

History A (Schools History Project)

General Certificate of Secondary Education **A952/21**

Developments in British Medicine, 1200–1945

Mark Scheme for June 2010

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

NOTES TO EXAMINERS

OCR will have provided you with a CD disk copy of the ASSESSORS' INSTRUCTIONS. This gives details of all administrative procedures. You should read it carefully before starting to mark. The additional notes below deal with instructions that are specific to this paper and how it is to be marked.

- 1 This marking scheme has been designed to assess candidates' skills in using sources, and their understanding of concepts relating to these skills, such as reliability, proof, similarity/difference. None of these skills and conceptual understandings can be demonstrated without the use of knowledge and information, but the testing of knowledge for its own sake is never the primary objective.
- 2 The marking scheme does not give examples of all possible, rewardable answers. There will almost always be a range of support which could be used in an answer. *Examiners must recognise and reward relevant material, even if it is not included in the marking scheme.* Just as important, where an example of an answer is given in the marking scheme, markers should not expect all rewardable answers to duplicate the example.
- 3 It is important to keep in mind that in the examination candidates have a limited amount of time to demonstrate what they can do. The skills and concepts being assessed are not all straightforward. Marking should not, therefore, be punitive. It should reward candidates for what they have managed to achieve, and not penalise them for lack of knowledge, understanding or skill.

Levels of Response Marking

- 4 This type of marking scheme rewards the level of skill or understanding displayed in an answer. The marker's task is to read the answer and identify the level it has reached. If a candidate's answer reaches a particular level, it **MUST** be awarded a mark within that level, regardless of any other considerations. A marker does not have the discretion to place what s/he regards as a weak/strong example in a level lower/higher than that to which it corresponds.
- 5 Often a level will comprise a band of marks. The marking scheme will usually give specific directions for the award of marks within a band, but where it does not, the marker has discretion to choose an appropriate mark within the band, bearing in mind the amount of supporting information used, and whether the answer can be regarded as a strong/weak example of the level.
- 6 Do not expect the whole of an answer to demonstrate attainment at the same level. Candidates may include a variety of perceptions, at various levels, in their answers. It is the highest level achieved in any part of the answer, no matter how brief, that earns the final mark to be awarded.
- 7 In levels of response marking, the award of marks within an answer is not cumulative, and neither does an answer have to demonstrate achievement in lower levels to be awarded a higher level mark.
- 8 Examples of responses which are given in the marking scheme are no more than examples. They are not prescriptive. There will be many other answers which fall within a given level. **The important aspect of each level is the LEVEL DESCRIPTOR.** Do not try to match the candidate's words with those in the example; rather, match the quality of the answer with the level descriptor.

- 9 If you come across an answer which is valid, but which does not fit into any of the level descriptors, consult the senior examiner who is supervising your work. He will advise you on placing the answer in the most appropriate equivalent level.
- 10 As a marker, your most important task is correctly to identify the level into which an answer falls. Deciding on the correct mark *within* a level is also significant, but it is unlikely to make such a difference as an incorrect decision about a level.
- 11 Where an answer merits the top mark in a level, do not hesitate to award it. There is no sense in artificially deflating marks by always awarding low marks within a level. If all markers were to adopt such an ungenerous approach, the effect would simply be to narrow and bunch the total mark range available.

Marking Technique

- 12 Half marks are never used, and must never be awarded.
- 13 The maximum mark for each question is fixed. Never transfer marks from one question to another.
- 14 You must mark the scripts in the following way:
- As you read an answer, you will come across certain passages which clearly satisfy the requirements of a particular level. Underline such material, and note in the right-hand margin the level being achieved (eg L2). By the end of the answer there may be several such annotations.
 - You may, if you wish, make other notes in the margin, briefly explaining why you have awarded a certain level. These will be helpful to anyone who subsequently checks your marking.
 - When you finish reading an answer, the highest level achieved will be evident from your notes in the right-hand margin. Now you must decide the mark within that level to be awarded. When you have decided, write the level and the mark as follows in the right hand margin at the end of the answer (eg L4/7) and draw a circle round it to indicate that this is the final mark awarded. There will, then, be a circled mark for every question.
 - When you have finished a script, transcribe the circled question marks to the front page of the script for totalling.

