe that women will be demeaned and coarsened and, perhaps more importantly, that their own attitude to women will be offended and outraged. This is supported by the cartoon (Source H) because quite clearly the young man has called the woman doctor because he quite fancies having a female doctor taking his pulse. He hasn't called her because he wants a doctor. This comment by Punch agrees with what the students are saying: both men and women will be demeaned.
- Level 4 Balanced answers making inferences from the sources to address 'how far' (7)**
 Answers at this level will combine inferences from the sources with own knowledge to address 'how far' in the question. This must be the focus of the question, and not just an 'add-on' throw-away comment.

7 Study all the sources.
‘Attitudes towards women in medicine have not changed over the years.’
How far do the sources support this statement?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (10 marks)

Level 1 Generalised answers: no source use (1–2)
Answers at this level will be reasonably accurate but will make no reference, either implicit or explicit, to the given sources.

Level 2 Generalised source use (3–4)
Answers at this level will demonstrate that the given sources have been used, but no direct reference to specific sources will appear. These answers are characterised by phrases such as ‘The sources tell us...’; ‘I know from the sources that...’.

Level 3 Answers that use the sources to support OR to disagree with the statement (7–8)

Level 4 Answers that use the sources to support AND to disagree with the statement (8–10)

Bonus of up to 2 marks (1 per source) for any consideration of the reliability of a source at any level.

N.B. This does not have to be developed discussions of reliability.

SOURCE INVESTIGATION 17

HOSPITALS THROUGH PICTURES

1 Study Source A.

What does this source tell you about the treatment in medieval hospitals?

Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)

- Level 1** **Surface description** **(1–2)**
e.g. *This source tells me that it was very crowded around the patients bed and that his urine was examined.*
- OR**
- General but valid inferences** **(2)**
e.g. *This source shows me that their treatments were not very advanced.*
- Level 2** **Unsupported inferences** **(3–4)**
e.g. *This source tells me that they used supernatural and natural treatments in hospitals at that time.*
- OR**
- Supported valid inferences about aspects of treatment other than supernatural/natural**
- Level 3** **Explains natural OR supernatural methods in source** **(5–6)**
e.g. *This sources tells us that they used natural methods in those days. The doctor is looking at the patient's urine trying to see what is wrong with him. This shows he still believed in the Theory of the Four Humours which was a natural belief about the causes of illness.*
- Level 4** **Explains natural AND supernatural methods in source** **(7)**

- 2 Study Source B.**
What can you learn from this source about conditions in hospitals around 1500?
Use the source to explain your answer. (6 marks)
- Level 1 Surface description (1)**
e.g. *You can see that they are sewing corpses into shrouds and there are lots of beds in the same room.*
OR
Claims that you cannot learn much because this is only one hospital.
- Level 2 Unsupported inferences (2–3)**
e.g. *The conditions look very overcrowded and not like a hospital should be.*
- Level 3 One valid inference supported (4–5)**
e.g. *The conditions are not very good and it does not look like a hospital. In fact it looks more like a church. There are religious symbols everywhere. This is why it is not organised properly because they are more interested in the religious side of it. The conditions do not look very hygienic. They are sewing dead people into shrouds in the same room as the patients are in.*
- Level 4 Two valid inferences supported (6)**

- 3 Study Sources B and C.**
These two pictures show the same hospital at different times. How similar are they?
Use the sources to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1 Unsupported assertions (1)**
e.g. They are not very similar, they look completely different.
- Level 2 Describes the hospitals without comparing them (2–3)**
- Level 3 Explains differences OR similarities (4–5)**
e.g. The hospitals do look the same. Both have beds lined up along both sides of the room and in both pictures they have dead people in them.
- Level 4 Explains differences AND similarities (6–7)**

- 4 Study Sources A and D.**
How far does Source D show that conditions and treatments in hospitals had improved since the Middle Ages?
Use the sources to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1 Unsupported assertions (1)**
e.g. Yes, I think things have got much better in Source D because it is hundreds of years later.
- Level 2 Answers that identify similarities/differences but do not explain whether these were improvements (2–4)**
e.g. There are some things in Source D that are the same as in Source A. In both they are using samples of urine and in both it is very crowded.
OR
Answers that claim you cannot judge by just two pictures (2)
- Level 3 Answers that explain improvements OR things getting worse (4–5)**
e.g. I think things had got a lot better in Source D. In Source A they are using religions a lot to make people better but in Source D there is no sign of this. They are only using natural methods to make people better. They are also carrying out operations but there is nothing like this in Source A.
- Level 4 Answers that explain improvements AND things getting worse (6–7)**

- 5 Study Source E.**
Why do you think this patient has decided to be treated at home and not in hospital?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (6 marks)
- Level 1 Unsupported assertions (1)**
- Level 2 Everyday empathy (2–3)**
 These answers will ignore the historical context and simply suggest reasons that could apply to any time, e.g. he wanted to be in more familiar surroundings, he was more comfortable at home.
- Level 3 Cross-references to other sources and/or to knowledge to identify possible reasons (3–4)**
- Level 4 Cross-references to other sources OR to knowledge to explain reasons (4–5)**
- Level 5 Cross-references to other sources AND to knowledge to explain reasons (6)**
e.g. I think he has decided to be treated at home because the conditions in hospitals were so bad. If you look at Source D you can see that it is crowded, there are patients having their legs chopped off right in front of other patients. This must have led to infection spreading. It looks noisy and horrible. He is much better off at home. He cannot catch anything else from other patients and he has peace and quiet. In those days rich people did not go into hospitals. They stayed at home and could afford to pay doctors to visit them and treat them. It was thought that if you went into hospitals you would die. They usually did not treat ill people they just prayed for them and hoped they would be healed by God. So you were better off staying at home and being looked after by a doctor.

- 6 Study Source F.**
Why do you think this was published in 1888?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. (7 marks)
- Level 1 Published for surface information (1)**
e.g. This was published to show people what nurses looked like.
- Level 2 Answers that concentrate on the differences between the two nurses (2–3)**
e.g. This was published to show how nurses had changed. The nurse in the second picture is very different from the nurse in the first.
- Level 3 Answers that suggest that the purpose was to show how much nursing had improved (4–6)**
 If knowledge of the context is used award at top of level.
e.g. This was published to show how the nursing profession was improving. In the first picture it shows an old woman. She would be untrained. The second picture shows the improvements brought in by Florence Nightingale. It shows a proper nurse who has been trained and has a proper uniform.
- Level 4 Answers that suggest the purpose was to attract women into nursing or to raise the status of nursing (6–7)**
 If knowledge of the context is used award at top of the level.

- 7 Study Sources G and H.**
Why did hospitals develop more in the two hundred years after 1800 than in the thousands of years before?
Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. (10 marks)
- Level 1 Unsupported assertions (1)**
e.g. I think they have got much better because people knew a lot more and were able to make the hospitals much better.
- Level 2 Describes the improvements but does not explain them (2–4)**
- Level 3 Identifies reasons – but does not explain them (4–6)**
 Reasons might include: reasons for improvements – germ theory, developments in technology, anaesthetics, antiseptics, Florence Nightingale, the NHS; reasons for lack of development – religious beliefs, ignorance about causes of disease, lack of government funding.
- Level 4 Uses knowledge to explain either why there was little progress earlier on OR why there was much progress after 1800 (6–8)**
- Level 5 Uses knowledge to explain both why there was little progress earlier on AND why there was much progress after 1800 (8–10)**