

History B

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **F984**: Using Historical Evidence – Non British History

Mark Scheme for June 2013

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, 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 2013

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p><u>Knowledge and Understanding</u></p> <p>Candidates will have looked at the many and varied reasons for Viking expansion. Theories include the nature of the Scandinavian homelands that 'pushed' explorers and settlers outwards (sources 1 and 2 for example), the changing nature of expansion in different parts of Europe and beyond (usually characterised as 'from raiding to settling') and the different motives that drove different groups of Vikings. Candidates will be able to use their knowledge and understanding both to examine the different motives expressed in these sources and to develop comments based on their case studies of England (source 7), Ireland and Normandy (source 3). Detailed knowledge of other countries the Vikings had contact with is not expected, but there should be a general understanding of the extent and nature of voyages.</p> <p><u>Evidence from the Sources that can support the interpretation</u></p> <p>S1 – candidates might infer from the description of Norway as a challenging environment which might have acted as a 'push' factor driving exploration and settlement. Although the source does not directly support this, cross-references to source 4 could strengthen the claim.</p> <p>S2 – over-population is given as a reason for expansion and this is directly linked to settlement 'on the lands of others'.</p> <p>S3 – although most of this source suggests other motives, there is a reference to some sort settlement in the phrase 'The Northmen also got control of the islands all around Ireland and stayed there without encountering any resistance'. It is unclear if this is a reference to permanent settlement or simply temporary over-wintering. Here is a good example of where candidates could use their knowledge of Viking activity in Ireland to reinforce their inferences from the source.</p> <p>S4 – although these brothers are opportunists who cannot resist raiding, there is an undertone of support for the interpretation – both seem interested in the prospect of moving to Iceland.</p> <p>S7 – suggests intensive settlement in Danelaw, though the source gives no direct indication that this was the original or primary intention.</p>	35	<p>Knowledge and understanding should be rewarded in so far as they support interpretation and evaluation of the sources.</p> <p>Where knowledge and understanding take into account change and/or continuity over time, this should be rewarded at Level 2 and above.</p> <p>Where knowledge and understanding is used to identify/recognise differences between groups this should be rewarded at Level 2 and above.</p> <p>Reward grouping of sources at Level 4.</p> <p>Reward cross-referencing of the content of sources at Level 3 and above.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Evidence from the Sources that can challenge the interpretation</p> <p>S1 – there is no direct reference to settlement as the consequence of poverty and climate. Instead, the author stresses the consequence of ‘piratical raids’. Here is an example of a point which could be examined by reference to provenance – how much weight should be placed on Adam of Bremen’s analysis since he is clearly writing much later and from a religious perspective.</p> <p>S3 – Danish voyages are linked here to the primary aim of plundering, raiding and obtain tributes.</p> <p>S4 – refers to an instance of a raiding expedition against Ireland.</p> <p>Candidates might ask how much weight should be placed on Leif’s actions when the brothers are clearly seeking to settle in Iceland.</p> <p>S5 – offers a variety of explanations for expansion which are possible precursors to settlement but do not in themselves support the interpretation.</p> <p>S6 – Swedish Viking motives at this point seem to be trade rather than settlement.</p> <p>S7 – it is not clear how long these settlements lasted or whether they existed beyond being named by Vikings.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of Sources</u></p> <p>Source 5 is a good starting point for cross-referencing, since ‘curiosity’ might explain the motives of the brothers in source 4 and ‘greed’ will explain motives in source 3. Sources can be treated as sub-sets depending on which Vikings are being discussed (S1, 4, 5 are principally about Norwegians, S3 and 7 detail Danish activity and S6 is about Swedish Vikings). At the top levels, sources need to be considered for the weight and value of their evidence and this will bring in issues of provenance. Source 2 for example, is a very fanciful account of why Vikings left their homelands written by someone who worked much later.