CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series

0470 HISTORY

0470/43 Paper 4 (Alternative to Coursework), maximum raw mark 40

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes 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

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

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences unsupported from th
status; victimised for race; patriotic; incredulou

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference t
professions closed; loss of vote; faith not criteria; war record; could not believe treatment. [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 – financiers aiming for Communist victory; international conspiracy, etc.

No – all Jews to be annihilated; their birth automatically reason for distrust; all parasites/vermin; warmongers etc. [3–5]

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

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

Level 1 – Useful/not useful – Choice made on the basis that one is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify information. [1]

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – A memories; B 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 the 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 Hitler's bodyguard in 1925; Himmler leader fr opposition/Final Solution etc.

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects, e.g. synagogues destroye camps etc.

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in additional detail. e.g. 'spontaneous' riots because of assassination of Van Rath in Paris; co-ordinated across Reich by Himmler; Hitler Youth and SA actions; synagogues and Jewish businesses targeted; c.100 Jews killed; 30 000 to concentration camps; no aid from police or rest of population etc. [2–4]

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

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

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. creation of jobs aided popularity; to maintain industrialists' support; to repress Trade Unions/socialism; direction of labour; rearmament etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions. e.g. Yes – SS and Gestapo power of the state; No – propaganda more effective. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of fear OR other methods, single aspect explained e.g.

Yes – Enabling Act; example of banning of political opposition; state backing for power of SS/Gestapo; concentration camps/execution; control of Courts; persecution of minority groups; no major opposition etc.

No – Propaganda example; satisfied sectors of society; Army loyalty; no resistance to persecutions; pride in military success/expansionism etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of fear OR other methods with multiple factors. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.
OR
Undeveloped suggestions of BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). [3–5]

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of fear AND other methods must be addressed. [6–8]

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905–1941.

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

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the of weaknesses; reform essential for survival; i

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. the disasters of war result of economic and military backwardness; industrialisation must continue despite critics 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 rewarded for what they produced; bonuses; incentives; Stakhanovites got extra rewards etc.

No – not paid by the time they spent at work; Stakhanovite production norms treated as normal, which most workers could not meet, so suffered pay reductions 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 Stalin 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 grounds of reliability.

Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of the source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross refererence 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 industrial towns quickly built with expert inexperienced labour. Iron and steel town, re-settled etc.

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

Level 1 – Identifies Gulag features and purpose e.g. Pun [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes features and purpose. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. Various types but often sited near place identified for major projects – new towns, dams, canals, etc.; poor conditions and food, hard labour and vicious discipline; often death inevitable; intimidation by guards and inmates. Purpose: 'corrective'; to deal with potential counter-revolutionaries; economic 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. To put his stamp on Communism in USSR after achieving leadership; to get rid of the old 'capitalist' NEP; to try to catch up the '50 to 100' years behind the West; for defence against aggression; to energise the revolution; to control all production from the centre; to be able to set targets; increased control on people and industry etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions. e.g. Yes, production went up everywhere. [1]

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

Yes – eventually production figures for wheat and meat rose enormously; able to export to raise capital for industrial projects; new industrial towns had better housing and medical care; education; women working; 'no unemployment'; huge increases in heavy goods – second only to USA in 1941 etc.

No – early famines and opposition of kulaks took time to overcome; kulaks killed livestock; peasants needed time to learn to drive tractors, use fertilisers and modern methods; industrial conditions often poor; impossible targets; cannot trust official production figures; often fear of punishment drove workers on; purging of kulaks and managers 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 C: The USA 1919–41

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

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in source, no inferenc

Level 2 Makes valid inferences unsupported from the stricken; lack of amenities; some transport/ ent

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to t facilities; poor schools, roads 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 – provided employment; some recompense; electricity; rapid completion etc.

No – huge area flooded; no cash/re-housing aid for tenants; only a minority employed; no improvement in housing or local agriculture etc. [3–5]

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

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

Level 1 – Useful/not useful – choice made on the basis that one is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify information. [1]

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – one a government survey, the other an economist so they 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 the grounds of reliability.

Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of the 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 talks to restore confidence, explain his inte directly to 'the little man', immensely popular et

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. closed banks; gave gov

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in additional detail e.g. Day after took office ordered Bank Holiday; emergency Banking Act; weakest closed permanently; government grants & expert advice; encouraged deposits; in June the new Banking Act allowed Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to regulate banks and interest rates 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. Unconstitutional; cost; increased taxation; Republican laissez faire; not radical enough for Father Coughlin, Huey Long etc. [2–6]

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

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

Level 2 – Explanation of limited effect OR benefits, single factor given e.g.

