

Commentary on examples of work, Activity 6

Note that this exercise is designed only to familiarise delegates with the use of the level descriptors. The comments below are a general indication of the judgements that could be reached, but cannot be seen as definitive in advance of the first operational marking process.

Response A

This answer shows understanding of the way that understanding of germs led to improved hygiene and that this would affect the spread of infection, but the comments are more focused on surgery than on prevention of illness. The material on surgery cannot be credited.

There is an awareness that vaccination campaigns raised the level of immunity among the public. However, no specific examples or details are given to back up these statements and the answer then digresses into comments about relations between rich and poor.

The response shows understanding of the question but has no specific detail beyond the stimulus points. AO1 and 2 are interdependent, making it difficult for the student to demonstrate AO2 convincingly without support. In applying the mark scheme, level 2 could be considered for AO2. However, the answer is so lacking in relevant AO1 knowledge of the period that a best-fit judgement would locate it on the level one/two borderline, with the top of level one best reflecting below-baseline performance in AO1 and level two performance in AO2.

SPaG: Intermediate level

Spelling and sentence construction are secure (in spite of hygiene). Some use of specialist terms (immune, average life expectancy). There are limitations in punctuation (apostrophes and commas omitted). Overall good enough for 'considerable', but not 'consistent' accuracy.

Response B

This is clearly focused on the question and structured in a way that covers both sides of the issue.

Additional aspects are brought into the discussion – the role of the government and the role of technology.

Specific detail is included to support some of the points made. Although the student has found it difficult to exemplify the development of vaccines and the role of new technology in the twentieth century, there is sufficient support to validate the points made.

Criteria for judgment are offered 'it allowed... to understand...'; 'would enable people to develop...'; 'becoming more accepted due to government intervention...'; etc.

The conclusion offers a criterion for judgement ('unable to prove...') that the role of the government is outweighed by improved scientific knowledge. This is not convincingly argued, but there would appear to be sufficient evidence in the answer as a whole to award Level 4. The student's judgement is consistent with the rest of the answer and the supporting detail.

SPaG: High level

Deploys a wide range of specialist terms, use of rules of grammar (good use of subordinate clauses indicated by commas) enables effective control of meaning. Consistent accuracy in spelling and punctuation. The response isn't faultless (there was minimal technological developments), but does not have to be.

Response C

The comment about Pasteur is not well linked to the focus of the question but the paragraphs on Jenner and Snow make valid points of argument, supported by relevant detail. The argument is further developed by comments about the role of government. Criteria are employed effectively. The answer can clearly show and argue that key advances were possible without the scientific knowledge. 'This can show that you don't need scientific ... disease to prevent it'

The challenge to the statement in the question has the analytical quality of secure Level 3, but consideration of the merits of scientific understanding is insufficiently well explored to merit a Level 4 response. The link between finding germs and prevention is assumed.

SPaG: Intermediate level

Comments as for Response A – lack of commas, misspelling 'vacine', but control of meaning, use of specialist terms and general sentence construction sufficient for intermediate level.