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><u>Judgement</u> At level 2 candidates will be able to extend the list of factors that explain Viking motives, perhaps by using the content of source 5 – ‘Some Vikings left to settle new lands but others went to raid, trade or win fame’. What will distinguish Level 1 answers is a more complex amendment of the original interpretation by, for example, showing that motives changed over time and that settlement may have been a later motive (eg by comparing sources 1 and 4 about Norwegians or sources 3 and 7 about Danish motives). Alternatively, candidates could adopt a spatial perspective and show that different groups of Vikings had their own motives – eg Swedish Vikings focused on trade in these sources while Norwegians settled the new lands of Iceland and Greenland.</p>		<p>Judgements that simply add extra factors to the existing interpretation, or make slight changes of degree should be rewarded at Level 2 (AO2b 7–8 marks). Judgements that recognise change or continuity over time, or make other more sophisticated changes to the given interpretation should be rewarded at Level 1 (AO2b 9–10 marks) To be rewarded, judgements must rely on reliable evidence inferred from the sources.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>Candidates will need to assess a number of issues to access high marks in this answer. Only one good example of each of the following is needed.</p> <p>Typicality – candidates can use context knowledge to judge whether the evidence in a source fits wider knowledge. For example, while S7 shows that the Vikings had a great impact on much of northern and eastern England, this pattern may not be true in other places they had contact with, especially Ireland, where settlement tended to be coastal and rather patchy.</p> <p>Reliability – S3 refers to activities that are repeated across numerous other sources in different countries, so can be clearly cross-referenced. Candidates might want to stress the religious context of the production of these sources and the nature of annals / chronicles but this should not lead to simplistic judgements that the source is therefore completely unreliable.</p> <p>Purpose – S2 forms the introduction to a history of the Normans, commissioned by a Norman ruler. Dudo is helping to create the so-called ‘Norman myth’ by inventing a pre-history that would reflect both the progress made by Norman rulers and aspects of their ‘heroic’ origins.</p> <p>Historians’ questions – this is more than summarising source content. Candidates need to step back from the sources and look at the more general lines of enquiry that can be followed, especially if they are not connected to motives for expansion. For example, historians could use these sources to investigate the influence of religious beliefs (sources 1 and 6) or family relationships (sources 2 and 4) on behaviour.</p> <p>Missing source types/content and why this might be an issue – candidates might want to have more evidence from one of the focus countries, especially as there is no direct reference to the activities of Rollo and England is limited to an over-view. If so, candidates must be clear about why they consider these sources important by discussing motives for expansion to these countries.</p>	15	<p>In AO1 candidates will probably show knowledge and understanding at a level similar to that shown in source evaluation.</p> <p>Reward more highly in AO1 those who show knowledge and understanding of missing source-types or aspects of the topic.</p> <p>Candidates need to develop each example used for it to be rewarded in AO2a.</p> <p>Reward one developed example of typicality/reliability/purpose at the bottom of Level 3 in AO2a (5 marks); reward two developed examples at the top of Level 3 in AO2a (6 marks).</p> <p>Where candidates consider the uses, issues and problems of the sources as a set, reward at the top of the level reached in AO2a.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>(a)</p> <p><u>Knowledge and Understanding</u></p> <p>Candidates should have made a case study of the Renaissance in the Netherlands. This question draws upon that to investigate the links between the Northern and Italian Renaissances – how was information transmitted between different parts of Europe? How far did new information have an impact on either side? The specification also mentions particular artists – such as Bosch – who is represented in these sources. Candidates may have seen works such as the Garden of Earthly Delights and can use this knowledge to develop the comments in the sources.</p> <p><u>Evidence from the Sources that can support the interpretation</u></p> <p>S2 – offers a complex view since the patron and audience are Italian yet the artist is Dutch. There is a good opportunity here for candidates to use their knowledge of Italian painting to contrast the style here with Italian works.</p> <p>S3 – could be used to support the importance of patrons in the Northern Renaissance and make use of own knowledge to compare this to Italy.</p> <p>S5 – strongly supports the interpretation by showing how artists from the North sought to learn from Italy and also drew inspiration from the classical past</p> <p>This is reinforced in S6 which shows advice to learn from Italy – though in this case, the motive is to surpass the achievements of the Italian Renaissance.</p> <p>S7 – suggests that Bosch was aware of the work of Italian artists such as Michelangelo and Raphael.</p> <p><u>Evidence from the Sources that can challenge the interpretation</u></p> <p>S1 – challenges the interpretation because the influence seems to be reversed – here it is Italians who are interested in acquiring Dutch art. However, not the comment that ‘they will not sell for much’, suggesting a specialised audience (a point picked up in S6)</p> <p>S3 – suggests that other influences were coming to the North from the New World.