

Candidate Style Answers

GCSE History A (Schools History Project)

OCR GCSE in History: J415

Unit: A952/21

These candidate style answers are designed to accompany the OCR GCSE History A specification for teaching from September 2009.

GCSE History A

A952/21 Developments in British medicine 1200-1945

OCR has produced these candidate style answers to support teachers in interpreting the assessment criteria for the new GCSE specifications and to bridge the gap between new specification release and availability of exemplar candidate work.

This content has been produced by senior OCR examiners, with the support of the Qualification Manager, to illustrate how the sample assessment questions might be answered and provide some commentary on what factors contribute to an overall grading. The candidate style answers are not written in a way that is intended to replicate student work but to demonstrate what a “good” or “excellent” response might include, supported by examiner commentary and conclusions.

As these responses have not been through full moderation and do not replicate student work, they have not been graded and are instead, banded “medium” or “high” to give an indication of the level of each response.

Please note that this resource is provided for advice and guidance only and does not in any way constitute an indication of grade boundaries or endorsed answers.

2) Study Source B.	
How useful is this source to an historian studying the cholera outbreak of 1831? Use the source and your knowledge to answer the question. (8)	
<i>Candidate style answer</i>	<i>Examiner's commentary</i>
<i>'Well you could see that they had very little understanding of the causes of the disease or how to cure it. They obviously don't realise that cholera is not contagious because the doctor feels the need to talk about how Eliza Turnbull had no contact with other people suffering from cholera. They also don't realise that the disease is water-borne and seem to think that blood-letting will cure it.'</i>	High level response This is an excellent answer. This candidate has used their own knowledge and understanding of the cause and treatment of disease in order to comment on the usefulness of the source. Notice how the candidate talks about how the disease is not contagious and is, in fact, a water-borne disease. This comes from the candidate's own knowledge. Clanney's report in the source clearly shows a lack of understanding of these factors in the cause of the disease. A completely perfect answer might have gone on to talk about whether Clanney's report is reliable, or whether you can generalize about the cholera outbreak of 1831 from a report which contains only a few case notes. Nevertheless, this answer is still excellent.

2) Study Source B. How useful is this source to an historian studying the cholera outbreak of 1831? Use the source and your knowledge to answer the question. (8)	
<i>Candidate style answer</i>	<i>Examiner's commentary</i>
<i>'It is very useful because it tells us the type of treatment that they gave people. Eliza Turnbull had a vein opened in each arm. On the other hand, I wouldn't find this useful if I wanted to know what causes cholera, because all it tells me about is a couple of people dying.'</i>	Medium level response This is a reasonable answer. The candidate has used details from the source to explain whether or not the source is useful. The answer explains what historians can learn about how people reacted to cholera in 1831. The answer also explains two things the historian cannot find out from the source. Both of these points are relevant to the cholera outbreak of 1831. However, to score higher marks on questions about the usefulness of sources (utility), candidates must try to use their own knowledge or make cross-references to other sources to show both the value and limitations of the source in question.

3) Study Source C.

‘This source is about a city hundreds of miles away from Sunderland, so there is nothing it can tell us about the cholera epidemic in Sunderland in 1831’. Use the source and your knowledge to explain whether you agree with this statement. (8)

Candidate style answer

‘I know that the two towns are hundreds of miles apart, but I don’t think that matters. In Exeter they are washing sheets in the river because they don’t know that cholera is water-borne. It wasn’t until later that Snow made the link between water supply and cholera. They would almost certainly have had similar practices in Sunderland, because they would not have known either. Public health in towns at this time was quite backward. It wasn’t until the 1860s that Pasteur proved that germs caused disease. People in towns in any part of Britain at this time probably did things like washing their clothes in the river. They did not understand the need for a clean water supply. So people in Sunderland almost certainly did the same. Therefore, this source is useful.’

Examiner’s commentary

High level response

The candidate has used impressive knowledge about the causes of cholera. The answer explains how the development of a scientific understanding of the cause of disease came later in the nineteenth century, well after the publication of this source. Therefore, the candidate correctly believes that the people of Sunderland would have had the same ideas about cholera as the people of Exeter did in 1831. Therefore the source gives the historian an insight into how people in towns like Sunderland reacted to cholera. If the candidate had used the statement that ‘Exeter and Sunderland are hundreds of miles apart’ to develop the idea that cholera had spread far and wide in 1831, this answer would have been worth full marks. However, it is still an excellent answer.

3) Study Source C.

