UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2010 question paper

for the guidance of teachers

0470 HISTORY

0470/43 Paper 43 (Alternative to Coursework), maximum raw mark 40

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- CIE will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2010 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

UNIVERSITY of CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918–1945.

1 (a) (i) Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made. (1–2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. Contemptuous of workers; the workers are exploited etc. (3–4)

Level 3 – Makes valid inferences, with reference to the source e.g. Workers are exploited as they can be sent anywhere; under orders; contemptuous as they have destroyed all the workers' unions and rights etc. (5–6)

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. (1–2)

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from the source e.g.

Yes Ability of Schacht; controls; avoided inflation etc.

No Goering over-ambitious; dispute with Schacht; Hitler objectives over-rode planned policy; economic stability undermined etc. (3–5)

Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from the source. Addresses the issue of 'How far?' (6–7)

(iii) Level 1 – Useful/not useful – Choice made on the basis that one is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. (1)

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One is from a British historian and the other is from an economic historian so they could both be biased/unreliable. (2)

Level 3 – Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information. (3–5)

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. (6–7)

© UCLES 2010

(b) (i) Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. Established in 1933, led by Ley; to replace free trade unions and socialism; to direct labour; became the largest of the Party organisations; 1939 had 23m members and c.10m corporative members etc. (1–2)

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. Leisure events; compensation for losing unions. (1–2)

Level 2 – Develops aspects. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in additional detail e.g. Cheap theatre/cinema tickets; sport; trips; education; saving scheme for car; Factory Troops (Werkscharen) within Strength Through Joy branch; spied on workers etc. (2–4)

(iii) Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for the explanation. (1–2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. Increase the birth rate (financial incentives and medals); family ideals and idealised families in propaganda; to make more jobs available to men by removing women but the war required they return; philosophy of male dominance etc. (2–6)

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, got jobs; No, discrimination. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of benefit OR lack of benefit, single factor given e.g.

Ben Employment; education; agriculture; big business; restored national pride; improved infrastructure; anti-Semitism popular; Hitler Youth etc.

Lack Lost freedoms in political, economic, religious, social fields; Jews and fellow scapegoats did not gain; later war deaths and damage, occupation and brutality etc. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of benefit OR lack of benefit with multiple factors given. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). (3–5)

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of benefit AND lack of benefit must be addressed. (6–8)

© UCLES 2010

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905–1941.

2 (a) (i) Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made. (1–2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. He was acting as if he was already Lenin's successor; he had taken charge etc. (3–4)

Level 3 – Makes valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. He had appeared to have taken over by speaking on behalf of the Congress; speaking in almost religious terms and tones – 'bequeathed', 'We swear' etc. (5–6)

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. (1–2)

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from the source e.g.

Yes Stalin would only agree if it did not advance Trotsky; Trotsky thought it was beneath him; the post was seen by most as a minor one etc.

No Lenin's idea to lessen Stalin's power; Trotsky's supporters thought it would have confirmed him as Lenin's heir etc. (3–5)

Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from the source. Addresses the issue of 'How far?' (6–7)

(iii) Level 1 – Useful/not useful – Choice made on the basis that one is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. (1)

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One source is from a Russian the other is British so they could both be biased/unreliable. (2)

Level 3 – Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information. (3–5)

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. (6–7)

© UCLES 2010

(b) (i) Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. Lenin's thoughts on his Bolshevik colleagues, criticising Stalin especially; the Will was suppressed by the Politburo. If released it would have increased Trotsky's chances of leadership etc. (1–2)

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies the Mutiny e.g. Mutiny by sailors who had previously supported the Bolsheviks. (1–2)

Level 2 – Describes the Mutiny. Award an extra mark for each valid element described in additional detail e.g. Previously Bolshevik supporters, registering the public's disquiet and the ravages of War Communism. Put down with violence and merciless thoroughness. Forced Lenin to think of a less restrictive economic system – NEP etc. (2–4)

(iii) Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for the explanation. (1–2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. Trotsky's brilliance and arrogance worked against him; Trotsky missed Lenin's funeral; he had been a Menshevik; other Politburo members underestimated Stalin; Stalin used his position to have his own supporters in key positions; Stalin used events and policies, alliances and cunning to manoeuvre against Trotsky etc. (2–6)

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.
No, they were all starving. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of benefit OR lack of benefit, single factor given e.g.