</p>	35	<p>Knowledge and understanding should be rewarded in so far as they support interpretation and evaluation of the sources.</p> <p>Where knowledge and understanding take into account change and/or continuity over time, this should be rewarded at Level 2 and above.</p> <p>Where knowledge and understanding is used to identify/recognise differences between groups this should be rewarded at Level 2 and above.</p> <p>Reward grouping of sources at Level 4.</p> <p>Reward cross-referencing of the content of sources at Level 3 and above.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>S4 – seems strongly to oppose the interpretation. Michelangelo (assuming the attributed comments are genuine) is very dismissive of northern art and complains that artists have not taken on Italian interests in perspective</p> <p>S6 – refers to areas where the author feels that Northern Renaissance already equals or surpasses what was happening in Italy</p> <p>S7 – clearly challenges the interpretation by showing the new direction taken by Bosch.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of Sources</u></p> <p>The artistic styles in S1 can be compared to the information given about Bosch in S7. Both S1 and 3 deal with the transmission of goods/ideas. S5 and 6 refer to visits to Italy and the impact they had on the artist (though they make some contrasting points). Candidates could question the provenance of some of the sources based on the typicality – most of the evidence provided is one-off examples and specific artists rather than generalisations about the two Renaissances.</p> <p><u>Judgement</u></p> <p>Good answers will consider what ‘borrowed’ might refer to and take issue with ‘heavily’ – it is clear that the two Renaissances were connected and that there was a dynamic relationship over time, but that they had different roots and traditions. Candidates might conclude that in some areas, Dutch artists did consciously seek to find out about and learn from their Italian counterparts (S5, 6) but that the product of these contacts (S2, 7) was not mere copying / borrowing (= Level 1). There is also evidence (S7) that later Dutch artists were not as influenced as earlier painters – historians suggest that after c1500–30 the influence of Italy began to decline.</p>		<p>Judgements that simply add extra factors to the existing interpretation, or make slight changes of degree should be rewarded at Level 2 (AO2b 7–8 marks).</p> <p>Judgements that recognise change or continuity over time, or make other more sophisticated changes to the given interpretation should be rewarded at Level 1 (AO2b 9–10 marks)</p> <p>To be rewarded, judgements must rely on reliable evidence inferred from the sources.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>Candidates will need to assess a number of issues to access high marks in this answer. Only one good example of each of the following is needed. Bearing in mind that these sources are different to most others that have appeared in this exam, be prepared to take a generous view of attempts at evaluation.</p> <p>Typicality – source 1 describes specific instances of trade or personal contacts – candidates could ask if this was representative of the links between North and Italy, especially as merchants were an important link.</p> <p>Reliability – S6 clearly takes a patriotic view of the art of the Netherlands which could be questioned (especially since S5 doesn't paint the best impression of visitors from the Netherlands).</p> <p>Purpose – S3 is intended to inform – it records a visit to the Netherlands by Durer in 1520. He was a German visitor / outsider so his impressions reveal something about his interests and priorities (eg he was clearly impressed by sights from the New World).</p> <p>Historians' questions – this is more than summarising source content. Candidates need to step back from the sources and look at the more general lines of enquiry that can be followed. For example, historians could use these sources to investigate the ways in which Renaissance art moved around Europe at this time (S2, S5 and to Spain in S7).</p> <p>Missing source types/content and why this might be an issue – candidates might want more evidence from Italian Renaissance itself, but they need to be clear why this is needed – not to make life easier for candidates and replace the need for own knowledge, but to show that there are other differences / similarities worth identifying (eg subject matter, types of patrons, artistic techniques, non-art forms of the Renaissance such as Vesalius / medicine).</p>	15	<p>In AO1 candidates will probably show knowledge and understanding at a level similar to that shown in source evaluation.</p> <p>Reward more highly in AO1 those who show knowledge and understanding of missing source-types or aspects of the topic.</p> <p>Candidates need to develop each example used for it to be rewarded in AO2a.</p> <p>Reward one developed example of typicality/reliability/purpose at the bottom of Level 3 in AO2a (5 marks); reward two developed examples at the top of Level 3 in AO2a (6 marks).