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

0470/43 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 inferences made. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s) unsupported from the source. e.g. steady rise; sharpening in 1922; catastrophic in 1923. (3 – 4)

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source. (5 – 6)

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

Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees with no support from the source. (1 – 2)

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

Yes everything crumbling; savers and old; cash-dependent.

No those with foresight/nerve; debtors; currency traders. (3 – 5)

Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from 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 – A, German; B, American hindsight so they could 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 BOTH on nature of information and reliability.
Discussion of utility must be based on valid evaluation of the sources in context. Include at this level answers which cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 for both sources. (6 – 7)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

(b) (i) One mark for each aspect to a maximum of two: units of armed volunteers, usually ex-junior officers; organised by Noske, minister of defence; paid to put down Bavarian soviet & Spartacists; Kapp Putsch etc. (1 – 2)

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects, e.g. led by Hitler; failed. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Describes aspects, e.g. SA/Ludendorff involved; took Kahr, Lossow & Seisser; failed to get police/army support; in confrontation with police 1 killed & 16 Nazis; arrests, etc. (2 – 4)

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

Level 1 – A single reason. One for the reason, one for the explanation.
e.g. 'stab in the back'; war guilt; loss of territory; scale of reparations; linked to socialists etc. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained. (2 – 6)

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions e.g. Yes, new currency; no, dependant on US loans. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of recovery OR weakness, single factor given e.g.

Recovery One aspect of Stresemann's foreign or domestic policy; economic recovery; Munich Putsch put down; ended Ruhr occupation; relative political stability.

Weakness US loans critical; unemployment rising – 8.5% in 1929; uneven economic recovery; right-wing resentments; coalition governments; etc. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of recovery OR weakness with multiple factors. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR undeveloped suggestions of BOTH sides of the argument, linking the two.
(annotate BBB – balanced but brief). (3 – 5)

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of recovery AND weakness 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 seen in source, no inferences made. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from the source e.g. he plays every role; conducts it as a Court; lectures people etc. (3 – 4)

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Stalin is taking every role in the Supreme Soviet; is the judge, jury and prosecutor; the message is that he is totally in control of the government of the USSR; gives the impression of legality but he is a dictator 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 the purges were to achieve political goals; sought to achieve political unity in society'; used the people to expose his possible political enemies etc.

No had economic and social goals as well; appears moral aspects as well; hard to separate political aspects from other aspects 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 source is more detailed/gives more information but does not specify what information. (1)

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One source is a cartoon and the other is from a former Soviet army officer 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 which cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both sources. (6 – 7)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

(b) (i) One mark for each aspect to a maximum of two e.g. Head of the Communist Party in Leningrad, ally of Stalin, very popular; shot by a party official, probably organised by a jealous Stalin; death the trigger of the Great Purge etc. (1 – 2)

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

Level 1 – Identifies Show Trials e.g. to legitimise punishment and warn about treason etc. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Describes Show Trials. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in additional detail e.g. purpose to publicise the treason of the accused; Working – to crush individuals with torture and threats before court appearance; to have the accused admit faults to the world to save families etc. and then execute immediately 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. Stalin feared a possible military coup; he purged about one-third of the officer corps; lost experienced and senior leaders; meant that Hitler could brush aside Soviet army in Barbarossa; lost defence chiefs when other industrial and agricultural reforms not complete; unsettled army and population; could argue those that survived would be loyal etc. (2 – 6)

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions – e.g. Yes, everyone was frightened; no, another method. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of fear OR other methods, single factor given e.g.

Fear Definitely factor with deportations, arrests, gulags, Show Trials, executions very much a part of every day life; millions disappeared; attacks against ethnic groups or class groups, Old Guard, managers, armed forces etc.