Yes – only short term measures; not all aspects covered; others had wider significance – Social Security Act; Labour Relations Act; banking regulation, ending Prohibition etc.

No – restored confidence; NRA, NIRA initiated greater government involvement; NRA banned child labour; AAA, FSA and TVA aided agricultural recovery and development; CCC environmental benefits; jobs stimulated spending etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of limited effect OR benefits with multiple factors. Allow single factors with multiple reasons
OR
Undeveloped suggestions of BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). [3–5]

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of limited effect AND benefits must be addressed. [6–8]

Depth Study D: China, 1945–c.1990.

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

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from t President at fault; heavy involvement and in movements that might affect American interest

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. sees the defeat as harming US interests, blame 'rests with' the President; thinks diplomats 'lost sight of tremendous stake' over the last 20 years; fearful of Communism spreading throughout Asia. [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 – city has fallen; troops waiting to surrender at barricades; seem willing to be marched off to prison; victors able to put up posters shows control of city etc.

No – held out for a month; still fighting to maintain an escape corridor; fierce battle 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 America, 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 change to a maximu
abolished child marriage, infanticide, bigamy a

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

Level 1 – Identifies methods e.g. confiscation and retribu

Level 2 – Describes methods. Award an extra mark for each method described in additional detail e.g. Confiscated the land and redistributed it to the peasants; set up People's Courts where peasant could 'speak bitterness' against landlords who were punished – often killed 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. Part of the ongoing story of foreign interference in China, exploiting it which had been going on since the nineteenth century; heavy investment needed to be protected; disliked Communism; saw China as an element to isolate Communist USSR; had supported Nationalists against Japan during Second World War etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions e.g. yes, essential for peasants. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of land issue OR other problems, single factor given e.g.

Yes – Mao wanted his revolution to be peasant-based, to eradicate landlord class; peasants conservative and suspicious of change; improved farming methods necessary; collectivisation etc.

No – inflation; civil war and Japanese occupation damage; Russians had dismantled and looted much of the industry in Manchuria; the need to develop new industry; education and training; social reforms in education, health and welfare; women etc. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of land issue OR other problems 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 land issue AND other problems must be addressed. [6–8]

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

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

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the sentences; linked to communism and violence had important white supporter etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. 'banished', 'silenced', 'house arrest'; 'life imprisonment'; 'Sabotage Act', 'Umkhonto we Sizwe'; a barrister refused to give evidence, willing to act 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 – treated blacks as human; long-established; publicity; good reputation amongst Africans; shared commitment to black political rights; worried the government etc.

No – broad definition of communism in Act made it a 'catch all'; Mandela not a member etc. [3–5]

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

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

Level 1 – Useful/not useful – Choice made on the basis that one is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify information. [1]

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – A is an opponent of apartheid; B Mandela in Court, 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 the sources 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
ANC from 1951 and national President from 1
Christian; firm advocate of non-violence; effe
awarded Nobel Peace Prize 1961; tribal chief

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. divided facilities into European and non-European. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in additional detail e.g. all public services, transport, open spaces divided and provision did not need to be equal – meant reduced quality, over-crowding for non-whites; formalised segregation strictly enforced; humiliating; international criticism 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. A major foundation of 'separate development'; linked to Group Areas Act of 1951 led to Bantustans 1959; forced removals, e.g. Sophiatown, District 6; a result of Tomlinson Commission; gave tribal chiefs more local 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, had not stopped segregation; no, gained international recognition. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of failure or success, single factor given e.g.

Yes – Defiance Campaign/Freedom Charter no effect on government; increased range of apartheid measures/government repression; split ANC/PAC and formation of Umkhonto we Sizwe; Sharpeville; Rivonia Trials etc.

No – increased ANC/Youth League (c7000 to 100 000 by end 1950s)/Indian organisations' membership; some Church support; 'stay-at-homes' had some effect; Treason Trials had collapsed; Black Sash and Women's League success v. Pass books; dignity increased international criticism – Anti-Apartheid Movement founded in UK, 1959; publicity of Sharpeville; Organisation for African Unity 1963 made abolition of apartheid first priority; UN and Commonwealth etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of failure OR success with multiple factors. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.
OR
Undeveloped suggestions of BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). [3–5]

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of failure AND success must be addressed. [6–8]

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

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

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the changed their minds about being ruled by I changes in education etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. 'Despite their desire for independence'; 'benefited' from the Israelis' policies, especially in education with the establishment of six universities since 1967 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 – fair given the context; allegations are false propaganda; Arabs stay; some dislocation of Arabs but caused by war, improvements, or for protection of the state etc.

