UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2012 question paper

for the guidance of teachers

0470 HISTORY

0470/42 Paper 4 (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.

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

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2012 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918–1945

1 (a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. Anti-Left; loyal to the government sympathisers of Freikorps; links with the wealthy; financed espionage and, secretly, the Nazis etc. (3 – 4)

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. 'Massacred communists'; restored Right-wing; used 'secret army funds'; money from capitalists' etc. (5 – 6)

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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

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

Yes Support of Ludendorff; publicity; ban brief; SA growing; switch to legal means etc.

No Putsch failed; seats falling and only gained 3% of the popular vote; Hitler imprisoned; Rohm went to South America etc. (3 – 5)

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

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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 history of the German Army, the other is by a German so they could both be biased/unreliable. (2)

Level 3 – Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must state 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)

(b) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. All over 20 could vote; secret ballot; proportional representation; election every 4 years; separate election for Presidency etc. (1 – 2)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. violence; broke up meetings. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Develops aspects e.g. Targeted communists and socialists; street fights, especially in Berlin; murders; parades; collected cash; enforcers etc. (2 – 4)

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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. Economy doing well; Stresemann effective – 'Golden Years'; too extreme; suspicions of its 'socialism'; divisions – contest with Strasser; lack of cash etc. (2 – 6)

(iv) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, appointed by Hindenburg. No, another factor like Depression increased the Nazi vote. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of weaknesses OR other factors, single factor given e.g.

Weak Grand coalition; could not agree on policy; from March 1930 government under Article 48; Hindenburg; Schleicher; Bruning role; Presidential election; Von Papen; Nazis had only 33 per cent of the vote etc.

Other Catch-all appeal of Nazi policies; propaganda; fear of Communism; role of SA; links to industrialists; unemployment at 30 per cent; Army influence; elections 1930/32; Hitler's intransigence etc. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of weaknesses OR other factors, 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 weaknesses AND other factors must be addressed. (6 – 8)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

Depth Study B: Russia 1905–1941

2 (a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. Curious about changes; conservative and thought the changes would not work etc. (3 – 4)

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Curious and amazed at the strength of the tractor; felt the smell would poison the ground; crops would not grow and the changes would fail; changes are Party driven etc. (5 – 6)

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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

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

Yes Stalin said it was; no more famines after the great famine; state farms produced more than private ones; peasants driving tractors; countryside transformed etc.

No Huge cost in human life and misery; great famine deaths; inefficiencies of collective farms etc. (3 – 5)

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

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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 peasant, the other is from a British 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)

(b) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. A Kolkhoz was a collective farm. A Sovkhoz was a state farm where workers drew wages as per in industry. (1 – 2)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

Level 1 – Identifies methods e.g. Persuasion by threat or reward. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Develops methods e.g. Most by fear but some peasants were given extra rewards and responsibilities. As per kulaks, arrest, transportation. Gulags, work camps, death etc. (2 – 4)

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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. Needed vast increases in production to bring USSR up to date and rival Western powers; for defence; to enrich USSR; to get away from capitalist NEP; to put his own stamp on the development of industry; to export to buy foreign technology etc. (2 – 6)

(iv) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, lots more was produced. (1)

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

Eff After a slow start, and after training the USSR became the second largest producer of heavy industry behind the USA; allowed USSR to survive German onslaught; increasing amounts of grown corn – used for export etc.

Ineff Great famine killed millions; Second Five Year Plan had to be redrafted; so many animals killed that animal production did not catch up till the 1950s; any improvement based on cruel targets, working conditions and exploited workers etc. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of effectiveness OR ineffectiveness, 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 effectiveness AND ineffectiveness must be addressed. (6 – 8)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919–1941

3 (a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. Did not understand the system; small investors were ruined; banks and major players did well, but not to be trusted; people disillusioned; future unclear etc. (3 – 4)

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. People were puzzled; they had lost all their money; banks had already made their profits by secret selling ahead of the crash etc. (5 – 6)

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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

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

Yes Wages had been rising steadily for thirty years and demand for consumer goods had been high in the 1920s; at his death Rockefeller still had a fortune of well over 1 percent of the total national wealth, despite losses in the Depression etc.