Ben Had got rid of corrupt Tsarist regime; had had some economic relief during the NEP; worst excesses of the Cheka were past by mid 1920s; most noticed little change in their conditions etc.

Lack Out of First World War; excesses of Civil War and War Communism; famines; awful living and working conditions persisted; constant fear etc. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of benefit OR lack of benefit with multiple factors given. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). (3–5)

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of benefit AND lack of benefit must be addressed. (6–8)

© UCLES 2010

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919–1941.

3 (a) (i) Level 1 – Repeats material stated in source, no inference made. (1–2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. Undermines the American way of self-reliance; an attack on freedom of choice and too costly etc. (3–4)

Level 3 – Makes valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. No free choice as the government is telling everyone what to do; Old Age Pensions and Social Security are costly, take away the incentive to save and be self-reliant etc. (5–6)

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. (1–2)

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from the source e.g.

Yes Supreme Court backed down; created Executive Office; permanent increase in Presidential power etc.

No Supreme Court, Senate and Congress could block policies; only 'most' measures approved later etc. (3–5)

Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from the source. Addresses the issue of 'How far?' (6–7)

(iii) Level 1 – Useful/not useful – Choice made on the basis that one is more detailed/gives more information than the other, but does not specify what information. (1)

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One is from a farmer and the other is from an American history book so they could both be biased/unreliable. (2)

Level 3 – Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information. (3–5)

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. (6–7)

© UCLES 2010

(b) (i) Level 1 – One mark for each valid proposal to a maximum of two e.g. Forcing judges to retire at 70; 'Court packing scheme' – six new judges to be appointed by Roosevelt increasing the total to 15. (1–2)

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies aspects – Radio programme. Supported New Deal at first but later opposed it. (1–2)

Level 2 – Develops aspects. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. Own radio programme, audience c. 45m in 1932; 'New Deal is Christ's Deal'; supported till 1934; opposed by 1936 because of FDR's 'dictatorship'; agreed with Huey Long; set up the National Union for Social Justice for worker rights and monetary reform – large membership; supported Lemke's Third Party in 1936. Later anti-Communist etc. (2–4)

(iii) Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for the explanation. (1–2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. The New Deal raised taxes to pay for it; restricted free enterprise; too many regulations; gave workers rights; union negotiating powers; Social Security payments; Republican influence; New Deal was said to smack of Communism etc. (2–6)

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, changed many things; No, limited intentions and scope. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of change OR lack of change, single factor given e.g.

Cha Unprecedented government involvement; Relief; Social Security; banking; agriculture; Alphabet Agencies for all sorts of things; changed attitudes for good? etc.

Lack Limited intentions and scope of policies; not meant to be long term; still democratic; no specific black reform; cutting budget; Second New Deal; unemployment not solved etc. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of change OR lack of change with multiple factors given. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument – Annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). (3–5)

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of change AND lack of change must be addressed. (6–8)

© UCLES 2010

Depth Study D: China, 1945–c.1990.

4 (a) (i) Level 1 – Repeats material stated in source, no inference made. (1–2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. They did not like the landlord and hoped to hurt him etc. (3–4)

Level 3 – Makes valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Hated and beat the landlord, forcing him to reveal his hidden money, 500 dollars taken etc. (5–6)

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. (1–2)

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from the source e.g.

Yes Targeting embezzlement, waste and slacking in a campaign against the 'Three Antis'; many thought that the Communists were trying to root out corruption etc.

