

Candidate Style Answers

GCSE History A (Schools History Project)

OCR GCSE in History: J415

Unit: A951/11 (Development Studies)

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

GCSE History A

A951/11 (Development Studies)

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.

Section A: Development Study

(a) Medicine Through Time

1(a) Study Source A. Would Pare have approved of the method described in Source A? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. [5]	
<i>Candidate style answer</i>	<i>Examiner's commentary</i>
<i>Pare would not have approved because he knew that this method caused a lot of pain and fever and did not clear up the infection. Instead of cauterizing he started to use an ointment made from eggs and oil of roses. This worked much better and more patients survived.</i>	High level response This is a very good answer. The candidate understands the possible effects of the treatment being used and has used impressive knowledge about Pare's methods to show convincingly that Pare would not approve of the methods described in the source.

<p>1(a) Study Source A.</p> <p>Would Pare have approved of the method described in Source A? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. [5]</p>	
<p><i>Candidate style answer</i></p> <p><i>On one hand, I think he would have approved because it is a very careful method. It is telling the doctor exactly what to do. However on the other hand, I don't think he would have approved. What good will it do burning the skin like this? It is a daft thing to do.</i></p>	
<p><i>Examiner's commentary</i></p> <p>Medium level response</p> <p>This is quite a good answer. The candidate has tried to find reasons for approving and disapproving. However, the candidate has failed to get beyond the details in the source. This answer is not about Pare's possible reaction; it is rather about anyone's reaction. To reach a higher level the answer needs to use knowledge about Pare to explain how he might have reacted.</p>	

1(b) Study Source B.

Study Source B. What dangers faced patients during and after operations at the beginning of the nineteenth century? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. [5]

Candidate style answer

One danger is pain. It looks like the operation is really painful. This is because they had no anaesthetics and so the patient had to put up with terrible pain. Some people died of the pain. You can also see that the operating theatre is a very dirty place. The people carrying out the operation are wearing normal clothes and there seems to be a lot of dirt and blood around. At this time the medical profession did not understand that germs caused disease, so no-one bothered to sort out any antiseptics.

Examiner's commentary

High level response

This is a very good response. The candidate has explained two dangers facing the patient; the dangers being those of pain and infection. The answer contains details from the candidate's own knowledge, both about the lack of antiseptics and anaesthetics. This knowledge is backed up with details from the source, especially about the lack of antiseptics and the unhygienic state of the operating theatre. More details could be given directly from the source about the apparent pain of the patient. Nevertheless, this is a high level response.

1(b) Study Source B.

Study Source B. What dangers faced patients during and after operations at the beginning of the nineteenth century? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. [5]

Candidate style answer

One danger is pain. It looks like the operation is really painful. This is because they had no anaesthetics and so the patient had to put up with terrible pain. Some people died of the pain.

Examiner's commentary

Medium level response

This is quite a good answer. The candidate has used knowledge about the lack of anaesthetics at this time to argue that operations would have been painful. If the candidate had also said something like 'You can see from the patient's facial expression that he must have been in a lot of pain', this would have improved the answer, since this would show that the candidate had used contextual knowledge **and** the source to answer the question. Furthermore, the candidate could have explained two or more dangers facing patients. The problem of infection was just as dangerous for patients at this time.

1(c) Study Sources A and C.

Do these sources prove that by the 1870s surgery had improved little since the time of Pare? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. [5]

Candidate style answer

I think there was lots of progress. In Source A there is a lot of pain and a great danger of infection. But Lister in Source C was trying to find a way of stopping infection. His carbolic spray did work and did cut down the death rate during operations so there was progress. However, there was still a long way to go to ensure successful operations were consistently carried out. Lister is still operating in his ordinary clothes, so the operating theatre is not completely germ-free. In addition, surgeons had still not found effective ways to deal with the loss of blood suffered by many patients.

Examiner's commentary

High level response

Here, the candidate has used details from the sources and knowledge to show that progress has been made. The comparison between the two sources is effectively made. There is also recognition that despite the progress, some problems remain. It is pleasing to see that the candidate has used contextual knowledge about blood loss, as well as details from Source C about the way Lister operated. This is a very good answer.

1(c) Study Sources A and C.

Do these sources prove that by the 1870s surgery had improved little since the time of Pare? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. [5]

Candidate style answer

I think there was lots of progress. In Source A there is a lot of pain and a great danger of infection. But Lister in Source C was trying to find a way of stopping infection. His carbolic spray did work and did cut down the death rate during operations so there was progress.