</p> <p>Where candidates consider the uses, issues and problems of the sources as a set, reward at the top of the level reached in AO2a.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p><u>Knowledge and Understanding</u> Knowledge of the ideas about what united Germans and Italians eg language, culture, history, and about how Germany and Italy could be united – eg federalism, dominance of states such as Prussia and Piedmont, role of the Pope in Italy. Understanding of the role of the ideas of nationalism in influencing events and of the roles of governments, their ministers and other individuals mentioned in the sources, such as Bismarck, Cavour, Garibaldi, Mazzini, and William I. Understanding of the aims of rulers and their ministers. Knowledge and Understanding of the developments that occurred in Germany and Italy – the road to unification in both countries, and beyond in Germany.</p> <p><u>Evidence from the Sources that can support the interpretation</u> Source 4 suggests that Cavour is an influential figure who will determine what happens in Italy, whether or not to the liking of National Society. Source 5 suggests that Cavour is working hard to manipulate the situation in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, with plans to undermine Garibaldi, but also for how Sardinia-Piedmont can benefit if Garibaldi is successful. Source 6 depicts Bismarck as the artist of the New Germany and Source 7 also identifies him as a creator of modern Germany, listing his achievements.</p> <p><u>Evidence from the Sources that can challenge the interpretation</u> Sources 1 and 2 express ideas about the future of the respective countries. As such they do not refer to specific governments or their ministers, but do, in places, imply a negative attitude towards existing rulers. In contrast, source 3 suggests that the Pope should be the ruler of a united Italy. In each case, other factors can be identified as responsible for driving developments – ideas, a common religion, language and culture. In source 4, a nationalist group is trying to influence the minister. Source 5 shows the role of Garibaldi and hints at the extent to which he was uncontrollable and therefore able to drive developments. Source 6 shows Bismarck as smaller than the two monarchs, and</p>	35	Knowledge and understanding should be rewarded in so far as they support interpretation and evaluation of the sources. Where knowledge and understanding take into account change and/or continuity over time, this should be rewarded at Level 2 and above. Where knowledge and understanding is used to identify/recognise differences between groups this should be rewarded at Level 2 and above.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>candidates could interpret this to mean that William and Ludwig are more important in driving developments.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of Sources</u> There is scope for generalising and cross-referencing. Candidates may look for different patterns in Italy and Germany. They may compare the way in which Bismarck's role is shown in sources 6 and 7. The idealism of sources 1 and 2 and contextual knowledge could be used to show that they are not rooted in the reality of events. Equally knowledge of the role of the papacy may be used to discount the proposals in source 3 as idealistic and far from reality. Knowledge of events in Naples in 1860 could be used to show how Cavour put the ideas he expresses in source 5 into practice. The cartoon of Bismarck is an American commentary on his role and source 7 is a later (American) encyclopaedia entry. Both may be considered unreliable as evidence of Bismarck's true role.</p> <p><u>Judgement</u> There is evidence to support and challenge the interpretation. Government ministers seem to be more active in events leading up to unification of each country, although candidates may question the extent to which they were central to developments. New interpretation adding more factors should be awarded level 2 provided they are supported. Those offering a more sophisticated interpretation, with an established relationship between different factors or suggesting development over time or contrasting the two countries may be awarded at level 1 provided they are adequately supported.</p>		<p>Reward grouping of sources at Level 4. Reward cross-referencing of the content of sources at Level 3 and above.</p> <p>Judgements that simply add extra factors to the existing interpretation, or make slight changes of degree should be rewarded at Level 2 (AO2b 7–8 marks). Judgements that recognise change or continuity over time, or make other more sophisticated changes to the given interpretation should be rewarded at Level 1 (AO2b 9–10 marks)</p> <p>To be rewarded, judgements must rely on reliable evidence inferred from the sources.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>The reliability, typicality and purpose of the sources should be considered. American sources about Germany may be considered unreliable as many Americans were of native German stock, many having moved because they did not like the repressive political systems represented by German monarchies. This may make them more inclined to see William and Ludwig in a poor light. The view of Gioberti may be considered atypical as popes were not normally seen as nationalist and were not supportive of nationalists. The purpose of source 1 is to rouse educated young Italians to support a version of nationalism that focuses on republicanism and full unity rather than monarchical or aristocratic or federal government. As such it provides a slanted view of Italy as historically republican in order to justify its stance.