UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2011 question paper for the guidance of teachers

0470 HISTORY

0470/41 Paper 4 (Alternative to Coursework), maximum raw mark 40

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

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- Cambridge will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2011 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

UNIVERSITY of CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918–1945

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

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made. [1–2]

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from the source e.g. Regular voting; number of votes cast and percentages vary for all candidates etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Hindenburg most popular; Hitler's vote increases but not big enough to overhaul Hindenburg's vote; Communist vote is diminishing 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 Largest party in the Reichstag; President willing to discuss; violent; feared; intransigent etc.

No New Party; no overall majority; distrusted; coalition needed 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 statistics and the other is from a German so they could both be biased/unreliable. [2]

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

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. [6–7]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(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. Chancellor of Germany 1930–32; Centre Party; ruled largely through Hindenburg's use of rule by decrees; willing to accept worsening economic crisis as a means of showing allies that payment of reparations was impossible etc. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies process e.g. November 1932 election propaganda; von Schleicher/von Papen errors; by invitation. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes process. Award an extra mark for each part of the process described in additional detail e.g. President and Article 48; von Papen rivalry with von Schleicher; Hindenburg's influence; thought Hitler could be controlled – only 3 Nazis in the Cabinet; fear of general strike/civil war 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. Intimidation; banning of Communist and Socialist press; anti-Communist propaganda; Goering SA/ police attacks; appeal to the German people; Reichstag Fire; Decree for the Protection of the People; finance; popular etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, killed opponents; No, popular. [1]

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

Viol Violence against other parties; Night of the Long Knives; SA and SS; concentration camps; Reichstag fire; anti-Semitism example etc.

Other Electoral/army/business support; quasi-legal means – Emergency Decree, Enabling Act; Centre Party support; abolition of federal states; destruction of free trade unions; dissolution of other political parties; death of Hindenburg; plebiscite; propaganda etc. [2]

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

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

Depth Study B: Russia 1905–1941

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

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made. [1–2]

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from the source e.g. He evoked many emotions in people and inspired them all etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Manager said he loved Stalin and that he inspired people to work; Stalin was the deliverer of a safe state after Lenin's death 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 He received a prolonged tribute of stormy applause rising to an ovation etc.

No The fulsome tribute was occasioned by the presence of NKVD men who would use the occasion to find independent thinkers and punish them etc. [3–5]

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

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

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

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – Both sources are from Russians so they could both be biased/unreliable. [2]

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

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. [6–7]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(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. Head of Communist Party in Leningrad and north-west Russia. Very popular. His assassination in 1934 – Stalin implicated? – began the purges of the 1930s etc. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies elements. Organised to give him God-like status. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes elements. Award an extra mark for each element described in additional detail e.g. Methods by which the Russian peoples would identify Stalin as the overall protector/father figure. Statues, towns named, in literature, media, photographs etc. [2–4]

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

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

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. Stalin paranoid; fearful of anyone who could undermine his authority or might pose a threat; Kulaks in agriculture; Old Guard who knew too much; senior army officers; managers; intellectuals. Turned people into informers on one another. Millions died or sent to gulags etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, he killed millions. [1]

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

Lack Purges, poor working conditions, fear, punishment, few consumer goods, uncertainty, people informing on one another etc.

Ben Employment, better housing, health care, education. In the end was able to resist attack from Germany. Second only to USA in heavy goods production. Differed from area to area, and between different peoples of the USSR etc. [2]

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

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919–1941

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

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made. [1–2]

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from the source e.g. Too few agents; overstretched; ignored; corruption and unpopular etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Overstretched and understaffed as only have 19 agents and administrators for the whole state; corruption as police chief is best friend of beer baron and supports action taken by the cop against the agents 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 States are enthusiastic; health improved; less crime; sober and more efficient workers; weakened brewers etc.

No Urban areas adopted less readily; high proportion still drinking; willing to drink illegally; wealthier unaffected; ended in 1933 etc. [3–5]

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

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

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

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One source is from a federal agent and the other is from a brewery so they could both be biased/unreliable. [2]

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

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. [6–7]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(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. illegal distillers; small scale; usually remote rural; victims of revenuers; suppliers of gangsters etc. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies activities e.g. Movers of illegal alcohol. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes activities. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. Large scale smugglers across national borders or delivered from the sea; small scale movements from brewers/distillers to local clients/markets 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. Anti-Saloon League and Women's Christian Temperance Union well established; many states already dry; influence of churches; politicians saw votes in it; country versus city; moral and anti-immigrant conservatism etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, it was ignored; No, anti-immigrant feelings were less damaging. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of Prohibition OR another form of intolerance, single factor given e.g.

Candidates may argue both sides of Prohibition or Prohibition against another form of intolerance – Accept both.

Proh Easily flouted; popular disobedience; everyone was abusing the law and being 'criminal'; government did not really like the loss of tax revenue so was soft on enforcement etc.