No – allegations of brutality and repression; dislocation of Arabs is not for their good but for the good of Israelis and the state of Israel 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 is a Jewish source 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 maximum usually agricultural; owned collectively by collectively; started 1909 to combine socialis their defence; during 1980 recruitment began t

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

Level 1 – Identifies events e.g. Violent protest, sparked etc. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes events. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. Young Palestinians protesting at Israeli rule of Gaza and West Bank; started 9 Dec 1987 – continued till 1993; many dead on both sides; inability to control protest led some Israelis to seek a settlement with PLO 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. Allocated by UN Plan ’48 as a separate Arab state; occupied by Jordan ’48, annexed ’49; 1967 Six Day War, taken by Israel; PLO launched guerrilla attacks from Jordan till ’71, later from Lebanon; Israeli occupation became more aggressive with increasing numbers of Jewish settlers expropriating land; more Arab refugees to Jordan and Lebanon; one of the factors behind the Intifada etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions e.g. no, there is no real settl

Level 2 – Explanation of control OR lack of control, singl

Yes – Israel recognised PLO as the le Palestinian people; established a Palest Palestinians control over daily life in Gaza a Police Force set up; Israel promised to withdra areas; took effect May '94; same year Arafat, Rabin and Peres won Nobel Peace Prize; PLO moved from Tunisia to Gaza and had authority over Gaza and Jericho etc.

No – put off long term decisions about Jewish settlements, Jerusalem, etc.; Israeli army stayed in areas to protect Jewish settlements; still aware that the Palestinians cannot do anything without Israel's approval; resentment and fighting – attacks; Netanyahu slowed the process after the assassination of Rabin etc. [2]

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

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

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

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from th public support; long-term influence possible.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to victory'; 'granted all their demands'; 'sympathy'; 'wider federation of labour'. [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 – had given in only on a promise of future payment; the leaders had not remained true to original aims; had promised good behaviour; suffering in vain etc.

No – did achieve negotiation and concession on the sixpence; had gained publicity; appeared to be some sympathy from capitalist press 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 – A is from a newspaper; B a socialist publication, 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 person to a maxim
Mann; Will Thorne; Annie Besant; John Burns.

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. casual work; hard and
rates etc.

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in additional detail e.g. work depended on ships being in dock; whims of the ganger choosing each day from those at dock gates; no safety restrictions stevedores, who loaded ships, paid more than dockers who unloaded 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. success of the dockers and others gave impetus to unskilled to form unions; influence of socialists, SDF; TUC; improved education and communication etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions e.g. yes, wages increased; no, many strikes failed. [1]

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

Yes – unions gave them common purpose; unskilled gained a voice; publicity for Match Girls/Gasworkers/Dockers, etc.; social problems given more political attention; pressure from socialists; rise in TUC membership etc.

No – agricultural workers' lives had not changed; employers also became better organised; use of blackleg labour; defeat of strikes such as miners; urban conditions and overcrowding remained serious problems; economic downturn etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of change OR continuity with multiple factors. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.
OR
Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument, (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). [3–5]

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of change AND continuity must be addressed. [6–8]

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

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

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from t picked over; other powers in conflict over spoi competitors etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. the dragon; examples of other powers' images 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 – China had to pay for conflict; make trade concessions; lost military reputation; sharpened rivalries between other powers; did not achieve change of government etc.

No – stimulated Chinese military and economic reforms; retained their system of government; allies had gained wealth and potential economic benefit 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 – A is a cartoon; B a general history of war 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 aspect to a maximum of Household Department; Grand Council; Pro Mandarins.

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. attack on Christians and armies, etc.

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each aspect supported with additional detail e.g. began in 1898 by secret society in northern China; at first anti-dynasty but gained backing of Empress Dowager against foreigners and Christians; by 1900 in Peking; Siege of the Legations; Eight Nations' Alliance to defeat, 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. weak government could not control many of the provinces; sheer size of Empire; divisions over reform; undermined by commercial interests; corruption; antiquated army; Western determination and strength etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions e.g. yes, lost status; no, brought improved government awareness. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of losses OR gains, single factor given e.g.

Yes – lost control over vital ports (Treaty of Peking 1860) and trade monopoly; territories lost – Indo-China; Burma; Korea; Manchuria; old traditions increasingly challenged; spread of Christianity; dynasty weakened etc.

No – government aided by British and French to put down Taiping Rebellion; some western influence on improving administration and army; trade did increase; educated reformers etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of losses OR gains with multiple factors. Allow single factor 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 losses AND gains must be addressed [6–8]