Other Education, propaganda, Cult of Personality, Stalin was tantamount to a God; improved conditions for women, housing, health convinced many; many Soviet citizens just wanted to get on with life without making waves etc. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of fear OR other methods 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 fear AND other methods 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 inferences made. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s) unsupported from the source.
e.g. declining; workers poverty-stricken; employed children; dangerous. (3 – 4)

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. 'mines shut down', 'never did recover'; 'hunger', father 'farmer and miner'; 14 year old; explosions. (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 6m lost land/jobs; fewer workers needed in both agriculture and industry; unskilled fared worst.

No 95% had jobs; industry booming; cities growing implies work; 'most' must mean some did have skills and thus work. (3 – 5)

Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from 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 – Usefu/not useful – A recollections; B an historian, so they could 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 BOTH on nature of information and reliability.
Discussion of utility must be based on valid evaluation of the sources in context. Include at this level answers which cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both sources. (6 – 7)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

(b) (i) One mark for each to a maximum of two: huge super-corporations which dominated vital sectors of industry – e.g. oil (Rockefeller), steel, (Carnegie); price fixing; monopolies; strangled competition; corruption; anti-unions; political influence on Republicans; able to flout anti-Trust laws. (1 – 2)

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects – e.g. laissez faire; tariffs; low taxation; supported 'captains of industry'/wealthy. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Describes attitudes – e.g. rugged individualism; Fordney-McCumber tariff 1923; regressive taxation; anti-unions; inaction on poverty. (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.
e.g. Wealth of resources; European weakness; mass production; car; consumer durables led; confidence/demand; low taxation. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained. (2 – 6)

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions. e.g. Yes, confidence; no, unemployment. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of strong OR not strong, single factor given e.g.

Strong e.g. wealthiest country in the world; not import dependent; 1 in 5 had a car; consumer durables; electrification continued; expansion of new industries created jobs; tariffs & trusts protected markets.

Not Strong e.g. demand tailing off before 1929; built on hire purchase/credit; inequalities; 42% below poverty line; speculation; banks unregulated; rapidity/scale of Crash; problems of older industries/agriculture. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of strong OR not strong with multiple factors. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR Undeveloped suggestions of BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – balanced but brief). (3 – 5)

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of strong/not strong 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 inference(s), unsupported from the source e.g. The 1960s seems to be a period of differing views on policy and physical confrontation etc.(3 – 4)

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Mao believed that peaceful co-existence policy is a non-Communist stance; increasing antipathy in the battle for leadership of the Communist world and provocations on the borders with armed clashes 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 USSR talking of peaceful co-existence; Khrushchev going to USA; USSR more interested in its own worries than a combined Sino/Soviet front etc.

No Congress for all Communist Parties in Moscow; Mao got much publicity and popularity from communist world because of his famous phrases 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 source is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. (1)

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – Both sources are from British people 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 sources. (6 – 7)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

(b) (i) One mark for each valid country to a maximum of two e.g. Korea, Vietnam. (1 – 2)

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

Level 1 – Identifies relations e.g. occupation of land etc. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Describes relations. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. Tibet declared itself independent of China in 1911 but Chinese always saw it as part of China; China invaded in 1950 and formally annexed it in 1951; given status of self-governing region; Dalai Lama left with 100 000 supporters to live in India, 1959. India – border dispute with China taking land but giving back some to which it felt it did not have a right; brief affair. (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. Home of the Chinese Nationalists led by Chiang Kai-shek (Jiang Jieshi); always threatened to invade mainland China; US protection in the straits between; Taiwan represented China on UN Security Council; US used its veto to stop Communist China taking that seat; while Taiwan existed, a different regime and system showed a different way to Chinese etc. (2 – 6)

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions, e.g. Yes, much better after Mao had gone. (1)

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

Imp Increasing trade and economic clout has given China more confidence and more respect from the rest of the world. Better relations with West especially USA; China taking a full part in most world affairs. **Remember** – date end is 1990.