</p> <p>Candidates need to identify historical investigations for which the sources would be useful. They need to recognise that historians answer questions based on historical concepts, such as change and continuity, explanation of cause and consequence, and historical significance. The sources could be used to explain Cavour's motives in relation to Garibaldi's actions. They could be used to trace the development of ideas about what the Italian state or the German state would comprise. They could be used to explain why the German and Italian states that emerged were so different from those envisaged by nationalists.</p>	35	<p>In AO1 candidates will probably show knowledge and understanding at a level similar to that shown in source evaluation.</p> <p>Reward more highly in AO1 those who show knowledge and understanding of missing source-types or aspects of the topic.</p> <p>Candidates need to develop each example used for it to be rewarded in AO2a.</p> <p>Reward one developed example of typicality/reliability/purpose at the bottom of Level 3 in AO2a (5 marks); reward two developed examples at the top of Level 3 in AO2a (6 marks).</p> <p>Where candidates consider the uses, issues and problems of the sources as a set, reward at the top of the level reached in AO2a.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (a)	<p><u>Knowledge and Understanding</u></p> <p>Candidates should use their contextual knowledge of the context of the sources – Reconstruction (source 1), the treaties with Native Americans and conditions on reservations (2), the activities of the Ku Klux Klan (3), internment during World War II, changes to immigration laws after the Second World War, and incidents in the Civil Rights campaigns of the 1950s and 1960s. They need to recognise the different racial minorities concerned, typical attitudes at the time of the incidents concerned, and changes over time to these attitudes.</p> <p><u>Evidence from the Sources that can support the interpretation</u></p> <p>Source 1 shows more concern for law and order, but does seem to condemn both whites and African-Americans. There is explicit reference to the mob being fearful, but the actions and threats of the white mob in the first and second paragraph could also imply that they were fearful of the results of African-Americans being educated. This could be their potential as better employees than whites.</p> <p>Source 3 suggests that the KKK was against a number of groups, some constituting racial minorities. The source does not refer directly to fear, but this could be inferred from the comments in the source. However, the fear is not of the physical strength of the African-Americans.</p> <p>The Japanese internees in source 4 will be kept in a prison-style camp – this suggests they were feared as potential enemies/enemy aliens.</p> <p>In Source 5 the word ‘protecting’ is in inverted commas, but at face value suggests that those framing the legislation (although not Truman himself) fear immigrants, as they did when the 1924 law was passed. That the President did not succeed in vetoing the law suggests that many people still feared immigrants/racial minorities and their impact on USA.</p> <p>Source 6 suggests that, as in Source 1, some white Americans feared the educated African American as the source says that there is evidence of organization of white mobs, including by Faubus, to intimidate the Little Rock Nine.</p> <p>In source 7, the writer’s parents are clearly hostile to African Americans, although fear has to be inferred – perhaps from their reaction to his marriage – the writer suggests they were ‘initially scared’..</p>	35	<p>Knowledge and understanding should be rewarded in so far as they support interpretation and evaluation of the sources.</p> <p>Where knowledge and understanding take into account change and/or continuity over time, this should be rewarded at Level 2 and above.</p> <p>Where knowledge and understanding is used to identify/recognise differences between groups this should be rewarded at Level 2 and above.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><u>Evidence from the Sources that can challenge the interpretation</u> The behaviour described in sources 1 and 2 could be ascribed to a number of motives. In 1, those attacking the schoolhouse are, at face value, trying to prevent African-Americans being educated – this suggests that they were seen as potentially as good as or better than whites.</p> <p>Source 2 suggests that white men saw the Native American land as a good source of income from furs, cattle ranching etc., so the motivation might be purely mercenary.</p> <p>The WASP identity is what the KKK are trying to secure, and their activities are directed at religious as well as racial groups that do not fit. The ‘crime’ of the Japanese is to originate from a country with which the US is at war. National allegiance rather than race is the issue here.