‘This source is about a city hundreds of miles away from Sunderland, so there is nothing it can tell us about the cholera epidemic in Sunderland in 1831’. Use the source and your knowledge to explain whether you agree with this statement. (8)

Candidate style answer

‘It is useful because Exeter is hundreds of miles away from Sunderland and it also had cholera. This shows that cholera must either have spread rapidly through England, or that there was more than one means by which it first came to England. Perhaps the outbreak in Sunderland happened separately to the outbreak in Exeter.’

Examiner’s commentary

Medium level response

This is quite a good answer. The candidate has used the fact that Exeter and Sunderland are so far apart geographically to make a valid comment about how the disease might have spread to Sunderland in 1831. The candidate also states that there might have been more than one cause of the outbreak. To get higher marks on a question of this kind, you need to use knowledge about health and hygiene, and particularly the state of public health in towns at this time. You need to show that whether people lived in Exeter or Sunderland, they would have still reacted in the same ways to the outbreak of cholera. Their understanding of the cause of disease was limited. They had not made the link between dirt and disease. Nor did they have an understanding that infecting the water supply could spread disease.

<p>6) Study all the sources. ‘In 1831 people had very little understanding of the causes of cholera’. How far do the sources on this paper support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. Remember to identify the sources you use. (10)</p>	
<i>Candidate style answer</i>	<i>Examiner’s commentary</i>
<p><i>I think this is true to some extent. In Source A it actually says that no specific remedy has been found, which suggests that if they didn’t know how to treat it, they probably didn’t know what caused it. In Source C, people are washing the clothes of a cholera victim in the stream from which the residents of the nearby houses got their drinking water. How stupid is that? People obviously did not have a clue about what caused cholera. In Source F Brown seems to think that it is something to do with alcohol. As a doctor, I think he would know that this is not true. I’m not sure I trust what Brown says. I think he is just trying to help out his boss, Lord Londonderry, who wants the ban on trade lifted. However, in Source B at least Clanney has some understanding that it can be spread by healthy people coming into contact with infected victims. And the government has put restrictions on movement of ships, so they know it can somehow be spread by people. Source D was a statement written by ship owners. They obviously want the ban on trade lifted, so I don’t think what they say about cholera is reliable.</i></p>	<p>High level response This is an excellent, balanced answer. The candidate has used details from a range of sources. Notice how the candidate has named the sources used and included precise details from them. This candidate realises that the answer to the question is not straightforward. Some sources support the statement, and this answer gives details from two sources that suggest that people had little understanding of the causes of cholera. However, the candidate also realises that some sources are written by particular people for a particular purpose. People who were losing out financially because of the trade ban played down the severity of the cholera, or blamed it on poor people. This does not necessarily mean that they did not understand the causes of cholera. They would just do or say anything to get the trade ban lifted. At least one source does not fully support the statement (Source B) and the candidate has used that source to show that there are two sides to this argument. The last sentence about Source D is a comment about reliability and along with their comment on this in Source F, the candidate would score bonus marks in this question for the evaluation of the sources.</p>

<p>6) Study all the sources. 'In 1831 people had very little understanding of the causes of cholera'. How far do the sources on this paper support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. Remember to identify the sources you use. (10)</p>	
<i>Candidate style answer</i>	<i>Examiner's commentary</i>
<p><i>I think this is definitely true. In Source A it actually says that no specific remedy has been found, which suggests that if they didn't know how to treat it, they probably didn't know what caused it. In Source F Brown seems to think that it is something to do with alcohol. In Source C, people are washing the clothes of a cholera victim in the stream from which the residents of the nearby houses got their drinking water. This does not seem like a very good idea. People obviously did not have a clue about what caused cholera.</i></p>	<p>Medium level response This is quite a good answer. Notice how the candidate has made direct reference to the letter of each source that has been used. The answer then takes details from each source to support the statement in the question that people did not understand the causes of cholera. In this kind of question, the examiner can usually award a range of marks for answers which use the sources to support or oppose the statement in the question. How many marks are awarded in that range depends on the number of sources used. This answer makes valid use of three sources, so it would score high marks within the range available. To score higher marks on this kind of question, the candidate would need to give a more balanced answer. They would need to show that some sources seem to have been written by those people who had an interest in getting the trade ban lifted. Therefore, it is in their best interests to play down the cholera outbreak, or to lie about what caused it. This does not mean that they did not understand the causes of the disease, just that it was more convenient for them to tell a different story.</p>