GCE

History B

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **F984**

Using Historical Evidence – Non British History

Mark Scheme for June 2010

Generic Mark Scheme for F984 Question 1(a), 2(a), 3(a), 4(a)

Maximum mark: 35

Allocation of marks within the Unit: AO1: 15; AO2: 20 (AO2a: 10; AO2b: 10).

	AO1 Knowledge and Understanding	AO2a Sources	AO2b Interpretations
Level 1	13-15	9-10	9-10
Level 2	10-12	7-8	7-8
Level 3	7-9	5-6	5-6
Level 4	4-6	3-4	3-4
Level 5	1-3	1-2	1-2
Level 6	0	0	0

	AO1 Knowledge and understanding	**AO2a: Interpretation of sources**	**AO2b: Historical interpretations**
Level 1	Uses sound knowledge and understanding of changes and developments across the period to evaluate sources. Uses appropriate historical terminology accurately. Structure of argument is coherent. Writing is legible. **13-15**	Evaluates sources of evidence in their historical context: makes sophisticated inferences from the sources, makes an informed use of the provenance of the sources and cross-references the sources to reach a reasoned and supported conclusion. **9-10**	Shows a sound understanding that interpretations are dependant on the available evidence and how it is interpreted. Suggests and justifies, through a sophisticated use of sources and knowledge, an amended or alternative interpretation. **9-10**
Level 2	Uses knowledge and understanding of changes and developments across the period to make inferences from sources. Uses historical terminology accurately. Structure of argument is clear. Writing is legible. **10-12**	Evaluates evidence from sources in their historical context: makes inferences from the sources, makes an informed use of the provenance of the sources or cross-references the sources to reach a supported conclusion. **7-8**	Shows an understanding that interpretations are dependant on the evidence that is inferred from sources. Uses interpretations of the sources to support and challenge the interpretation and reaches an overall conclusion. **7-8**
Level 3	Uses some knowledge and understanding of changes and developments across the period to go beyond face value reading of sources. Uses a limited range of historical terminology accurately. Structure of argument lacks some clarity. **7-9**	Makes inferences from the sources and cross-references the sources to reach a conclusion. Some simple evaluation. References to the provenance of the sources are not developed in context. **5-6**	Shows some understanding that interpretations are dependant on sources of evidence. Uses evidence inferred from sources to test the interpretation by showing how they support and disagree with it. **5-6**

Level 4	Uses knowledge of the period to evaluate sources for bias, suggest missing information. Uses a limited range of historical terminology with some accuracy. Structure of writing contains some weaknesses at paragraph and sentence level. **4-6**	Makes simple inferences from the sources. Makes claims of bias, exaggeration and lack of typicality. Cross-references information from sources. **3-4**	Uses evidence inferred from the sources to test the interpretation by showing either how they support it or disagree with it. **3-4**
Level 5	Knowledge is used to expand on the information contained in the sources. Use of historical terminology is insecure. Structure of writing is weak, with poor paragraphing and inaccuracy at sentence level. **1-3**	Uses sources in isolation. Extracts relevant information from sources at face value. **1-2**	Matches information in the sources to show how the interpretation is right and/or wrong. **1-2**
Level 6	No additional knowledge is provided. Does not use appropriate historical terminology. Structure is incoherent. **0**	No use is made of the sources. Misunderstands sources. **0**	No successful matching of information or evidence to the interpretation. **0**

Generic Mark Scheme for F984, Question 1(b), 2(b), 3(b), 4(b).

Maximum mark: 15

Allocation of marks within the Unit: AO1: 5; AO2: 10 (AO2a: 10; AO2b: 0).

