CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 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 2014 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 inferences, unsupported from th
rise to power; reliable; commanded fighting force; major f

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to
efforts'; 'final struggle won'; 'lasting loyal service'; 'Chief of Staff'; 'my dear/grateful' 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 – Threatened the security of Germany; plotting treason; size in comparison with the army; means to Hitler's total power etc.

No – No resistance; small number murdered 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 Hitler and the other is from a German 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 a

Level 1 – One mark for each valid party to a maximum
Centre Party, Nationalists, Communists.

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects. Banned; leaders persecuted

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark
additional detail e.g. Outlawed in 1933; leaders killed or sent to concentration camps; replaced by German Labour Front (DAF) under Ley which included employers; no means to negotiate 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. Means of control; generate enthusiasm for Nazi ideas and policies; appeal to prejudices; talents of Goebbels; stifle opposition; maintain war effort etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions. Yes, power of the state. No, some young resisted. [1]

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

Crush – Enabling Act; power of SS/Gestapo; concentration camps/execution; control of courts; Army loyalty; SA weak; regime popular; any possible legal means to oppose destroyed; no unity of aims; small groups etc.

Not – Regime not totally efficient; underground Communist attempts to influence workers and spying for USSR; Concordat led to some Catholic resistance, Galen; Confessional Church, Niemoller, Bonhoffer; Kreisau Circle; 1944 July Bomb Plot; young resistance – Baum Group, White Rose, Edelweiss Pirates; passive resistance etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of crushing OR not crushing 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 crushing AND not crushing 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 inferences, unsupported from the defeat and its ongoing support of the Russian people etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to t
German attack which the army could not stop; worried that if they do not sign the peace they will be swept away and lose power; conscious that ordinary Russians need the war to stop 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 – Slow to react to events in Petrograd; allowed themselves to be surrounded in the Kremlin and obeyed instructions to surrender with many killed (implies very little forward planning); had to find rifles and artillery etc.

No – Quickly rallied and got together a force of workers; seized strategically important area of the Kremlin; once they had artillery they quickly overcame government troops (implies forward planning and know-how) 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 Lenin and the other is British so they could both be biased/unreliable. [2]

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

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.

Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross reference between A and B to show reliability.

6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. [6–7]

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

Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximu
Switzerland in April 1917, Lenin advocated in these the
cease to support the Provisional Government, that all
soviets, and Russia should withdraw from the war etc.

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

Level 1 – Identifies part. Important council of workers, so
with the Provisional Government.

Level 2 – Describes part. Award an extra mark for each valid part described in additional detail e.g. Issued Order Number 1 which gave itself primacy over military matters and reduced officer powers; quarrelsome links with Provisional Government; early on tried to be moderate; after Trotsky's release from prison to become leader of the Soviet, and elections following the Kornilov Affair, the Soviet became more radical and endorsed the plan to overthrow the Provisional Government 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. Provisional government continued the war; disastrous June offensive; undermined by sharing power with the Soviets; delayed elections to Constituent Assembly; return of Lenin and exiled revolutionaries; economic chaos and shortages; Bolshevik's slogan 'Peace, bread, land'; Kornilov Affair armed the Bolsheviks who became the saviours and undermined the Government; 20 October decision by Petrograd Soviet to seize power etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions. No, lots of people liked the Bolsheviks. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of Whites' lack of support OR support, single factor given e.g.

Lack – Only two real armies in support – Admiral Kolchak in Siberia, General Denikin in the Caucasus; also Czech Legion seized stretches of the Trans-Siberian railway; many intimidated by the Red Terror, and increasingly appalled by the behaviour of the Whites; no real unity of purpose etc.

Supp – Constituent Assembly elections saw Bolsheviks gain only 175 of the 700 seats; Assembly dispersed by Red Guards; difficult and slow to spread the revolution in towns and country people preferred the Social Revolutionaries; intervention by British, French, American and Japanese troops etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of Whites' lack of support OR support, 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 Whites' lack of support AND support 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 inferences, unsupported from the
and contempt for the law; illegal trade; popular; fashiona

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the
Capone's income; bootleggers; flapper image 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 – Increased productivity; better health and income for the poor; less crime; support in rural areas implies benefit appreciated etc.

