CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 series

0470 HISTORY

0470/41 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 should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2013 series for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945

(a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no infere

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from th
party; ambitious; self-important; arrogant etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to t
'committee member'; 'in charge of propaganda by early 1920', 'announced new party name'; 'own newspaper'; 'I was in charge'; 'I announced' 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, Anti-capitalism; pro-workers; demand for health care and better pensions; education reform etc.

OR

No, Nationalist; anti peace terms; expansionist; favoured autocracy; wanted limited citizenship 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 Hitler, 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. Sturmabteilung/ Stormtroopers: Brownshirts; ex-soldier Nazis; largely from Freikorps; led by Rohm; thugs to be used against communists etc. [1–2]

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. Nazi attempt to overthro violence; Hitler imprisoned etc.

Level 2 – Describes aspect. Award an extra mark for additional detail e.g. Sparked by Stresemann calling off to take over Bavaria and spark a national revolt; Lude support; failed; SA taking over government buildings; poli

(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. Better organisation; set up local branches of the party throughout Germany; youth groups; publicity – marches, propaganda; financial support; appeal of 'catch-all' messages; Hitler released; ban lifted in Bavaria etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions. Yes – great speaker; No – economic problems. [1]

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

Hitler; Exploited Munich trial; publicity; shift to democratic tactics; Party organisation; Nuremburg rallies/speeches; short term – promised salvation; renewed violence against Communists; stood for Presidency; exploited other politicians etc.

Other; Effects of Depression ended Stresemann prosperity; by 1932 c.30% unemployed; business and financial support; fear of communism; Goebbels; coalitions weak; parliamentary government broken down by 1930 – rule by Decree; did not beat Hindenburg; still no majority of votes.

NB: End date is 1932. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of Hitler OR other reasons with multiple factors. Accept 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 Hitler AND other reasons must be addressed. [6–8]

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

(a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no infere

Level 2 - Makes valid inference(s) unsupported from decisions; checked up on people; no-one was safe etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to t people including Politburo members; made sudden decisions without consultation; 'puffing his pipe' alone; trusted no-one as he moved officials about 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 – Lenin probably favoured Trotsky; Red Army power base; even Politburo hostility when Lenin appeared to favour Trotsky shows some support; Lenin did not like to trust Stalin etc.

No – Lenin worried about Trotsky's World Revolution; not supported by old party members; they disliked his policies and manners; Lenin's support had reservations 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 historian quoting a Russian, the other is from a British textbook 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 name to a maximum of two e.g. Kamenev and Zinoviev. [1–2]

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. New policy which gave g dealings etc.

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark additional detail e.g. A lighter and fairer food tax; privat production; smaller industries and trade restored to pri steel, banking, power and transport remained under state

(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. First internal exile and then foreign exile; to keep Trotsky away from his old power base of the Red Army and possible support within the government and party; to humiliate his old opponent for leadership after Lenin's death; to isolate a dangerous speaker and thinker; Stalin paranoid; out of sight, out of mind etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions. Yes, they were all hungry and wanted a quiet life. [1]

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

Lack of benefit; Deaths from Civil War, famine, chaos; War Communism; foreign invasions; Kronstadt Rebellion; very little order in the country etc.

Benefit; Got rid of the Romanovs and the old form of government; out of First World War; peasants had some land and peace at the end; NEP introduced in 1921; education, health and women's policies beginning etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of lack of benefit OR 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 lack of benefit AND benefit must be addressed. [6–8]

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

(a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no infere

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from t
new sins/fashions; having greater freedom; immodest;
members more traditional etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. High life for 'wild young things'; smoking considered a vice – not for the respectable; swimming suits exposed more they should; mothers' attitudes 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 – Gained the vote; doubled the electorate; on national and local committees; fund raising organisers; men speak more frankly when women not present etc.

No – Policies and candidates still male preserves; attitudes still condescending; sometimes do not attend meetings 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 an American history book, and the other is from the President's wife 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. Established selling illegal alcohol after 18th Amendment/Volstead Act; secret entry; often gang controlled; bootleg suppliers etc. [1–2]

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. Agents, coastguards.

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark additional detail e.g. Prohibition Bureau Agents; federal Coast Guards; 3 mile limit increased to 12 miles; de imprisonment etc.

(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 explanation e.g. Economic prosperity; stock market speculation; new labour-saving devices; cars; entertainment; relaxed morals etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.

Yes, cinema developed; No, women had new opportunities. [1]

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

Entertainment/Cinema boom; range of films; limited censorship; radio, choice of stations; increasing popularity of jazz; dancing etc.

Other; Job opportunities increased freedom to move; new labour-saving devices; fashion, vote and rise in divorces for women; effects of car ownership; Republican policies etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of entertainment OR other factors 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 entertainment AND other factors must be addressed. [6–8]

Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990

(a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no infere

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s) unsupported from th
unite them; all wanted different things; not really a group

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to
common was anti-corruption; some wanted to increase the pace of reform as they were impatient at the speed of change; some wanted social reform while others wanted economic reforms 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 – Incentives in pay meant that workers and peasants could buy consumer goods like televisions and clothes; implies approval as shops were opening to meet the new demands etc.