	AO1 Knowledge and Understanding	AO2a Sources	AO2b Interpretations
Level 1	5	9-10	0
Level 2	4	7-8	0
Level 3	3	5-6	0
Level 4	2	3-4	0
Level 5	1	1-2	0
Level 6	0	0	0

	AO1 Knowledge and understanding	**AO2a: Analysis of sources**
Level 1	Good and detailed knowledge and understanding of the characteristics of the period and changes and developments across the period, used to support analysis of sources. **5**	Explains, with examples from most of the sources, that the value of sources depends on the purpose of the historian, the questions being asked, different interpretations of the sources and judgements about the typicality, purpose and reliability of the sources. Candidates will explain both the value and the problems associated with using these sources. Candidates will also show knowledge of the range of sources used for studying this period. **9-10**
Level 2	Reasonable knowledge and understanding of the main characteristics of the period and the main changes and developments across the period used to support analysis of the sources. **4**	Explains, with examples from some of the sources that the value of sources depends on most of the following issues: the purpose of the historian, the questions being asked, different interpretations of the sources and judgements about the typicality, purpose and reliability of the sources. Candidates will explain both the value and the problems associated with using these sources even if one side of the explanation is stronger than the other. Candidates will show awareness of some of the types of sources used for studying this period. **7-8**

Level 3	Some knowledge and understanding of some of the main characteristics of the period and some of the main changes and developments across the period. This is sometimes used to support the analysis of the sources. **3**	Explains, with examples from some of the sources that the value of sources depends on judgements about the typicality, purpose and reliability of the sources. Candidates will explain either the value of the sources or the problems associated with using these sources. Candidates will show some awareness of some of the types of sources used for studying this period. **5-6**
Level 4	Some knowledge of the period occasionally used to support the analysis of the sources. **2**	Identifies ways in which these sources are of use to an historian and identifies some problems associated with them. Relevant parts of the sources are also identified. **3-4**
Level 5	Some knowledge of the period but not used to support the analysis of the sources. **1**	Fails to use the sources but explains some valid issues associated with historical sources generally. **1-2**
Level 6	Little knowledge of the period – not used to support the analysis of the sources **0**	Fails to use the sources but identifies some valid issues associated with historical sources generally **0**

Question 1

The Vikings in Europe 790s-1066

The nature of Viking culture

Interpretation: **Viking culture was military in nature**

1   (a)   Explain how far Sources 1-7 support this interpretation. You may, if you wish, amend the interpretation or suggest a different interpretation. If you do this you must use the Sources to support the changes you make.
[35]

Examples of arguments, evidence and source evaluations that may be included in responses:

Knowledge and understanding:

Candidates may use their wider knowledge of Viking society to evaluate the interpretation in the light of the sources. It is important to recognise that the nature of the written sources leaves little room for anything but support for the interpretation. Better candidates will recognise the heroic nature of much of the evidence that originates from Scandinavia and the impact that this has had on popular images of the Vikings. Of course, Viking society was as complex as any other and was peopled by a range of types of individual. Better candidates will be able to distinguish the mass of Vikings from the warrior elite. Further, the nature of the archaeological evidence has a bearing on this debate. Here the elite are less obvious and the evidence in relation to the interpretation is more balanced.

Evidence from the sources that can support the interpretation:

Source 1: as an example of heroic poetry, at face value this supports the interpretation. Candidates may also discuss the religious and ritual tone of the text, pointing to pre-Christian beliefs and hence inferring firm support for the interpretation.

Source 2: contains a typical non-Scandinavian view of the Vikings as blood-thirsty marauders.

Source 4: depending on the candidate's interpretation of the grave goods, the evidence may be used to support the interpretation. These blades may be interpreted as weapons.

Evidence from the sources that can challenge the interpretation:

Source 3: laws imply a settled and organised society with sophisticated government discouraging violence. Perhaps this gives a more realistic view of everyday Viking life.

Source 4: the blades may be interpreted as having symbolic significance in the grave, or as being from knives with a domestic or other non-military purpose.

Source 5: is Viking art of exceptionally high quality. It has military associations: it is from a ship burial of a warrior, but it provides evidence of the artistic achievements of Viking society.

Source 6: provides evidence of the role of Viking kings in caring for their people.