Examiner's commentary

Medium level response

Here, the candidate has made a good start. The answer includes some pretty good detail from the two sources in the first three sentences. The mention of the carbolic spray and the statement that it reduced the death rate during operations clearly comes from the candidate's own knowledge. However to improve this answer, the candidate would need to think about the problems that still remained for surgery. Although there had been progress since Pare, there was still a long way to go!

<p>2 Ancient societies like those of the Egyptians and the Greeks made more progress in medicine than people in the Middle Ages.</p> <p>(a) Briefly describe the medical progress made by the Ancient Egyptians. [5]</p>	
<i>Candidate style answer</i>	<i>Examiner's commentary</i>
<p><i>The Egyptians made progress because they developed a natural theory about illness. They thought that you became ill because the channels in the body were blocked. They got this idea from their irrigation channels getting blocked. The Egyptians were also able to make progress because they had doctors who looked for natural reasons. We also know they kept medical records on papyrus.</i></p>	<p>High level response</p> <p>This is an excellent response. You could get full marks for simply listing 5 different examples of progress made by the Egyptians in medicine. In this case, however, the candidate has explained the first point about natural ideas and scored 3 marks for this. Two other relevant points have been identified = total of 5 marks.</p>

<p>2 Ancient societies like those of the Egyptians and the Greeks made more progress in medicine than people in the Middle Ages.</p> <p>(a) Briefly describe the medical progress made by the Ancient Egyptians. [5]</p>	
<i>Candidate style answer</i>	<i>Examiner's commentary</i>
<p><i>The Egyptians made progress because they developed a natural theory about illness. They thought that you became ill because the channels in the body were blocked. They got this idea from their irrigation channels getting blocked.</i></p>	<p>Medium level response</p> <p>Here the candidate has made quite a good start. The answer contains one explained example of Egyptian medical progress. To get higher marks, more examples need to be given or explained. Other examples include the Egyptians knowledge of anatomy and physiology, their close examination of patients, the fact that they had doctors, and they recorded treatments/diseases. Remember the maximum that can be scored for one point is 3 marks - even if it is developed as this one is.</p>

<p>2 Ancient societies like those of the Egyptians and the Greeks made more progress in medicine than people in the Middle Ages.</p> <p>(b) Explain why bloodletting was widely used in the Middle Ages. [7]</p>	
<i>Candidate style answer</i>	<i>Examiner's commentary</i>
<p><i>Bloodletting was popular because of the Theory of the Four Humours. This was accepted by everybody as the way to explain why people became ill. This was because the humours got out of balance. One way of getting the humours back into balance was to bleed people so that the excess blood was lost and the person became better. Another reason why bloodletting was used was the fact that it had been used by the Greeks like Hippocrates and Galen. People in the Middle Ages had great admiration for the Greeks and so copied their ideas.</i></p>	<p>High level response</p> <p>This is an excellent answer. The candidate has produced clear explanations of two reasons. Both of these explanations have used relevant knowledge. The impressive point about this answer is the way that it answers the question directly and does not waste time filling the answer up with irrelevant description.</p>

<p>2 Ancient societies like those of the Egyptians and the Greeks made more progress in medicine than people in the Middle Ages.</p> <p>(b) Explain why bloodletting was widely used in the Middle Ages. [7]</p>	
<i>Candidate style answer</i>	<i>Examiner's commentary</i>
<p><i>Bloodletting was popular because of the Theory of the Four Humours. It was also popular because the Church supported Galen. Another reason was the fact that Hippocrates had used it.</i></p>	<p>Medium level response</p> <p>This answer starts well. Three valid reasons are identified. However, the candidate had not explained any of them. This means that the answer stays in a middle level in the mark scheme. To achieve a better mark the reasons need to be explained.</p>

2 Ancient societies like those of the Egyptians and the Greeks made more progress in medicine than people in the Middle Ages.

