

HOW TO DO SOURCEWORK IN IB HISTORY

1 a	Why, according to Source B, did...	<p><u>How to write the answer</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first reason given by the source is that [...] • The second reason given by the source is that [...] • The third reason given by the source is that [...] <p><u>Markscheme</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Award a mark for each <i>valid</i> reason provided from the source (no background knowledge needed). • A <i>valid</i> reason is one which is backed up by detail from the source. 	3
1 b	What message is conveyed by Source B?	<p><u>How to write the answer</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One message conveyed by the source is that [...], because the source says / shows [...] • A second message conveyed by the source is that [...] because the source says / shows [...] <p><u>Markscheme</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Award one mark for each <i>valid</i> reason given based on the source (background knowledge is not needed). • A <i>valid</i> reason is one which is backed up by detail from the source. 	2
2	In what ways do the views expressed in Source C support the conclusions expressed in Source D?	<p><u>How to write the answer</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly, both source agree that [...] – Source C says that [...] and Source D says that [...]. • Secondly, both source agree that [...] – Source C says that [...] and Source D says that [...]. • Thirdly, both source agree that [...] – Source C says that [...] and Source D says that [...]. <p><u>Markscheme</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If only one document is addressed award a maximum of [2 marks]; • If the two documents are discussed separately award [3 marks] or with excellent linkage [4 marks]. • For [5-6 marks] expect a detailed running comparison. <p><u>Notes</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unless phrased "To what extent" or "compare and contrast" there is no need to provide a balanced answer looking at both agreements <i>and</i> differences of opinion. • There is no need to explain <i>why</i> the sources agree or disagree – just describe <i>how</i> they do so. 	6

<p>3</p>	<p>With reference to their origins and purpose, assess the value and limitations of Sources A and B for historians studying...</p>	<p>How to write the answer Source A is valuable because [...refer to origin and / or purpose] The limitations of Source A are that [...refer to origin and / or purpose] Source B is valuable because [...refer to origin and / or purpose] The limitations of Source B are that [...refer to origin and / or purpose]</p> <p>Markscheme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1-2 marks: The sources are summarised. • 3-4 marks: One source is assessed well, or two superficially • 5-6 marks: Both sources are assessed well (value <i>and</i> limitations, reference to origins <i>and</i> purpose) <table border="1" data-bbox="365 516 1921 885"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Value</th> <th>Limitations</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Origins (When, where and by whom was it produced?)</td> <td>Primary sources: provide first hand knowledge of the events described, give a 'snapshot' of opinion at the time. Secondary sources: Hindsight, objectivity</td> <td>Primary sources: Too wrapped up in events, miss 'big picture', sometimes subject to censorship (e.g. USSR, China) Secondary sources: Often a narrow depth study, or a superficial overview</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Purpose (What is the intended audience?)</td> <td>Facts • Dry, objective sources give data to be checked against other sources to provide conclusions Opinions • Biased, subjective sources give an insight into the attitudes of the time</td> <td>Facts • Censorship – a factual account can still be misleading if it leaves out "inconvenient truths" Opinions • Propaganda misleads the reader about the popularity of a regime's policies</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>• Notes: Avoid at all costs the line that "primary sources are reliable; biased sources are useless". Whilst this is sometimes true, each source must always be assessed on its own merits.</p>		Value	Limitations	Origins (When, where and by whom was it produced?)	Primary sources: provide first hand knowledge of the events described, give a 'snapshot' of opinion at the time. Secondary sources: Hindsight, objectivity	Primary sources: Too wrapped up in events, miss 'big picture', sometimes subject to censorship (e.g. USSR, China) Secondary sources: Often a narrow depth study, or a superficial overview	Purpose (What is the intended audience?)	Facts • Dry, objective sources give data to be checked against other sources to provide conclusions Opinions • Biased, subjective sources give an insight into the attitudes of the time	Facts • Censorship – a factual account can still be misleading if it leaves out "inconvenient truths" Opinions • Propaganda misleads the reader about the popularity of a regime's policies	<p>6</p>
	Value	Limitations										
Origins (When, where and by whom was it produced?)	Primary sources: provide first hand knowledge of the events described, give a 'snapshot' of opinion at the time. Secondary sources: Hindsight, objectivity	Primary sources: Too wrapped up in events, miss 'big picture', sometimes subject to censorship (e.g. USSR, China) Secondary sources: Often a narrow depth study, or a superficial overview										
Purpose (What is the intended audience?)	Facts • Dry, objective sources give data to be checked against other sources to provide conclusions Opinions • Biased, subjective sources give an insight into the attitudes of the time	Facts • Censorship – a factual account can still be misleading if it leaves out "inconvenient truths" Opinions • Propaganda misleads the reader about the popularity of a regime's policies										
<p>4</p>	<p>Using the sources and your own knowledge, explain to what extent you agree with this statement: "X"</p>	<p>How to write the answer</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A section providing one interpretation (the interpretation provided by the question if appropriate)* 2. A section which provides a second interpretation* 3. A section which provides a third interpretation (this section is not always needed)* *Each of these sections should use <i>sources</i>, <i>background knowledge</i> and (if possible) <i>historiography</i> 4. A conclusion showing how the truth of the statement depends on factors like when / where you are looking; the best candidates will pick fault with loaded words in the question like "totally", "mainly", "brutal" and suggest better ones. <p>Markscheme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 mark – one sided answer, sources OR background knowledge used • 2-3 marks – one sided answer, sources AND background knowledge used • 3-4 marks – multi-causal answer, sources OR background knowledge used • 5-6 marks – multi-causal answer, sources AND background knowledge used • 7-8 marks – as above, but with evidence of historiography and / or a meaningful conclusion 	<p>8</p>									



By RJ Tarr at www.activehistory.co.uk and www.ibhistory.net / 3