No – A few Chinese were afraid of a return to capitalism with the accompanying evils of inequalities of wealth and a return of inflation 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 – Both sources are British but written at different times 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 post identified e.g. Prime Minister (accept Premier) and Foreign Minister. [1–2]

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Identifies the struggle e.g. Individuals and grou

Level 2 – Describes the struggle. Award an extra mar additional detail e.g. Three candidates: Hua Guofeng, successor, Deng Xiaoping, who had been sacked dur being too liberal, and the Gang of Four led by Mao's w more Maoist than Mao. At first Hua seemed dominant Deng then emerged and shared control with Hua before taking over fully in 1981; Gang of Four on trial, found guilty, death sentences commuted 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. It undermined the Party; if government had given way to demands for more democracy, it could have got out of hand; the government wanted Party control to deliver a 'socialist market economy'; to deliver a very strong message to protesters all over China; international condemnation was of secondary consideration; it could have upset Deng's plans and strategies etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions, e.g. They were better off because of incentive payments. [1]

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

Improvement – Huge development of economic freedoms with incentive payments, consumer goods, special economic zones; contact with world financial institutions; Western companies invested; education and health still progressing etc.

Lack of improvement – CCP still in total control; democracy was forgotten; human rights abuses; some outlying areas saw little change; minority ethnic groups like Tibetans suffered etc. [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 an balanced argument.

BOTH sides of improvement AND lack of improvement must be addressed. [6–8]

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

(a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no infere

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from th
from imported to self-sufficiency. Exporter of arms; U
countries willing to ignore UN to trade with South Africa;

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Originally depended on other countries for arms but developed arms industry to become its leading export; voluntary/compulsory arms ban; named countries; circumventing restrictions 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 – Demonstration in UK with church leaders and MPs; shock over Sharpeville/Langa; Black Sash in SA; Canada's Prime Minister; Commonwealth Conference etc.

No – Economic interests in UK; Macmillan; clearly little opposition in SA as it left the Commonwealth 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 an American and the other is from a British MP 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 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 a

Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum Nation/MK; underground ANC sabotage organisation; declared illegal in 1961; members such as Mandela, neighbouring countries etc.

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. Leaders of ANC trie speeches; guilty verdicts. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. Result of a raid on a Rivonia farmhouse finding MK HQ and weapons; 10 leaders tried for 220 acts of sabotage and as communists; death penalties expected; Mandela gave a 4 hour opening speech; gained worldwide publicity; Bernstein released; others sentenced to life on Robben Island, June 1964 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. Founder of the South African Students' Organisation; leader of Black Consciousness; helped set up Black Communities' Project; friction with ANC over inclusion; linked to Soweto; trial publicity; died in police custody, September,1977; martyr etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions e.g. Yes – apartheid lasted; No – sporting sanctions hurt. [1]

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

Ineffectiveness – International opposition half-hearted because of economic importance and SA anti-Communist; internal repression; Sharpeville 1960; Soweto 1976; bannings; police powers; sentences; Verwoerd; Vorster etc.

Effectiveness – OAU 1963; some African bases for MK/PAC; worldwide publicity/condemnation and boycotts; Black Consciousness; mobilised the young; stimulus to ANC/PAC; shift to violent methods etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of ineffectiveness OR effectiveness 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 ineffectiveness AND effectiveness must be addressed. [6–8]

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

(a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no infere

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from th
by the British and felt that they had lost out in many area

Level 3 – Makes valid inferences with reference to the s
the British as they had promised freedom; they had lost their land and become exiles in other states 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 – 800 000 Jewish refugees that had been expelled from Arab countries had settled in Israel quickly etc.

No – 800 000 Arab refugees; Arab governments perpetuated the problem and used refugees as a political pawns; lived in refugee camps throughout the Middle East, supported by international charity 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 grounds that one is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. [1]

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One is from a Palestinian, 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 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 a

Level 1 – Award one mark for each country identified e.g.

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Identifies events e.g. An Israeli attack on a Pal in Jordan.

Level 2 – Describes events. Award an extra mark for eac detail e.g. 21 March 1968, 15 000 Israeli troops advanc and guerrilla training base; unusually guerrillas stayed and fought – King Hussein sent some troops to help; heavy losses but the heroic fight brought huge increase in recruits and an increase in fedayeen attacks across the border into Israel (300 in 1967 to over 30 000 by 1970) 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. 1975 civil war in Lebanon – Muslims vs Christians. Syrian soldiers were in Lebanon and by 1977 controlled half the country. Menachem Begin sent Israeli troops to stop the civil war, destroy the Palestinian guerrilla bases, minimise Syrian influence and set up a puppet government of Lebanese Christians to act as a buffer state on the northern border. However, the fighting became ever more confused, the numbers of dead mounted daily and no friendly government was established. International criticism led the Israelis to withdraw in 1985 etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions, e.g. Yes – PLO terror operations got publicity. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of effect of PLO OR effect of UNO, single factor given e.g.