(c) Why did the Ancient Greeks make more progress in medicine than people in the Middle Ages? Explain your answer [8]

<i>Candidate style answer</i>	<i>Examiner's commentary</i>
<p><i>The Greeks made much more progress than the people in the Middle Ages because the Christian Church held things back in the Middle Ages. It taught that illness could be caused by devils or by God as a punishment. God had to be prayed to make people better because he was the only one powerful enough to do this. People themselves could not cure illness. This led to people thinking they had to rely on God to cure them and so they lost interest in researching the causes of disease and investigating the structure of the body. This held back progress. On the other hand, the Greeks developed natural explanations for the cause of disease. Greek doctors observed patients to work out what was wrong with them. Through clinical observation, they recorded the daily symptoms of their patients. This led the Greeks to look for natural cures for disease.</i></p>	<p>High level response</p> <p>The examiner would be really impressed by this answer. The candidate clearly knows a lot about medicine in the Middle Ages and also during the Greek period. The answer starts off by explaining why little progress was made in medicine in the Middle Ages. In this answer, the candidate concentrates on the negative impact of the Church. Notice how the candidate then turns to the Greeks and offers an explanation as to why they were able to make more progress than people in the Middle Ages. To achieve top marks in this question it is necessary to explain both why the Middle Ages made little progress and why the Greeks made a lot of progress. This answer does this.</p>

<p>2 Ancient societies like those of the Egyptians and the Greeks made more progress in medicine than people in the Middle Ages.</p> <p>(c) Why did the Ancient Greeks make more progress in medicine than people in the Middle Ages? Explain your answer [8]</p>	
<i>Candidate style answer</i>	<i>Examiner's commentary</i>
<p><i>The Greeks made much more progress than the people in the Middle Ages because the Christian Church held things back in the Middle Ages. They also used methods that did not help like astrology and supernatural methods. The fall of the Roman Empire did not help much either. On the other hand the Greeks had natural ideas and examined patients carefully.</i></p>	<p>Medium level response</p> <p>This candidate has some reasonable knowledge and has managed to identify a number of reasons why The Greeks made more progress. However, the candidate has failed to explain any of these reasons. One of the important moves that candidates need to make in answering (b) and (c) questions is to move from identifying reasons to explaining them. Answers that do this quickly move up the mark scheme.</p>

Section A: Development Study

(b) Crime and Punishment Through Time

1(a) Study Source A. Are you surprised that these crimes could be punished by the death penalty? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. [5]	
<i>Candidate style answer</i>	<i>Examiner's commentary</i>
<i>No I am not surprised because the laws in those days were passed by the landed classes. They wanted to protect their property. They regarded the rabbits on their land as their property and they saw poaching as theft. They did not want people making their faces black because this is what they did when they were poaching at night so they would not be seen.</i>	High level response This is a very good answer. Notice how the candidate has referred to the particular crimes listed in the source and has used contextual knowledge about the dominance of the landed classes in society at this time to show that these crimes were against landed interests. Given the power and importance of the landed classes, it is therefore not surprising that the punishments for these crimes were so harsh.

1(a) Study Source A.

Are you surprised that these crimes could be punished by the death penalty? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. [5]

Candidate style answer

No I am not surprised because this was the time of the Bloody Code when hundreds of minor crimes were punished by death. This is because people thought the crime rate was going up and something had to be done to stop it.

Examiner's commentary

Medium level response

This is quite a good answer. Notice that the candidate has used knowledge of the eighteenth century ('the time of the Bloody Code') to answer the question. This knowledge has been used to effectively explain why punishments were harsh at that time. To improve this answer, the candidate needs to show an understanding that law and the punishment of crime were controlled by the landed classes at this time. The crimes listed in Source A are all against landed interests. Nevertheless, this is still a pretty good answer.

1(b) Study Source B.

How far does this source give an accurate impression of eighteenth-century smugglers? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

[5]

Candidate style answer

This source doesn't give an accurate impression of smugglers. Smugglers were not murderers like this; they were just ordinary people who did not have enough to live on and needed to save some money by not paying duties. Many people did not regard smuggling as a crime and it was part of their everyday lives. They didn't all go round murdering people like in the picture. Moreover, this source is an engraving, published in 1748, about the Hawkhurst Gang of smugglers. We do not know who had the engraving made. It could have been done by opponents of smuggling who were trying to give a bad impression of smuggling in general. In any case, it only shows one particular group of smugglers who might have been very different from other smugglers in the eighteenth century.

Examiner's commentary

High level response

This is a very impressive answer. The candidate has used details from the source and contextual knowledge to explain that the scene shown does not match the common impression of eighteenth-century smuggling. The answer then goes on to investigate the origins of the source and suggests that it may have been produced to give a bad impression of smugglers - so it cannot be trusted as an accurate impression. By the end of the answer the candidate has explained two reasons why the source is not accurate.