Source 7: contains clear reference to trading and implies other important gatherings as a feature of Viking culture.

Evaluation of sources:

Sources 1 and 2 represent typical versions of the Vikings as warriors, but from different directions. One is Scandinavian, the other from an Anglo-Saxon who had been subjected to the fury of the Norsemen. Both accounts are the result of clear literary and hagiographical stereotypes. Source 3 is part of a large corpus of legal literature, so candidates may refer to its typicality. There is some debate as to how law was imposed on Viking society. The extent to which some personal enforcement was required can support the warrior ethic prompt of the interpretation. Source 4 should prompt a debate about the interpretation of archaeological evidence. A complex and detailed debate with reference to the interpretation is possible here. Source 5 is also archaeological and may prompt a debate about typicality. Source 6 may be cross-referenced with source 1 and 2.

Judgement:

The judgement will centre on the nature of one part of the corpus of written evidence and the nature of its composition. The saga tradition on the one hand, and the records of the enemies of the Vikings on the other, create an image of a warrior culture for different reasons. Archaeological and law-making evidence should create a valuable balance. There is considerable mileage in a discussion of the elite culture embodied in the sagas and the reality of everyday life. Candidates may also distinguish between pagan and Christian eras.

(b) **Explain how these sources are both useful and raise problems and issues for a historian using them.**   **[15]**

Source 1 is from an epic poem that has cultural and hagiographical content. It was written for the elite and would have been read in public assemblies of that group. It presents an image of warfare with strong religious content. It may, however, present an ideal of a military society that is greatly distorted and divorced from reality. It may present an image unknown to the bulk of Viking society.

Source 2 is derived from an English ecclesiastical source which depicts Vikings in a very stereotypical - and military – manner. Its origins lie in a society at war with the Vikings and it is written from a religious (Christian) standpoint.

Sources 3 and 7 are written long after the events described and the accounts may be coloured by intervening developments such as the conversion of Vikings to Christianity.

The objects in Source 4 are derived from a number of burials and selection has taken place to focus on weapons in this picture. The nature of archaeological deposition might be discussed. Weapons might be found in graves other than those of warriors, for example those of women and children. They may indicate status or wealth or have ritual function beyond purely face value evidence of military activity.

Source 5 is also archaeological and gives evidence of art and exquisite craftsmanship. It therefore gives clear evidence of skill and artistic achievement in Viking society. Its typicality is open to doubt as it is from a ship grave of a member of

the elite. It displays characteristically Viking typology, but may have been crafted by a non-Viking.

The context of source 6 is limited: there is no proof that the measure was effective.

Question 2

The Italian Renaissance c1420-c1550

The Development of Political Thought and Ideas

Interpretation: **Developments in political ideas were a response to practical situations.**

2   (a)   Explain how far Sources 1-7 support this interpretation. You may, if you wish, amend the interpretation or suggest a different interpretation. If you do this you must use the Sources to support the changes you make.   [35]

Examples of arguments, evidence and source evaluation that may be included in responses:

Knowledge and understanding:

Candidates may use wider knowledge of Renaissance political ideas. For example they may recognise the classical ideas about forms of government (monarchy, aristocracy etc.) in Sources 1, 5 and 6 and comment on how Renaissance writers used these ideas to characterise the governments of Italian city states, the conduct of rulers etc.

Candidates may use their knowledge of events and developments in Florence in particular and Italy in general to contextualise the descriptions of Cosimo and Lorenzo de' Medici. This might include the impact of the Italian Wars alluded to in Source 3, which began shortly after Lorenzo's death.

Candidates may use their wider knowledge of the workings of the governments of Florence and Venice, described in Sources 1 and 6, to comment on the practicalities of the workings of these patrician systems of government.

To reach the higher levels, candidates should show an understanding of change and development, for example in the government of Florence which became increasingly dominated by the Medici, especially after the Savonarolan period.

Candidates may use their knowledge about the authors, such as their other activities in diplomacy and government, to evaluate the sources in relation to the interpretation.