No – Rich resented abolition of liquor tax; employers resented weak enforcement; workers' resentment; risk of death 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 American website, the other is British so they could both be biased/unreliable. [2]

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

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.

Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross reference between A and B to show reliability.

6 mark 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 maximu Massacre; Capone's South Side versus Bugsy Malon trade; neither boss present; seven of Malone's men kill men disguised as police etc.

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects. Hollywood; talkies; cinemas.

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. The dominance of Hollywood and big studios; film stars; 1927 Jazz Singer; 20 000 cinemas, 100 million tickets a week sold by the end of the decade; impact on society 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. Feared as Bolsheviks and anarchists; keep out 'undesirables' on social and medical grounds; too many from southern and eastern Europe already; would compete for jobs and accept lower pay etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions. Yes, still housewives. No, more freedom. [1]

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

Chan – 1920 the vote; wider range of jobs; greater social freedom – smoking in public, dating etc.; new fashions; divorce and birth control increased; household appliances meant more leisure; change mainly for the young; urban middle class etc.

Lack – Few entered politics; always lower pay than men; poorer women had always worked; contrast between urban and rural remained; older women more likely to be tied to church; conservatism etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of change OR lack of change 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 change AND lack of change 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 inferences, unsupported from t history and people had to be removed to allow the re return of the Chinese to bad old ways etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Mao genuinely believed that he had to destroy evidence of past history and classes to allow the revolution to succeed, even if this meant that many had to die; encouraged deaths of many without trial 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 – Red Guards supported and carried out orders to smash and destroy, to hold Denunciation meetings; Peking University had taken the lead; no-one tried to stop events etc.

No – Author did not like the revolution; asserts that many did not support it; no-one checked if the students were actually taking part 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 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 a

Level 1 – One mark for each valid example to a ma teachers, government officials, managers – anyone w revolutionary etc.

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

Level 1 – Identifies experiences. Mao saw him as a rival

Level 2 – Describes experiences. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. Mao used the revolution to get rid of rivals; Deng was condemned as a reactionary; deprived of all posts; he had to recant his bourgeois-reactionary tendencies; packed off to labour in a factory; did not complain. Zhou Enlai began his re-instatement in 1973 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. Red Guards had caused economic and social chaos and it was getting worse; Mao could see that if things continued much of the progress made since 1949 would be destroyed; Mao had reasserted his authority and most of his rivals were dead, in prison or working as labourers; time to call a halt to chaos and uncertainty etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions. Yes, look at how many died during the Great Leap Forward. [1]

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

Little – For many in the countryside little change would be noticed in their daily lives; violent outcomes and famine of the Great Leap Forward; death and destruction of the Cultural Revolution; withdrawal of Soviet aid meant less industrial training and support etc.

Much – Landlord class had gone, land redistributed; improvements in education and health; equality for women; despite failures, agricultural and industrial outputs increased; Chinese said to have become more confident and unified with increasing successes, especially after the withdrawal of Soviet aid etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of little benefit OR much 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 little benefit AND much benefit 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 inferences, unsupported from t international powers; attempt to weaken apartheid; affe economy; did not extend to main mineral exports; limited

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Names powers; names aspects of economy affected; 'frustration with' apartheid; Gives GDP figures to show SA economy still growing 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 – Ten years of bannings/detentions removed some active leadership of opponents; the army could not be defeated; ANC in exile; no active international support from the West; USSR did not want to be involved; internal divisions UDF and Inkatha etc.

No – Divisions among the whites increased; blacks harder to control across a range of aspects; UDF popular; trade sanctions by Britain, Common Market and USA 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 American book, the other is from a British book so they could both be biased/unreliable. [2]

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

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.

Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross reference between A and B to show reliability.