<p>1(b) Study Source B.</p> <p>How far does this source give an accurate impression of eighteenth-century smugglers? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. [5]</p>	
<i>Candidate style answer</i>	<i>Examiner's commentary</i>
<p><i>This source doesn't give an accurate impression of smugglers. Smugglers were not murderers like this; they were just ordinary people who did not have enough to live on and needed to save some money by not paying duties. Many people did not regard smuggling as a crime and it was part of their everyday lives. They didn't all go round murdering people like in the picture.</i></p>	<p>Medium level response</p> <p>This is a promising answer. The candidate has used good knowledge about smugglers to show that the source is inaccurate in the impression it gives of eighteenth-century smugglers. To improve the answer further, the candidate could have gone on to comment about the reliability of the source as evidence, or to have used knowledge to explain that some smugglers were like those shown in the illustration.</p>

<p>1(c) Study Source C.</p> <p>Does this source prove that transportation was a failure? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. [5]</p>	
<i>Candidate style answer</i>	<i>Examiner's commentary</i>
<p><i>No this source doesn't prove it was a failure. As the source says those convicts who had a dreadful time in Australia did not write back home telling people about it. The conditions were terrible. They were put in prison camps like those on Tasmania where they were put to hard labour and were often whipped. They were often put into solitary confinement. This means that transportation was feared because of these terrible conditions and so was not a failure.</i></p>	<p>High level response</p> <p>This is a very good answer. Here, the candidate has used source details and contextual knowledge to challenge the view expressed in the question. It starts by quoting details from the source about those convicts who did not write home but then adds details about prison camps in Tasmania which is not mentioned in the source, coming instead from the candidate's own knowledge. This would be even better if the candidate could have used contextual knowledge of examples where transportation did fail, but this is still a top level answer.</p>

1(c) Study Source C.

Does this source prove that transportation was a failure? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. [5]

<i>Candidate style answer</i>	<i>Examiner's commentary</i>
<p><i>This source does prove it was a failure because it says that prisoners thought Australia was a good place so it would not put them off breaking the law. As it says in the source, 'There was the idea that you might be better off there than in England.' However, it also says that prisoners who were destroyed by the system did not write home. In that case, even this source seems to suggest that transportation might have worked on some of the prisoners.</i></p>	<p>Medium level response</p> <p>This is quite a convincing answer. The examiner will be impressed by the fact that the candidate has written a balanced answer; notice how it explains that the source may prove and disprove that transportation was a failure. Details from the source are given to support both sides of the argument. The weakness of the answer it is it is all comes from the source. To achieve more marks the candidate needs to use some knowledge and provide examples of transportation failing or succeeding, or both.</p>

<p>2 Some attitudes about crime and punishment have changed over the years.</p> <p>(a) Briefly describe ways in which the Romans punished criminals. [5]</p>	
<i>Candidate style answer</i>	<i>Examiner's commentary</i>
<p><i>The Romans punished people harshly. If a shop keeper cheated customers by selling under-weight bread they would have to pay the customer the cost of the bread. Crimes such as false witness, adultery and counterfeiting were punished with the death penalty. The death penalty was enforced by burying alive, throwing from a cliff or burning the guilty one. Executions were even ordered for possession of weapons with criminal intent or for possession of poison.</i></p>	<p>High level response</p> <p>This is a very good answer. Notice that the candidate does not tell us about every method of punishment used by the Romans. The answer lists two methods of punishment, but scores highly because each method is supported by examples which demonstrate the candidate's good understanding of the Roman system for the punishment of crime. Usually in questions of this kind, it is enough to list two examples and describe them more fully, or explain how they were used, in order to get full marks for the answer.</p>

<p>2 Some attitudes about crime and punishment have changed over the years.</p> <p>(a) Briefly describe ways in which the Romans punished criminals. [5]</p>	
<i>Candidate style answer</i>	<i>Examiner's commentary</i>
<p>The Romans punished people harshly. If a shop keeper cheated customers by selling under-weight bread they would have to pay the customer the cost of the bread.</p>	<p>Medium level response</p> <p>This is not bad. The candidate has given one example only of how the Romans punished criminals. Normally, this would be worth very few marks, but the candidate has rescued this by describing this method of punishment with the use of a specific example. This gets the candidate a couple of extra marks. To improve this, the candidate could have gone on to talk about other methods of punishment, like burning at the stake, fighting in the arena, the death penalty, or the exiling of noblemen, for example.</p>