Evidence from the sources that can support the interpretation:

Source 1: this source describes the government in theory, yet could be interpreted (especially if cross-referenced with Sources 2 and 3) as describing the practicalities of rule in a city dominated by merchants and bankers.

Source 2: the increasing dominance of the Medici is shown to be a result of their physical power, with armed supporters forcing their point of view on the city.

Source 3: suggests that all aspects of Florentine policy were determined by Lorenzo de' Medici on the basis of his own interests and in response to changing circumstances.

Source 4: the context of this Source and its dedication imply that Machiavelli's experiences and observations have led him to advocate particular policies in princes.

Source 6: the Source refers to the constitution established by 'our ancestors' as a pragmatic approach to government based on experience.

Source 7: suggests that threats from her neighbours produced civic sentiments in Florence.

Evidence from the sources that can challenge the interpretation:

Source 1: Bruni has clear ideas about the different ways of managing power in a state which he relates to the government of Florence. Cross-referencing this to Source 5 may confirm that these ideas are based on theories of government from classical antiquity, as the terminology used is the same and, as 5's title suggests, is based on Livy.

Source 4: implies a set of ideas on which government in based and makes reference to classical examples to illustrate the wisdom of the advice proffered.

Source 6 refers to a system set up on the basis of both ideas and practical considerations. As with Source 4, classical examples are cited to add authority to the system described.

Source 7: makes reference to the institutions of republican Rome, with which Renaissance men would have been familiar, and, it is suggested, they would have wished to emulate.

Evaluation of sources:

Candidates may be familiar with the writers of several of the sources, such as Bruni, Machiavelli, Guicciardini and Contarini. The involvement of these writers in diplomacy and other tasks on behalf of their governments may be considered in relation to their attitudes towards the systems of government in their own states. For example, the difficulties of Machiavelli's career as a diplomat, and his experiences observing the course of the Italian Wars, may have coloured his view of the ideal behaviour of a prince. His commitment to republican government may have influenced the dedication of 'The Prince'.

Rivalry between citizens of the various Italian states may have led to them describing their own governments as ideal – this could be used in evaluation of Source 1 and 6; contextual knowledge of the workings of these governments, in addition to cross-referencing to Source 2 which describes an incident in Florence, could be used to evaluate the descriptions of both Florentine and Venetian governments.

Judgement:

The Sources refer to three main influences on the forms of government developed in the Italian states in the Renaissance period: classical antiquity; the forefathers of the current governments; reactions to events of the period. Candidates will need to decide what weight to give to these, in the light of their analysis and evaluation of the Sources. They may broadly agree with the interpretation provided, arguing that although there are references to classical antiquity, these ideas were imposed on existing forms of government and that these forms of government were evolutionary, adapting to circumstances. On the other hand, candidates may consider that there is sufficient evidence to suggest that forms of government were consciously modelled with reference to earlier forms of government. The extent to which a balance of powers was established in Venice, as described by Contarini, and that patrician

powers were deliberately allowed to dominate at the expense of the nobility and plebeians in Florence suggests more than simply reaction to circumstances.

(b)   **Explain how these sources are both useful and raise problems and issues for a historian using them.   [15]**

The Sources may be used for a range of purposes:
- Several of the writers refer to the classical past, making them useful for a historian studying classical influences in the Renaissance period.
- At face value the Sources provide useful evidence of the workings of the Florentine and Venetian governments. They also suggest the priorities of the patrician rulers, attempting to balance self-interest and civic obligations. Inter-state relations also feature, with marriage alliances and fear of invasion referred to as influential factors.
- The observations of diplomats, with experience of both the frustration of negotiating on behalf of a relatively weak government in the case of Machiavelli, and with widespread experience of other systems of government in the cases of Guicciardini and Contarini, are useful because they can take an informed view of their own governments.

Issues pertaining to the Sources include:
- The purpose of the Sources and its impact on the descriptions.
- The personal experience of the writers and the influence of this on their commentaries.
- The need to have some understanding of classical forms of government and perceptions of them during the Renaissance period.