- 1 Study Source A.**
What can we learn about quack doctors from this source? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. [6]
- Level 1: Answers which describe surface features of the source. [1]**
Eg 'Quack doctors wore fancy clothes and a posh hat.'
- Level 2: Answers which make unsupported inferences. [2-3]**
Eg 'Quack doctors conned the public into buying medicines. They performed in travelling shows.'
- Level 3: Answers which make inferences supported from the source. [4-5]**
Eg 'Quack doctors conned the public into buying medicines. You can see the quack doctor displaying his medicines in a special box. They performed in travelling shows. You can see the quack and his performing monkey sitting on his shoulder. He is sitting on a donkey and a jester is blowing a trumpet. These were all probably part of the entertainment team that kept the crowds amused.'
- Level 4: Answers which make inferences supported from the source and contextual knowledge or cross-reference to other sources. [6]**

Valid inferences

Showman/entertainers/performers
 Sold medicines
 Sly/cunning
 Extravagant/exotic/travelled abroad

Invalid inferences

Travelled
 Made a lot of money

NB Make sure use of own knowledge is valid

2 Study Source B.

Are you surprised by what this patient said to Dr Strachan? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

Level 1: **Everyday empathy** [1]

Eg 'I am surprised. How could spiders webs have worked?'

OR: **Answers which make valid points but do not say whether they are surprised or not.**

Level 2: **Answers which state surprised or not surprised and use support internal to the source.** [2–3]

Eg 'I am surprised. The doctor went and got all of this help for the patient and got him to change his lifestyle and gradually he got better. All the thanks the doctor got was to be told by the patient that he had been cured by some stupid remedy given to him by a quack doctor.' OR

'I am not surprised. The patient tells Dr Strachan that he is doing very well and the source says that Dr Strachan had restored him to good health.'

Level 3: **Both elements of Level 2** [4]

Level 4: **Surprised OR not surprised developed through contextual knowledge or cross-reference.** [5-7]

Eg 'I am not surprised. Source G tells us that quack medicines were cheaper than prescriptions from professional doctors and that by 1800 many people were supplementing cures from professionals by visiting quacks. This is exactly what this patient has done.'

NB. Award 5 for general contextual knowledge.

Level 5: **Both elements of Level 4.** [8]

Eg 'I am very surprised. Source D says that quacks poisoned people and tricked them. I'm surprised he went to a quack. However, I am also not surprised. Source G tells us that quack medicines were cheaper than prescriptions from professional doctors and that by 1800 many people were supplementing cures from professionals by visiting quacks. This is exactly what this patient has done.'

3 Study Source C.

How useful is this source as evidence about quack doctors? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

Level 1: Bases the answer on undeveloped comments about source type or date. (Simple provenance) [1]

Eg 'It is not that useful because it is only from a dictionary. It is only from 1755, so it can't tell us much about things before or after that date.'

Level 2: Answers which explain what we can or cannot find out about quack doctors in general from the source. [2-3]

Eg 'It is useful. It tells us that they were 'sly' and were also 'pretenders'. This tells us that quack doctors were tricking the public. It also tells us that they advertised their products.' ('One who advertises his own abilities in public places.')

Level 3: Both elements of Level 2. [4-5]

Eg 'It is useful. It tells us that they were 'sly' and were also 'pretenders'. This tells us that quack doctors were tricking the public. It also tells us that they advertised their products. ('One who advertises his own abilities in public places.') It would have been helpful if the source had contained other details. It doesn't tell us that quack doctors were popular and many people used their remedies.'

Level 4: Answers which evaluate the source using the language in the source or by cross-reference to other sources. [6-7]

Eg 'This source is very useful because what it says about quack doctors is correct and other sources back it up. Source D says quacks tricked the public as well. Source E is a song which is making fun of quack doctors and the ludicrous claims they make. Therefore, Source C is useful because it is backed up by the other sources and my own knowledge.'

Level 5: Answers which use the source as evidence of attitudes to quacks or the purpose of the author in the dictionary. [8]

Such answers must be substantiated. If answers are simply asserted at this level, =L2.

4 Study Sources D and E.

How similar are these two sources? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. [9]

Level 1: Answers based on provenance or dates [1–2]

Eg 'They are similar because they are both written in the eighteenth century. However, one is from a book and the other is from a song in a show.' (2)
1 mark for time or type. 2 marks for both.

OR: Answers based on misinterpretations of source E.

Level 2: Answers based on topic/or message. But without support from the sources [3-4]

Eg 'Yes they are similar. They both talk about quack doctors.'

OR: Uses both sources and then concludes 'so they are similar'. (No direct comparison/assertions).

OR: Identifies information that is in one source but not the other (eg. 'travel' etc.)

Level 3: Answers which explain similarities in message and provide support from sources. [5-6]

Eg 'I think that they are very similar. Source D criticizes the role of quack doctors, saying they trick the public by selling them 'dross'. In Source E it is making fun of quacks. Let's face it, who really believes they can cure the dead? Both sources set out a negative view of quack doctors.'

Level 4: Answers which explain similarities AND/OR differences in tone and support from sources [7]

Eg 'I think that they are very different. Source D criticizes the role of quack doctors in a very serious way, saying they trick the public by selling them 'dross'. In Source E it is making fun of quacks in a light-hearted way.'