No The Communists had frightened those with access to money but the saved monies were not to be used for the benefit of the Chinese people as a whole etc. (3–5)

Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from the source. Addresses the issue of 'How far?' (6–7)

(iii) Level 1 – Useful/not useful – Choice made on the basis that one is more detailed/gives more information but does not specify what information. (1)

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One is from a Chinese peasant and the other is from a British book so they could both be biased/unreliable. (2)

Level 3 – Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information. (3–5)

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. (6–7)

© UCLES 2010

(b) (i) Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. Medical practitioners with rudimentary training to look after the health of the Chinese in the countryside. Did not want to get their sandals wet in the paddy fields – hence, barefoot etc. (1–2)

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies the courts e.g. Dealt with landlords etc. (1–2)

Level 2 – Develops description. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect that is described in additional detail e.g. Almost kangaroo courts where peasants could list the evil doings and behaviour of former landlords. Punishment often harsh. Supervised by Mao's troops – later officials etc. (2–4)

(iii) Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for the explanation. (1–2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. Communists had identified that previous managers, academics, scientists etc were not too enamoured of the Communist regime, so the campaign was to invite constructive criticism and open a dialogue between Party cadres and the experts. The campaign achieved a huge and growing amount of criticism and was felt to be undermining the Party so Mao stopped it. Some say he was 'outing' his critics and many were punished severely. (2–6)

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.
They were all just as badly off as before. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of improvement OR lack of improvement, single factor given e.g.

Impr Gone are the warlords and the landlords; improvements in education, health and the position of women; one central government. Some improvements in agricultural production in good years, and in industry etc.

Diffs The tyranny of the warlords and the landlords had been replaced by state tyranny and that of local officials; famines; land taken by the state; central direction, which at times lacked common sense; doubtful if many Chinese saw any great changes in that decade etc. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of improvement OR lack of improvement with multiple factors given. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). (3–5)

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of improvement AND lack of improvement must be addressed.
(6–8)

© UCLES 2010

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century.

5 (a) (i) Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made. (1–2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. Expanding; rapid increase in jobs; marked difference between black and white workforce; huge profits; benefited State revenue etc. (3–4)

Level 3 – Makes valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Almost 100 per cent increase in black and white workers from 1929 to 1940 yet black workers out number whites almost ten-fold; huge state profits which rose by 14 times the amount between 1929 and 1940 etc. (5–6)

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. (1–2)

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from the source e.g.

Yes Decline in markets; agriculture needed government support – even industry at times.

No Industry largely developed rapidly; job opportunities from expansion in textiles; wine and tobacco problems pre-question date etc. (3–5)

Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from the source. Addresses the issue of 'How far?' (6–7)

(iii) Level 1 – Useful/not useful – Choice made on the basis that one is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. (1)

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One is statistics, the other is from a British writer so they could both be biased/unreliable. (2)

Level 3 – Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information. (3–5)

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. (6–7)

© UCLES 2010

(b) (i) Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. Company set up by Oppenheimer in 1917; by 1929 controlled de Beers and some of the Rand goldfields; huge economic power; an influence on the state etc. (1–2)

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. Slums, camps, hostels. (1–2)

Level 2 – Develops aspects. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in additional detail e.g. Hostels for male workers; squatter settlements within white areas; own homes in areas such as Sophiatown; new townships e.g. Orlando, Soweto etc. (2–4)

(iii) Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for the explanation. (1–2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. Labour shortages; black unions better organised than earlier ICU; increased membership e.g. on Rand 23 000–80 000 in the five years to 1945; more confident; colour bar re. jobs had been lifted to an extent; black urban population doubled 1936–46; Communist Party active; better wages campaign; 1946 solidarity of black miners' strike etc. (2–6)

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, more jobs; No, unequal distribution of wealth. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of benefit OR lack of benefit, single factor given e.g.

Ben World gold demand increased throughout the period; employment available; rising wages and standards of living; population increased; health/education improved; highest standard of living in Africa; range of industries; government involvement etc.

Lack Disparity between black and white increased; urban and rural differences; State and large industries held considerable power; weakness of trade unions etc. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of benefit OR lack of benefit with multiple factors given. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR Undeveloped assertions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). (3–5)

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of benefit AND lack of benefit must be addressed. (6–8)

© UCLES 2010

Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians, 1945–c.1994.

6 (a) (i) Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made. (1–2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. They felt confident and were complacent etc. (3–4)

Level 3 – Makes valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. They felt confident that they would not have to mobilise reserves; felt that the Arab states would not be able to co-operate against them etc. (5–6)

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. (1–2)

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from the source e.g.