Lack World has issues with human rights and latterly with environmental issues. It will take time in the post-Mao era to forget Chinese actions in 1950s-1980, but equally the Chinese remember the imperial actions of the West in the first half of the twentieth century. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of improvement OR lack of improvement 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 improvement AND lack of improvement 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 inferences made. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s) unsupported from the source.
e.g. controlled diamond mining; powerful; own secret service; suspicious – of robbers and any possible opposition; ambitious; dictatorial. (3 – 4)

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. 'all the mines', '90% world'; 'more effective than govt'; 'system of spies'; 'inspired distrust'; 'dominate/subdue'. (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 powerful; 'king' for a while; imperial acquisition; popular; alone made area important.

No wealth; business empire; economic influence; 'king' only for a short while; over-ambitious; own worst enemy. (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 – A British, B – memories of a friend so they could 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 BOTH on nature of information and reliability.
Discussion of utility must be based on valid evaluation of the source(s) in context. Include at this level answers which cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both sources. (6 – 7)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

(b) (i) One mark for each: Zululand (Cetshwayo); Pedi (Sekhukhuni). (1 - 2)

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects, e.g. British defeated; suzerainty. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Describes aspects, e.g. defeat at Majuba Hill; Pretoria Convention recognised Transvaal as SAR; British 'suzerainty' explained; increased Boer/Kruger confidence. (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.
e.g. control of diamond/goldfields/railways; GB concern about German/Portuguese influence; wealth/arms of Transvaal; Boer nationalism; GB imperialism; Kruger intransigence; Rhodes' ambitions; Uitlanders; Jameson Raid, 1895; Milner. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained. (2 - 6)

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions e.g. Yes – lost their independence; no, gained jobs. (1)

Level 2 Explanation of losers OR not losers, single factor given e.g.

Losers e.g. suffered invasion/loss of land in expansion rivalries; tribes set against each other – e.g. Swazi v Pedi; taxation; working conditions; used by both sides in war; 14,000 died in concentration camps; loss of any rights, 1903–10.

Not losers e.g. increase in job opportunities; paid far better than agriculture. British 'Protectorates'; loyal chiefs did well; did worst in Boer states. British did worse – costs of war; loss of prestige, Act of Union. Boers suffered – war of attrition; defeated; terms of Vereeniging. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of losers OR not losers with multiple factors. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR Undeveloped suggestions of BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – balanced but brief). (3 - 5)

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of losers AND not losers must be addressed. (6 – 8)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

DEPTH STUDY F: ISRAELIS AND PALESTINIANS, 1945–c.1990

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 inferences made. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from the source e.g. Jewish people are passionately attached to their homeland; proud of what their civilisation has given the world etc. (3 – 4)

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Throughout their dispersion the Jews were praying, hoping to return to their homeland; proud of their civilisation and culture which gave much to the world including the Bible 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 Arab groups not prepared properly; tactics no better than previous skirmishes; defence was piecemeal; aims confused and diverse etc.

No They were not taken by surprise; they had weapons; several countries joined in quickly 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 source is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. (1)

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One source is from a Jewish proclamation and the other is from an Arab 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 sources. (6 – 7)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

(b) (i) One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. term given to modern movement founded by Herzl aiming to establish a Jewish homeland in Palestine as the only way of escaping centuries of persecution and discrimination. (1 – 2)

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

Level 1 – Identifies terms e.g. to be responsible for the development of Palestine. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Describes terms. Award an extra mark for each valid term described in additional detail e.g. League of Nations Mandate awarded in 1920 and confirmed by L of N in 1922; to be responsible for the political, economic and administrative control; to be responsible for the training and development of the population; to foster good relations with both Arabs and Jews; to encourage the immigration and settlement of Jews; protect the civil and religious right of all citizens 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. Britain was exhausted financially; short of men; too expensive; at the time trying to set up welfare state; Palestine had always been difficult with increasing immigration by Jews and the religious and cultural clashes; because GB could walk away as the new UNO could pick up the pieces etc. (2 – 6)

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions, e.g. no, the fighting was in Palestine. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of events in Palestine OR outside influences, single factor given e.g.