Problems with the Sources include:
- The writers comment on existing governments more than putting forward theories of government. Their interest in classical forms of government influences the way in which they analyse Renaissance government.
- The educational levels of the writers and their intended audience mean that they display class prejudices, such as those of Bruni who clearly regards those practicing menial trades as lesser citizens.
- The situations and mechanisms of government were far more complex than selective sources can illustrate.
- The experiences of Machiavelli led to a degree of cynicism about government and power, and this has probably coloured his analysis in Source 5, as has his service of the *republican* government in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.

Question 3

European Nationalism 1815-1914: Germany and Italy

The importance of war to the development of Germany and Italy

Interpretation: **It was war that determined the development of Germany and Italy.**

3   **(a)**   **Explain how far Sources 1-7 support this interpretation. You may, if you wish, amend the interpretation or suggest a different interpretation. If you do this you must use the Sources to support the changes you make.   [35]**

Examples of arguments, evidence and source evaluation that may be included in responses:

Knowledge and understanding:

Candidates may use their knowledge to develop/explain the evidence in the sources. For example, Source 1 raises the issue of how strong German nationalism was in the 1830s and how far it was the most important driving force. Source 2 could be developed/explained with knowledge of the Zollverein and Austrian/Prussian rivalry. Source 3 may be set in the context of the 1848 revolutions, what had already happened in Italy, the role of Austria. Source 4 may be interpreted in the context of the failure of 1848-9 and the importance of Piedmont. Source 5's context is the roles of Napoleon III and Cavour and the war of 1859 with Austria. Candidates may refer to the context of the speech (Source 6) and future wars with Denmark, France and Austria. Source 7 may be set in the context of candidates' knowledge of the real nature of Wilhelm's rule: was he really interested in social reform?

Evidence from the sources that can support the interpretation:

Source 3: war is being used to drive the Austrians out and to put down rebellion.

Source 4: there is clear evidence of the view that war will have to be used to achieve independence.

Source 5: there is evidence of planning war to drive out the Austrians.

Source 6: Bismarck is planning to use war.

Evidence from the sources that can challenge the interpretation:

Source 1: shows an alternative to war for achieving German liberty.

Source 2: shows the importance of economics and Prussian political power.

Source 5: shows political intrigue/diplomacy being used as well as war.

Source 7: Wilhelm proposes social reforms to develop Germany.

Evaluation of sources:

Candidates may use their knowledge of Germany and Italy across the period, comparing their knowledge of patterns and developments and the role of war and other factors with those suggested by the sources.

Source 1 may be evaluated in terms of how representative it was: how strong was nationalism at this time? Does the source represent aspirations more than anything else? Source 2 may be viewed in term of the context, the author and to whom it is being written. Candidates may question the purpose of the source. Source 3 may be evaluated in terms of the author and his purpose, and the situation in 1849. Source 4 may be evaluated in the context of post-1848. The purpose of Source 5 is to convey an impression to Victor Emmanuel to influence his view and decisions. Bismarck has two audiences in Source 6 – one in Prussia, given recent events, and the international one. Source 7 may be evaluated in terms of knowledge of Wilhelm, his policies and the nature of his rule in Germany.

Judgement:

There is evidence here for supporting the interpretation to some degree, but there is strong evidence for amending it in terms of other factors. There is also scope for differentiating between Germany and Italy and looking for patterns over time. There is scope for looking at the different ends to which war was used.

(b)   Explain how these sources are both useful and raise problems and issues for a historian using them.   [15]

Some sources cannot be accepted at face value. For example sources 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 tell us more about the intentions of the authors. Candidates may use this to develop an argument about what the sources can be used as evidence of.

The sources could be used as a set to pose and respond to the question of how representative they are in relation to issues, events, developments, organisations and periods that are not covered. There is, for example, no mention of Germany's wars with Denmark, France and Austria. Candidates may consider types of sources which are important to this period but are not represented here.