No Inequalities of wealth; 350 000 owned 12 per cent of total national income; robber barons owned too much and could exploit their power and the workers; Rockefeller lost 80 per cent of his fortune, so what about the poor? (3 – 5)

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

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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 newspaper, the other is from a 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)

(b) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. Queues of unemployed waiting for food; distributed by charities; not state help; usually insufficient but the choice was to scavenge or starve so breadline looked attractive. (1 – 2)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. Democrats support; violently dispersed. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Develops aspects e.g. Set up camps in Washington; congress voted for immediate payment in June 1932; Republican Senate refused; July, Hoover ordered camps to be demolished; MacArthur's army with tanks and weapons attacked and burned tents; riots; two marchers killed; dispersed etc. (2 – 4)

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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. Overproduction; long standing problems; bankruptcies; downward spiral worsened by lack of confidence; no welfare provision; drought/dust bowl; no chance to work in towns; black people usually dismissed first etc. (2 – 6)

(iv) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, failed to act. Yes, appeal of FDR. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of Hoover's unpopularity OR other factors, single factor given e.g.

Hoov 'Prosperity just around the corner'; blocked Relief Bill 1932; attack on Bonus Army; measures taken inadequate – initially lowering taxes; cutting government expenditure; new tariff; not tackling banks; tax on higher incomes raised in 1932 angered some supporters; Reconstruction Finance Act; Republican campaign ineffective etc.

Other FDR's promises; success as Governor of New York; personality; whistle-stop campaign; Democrats united for once; Depression worsening; voters willing to try an alternative etc. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of Hoover's unpopularity OR other factors, 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 Hoover's unpopularity AND other factors must be addressed.
(6 – 8)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

Depth Study D: China 1945–c.1990

4 (a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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 new economy had problems in balancing the books and keeping the economy under control; the government tried to take some action etc. (3 – 4)

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Market socialism had side effects; exports went up but imports went up more; government put tariffs on imports; inflation up by 22 percent etc. (5 – 6)

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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

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

Yes Mao's revolution and process had made progress in literacy; shattered the old imperial system of government; left foundations for Deng's developments etc.

No Mass murders; excesses of the revolution; destroyed ancient culture; Deng was the great pro-market reformer etc. (3 – 5)

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

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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 historian and the other is from a journalist 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)

(b) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

Level 1 – One mark for each valid area to a maximum of two e.g. Hong Kong, Macao. (1 – 2)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. Squabble to take the reins of power. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Develops aspects e.g. Three candidates: Hua Guofeng (Mao's choice), Deng, sacked during Cultural Revolution, Gang of Four, led by Mao's widow Jiang Qing. Hua initially held power, kept Deng in the background, arrested Gang of four; Deng reasserted himself, shared leadership with Hua but then forced Hua to resign as Party Chairman; Deng in sole control; Gang of four on trial, sentenced to death, later commuted to life imprisonment etc. (2 – 4)

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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. Frustration with economic problems – inflation at 30 per cent and state employees wages lagging behind prices in 1988/9; April – demonstration at slow pace of political reform towards democracy; example of Gorbachev's reforms in USSR; Chinese Govt (Zhao Ziyang) promises student demands will be met; Deng outraged; Gorbachev's visit (15–18 May); June, often as many as 250 000 in Square; internal disagreements in govt; Deng won. Thousands of troops brought into dispel protesters on 3–4 June. Basically, frustration at the slow pace of economic and political change. (2 – 6)

(iv) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, many Chinese were becoming richer. (1)

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

Cha More contact and trade with West; investment from West meant huge increase in commercial enterprise; UNO and World Bank contact also helped; incentives in pay increased production; demand and use of consumer goods from Western fashions, TVs etc; more travel; special economic areas etc.

