CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 series

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 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
German responsibility for war; says Germany had to defe
etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Denies responsibility for starting the war as it was last resort; felt Germany had been bullied by a host of enemies; still popular despite defeat as he was cheered by 100 000 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: Needed Reconstruction; right-wing opposition; Rathenau assassinated; accused of communism etc.

No: Politicians had left–wing support despite opposing socialism; Rathenau mourned throughout Germany; able to negotiate treaties; secretly rearming despite Versailles 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 American and the other is socialist 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 aspect to a maximum of two e.g. Cessation from war against the Western Allies; a truce; advised by military – who later denied; signed by members of the Republican government; expected to be pending peace negotiations on the basis of Wilson's 14 points – not so etc. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies limits e.g. Reduced army; no air force

Level 2 – Describes limits. Award an extra mark for eac detail e.g. **Army**: restricted to 100 000, no conscription heavy artillery. N**avy**: restricted to 15 000 men and 6 b **Force**: not allowed. **Army and Navy**: import of arms associations to instruct in use of weapons or connect wit

(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. Seen as too high; could not pay: hyperinflation meant cheaper; to stabilise the currency; American influence with Dawes and Young Plans; skill of Stresemann; to avoid political revolution etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions. Yes, the republic had survived; No, economy depended on loans. [1]

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

Success: Survived violent extremism; remained a democracy; economic recovery; foreign relations improved; entered League; reparations reduced etc.

Lack of success: Still blamed for signing Versailles; problems of Constitution and coalition governments; conservatism more entrenched; lack of army support; depended on American loans etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of success OR lack of success 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 success AND lack of success 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 t
built for such heavy work; equipment was not always ap

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Not always built for heavy work as she was small and slender; not appropriate equipment as boots are the wrong size; enthusiastic and they wanted do it more than anything; only tells you about Metro builders 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: Production of all commodities was superior to that of 1928; in oil the target was exceeded etc.

No: Although production of 1932 exceeded that of 1928 only oil exceeded its target; may comment on whether the targets were realistic or whether they were set deliberately high – Allow this. Patchy performance in some areas 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 old lady and the other is Soviet statistics 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 detail to a maximum of two e.g. A new industrial city built in the Urals by inexperienced but enthusiastic workers; appalling conditions etc. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies incentives as carrot and stick.

Level 2 – Describes incentives. Award an extra mark for additional detail e.g. Carrot – medals, Stakhanovites, health treatment and rewards. Stick – punishment, G family members etc.

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

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. For defence – Stalin thought USSR to be 50 to 100 years behind; needed to be able to direct and control production; prioritise development; placed new industrial developments in the Urals away from possible invaders; to get rid of capitalist NEP; to ensure state planning and direction etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions, e.g.just led to terrible famine. [1]

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

Success: With larger holdings, the use of tractors and other mechanical equipment, fertilisers, actual production began to rise again at the end of the decade; had got rid of the kulaks and overcome opposition etc.

Lack of success: Early opposition from kulaks who slaughtered their animals and hid grain; considerable reduction in production of cattle and pigs by 1932; slight reduction in grain production; led to brief stopping of collectivisation when Stalin blamed officials of being ‘dizzy with success’; ordinary peasants half-hearted or did not understand new methods or machinery; Great Famine 1932-3 in Kazakhstan and Ukraine – millions died 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 a balanced argument.

BOTH sides of improvement AND lack of improvement 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 the caring and wants to support every family through the pr ensure everyone is looked after etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. He believes America had sufficient resources to prevent starvation; believes the government must intervene to provide jobs and security; believes bad practice in private business caused the problem 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 President clearly supports it with enthusiastic backing from the farmers; steamroller implies heavy support etc.

No: The cartoon shows business men, tax payers and consumers running from the steam roller; implies representation of most of those groups 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 President Roosevelt, the other is a cartoon so they could both be biased/unreliable. [2]

Level 3 – Choice made on the nature or amount on 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 measure to a maximum of two e.g. Share Our Wealth Scheme included confiscation of large fortunes; minimum wage, pensions' schemes, veterans' bonus; to extend to all US states, beginnings made as Governor of Louisiana on public works and high taxation etc. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. Gave subsidies and set

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark additional detail e.g. Quotas to reduce production to programmes; paid rent for unused land; crops/animals d methods, soil conservation; finance from taxes for food p

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

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. Urgency of solving banking crisis; restore confidence; demonstrated that FDR would meet election pledges; had the backing for 15 bills; far reaching innovations – FERA, CWA, CCC, AAA, PWA, TVA, Farm Credit Act. NRA, NIRA etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions, e.g. Yes, created jobs; No, not permanent. [1]

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

Success: Need examples of agencies which provided work; aid to industry; restored confidence/Keynesian effect; lend-lease had fallen from 25% in 1933 to 10% in 1941 etc.