Yes Israel could be seen as the military victor; the issue of the state of Israel was still of importance to USA and UNO; both USA and UNO positions seemed to advance which implies influence for peace and existence of the Israeli state. Sadat now turning to USA, Israel's foremost supporter etc.

No Egypt, Syria had a political victory; Israel had to withdraw from Sinai; Egypt's third Army rescued and still intact etc. (3–5)

Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from the source. Addresses the issue of 'How far?' (6–7)

(iii) Level 1 – Useful/not useful – Choice made on the basis that one is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. (1)

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One is from an Israeli newspaper, the other is from a British history book so they could both be biased/unreliable. (2)

Level 3 – Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information. (3–5)

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. (6–7)

© UCLES 2010

(b) (i) Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. He was Minister for Defence in the Israeli government. His reputation was harmed by the ill-preparedness of the Israeli forces to counter the Egyptian and Syrian attacks. Accepted he had to fight on two fronts. Dropped from Rabin's cabinet in 1974 etc. (1–2)

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies use of oil as a weapon. Blackmail? (1–2)

Level 2 – Develops use of oil as a weapon. Award an extra mark for each aspect that is described in additional detail e.g. USA particularly influenced by the cutting of oil production by Arab states and the banning of exports to USA and Holland. Showed that the USA and USSR would suffer consequences for supporting the client states. The superpower leaders worked hard for a cease fire, as did the Security Council at UNO. (2–4)

(iii) Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for the explanation. (1–2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. Tension – PLO pressure; hijacked airliners blown up at Amman 1970; Terrorist attack at Munich Olympics. Sadat was convinced he could not win a war against Israel so wanted USA support for a negotiated settlement. After terrorist attacks world opinion turned against the Arab states; so, Sadat turned to Syria to mount a joint attack to force USA to intervene and create a settlement. Egyptians more confident as they had USSR support, modern Soviet weapons and Soviet training for its troops.
One country only – max 4 marks. (2–6)

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.
No, they still all hated one another. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of change OR lack of change, single factor given e.g.

Cha. Some glimmer of peace; Egyptian and Israeli leaders came together – but not in the same room – in Geneva. Israelis agreed to move back from Suez Canal (closed since 1957) enabling Egypt to repair and re-open the Canal – BUT not to Israeli ships). Oil had been shown to be a good weapon and affected USA especially. OPEC's success, and mindful that resources were not unlimited, caused it to raise prices –caused a world recession in 1979.

Lack The Palestinian problem had not been resolved. Most Arab states still hated the idea of the Israeli state. Were Jordan and latterly Egypt sincere about wanting an accommodation? (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of change or lack of change with multiple factors given. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). (3–5)

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of change AND lack of change must be addressed. (6–8)

© UCLES 2010

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society.

7 (a) (i) Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made. (1–2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. It appears that the situation changes from place to place etc. (3–4)

Level 3 – Makes valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Conditions differ from place to place; there appears to be no regulations for any of the towns mentioned; although there are some good sewers in Bury, even there the conditions are as bad as Liverpool and Bradford in places etc. (5–6)

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. (1–2)

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from the source e.g.

Yes Illustrated London News sufficiently interested to report the inquest; medical officer appointed and an inquest held indicates some official concern at least etc.

No Bad conditions for years with no improvement; moneyed interests at play; local authorities making no real effort etc. (3–5)

Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from the source. Addresses the issue of 'How far?' (6–7)

(iii) Level 1 – Useful/not useful – Choice made on the basis that one is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. (1)

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – A is a Government report, B is from a newspaper and C is from a book so they could all be biased/unreliable. (2)

Level 3 – Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information. (3–5)

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A, B and C to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for more than one source. (6–7)

© UCLES 2010

(b) (i) Level 1 – One mark for each valid Act to a maximum of two e.g. Many to choose from but expect 1858 – act to allow sewers to be built in London; 1846 Baths and Wash-houses Act; 1848 Public Health Act; 1866 Sanitary Act – to effect the supply of good water; 1875 Public Health Act; 1875 Artisans Dwellings Act etc. (1–2)