6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. [6–7]

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

Level 1 – One mark for each name in the correct order t
Tambo; Nelson Mandela.

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects. Increased violence and supp

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for additional detail e.g. More powers for police; army into townships; detentions increased, including children; initially in 36 districts but extended to the whole country in 1986; censorship of press and broadcasting; foreign journalists expelled; foreign investments/currency declined 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. Violence between black people becoming uncontrollable; State of Emergency not effective; Botha's 'Crossing the Rubicon' speech; Botha began negotiations with Mandela; collapse of USSR made ANC less suspect; 1989 election results; de Klerk's 'calling from God'; PAC and CP unbanned; to use Mandela's reputation; to play off ANC and Inkatha etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions. Yes, whites unwilling to relinquish power. No, skilled negotiation, compromise. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of difficulty OR less difficulty, single factor given e.g.

Diff – de Klerk wanted power-sharing, not majority rule; playing off ANC/Inkatha; CODESA talks collapsed 1992; ANC mass action; c. 60 000 deaths in Township troubles; Conservatives/Terreblanche opposition; murder Chris Hani etc.

Less – Dismantling of apartheid had already begun; secret negotiations with ANC; March 1992 white referendum – 70% supported reform; Joe Slovo compromise 1992; Mandela's international reputation; peaceful election 1994 and Government of National unity established etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of difficulty OR less difficulty 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 difficulty AND less difficulty 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 inferences, unsupported from th
the areas of defence and government; trying to make Pal

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Organised to defend camps with police and militia; sees to welfare of Palestinians with schools and clinics; local government with taxation 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 – Work of UNRWA in maintaining camps; food supplies and welfare services for the refugees.

No – Some have lived in the camps for 25 years; impossible to lead any kind of civilised life; lack of employment opportunities; overcrowding through increases in refugee numbers 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 Palestinian source, the other is British so they could both be biased/unreliable. [2]

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

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.

Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross reference between A and B to show reliability

6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. [6–7]

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

Level 1 – One mark for each valid example to a maxim
Egypt, Jordan (accept Transjordan),

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

Level 1 – Identifies aims. To support Palestinians and op

Level 2 – Describes aims. Award an extra mark for each detail e.g. For the formation of a democratic and secular the state of Israel. [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. civil war in Jordan began in 1970; Jordan had the largest number of exiles of any Arab state; Jordan used as a base for guerrilla attacks on Israel; PLO almost becoming a state within the state of Jordan; King Hussein increasingly hostile, especially after raids continued even though there was a ceasefire agreed between Israel and Arab states in August 1970; objected to hijacking of aeroplanes; Jordanian army loyal and defeated PLO fighters; PLO moved to Lebanon etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions. No, there is no state of Palestine. [1]

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

Eff – Founded in 1964 from groups opposed to Israeli presence in Palestine; wanted a secular Palestinian state and the destruction of Israel; guerrilla raids against Israel made the group popular with Arab peoples, even if not always with Arab governments; 1973 recognised by all Arab states as the sole representative of the Palestinian people; 1974 Arafat speech to UNO; Israel talks to PLO – Oslo Accords signed in 1993; Gaza-Jericho Agreement 1994 and 1995 allowed a Palestinian Authority to run much of Gaza and the West Bank; 1996 Arafat elected President after high voter turn out; by peaceful and non-peaceful action the PLO kept the Palestinian cause at forefront of UNO and world opinion etc.

Lack – Upset Jordan, thrown out after 1970 conflict; growing strength and actions from bases in Lebanon caused Israel to attack the camps and eject the PLO – moved to Tunisia; splits and challenges to Arafat's leadership – Hezbollah and Hamas; guerrilla and terrorist activities upset Arab governments and countries all round the world etc. [2]

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

OR

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

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.