</p> <p>In source 5 the President recognises the stupidity of immigration quotas, suggesting he disagrees with the idea of a racial hierarchy on which these were based and does not, therefore, fear the impact of different racial groups on the USA.</p> <p>In Source 6 the motives Faubus and of the ‘mob’ need to be considered. Did they act to ‘defend the Southern way of life’, to ensure the continued inferior schooling of African-Americans, or, in the case of Faubus, simply to secure electoral success?</p> <p>Judging from the behaviour he describes, the writer of source 7 does not fear racial minorities.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of Sources</u> The date and location of source 1 suggests that it may relate simply to resentment of emancipation and the loss of the civil war. The presence of a white school teacher suggests that not all whites had the same attitudes.</p> <p>Source 2 is written by a Native American who sees the events from his own viewpoint, making no reference to the way in which white people saw ‘treaty violations’ by Native Americans. The purpose of 3 is to rouse the African-American population’s awareness of the KKK and the dangers it poses to them. This may mean it exaggerates, but contextual</p>		<p>Reward grouping of sources at Level 4. Reward cross-referencing of the content of sources at Level 3 and above.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>knowledge should confirm the basic points made by the source – hostility to Jews and Catholics as well as African-Americans. The KKK was not, however averse to indirect attacks on Catholics – e.g. in the election campaign of 1928 when the Catholic, Al Smith, was a candidate.</p> <p>In source 6 the writer is sympathetic to the Little Rock Nine, praising their behaviour, implying they are better than the white demonstrators. He also cites the lack of support for Faubus from many citizens of Little Rock.</p> <p>Cross-referencing could be used to demonstrate change over time, provided that details from sources are used. For example the difference between the KKK in source 3 and the behaviour of some whites in source 6 may be noted. Equally the similarities between 1 and 6, both showing hostility to African-Americans receiving an education may be noted and used to form an argument.</p> <p><u>Judgement</u></p> <p>There is evidence to support and challenge the interpretation as well as evidence of some change and continuity over time. This can be used to generate a new interpretation, for example suggesting differences between attitudes to different racial groups , or suggesting that the way of thinking changed over time and according to the circumstances (for example in time of war).</p>		<p>Judgements that simply add extra factors to the existing interpretation, or make slight changes of degree should be rewarded at Level 2 (AO2b 7-8 marks).</p> <p>Judgements that recognise change or continuity over time, or make other more sophisticated changes to the given interpretation should be rewarded at Level 1 (AO2b 9-10 marks)</p> <p>To be rewarded, judgements must rely on reliable evidence inferred from the sources.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>The purpose, reliability and typicality of the sources should be addressed, with worked examples to reach level 3 and above. The purpose of source 2, justifying attacks on white people who have broken treaties made with native Americans may be used to explain the tone of the source. The typicality of the view in source 1 may be questioned. The writer is a northern, occupying Unionist during the Reconstruction Era. His view does not typify those of whites in the south, but is typical of the Unionists, wanting to pacify relations in the south so the army of occupation could be withdrawn.</p> <p>The reliability of source 3 may be questioned. There were big KKK meetings, but membership was notoriously difficult to gauge, given the secrecy surrounding the group. However, figures for lynchings in this period could be used to confirm the final statement.</p> <p>The sources could be used for a range of historical enquiries. To reach Level 2 and above in AO2a candidates must recognise that historians ask questions requiring second-order thinking, rather than simply investigating topics. Hence the sources could be of use for investigations of changing governmental actions (failing to keep treaties with Native Americans/imposing integration in Little Rock), or differences between different parts of government – Congress vs. President in 5, Federal vs State in 6.</p>	15	<p>In AO1 candidates will probably show knowledge and understanding at a level similar to that shown in source evaluation.</p> <p>Reward more highly in AO1 those who show knowledge and understanding of missing source-types or aspects of the topic.</p> <p>Candidates need to develop each example used for it to be rewarded in AO2a.</p> <p>Reward one developed example of typicality/reliability/purpose at the bottom of Level 3 in AO2a (5 marks); reward two developed examples at the top of Level 3 in AO2a (6 marks).</p> <p>Where candidates consider the uses, issues and problems of the sources as a set, reward at the top of the level reached in AO2a.</p>

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

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 2013