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies places. (1–2)

Level 2 – Develops places. Award an extra mark for each place described in additional detail e.g. Wells, pumps, springs, rivers, water carriers, and piped water. **Reward candidates who develop safety and danger issues with each source of water etc.** (2–4)

(iii) Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for the explanation. (1–2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. Epidemics regular, widespread and often fatal. Poor living conditions helped to spread these diseases; impure water and overcrowding; Medical knowledge slow to combat the diseases – did not understand the links between conditions and diseases; no local or national government action; feeling that it just happened and mostly to the poor. (2–6)

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, as towns grew, conditions got worse. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of town growth OR other reasons, single factor given e.g.

Growth. Towns grew rapidly to house the workers of the industrial revolution; need for speed of building to enable industry to flourish; profit motives of builders and developers meant poor building with little heed for the conditions that would ensue; Speed and profit meant no proper drainage and many people crowded close to smoke-belching factories.

Other No adequate legislation or local government structure to help in the early days; poor wages meant little money for food and hygiene; nobody understood major diseases; many brought bad country habits into the towns; enforcement of municipal Corporations Act 1835 etc? (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of town growth OR other reasons with multiple factors. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). (3–5)

Level 3 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of town growth AND other reasons must be addressed. (6–8).

© UCLES 2010

Depth Study H: The Impact of Western Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century.

8 (a) (i) Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made. (1–2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. The lady has mixed feeling about life in India etc. (3–4)

Level 3 – Makes valid inferences, supported from the source e.g. The lady has mixed feelings about life in India, disliking Calcutta, the Indians and their habits, whilst quite attracted to the countryside around Calcutta; language and tone could be argued to show resentment etc. (5–6)

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. (1–2)

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from the sources e.g.

Yes Source B's officer admires the sepoys and their loyalty – implies mutual respect. Source C mentions that the English do not generally behave with cruelty; men sometimes might have sensitivity towards the natives etc.

No Almost all of Source C, its evidence, language and examples show that many resented their time in India, saw the Indians as a lower class and insulted them whenever possible; that treatment must, in time, bubble to resentment and action etc. (3–5)

Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from the source. Addresses the issue of 'How far?' (6–7)

(iii) Level 1 – Useful/not useful – Choice made on the basis that one is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. (1)

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – A, B and C are all from letters so they could all be biased/unreliable. (2)

Level 3 – Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information. (3–5)

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A, B and C to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for more than one source. (6–7)

© UCLES 2010

(b) (i) Level 1 – One mark for each valid religion to a maximum of two e.g. Hinduism, Islam, Buddhism, Christianity, Sikhism, Jainism etc. (1–2)

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies the Company. English company with Royal Charter (First Charter 1600) to trade in India etc. (1–2)

Level 2 – Describes Company. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. English company with Royal Charter with own army and civil service; led by Governor-General; effective government for many parts of India; drove out French in 1757; allowed local princes to remain as long as they were loyal; members of EIC often became very rich – 'nabobs' etc. (2–4)

(iii) Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for the explanation. (1–2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. The Company, and after 1858, the British Government, needed many officials, officers, lawyers and engineers in India. Pay was often only a reasonable remuneration but there were great opportunities to make personal fortunes by private trading, looting, purchase of jewels etc. A good life style for British as labour and goods were cheap. India was attractive to men who wanted to get away from Britain for whatever reasons. (2–6)

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions
No, there was a mutiny. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of benefit OR lack of benefit, single factor given e.g.

Ben Many benefits were co-incidental with EIC rule, but in order to trade the EIC needed peace and order; needed access to parts of India so communications were improved with railways and telegraph; Laid seeds of new religions (mixed blessing?) and new methods of government; – helped some Indians.

Lack EIC was there to make profit not help Indians; treatment of Indians, both peasants and princes; interfered with local customs (suttee, thuggee and infanticide; policy of lapse; Mutiny caused by EIC mistakes – but Mutiny led to improved government, etc. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of benefit OR lack of benefit with multiple factors. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). (3–5)

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of benefit AND lack of benefit must be addressed. (6–8)

© UCLES 2010