Lack CCP remained fully in control; peasants barely saw any change except that some land was taken for building; largest economic and social developments took place from mid-1990s onwards etc. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of change OR lack of change, 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)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

5 (a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. New; differences between theory and practice; complex; impractical; divisive; to ensure racial hierarchy etc. (3 – 4)

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Clashes with the reality of life in Cape Town and history of relationships; rainbow colours of mixed racial origins; to control etc. (5 – 6)

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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

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

Yes To lead to salvation; to secure a fair future; justice for all; lead to independence; government aid; popular with Afrikaners etc.

No Afrikaner focus; integration impossible; government decision of timings; urban areas exclusively white – blacks can only be visitors etc. (3 – 5)

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

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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 Afrikaner and the other is from a communist 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)

(b) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. To prevent an individual or group from attending meetings, writing or broadcasting; not allowed to move without police permission; no appeal etc. (1 – 2)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. Trial of opponents of apartheid; failed. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Develops aspects e.g. About 150 leaders of ANC and Indian Congress involved in 1955 Freedom Charter, accused of communist/violent aims; huge publicity; government failed – 60 released in 1958, another 60 in 1959, final 30 found not guilty in 1961. (2 – 4)

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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. Too small for their large populations; poor land; chiefs not always trusted by government or subjects; industry needed black labour outside; cost; 'independence' not recognised outside South Africa etc. (2 – 6)

(iv) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, kept opposition down. No, apartheid has now gone. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of impact of security forces OR other factors. Single factor given e.g.

SF The security forces used physical action and intimidation to keep control and force apartheid on the native population – also forced it on some liberal whites as well; expect examples of suppression, torture and imprisonment; individual events like Sharpeville etc.

Other Most Afrikaners approved of apartheid so it had general white approval; some areas more relaxed; the very fact that black political movements continued the struggle against apartheid despite the security forces shows opposition could not be stopped; neighbouring states; international condemnation etc. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of impact of security forces OR other factors, 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 the impact of security forces AND other factors must be addressed. (6 – 8)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

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

6 (a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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 had not spent money in preparation; leaders appeared to quarrel easily; seemed to be a personality thing etc. (3 – 4)

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Had not prepared for an Israeli attack on their aircraft; money had been diverted for other things; Nasser not prepared to accept genuine and objective suggestions/observation etc. (5 – 6)

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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

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

Yes Nasser publicised troop movement to Sinai; massed Egyptian forces and tanks on south-western border of Israel etc.

No Hysteria in the Arab world; prediction of long peace by Israeli Chief of Staff; celebration of Independence Day; Israelis believed predictions were right etc. (3 – 5)

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

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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 person, the other is from an Israeli 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)

(b) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. A militant Palestinian organisation set up by Arafat in Kuwait in 1958 to fight for the restoration of Palestine to the Arabs. Began paramilitary operations in 1964 and assumed the leadership of the PLO in 1969 etc. (1 – 2)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

Level 1 – Identifies part played e.g. Egyptian news vehicle used by Egyptian government. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Develops part played e.g. Official mouthpiece of Egyptian government; propaganda vehicle; whipped up Egyptian/Arab hostility to Israel; to threaten Israel and frighten its population etc. (2 – 4)

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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. Egypt not really recovered from previous losses but needed to save face after criticism of Syria and Jordan; unplanned, unprepared, different agendas for Arab states; false Soviet intelligence; Israel unified, single purpose, better leaders, more organised, air power etc. (2 – 6)

(iv) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, they grabbed a lot of land. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of total OR limited victory, single factor given e.g.

Total Complete military victory, inflicting severe losses on Arab air forces and land forces; captured equipment meant enemies would take time to re-arm; expensive and time consuming; now had defendable borders; retained US support – admiration around the world etc.