<p>2 Some attitudes about crime and punishment have changed over the years.</p> <p>(b) Explain why the story of Robin Hood was popular in the Middle Ages. [7]</p>	
<p><i>Candidate style answer</i></p>	<p><i>Examiner's commentary</i></p>
<p><i>The story was popular because people hated the forest laws. These were laws that stopped anyone hunting or taking wood from the King's forests. People needed this timber and hunting deer would give them some meat to eat which they did not normally have. So the story of Robin was popular because people liked to hear about someone breaking these laws. According to legend, Robin Hood and his band of outlaws lived in the royal forest of Sherwood. Poor people had nothing to fear from Robin Hood – but when rich people passed through the forest, Robin Hood would stop them and demand their money. The money was not for himself; Robin Hood gave it all to the poor people. He was therefore popular because he was defending the poor against the rich and the corrupt Sheriff of Nottingham. The sheriff was a cruel nobleman who demanded more and more money from the poor people under his control.</i></p>	<p>High level response</p> <p>This is a very pleasing answer. Look at how the candidate has explained two reasons for the popularity of the story of Robin Hood in the Middle Ages. The answer begins by talking about the unpopularity of the forest laws, which Robin Hood was said to have broken on behalf of the poor. The answer then goes on to describe how the story was an attack on the rich, which was popular with poor people. This point is supported by reference to the sheriff of Nottingham. Throughout, the candidate has made good use of contextual knowledge to support the arguments given.</p>

<p>2 Some attitudes about crime and punishment have changed over the years.</p> <p>(b) Explain why the story of Robin Hood was popular in the Middle Ages. [7]</p>	
<p><i>Candidate style answer</i></p> <p><i>The story was popular because people hated the forest laws. It was also popular because it made fun of sheriffs and people in authority. It also criticised King John.</i></p>	
<p><i>Examiner's commentary</i></p> <p>Medium level response</p> <p>This answer lists three perfectly good reasons why the story was popular. Unfortunately, the candidate has not explained any of them. In answers to (b) and (c) questions the way to score high marks is to explain reasons rather than just identifying or describing them.</p>	

<p>2 Some attitudes about crime and punishment have changed over the years.</p> <p>(c) 'The treatment of criminals in the nineteenth century was different from their treatment in the Middle Ages.' Explain how far you agree with this statement. [8]</p>	
<i>Candidate style answer</i>	<i>Examiner's commentary</i>
<p><i>The treatment was different. In the nineteenth century they increased the number of prisons and people were sent there instead of being executed or being transported. Prisons were meant to reform the prisoners and to do this they introduced the separate system which stopped prisoners mixing and spreading bad habits. They would spend most of their time in their cells where they would work and would say their prayers. This was different from the Middle Ages where prisons were not used as a punishment but just to hold someone while they waited for their trial. However, although the number of executions was reduced, in the nineteenth century criminals could still be executed for crimes they had committed. Physical punishments (for example corporal punishment) were used in the Middle Ages and were still being used in the nineteenth century. I believe punishments were still harsh and at times physical, but in the nineteenth century, people had begun to look for other ways to treat criminals so that they would not commit crime again.</i></p>	<p>High level response</p> <p>This is a good answer. Notice how the candidate has tried to be balanced in the answer. As well as describing differences in the methods of treating criminals in the two periods, the answer also identifies some things that were similar. The only weakness is a failure by the candidate to tackle the 'how far?' part of the answer. A conclusion is needed where the candidate could explain whether the treatment of criminals in the nineteenth century had more differences or more similarities with the Middle Ages.</p>

<p>2 Some attitudes about crime and punishment have changed over the years.</p> <p>(c) 'The treatment of criminals in the nineteenth century was different from their treatment in the Middle Ages.' Explain how far you agree with this statement. [8]</p>	
<i>Candidate style answer</i>	<i>Examiner's commentary</i>
<p><i>The treatment was very different. In the nineteenth century they increased the number of prisons and people were sent there instead of being executed or being transported. Prisons were meant to reform the prisoners and to do this they introduced the separate system which stopped prisoners mixing and spreading bad habits. They would spend most of their time in their cells where they would work and would say their prayers. This was different from the Middle Ages where prisons were not used as a punishment but just to hold someone while they waited for their trial.</i></p>	<p>Medium level response</p> <p>This is a well-explained answer about the differences between the treatment of people in prisons in nineteenth century Britain compared to the role and purpose of prisons in the Middle Ages. As such, it would score fairly good marks. However, the answer asks 'how far' and the candidate has only given examples of differences. To achieve more marks examples of similarities would be needed and a conclusion comparing whether the differences were greater than the similarities.</p>