BOTH sides of effectiveness AND lack of effectiveness 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 inferences unsupported from the s
from accepting that things could not change; they were c
the 'unskilled' workers discovered they had value and str

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Working class of the 'unskilled' found that they had worth and could express through new unionism; differed from old unions of skilled workers in their thinking about pay; had returned to life with pride in themselves 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 – Any initial success followed by defeats; Gas workers – few union members employed after dispute; Hull – union took control of the port only to be defeated by an employer counter attack; agricultural unions in constant difficulty and appeared broken up in 1890s etc.

No – Had some original successes which demonstrated what could be achieved by combination; new unionism survived as unskilled realised that they had value in the labour market and could therefore bargain 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 Marxist, the other is a book about trade unions 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 a

Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum
by Samuel Nicholson, President of the Manchester and
a Trades Union Congress both to publicise the trades'
general forum of the trade union movement. Founded in

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

Level 1 – Identifies strike. Strike by female workers
conditions.

Level 2 – Describes strike. Award an extra mark for any valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. Conditions in which the match girls worked and the medical consequences were brought to light by Annie Besant. Their parades and publicity gained them popular and parliamentary support. Bryant and May tried early resistance but in the end gave in to the match girls' demands etc. [2–4]

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

Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for the explanation. [1–2]

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. Because both had a degree of organisation and good leaders emerged – Annie Besant and Ben Tillett; public sympathy and material support – money and in kind – they got from other trades, workers, general public and, even, from abroad; they had good cases and employers realised early on that concessions would be required; Dockers brought London docks to a standstill and the economic argument was won etc.

[2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions. Yes, some were better off. No, others were not. [1]

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

Success – Victories of unskilled workers at Bryant and May and in the docks achieved this, as did some others; Parliament became more sympathetic and some supportive legislation was passed; trade union membership numbers rose and this put more pressure on employers to settle before strikes happened etc.

Lack – Conditions for many remained poor and poverty showed little sign of decreasing in poorer city areas; some strikers and their families suffered great hardship during strikes; aggressive counter-attacks by employers using 'lock-out' tactics to intimidate workers; Rowntree's survey showed the massive extent of persistent poverty at the end of the century 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 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 seen in the source, no inferen

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from superior with a moral right to dictate actions; sees Ch culture; has the power to insist on actions etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Inference that the West was 'civilised' from character speaking; dictating actions to Chinese and assumes both moral and physical right to do so – caption; sees Chinese as inferior – size of Emperor and gruesome artefacts 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 – Rebellion started to 'spiral out of control' and massacres took place of Christian Chinese; one of the reasons for Powers giving the Chinese the twenty-four hour ultimatum etc.

No – The Empress' edict gave the Boxers a kind of legitimacy which angered the Powers and raised tensions; destruction of foreign property; availability of troops to enforce suppression 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 cartoon and the other is from a history book, so they could both be biased/unreliable. [2]

Level 3 - Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information. [3–5]

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.

Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross reference between A and B to show reliability.

6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. [6–7]

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

Level 1 – One mark for each valid city to a maximum
Canton, Swatow, Amoy, Ning Po etc.

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects. Attack on and siege of foreig

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for additional detail e.g. There were several foreign legatio
they fought off several attacks by the Chinese and, although besieged and suffering great hardships, few foreign lives were lost during the 55 day siege; relieved by a combined allied force 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. long term – Chinese decline and foreign interventions, weak government etc. led to a weak prosecution of the war; Japan had decided to modernise during the nineteenth century and attitudes were of a modern, military country. Short term – China was poorly armed and organised with a divided leadership; Japan had a modernised army, well-trained and well-armed etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions. Yes, Britain was a great imperial power. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of Britain causing decline OR other factors, single factor given e.g.

Brit – British victory in the Opium Wars weakened China both militarily and politically; Britain forced China to accept unfavourable trade treaties which weakened it economically and encouraged other countries to seek treaties; British missionaries helped to create divisions in Chinese societies etc.

Other – China already in a state of decay and decaying further; still feudal and no new technology or ways of thinking; weak and intrigue ridden dynasty; other nations interfered and helped in the decline of China etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of Britain causing decline 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 Britain causing decline AND other factors must be addressed.

[6–8]