Outside e.g. demand for more and more Jews to be allowed to move from Europe etc; impact and sympathy for Jews from Holocaust revelations; views of President Truman, Jewish lobby and funding from US Jews; the world felt guilty etc.

Pal e.g. increasing number of Jews brought social and religious tensions and violence; terror gangs on both sides. Jews felt a need to establish their homeland; British could not control and in the end could not get the two sides to join talks; Palestine would be the place for decisive fighting etc. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of outside influences OR events in Palestine 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 events in Palestine AND outside influences 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 stated in the source, no inference made. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s) unsupported from the source e.g. seen as useful, within limits; influence on Parliament; range of demands excessive; threatening. (3 – 4)

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. 'maintaining rights of labouring classes'; PM 'no opponent of TUs'; 'agree amongst themselves not to work', 'prevent or intimidate'. (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 legislation strengthened their position/status; increased membership strengthened influence; founded TUC; optimistic.

No only 'seemed' to improve; concessions only because of 1867 Reform Act; over-optimistic. (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 source is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. (1)

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One source is from the PM and the other is from an American 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) One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. action of a minority to force 'blacklegs' to join TU; result of rivalry between different cutlers' unions; some violence including dropping gunpowder down a workman's chimney; factor in bringing about Royal Commission to enquire into TU movement. (1 – 2)

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

Level 1 – Identifies terms e.g. TU Act protection union funds; CLAA forbade picketing OR considers only one Act. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Describes terms. Award an extra mark for each valid term described in additional detail e.g. TU Act combinations not unlawful; full legal protection of funds for the first time; CLAA weakened picketing by forbidding 'molestation' and 'intimidation'; Jail sentences. (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. 1867 & 1884 extensions of franchise gave working men some political influence on elections; activities of TUC and socialists; Match Girls' Strike; formation of unskilled unions; Dock Strike. (2 – 6)

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions, e.g. Yes, they were better organised. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of trade unionists influence OR other factors, single factor given e.g.

TUs New Model Unions; TUC; New Unionism; agricultural workers.

Other growing social conscience; politicians – Disraeli, Gladstone; Socialists – Webbs, Shaw, Hardie etc; some employers came to see benefits of negotiation/happier workforce. Can argue little genuine progress. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of own efforts OR other influences 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 events in Palestine AND outside influences 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 inferences made. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s) unsupported from the source e.g. disinterested; apathetic; cruel; one concerned. (3 – 4)

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. 'we do not care'; no effort over 'lingering deaths' famine; 'could so easily remove'; Florence attacks government. (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 protected lives; reduced famine; Civil Service worked hard; gave credit to Indians.

No worked to death; took all the blame for problems; 'may' become self-sufficient. (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 source is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. (1)

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One source is from a British campaigner and the other from an imperialist 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 sources. (6 – 7)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012

(b) (i) One mark for each to a maximum of two, e.g. Canning, Lawrence, Elgin, Mayo, Northbrook, Lytton, Ripon, Dufferin, Lansdowne, Kincardine, Curzon, Minto, Hardinge. (1 – 2)

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

Level 1 – Identifies terms e.g. Crown government, Governor-General became Viceroy. (1 – 2)

Level 2 – Describes terms. Award an extra mark for each valid term described in additional detail e.g. East India Co. abolished, all property taken over by Crown; direct government; Secretary of State advised by 15 members of a Council of India. (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. extremes of climate; inability to transport food to affected areas; size of country; corruption and incompetence; cost. (2 – 6)

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions, e.g. yes, more opportunities. (1)

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

Impr. e.g. jobs in Civil Service; increased trade; development of roads, railways; education; uniform system of government.

Continuity e.g. famines still occurred; border areas still lawless; caste system remained; Westernisation not always popular. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of improvement OR continuity 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 improvement and continuity must be addressed. (6 – 8)

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2012