Level 5: Level 3 and level 4.

OR: Compares purpose/motivation of D with tone/message/purpose of E [8–9]

Eg 'Source D is very critical of quacks. It says their medicines are 'dross' and it says they tricked the public. It was written by a regular doctor who, like most regular doctors, probably resented the popularity of the quacks. This explains his hostile tone. Source E is not as harsh. It is from a show and the song is meant to amuse and entertain the audience. Although it makes fun of quacks, it does not call them cheats or say their medicine was dross.'

5 Study Source F.

Does this source prove that quack doctors were unpopular in the eighteenth century? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

[9]

Level 1: Generalised answers without support from the source.

[1]

Eg 'Yes it does. People didn't like quack doctors.'

Level 2: Yes it does because that is what it shows.

[2-3]

Eg 'They must have been unpopular. You can see an angry crowd pelting the quack and his assistants with stones. Nobody seems to want to defend him, so he must have been unpopular.'

OR: Undeveloped provenance.

Eg 'One person's view.'

Level 3: Answers based on typicality/limitations of the source using the source only to challenge the statement.

[4-5]

Eg 'The picture seems to suggest they were unpopular, but this is only one doctor. He might normally have been popular, but maybe one of his treatments went wrong in this village and the people want revenge. It doesn't mean all quack doctors were unpopular.'

Level 4: Evaluation by presumed purpose of source.

[6]

Eg 'I don't know whether I believe this source. Yes, it appears to show that this quack doctor and his assistants have come under fire. However, it is only a cartoon. We do not know who drew it. It may have been done by someone who did not like quacks and wanted to show them in a bad light. It may have been done on the instructions of the trained medical profession who may have been jealous of quack doctors.'

Level 5: Evaluation by cross-reference to other sources or contextual knowledge to support argument.

[7-8]

Eg 'I don't know whether I believe this source. Yes, it appears to show that this quack doctor and his assistants have come under fire. However, it is only a cartoon. We do not know who drew it. It may have been done by someone who did not like quacks and wanted to show them in a bad light. It may have been done on the instructions of the trained medical profession who may have been jealous of quack doctors. I know that there was great rivalry between so called 'regular' doctors and quacks. There was often opposition to new ideas at this time. Even Harvey had been called a quack, and Pasteur was also accused in the same way later in the nineteenth century. Professional doctors could make money from prescribing medicines and treatments and quacks were competing with them. Perhaps the doctors wanted to discredit the quacks to protect their own interests. Source G also says that treatments sold by quacks were popular with ordinary people, so this goes against this statement.'

Level 6: Level 4 plus Level 6

[9]

6 Study all the sources.

‘Quack doctors made little contribution to caring for the sick in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.’

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]

Level 1: Answers which do not use sources [1]

At this level candidates just write about quack doctors and ignore the sources.

Level 2: Non specific source use ie no supporting detail, no reference to source by letter or quote [2–3]

At this level candidates may talk of ‘the sources’, ‘Some sources’, or even identify sources without using the detail in them.

Level 3: Uses source(s) to support OR oppose interpretation [4–6]

Eg ‘I agree with this statement. The background information says that quack doctors were ineffective. Source A shows that they had little understanding of the cause of disease. It is obvious from reading Source E that quack doctors made ludicrous claims about what they could do. Some doctors even claimed they could cure those who had already died.’

Level 4: Uses source(s) to support AND oppose interpretation [7–9]

Eg ‘I agree with this statement. The background information says that quack doctors were ineffective. (Y) Source A shows that they had little understanding of the cause of disease. (Y) It is obvious from reading Source E that quack doctors made ludicrous claims about what they could do. Some doctors even claimed they could cure those who had already died. (Y) However, Source G shows that even though quack cures were probably ineffective, people nevertheless turned to quack doctors for help. (N) Source B shows that people still believed in the cures of quack doctors, even when it was clear that their recovery was due to other reasons. This shows that quack doctors were still trusted by many people. (N) As a result, as Source G says, there was little difference between quack doctors and professionals. Even though quack doctors probably made little contribution to the advance of science or medicine, they certainly played their part in caring for the sick.’

Award up to TWO marks for any explanation of the reliability, sufficiency etc of source but mark must not exceed 10.

- To score in L3/L4, there must be source use, ie direct reference to source content.
- Only credit source use where reference is made to a source by letter or direct quote. Simply writing about issues covered by the sources is not enough.
- Candidates must explain how the sources help them to support or oppose the statement.

When marking, indicate each valid source use for 'little contribution' with 'Y', and 'N' if the candidate makes a valid point about the contribution made by quack doctors to caring for the ill and supports it from a quoted source.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2010