Lack of success: 1937 budget sharply cut back aid; agricultural measures insufficient; temporary nature of work; chronic problems of black Americans and immigrants; argument that high taxes/regulation stifled enterprise; more opposition to measures after 1936 election etc.

[2]

Level 3 – Explanation of success OR lack of success 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 success AND lack of success 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 the behave better than KMT and warlord troops; they were etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. They were trying to behave better than KMT troops with politeness, kindness and honesty; they were trying to win over the peasants – by treating them with fairness and respect, women and/or prisoners 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: Aid regularly forthcoming; regular treaties and superior weapons; very useful to the corrupt KMT officials etc.

No: Undermined by Jiang's mistakes and incompetence; Chinese traders angered by the influx of American goods – diminished their support for KMT; much aid diverted to the black market 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 British and the other is Chinese 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 aspect to a maximum of two e.g. Between 1950 and 1952 the law allowed the confiscation of landlords' land and its redistribution to individual families. Allow that it led to landlords being prosecuted etc. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies reforms e.g. Tried to give equality wit

Level 2 – Describes reforms. Award an extra mark additional detail e.g. 1950 Marriage Law abolished chil Maternity pay, equal pay to men for many women; eq traditional attitudes persisted in remote rural areas etc.

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

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. United, clear command structure, quality of commanders and strategies, treated people well, seen as the real resistance to the Japanese. KMT weakness in treatment of people, corruption and desertion of troops; Chinese people just wanted an end to wars which had been going on since 1928; many did not care which side won, just as long as the war stopped etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions, e.g. Yes, the Communists were very popular. [1]

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

Welcome: Peasants delighted with land and landlord trials in CCP liberated areas; many increasingly frustrated by corrupt Nationalist government and the lawlessness of their troops; waste, selfishness and brutality contrasted with Communist apparent compassion; many middle class wanted wars to end and time to restore the country etc.

Not welcome: Not welcomed by Nationalist government and its supporters, many of whom fled with Jiang to Formosa (Taiwan); the rich and corrupt officials; the landlord class 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]

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
compromise; British hostile; appear to be bullying Transv

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to th
Kruger to settle differences has been given no credit; Britain is bullying and acting like pirates 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: Shared origins and political structure; OFS citizens could work in Transvaal; had been earlier disputes with British etc.

No: Cooperation with British; shared economic grievances against Transvaal; refused political rights 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 Briton who lives in South Africa, the other is from a Briton who visited South Africa 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. Rhodes, Barney Barnato, Joseph Robinson, Wernher, Beit, Eckstein, Phillips, Lewis, Marks, Goertz. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies features e.g. Taxes increased; tariffs:

Level 2 – Describes features. Award an extra mark additional detail e.g. Dynamite monopoly/railway conc 80% of taxes paid by Uitlanders; Kruger re-elected Pr Johannesburg; German artillery officers training Transv with OFS 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. Inequitable; Frank Rhodes was a leader of the Uitlander Reform campaign; Milner/Chamberlain exploited the issue; to foment Uitlander rising; excuse for British intervention; increased support in Britain. Boers saw it as a threat; Kruger 'It's our country you want'; gained OFS support; time spent negotiating useful for military preparation etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions, e.g. Yes, it confirmed Boer suspicions; No, it failed. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of main cause OR other causes, single factor given e.g.

Main cause: Conspiracy of Rhodes/Jameson/Uitlanders/Randlords with knowledge of Chamberlain in Britain; Failure of the raid humiliated Britain internationally; gave Germany an opportunity – Kaiser telegram; speeded Transvaal military preparation etc.

Other causes: A more longstanding aspect; British imperialism; Rhodes/Milner; significance of railways; encirclement; Boer resentment; ambiguity of suzerainty; Kruger's intransigence; Transvaal's wealth; first to declare war etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of main cause OR other causes 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 main cause AND other causes 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 number of Jews in Palestine seems faster than the g Palestinians appear to leave Israel etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. There is a five-fold increase of Jews pre-war, outstripping the rise of the Palestinians; after the war the Jewish expansion continues to rise to two and half million while Palestinians leave the country 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: Illegal immigration of Jews to Palestine increased after World War II; and still more tried to reach Palestine etc.

No: British forces intercepted many Jews; the *Exodus* was rammed and migrants sent back to Germany; there was a British naval blockade 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 set of statistics and the other is from a British author so both 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 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 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum
for self-rule at some time in the future; to allow Jewish i
of the indigenous Arabs etc.