Limit Still had to defend enlarged borders; beaten states had not given in completely; Israel still not recognised; more refugees in occupied lands; Khartoum Accord where Arab states agreed 'no peace, no recognition and no negotiation'; UNO Resolution 242 demanded Israel vacate captured territory etc. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of total OR limited victory 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 total AND limited victory must be addressed. (6 – 8)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

7 (a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences unsupported from the source e.g. Serious trouble in the stocking industry; things have been damaged; a lot of money is being offered to get a conviction etc (3 – 4)

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Stocking making machinery has been damaged and the owners are offering the huge sum of 50 Guineas to secure a conviction; asking conspirators to turn on one another with information and attempts to get a pardon etc. (5 – 6)

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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

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

Yes There is a large crowd present and they appear to be listening to the speaker; the very fact it is recognisable and fun is being poked at it, must mean evidence of popularity and someone feels threatened etc.

No Not all the audience is concentrating; a fine hotchpotch of strange characters; the poor English and outrageous principles make the tone of the cartoon mocking etc. (3 – 5)

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

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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 a Reward poster, and the other is a cartoon so they could both be biased/unreliable. (2)

Level 3 – Choice made on the nature and 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)

(b) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. Machine breakers led by the mythical Ned Ludd. Originally stocking frame workers but term became applied to anyone who opposed 'progress' etc. (1 – 2)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

Level 1 – Identifies problems e.g. Danger and insecurity. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Develops problems e.g. Dangerous machinery; long hours; harsh overseers; fines for wrongdoing/lateness; could face instant dismissal; unemployment if orders fell etc. (2 – 4)

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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

Level 2 – One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. They had never been properly enforced; they were a wartime measure to control population/armed forces; pressure from many quarters to repeal, especially from Francis Place; they served little purpose; the development of workers' associations needed better legislation and proper consideration etc. (2 – 6)

(iv) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, they were well-known to be harsh and heartless. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of brutality OR kindness, single factor given e.g.

Brut Selfish in many cases as their main concern was profit, not the workers; brutal in the sense that there was no concern for the welfare of the workers; physical brutality was more the concern of the overseers, but they were still the agents of the owners; child and female exploitation etc

Kind Instances of more enlightened factory owners with Robert Owen and New Lanark factory; legislation softens the employers approach; attitudes and the beginnings of a caring culture; effects more easily seen in the second half of the century etc. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of brutality OR kindness, 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 brutality AND kindness must be addressed. (6 – 8)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

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

8 (a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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 has been a great help even if somewhat patronising; the British had little idea of what Indians need; they do not appear to understand Indians; but have their heart in the right place etc. (3 – 4)

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. The British have been of great service morally; have a mixed performance politically have introduced new technology with benefit to Indians; they do not really understand Indians and their needs; but have a firm belief in fair play and justice etc. (5 – 6)

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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

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

Yes Imports of Western technology – trains, canals, steamships; irrigation and food production; world markets; textiles in Western India; stagnation of the early nineteenth century had been overcome etc.

No Only a small minority benefited; famines of the 1880s and 1890s showed that economic growth was limited and the British could not overcome all problems etc. (3 – 5)

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

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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 Indian and the other is from a Briton 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)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

(b) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. This was the Act of Parliament that conferred the title of Empress of India on Queen Victoria. (1 – 2)

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

Level 1 – Identifies problems e.g. Hunger and insecurity. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Develops problems e.g. Famine as per 1880s and 1890s; Lack of opportunity; growing political disaffection leading to Mutiny and with the 1858 legislation; slowly growing economy; wars; British notion of their natural superiority etc. (2 – 4)

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

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. Because the Mutiny revealed mistakes and deficiencies under the rule of the East India company; political concern in Britain at possible loss of the 'jewel in the crown' if India was lost; need to re-establish control in a fairer system and to convey to Indians that they were important; to begin to give Indians more of a stake in the 'partnership etc. (2 – 6)

(iv) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question (0)

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Most resented British interference. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of welcome OR unwelcome, single factor given e.g.

Wel Provided increased opportunities; improved communications by rail, telegraph and shipping; investment in agriculture and industry; system of justice; law and order; fairness etc.

Unw British sense of superiority; racial distinctions and treatment; lack of respect for Hindu and Muslim customs and religious sensitivities; India was the servant of the Mother country etc. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of welcome OR unwelcome 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 welcome AND unwelcome must be addressed. (6 – 8)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012