PLO – Constant pressure on Israel from attacks both in Israel and worldwide have gained the PLO attention and publicity; also the violence and bloodshed have brought notoriety as well. **Reward details of attacks, events and people involved.**

UNO – Sponsored support for Palestinians in camps through aid, education, health etc.; sponsored attempts to negotiate settlements – some seemed hopeful but usually failed in long term; appeals often brought UNO resolutions but they appear to have had little effect on the two sides. **Reward detail of resolutions and peace attempts. Candidates might also argue other agencies did more than the two named in the question – USA, Arab states etc. Allow this approach.** [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of effect of PLO OR effect of UNO 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 answer.

BOTH sides of the effect of the PLO AND the effect of UNO must be addressed. [6–8]

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

(a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no infere

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from th
all sorts of opportunities to the poor, widening their e
mobility; helped classes understand one another etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. The poor could experience travel as a means of recreation, visits and holidays, widening experience greater than possible with coaches and wagons; the rich could understand the poor better as all classes now travelled by rail 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 – Generally welcomed by the people. Now South Yorkshire inhabitants were connected to the Midlands and London; mobility seemed to please all etc.

No – Centres of the coach trade like Hounslow lost out and many lost jobs in the coach industry; shopkeepers in Lancashire finding shoppers were taking the train to shop in Manchester rather than shop locally 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 an old magazine and the other is from a new 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 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 example to a maximum of two e.g. Stockton to Darlington; Liverpool to Manchester. [1–2]

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Identifies work e.g. Great engineer, working wit

Level 2 – Describes work. Award an extra mark for additional detail e.g. Great Western Railway, London tunnels (Box Tunnel) and bridges for it; shipping – Great Britain etc.; bridges e.g. Clifton Suspension Bridge etc.

(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. Some did not like the smoke, noise and dirt; farmers felt that the trains would make cows dry up and horses uncontrollable; some thought people's flesh would be torn off at speed; land owners did not want the view spoiled or the countryside; others withheld permission to cross their land to drive up the price of land; some feared loss of jobs in coach industry and canals; some just did not like change etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertion, e.g. Trains go faster. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of end of importance OR not an end of importance of canals, single factor given e.g.

End of importance – Railways could transport goods more cheaply; railway companies bought up canal companies and ran them down ; railway companies charged very low rates to get rid of canal rivalry, only to raise charges when competition was gone; railways could often get to places that canals could not so were more attractive to business etc.

Not an end of importance – Many canal companies continued to prosper; they were better for transporting heavy goods where time was not the important factor e.g. stone, coal, ore etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of end of importance OR not an end of importance 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 end of importance AND no end of importance must be addressed. [6–8]

Depth Study H: The Impact of Western Imperialism in the Ninetee

(a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no infere

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from th is undeveloped and unproductive; it has not been improv there long etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. The Congo Basin is undeveloped and wild as Europeans have not yet been able to make it productive with seeds so that the locals can reap the harvest; so far Europe had ignored the area 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 sources. [1–2]

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

Yes – The London and Leeds newspapers think that colonisation will bring openings for British business from textiles, crockery and guns etc.; praise for King Leopold for his enterprise; optimistic for the future etc.

No – Missionary has visited a village were misery and abandonment is rife; it would appear that local tribes people are being executed for no reason 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 – A is from an explorer of the Congo Basin, B is from a recent book, and C is from a missionary 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 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, B and C to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for more than one source. [6–7]

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

Level 1 – One mark for each valid explorer to maximum of two e.g. Livingstone, Speke, Burton. [1–2]

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Identifies Conference e.g. A meeting to carve u

Level 2 – Describes Conference. Award an extra mar additional detail e.g. A meeting of European powers imperialism and influence without going to war – N colonised; to consider the future of the Congo Basin; slave trade, navigation rights of coast and rivers etc.

(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. Countries wished to become overseas imperial powers to establish prestige and status; some had only just become nations – Italy, Germany; a belief that colonies would be good for trade offering natural resources, cheap labour and ready markets; some were envious of existing imperial powers etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions, e.g. Yes, they treated them badly. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of exploitation OR non-exploitation, single factor given e.g.

Exploitation – Europeans tried to extract raw materials and produce cheaply with little regard for the welfare of natives – either workers or owners of lands; particularly bad treatment in Congo; very little evidence of altruistic commercial exploitation etc.

Non-exploitation – Europeans brought trade and infrastructure which helped countries develop; treating natives badly was not the main reason for exploitation; missionaries brought Christianity and education etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of exploitation OR non-exploitation 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 exploitation and non-exploitation must be addressed. [6–8]