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

Level 1 – Identifies actions e.g. Both were Jewish terroris

Level 2 – Describes actions. Award an extra mark
additional detail e.g. Intimidate by attacking property, people or resources of both Palestinians and British; Assassinations (338 British troops killed); bombings – King David Hotel, Jerusalem blown up in July 1946; blowing up power and radio stations; mining roads; slaughter of Palestinians at Deir Yassin in April 1948 by Irgun 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 suffering from war weariness; financially exhausted, with a population needing time to recover; Britain faced hostility from both Jews and Palestinians, and criticism, especially from USA: streams of Jewish migrants and attacks by both Jewish and Palestinian terror groups undermined troops and the British public's support for undertaking the role; called Jews and Palestinians for talks – never successful; Britain handed over the problem to the new UNO etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions, e.g. The Arab states could never trust one another [1]

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

Arab disunity: There had always been disunity and rival ambitions among Arab nations; Arab states did not enter Palestine to fight until after the State of Israel had been proclaimed; initial Arab successes against poorly equipped Israelis who later got rifles from Czechoslovakia; overwhelming advantage of Arab manpower and weapons but personalities and tactics clashed so that Arabs driven out etc.

Other reasons: Unity of Israelis to preserve their 'homeland'; arms from Czechoslovakia; unified command; sympathy and support after Holocaust worldwide; the 29 November 1947 UN Resolution calling for the establishment of a Jewish state gave Jews a feeling of legitimacy; strong support from President Truman and the American Jewish lobby etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of Arab disunity OR other reas
single factors with multiple reasons.

OR

Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argum
but Brief).

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.

BOTH sides of Arab disunity AND other reasons 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 seen in the source, no inferen

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s) unsupported from
popular; full of people of all social groups; very little priva

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to t
classes as can be seen by top hats, caps and ladies' dresses; overcrowded with all seats taken and people standing; popular form of transport with such a large group of passengers 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: They were crowded so acceptable in some ways. Companies tried to improve comfort but profits fell when attempted etc.

No: The companies acquired unflattering nicknames which reflected their service; it was competition that kept the prices down 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 a sketch and the other is from a recent 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 a

Level 1 – One mark for each valid example to a maximu
Stephenson, Brunel, Thomas Brassey.

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

Level 1 – Identifies problems e.g. Safety, comfort, reliabil

Level 2 – Describes problems. Award an extra mark
additional detail e.g. Open carriages at first so a safety risk, also open to the elements; not always cheap to travel so danger to one's pocket; unreliability of new technology, accidents and break downs; many rail companies, so a long journey involved many tickets, changes and delays 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. Demand from industry and public; speculators believed good profits could be made so a frenzy of line building; improvements in rolling stock and engines increased demand; ready availability of building materials and cheap labour (mainly Irish) etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions, e.g. Yes, it was very popular. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of railways OR other factors, single reason given e.g.

Railways: It enabled goods to be transported more widely, quickly and cheaply; the building of the railways boosted other industries like coal and iron/steel; enabled workers to travel to work from outskirts to factories etc.

Other factors: Industry was growing rapidly before railways – the canals had been an effective form of transport for some industries; factors of the developments in industries like iron, steel and textiles meant there was growth anyway – but the railways encouraged the growth etc. [2]

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

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

(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
to have British rule; simple and naïve assumptions; show

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to th
language of the 'nice letter' (English grammar?); do not take offence when replies do not arrive; admire the law and peace in British administered areas; believe British rule will help avoid violence and idol worship 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: Worried about French activity and offers plans to diminish French influence; almost frenetically lists French expansion and development. Sees it as natural to wish to counter French activity etc.

No: Almost arrogant view that Britain has a right to be in charge; action is forced on us; the main worry is to protect trade from any threat, not just the French (Brazza in the Congo) 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 Oil River kings and the other is from a British diplomat 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. Gold Coast, Gambia, Ivory Coast, Sierra Leone. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies term e.g. Trade (business) exploits co

Level 2 – Describes term. Award an extra mark for additional detail e.g. Whenever Crown forces are used to business will follow to exploit raw materials and market follows trade – Crown feels obliged to protect British int

(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. Germany did not become a single country until 1871; it was more occupied by problems in Europe and establishing itself as a new state; Britain had a long imperial tradition going back centuries; Britain had a huge navy to protect her colonies; Britain's wealth from the industrial revolution etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions, e.g. No, Europeans had no right to take other countries' lands. [1]

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

Justified: In the sense that there was a desire to gain land for prestige, trade, resources, Christianity, there was a scramble, and in cases there was no real connection between the occupiers and the occupied; locals had no say in the scramble etc

Not justified: If European countries were going to take territories it would be better to agree upon the process – Berlin Conference – with large territories like Congo being agreed to go to Belgium. Much of Africa had already been 'taken' by older colonial countries like Britain, France and Portugal, so little was left to take by new countries like Germany and Italy. Accept challenges that say it was not a scramble because too little land left to scramble over etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of justified OR not justified 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 justified AND not justified must be addressed. [6–8]