Question 4

Race and American Society 1865-1970s

Methods and effectiveness of civil rights organisations

Interpretation: **Minority groups have sought to improve their rights by negotiation.**

4   (a)   **Explain how far Sources 1-7 support this interpretation. You may, if you wish amend the interpretation or suggest a different interpretation. If you do this you must use the sources to support the changes you make.   [35]**

Examples of arguments, evidence and source evaluations that may be included in the responses:

Knowledge and understanding

Candidates may use their wider knowledge of methods used by minority groups to improve their rights. These include legal methods, either campaigning through the courts.

Evidence from the sources that can support the interpretation:

Source 1: a face value reading of the source suggests that the Native Americans intend a peaceful approach and are negotiating with government commissioners.

Source 2: the approach described here is peaceful, but does not involve negotiation with the government.

Source 3: at face value this is a plea to the president, suggesting negotiation.

Source 4: the white official describes a consultation process involving Native Americans in planning their future, and thus giving them civil rights.

Source 5: This source sets out demands, and there is no sense of violence as a means to obtaining their ends.

Source 6: the phrase 'we believe in obeying the law' suggests that African Americans will negotiate a solution.

Source 7: the method proposed is to use the law courts.

Evidence from the sources that can challenge the interpretation:

Source 1: reference is made to warring before the Medicine Creek agreement, and contextual knowledge suggests that wars continued after the agreement.

Source 2: The method described is of self-help rather than negotiation, implying that the African Americans have not gained the rights as stated in the constitutional amendments.

Source 3: Contextual knowledge of Geronimo would suggest that this approach is not typical of him.

Source 4: the democratic system as introduced by the federal government is imposed on the Native Americans regardless of their traditions.

Source 5: There is no negotiation as such in this set of demands.

Source 6: this suggests that African Americans are prepared at least to meet violence with violence and perhaps to initiate it.

Source 7: this source suggests that African Americans will resort to concerted action both in the courts and outside, using a range of methods such as demonstrations and direct action to draw attention to continuing inequalities.

Evaluation of sources:

The sources may be grouped and cross-referenced, for example according to whether they concern Native Americans or African Americans.
Sources 1 and 3 are statements by individual Native Americans and should be evaluated to consider what their status is in relation to the general view of Native Americans.
Sources containing descriptions of African American actions should be evaluated for typicality.
Sources that are statements made publicly, such as Source 6, should be evaluated in terms of their purpose and audience in order to judge how literally they can be read. Source 6 should also be judged in relation to the activities of the N o I.
Source 7 may also be judged in relation to the activities of CORE and the NAACP.
Source 4 should be judged for purpose and audience as it is written by a government official about the intentions of his policies. He is sympathetic and positive in his attitude, but nevertheless the positive picture he paints needs evaluation.
Source 2 could be evaluated in relation to the Plessey vs Ferguson Supreme Court judgement that 'separate but equal' was constitutional.

Judgement:

The interpretation may be accepted, albeit with some qualification, or it may be altered. The Native American sources appear most supportive of the interpretation, at least at face value. The African American sources are less directly supportive, although most of them suggest that self-help rather than violent reaction against the government is the best course of action. Several refer to legal challenges, suggesting that the law was seen as the most productive way to achieve their rights.

(b) **Explain how these sources are both useful and raise problems and issues for a historian using them.** **[15]**

The sources might be used in a range of ways for a variety of enquiries. White attitudes towards African Americans may be deduced from Source 2, and towards Native Americans from Source 4. The impact of government actions on Native Americans can be inferred from Sources 1, 3 and 5. Differences in treatment, actions and organisation between the two minority groups are illustrated and can be inferred. Issues that could be raised include:
Differences in the situations faced by different minority groups, and consequent differences in their approaches and methods.
The problem of knowing what Native Americans intended, given the wars of the early period and the difficulty for white people at the time in understanding the tribal structure and the status of any agreement reached with Native American leaders.

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