Other Was the law in 47 states; Federal enforcement; defeat of 'wet' Presidential candidate in 1928; Other forms of intolerance – anti-black, anti-left, anti-unions, anti-immigrant, anti-Darwinism etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of Prohibition OR another form of intolerance 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 Prohibition AND another form of intolerance must be addressed. [6–8]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

Depth Study D: China, 1945–c.1990

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

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made. [1–2]

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from the source e.g. Some Chinese stayed in China, some left; some hoped for a better future etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Although some supporters of the KMT went to Taiwan with the Nationalist government, many stayed in the hope of better things; 'wait and see' middle class Chinese joined by returnees from abroad; all hopeful of using their talents to help the new China 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 Businesses and factories were told to work on as normal; collectivisation of agriculture was years away yet etc.

No Areas of control like law and the media were immediately brought under strict Party control 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 British, the other is from a Chinese author so they could both be biased/unreliable [2]

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

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. [6–7]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(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. People with rudimentary training in First Aid and treatments who went from village to village in an attempt to improve the overall health of the Chinese people; so-called as they removed sandals to prevent them getting wet and muddy in paddy fields etc. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies collective farms (cooperatives) as larger than normal units. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes collective farms. Award an extra mark for each valid detail described in additional detail e.g. After early redistribution of land, peasants were persuaded to join collective farms in order to increase food production. Between 100 and 300 families in each collective, sharing ownership of the farm and sharing equipment 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. The peasants had long been resentful of the oppressive nature and treatment by landlords. They felt exploited and crushed by the system of landlordism. As CCP conquered territory they introduced People's Courts where 'justice' could be meted out to landlords and land redistributed. Peasants saw KMT as the landlords' party and KMT officers and soldiers were very harsh with the peasants whereas CCP soldiers were much more respectful etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions. Yes, everyone was treated better. [1]

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

Chan Vast public health campaigns; reduced infant mortality; working conditions and welfare regulated. Retirement ages; working hours defined; national secondary system of education; language simplified; women equal – Marriage Law stopped child marriages, infanticide; Mao 'Women hold up half the sky' etc.

Lack Implementation patchy; cadres often implemented regulations to suit themselves; many aspects untouched or insufficiently developed; peasants still had a grindingly hard time which was to get worse during GLF; Antis campaigns meant the Party bureaucrats could use positions to settle old scores, undermining all reforms 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]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

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

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made. [1–2]

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), supported from the source e.g. Negotiations began amicably; became difficult; views far apart; quarrelled but maintained dignity in front of the public etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Mandela's original respect for de Klerk was undermined in later negotiations by his refusal to compromise; both maintained a dignified public image despite the private arguments 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 Would not give in over MK even though it was not a security threat; held a referendum; increased demands etc.

No ANC and trade union threats; MK was armed; conflict still continuing 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 South African so they could both be biased/unreliable. [2]

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

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. [6–7]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

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

Level 1 – One mark for each valid Act to a maximum of two e.g. Group Areas Act, Population Registration Act, Separate Amenities Act, Land Act. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies Constitution e.g. Interim; prepared for 1994 election. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes Constitution. Award an extra mark for each element described in additional detail e.g. Interim Constitution; 34 major principles laid down; basic human rights, freedom of speech, religion and association, equal votes for all races; set up Constitutional Assembly of 400 – 200 national/200 regional; proportional representation for 1994 election; basis of 1996 Constitution; 11 official languages recognised; national flag accepted. [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. Fully controlled Inkhata; tribal suspicions Zulu/Xhosa; vying for power; violence; collusion with government/police; legal weapons 1991; 1994 made deputy leader/made Minister for Home Affairs in Mandela's government of National Unity to ensure peace (failed) etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, it was democratic; No, opposition still existed. [1]

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

Peace Peaceful election of 1994; Government of National Unity; Mandela's deliberately inclusive actions; TRC; 1996 constitution agreed; an aspect of constitution, implemented in 1997; programme of development begun; redistribution of 30 per cent of land planned; international isolation ended; Mandela stepped down as President in 1997, Mbeki popular; violence diminished by 1997.

Lack National Party had 21 per cent of vote in 1994, left government in 1996; Buthelezi; violence in townships; areas and wealth still racially divided; scale of poverty etc. [2]

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

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

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

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

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made. [1–2]

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from the source e.g. They used publicity to embarrass anyone who opposed them etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. They filmed and transmitted the attempts by the British to prevent Jewish migration; made out Britain was a cruel country trying to stop Jewish victims from reaching a final, safe haven 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 Huge influx from Europe in the period 1948 to 1950.

No Influx from Arab states; natural population increase; growth fluctuated after 1950. [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 an Arab 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 address the question. [0]

Level 1 – One mark for each valid detail to a maximum of two e.g. First Prime Minister of the state of Israel and oversaw the establishment of the new state against Arab opposition. Apart from two years of chosen retirement he remained in office till 1963. [1–2]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

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

Level 1 – Identifies activities. Terror groups. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes activities. Award an extra mark for each valid activity described in additional detail e.g. Anti-British and Anti-Arab terrorist gangs, using assassinations, bombings etc to quell Arab opposition and to try to drive the British into giving up its mandate over Palestine and quitting the country. Irgun was responsible for blowing up the British HQ in King David Hotel, Jerusalem, July 1946 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 reason explained. [1–2]

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. The whole situation was confused and dangerous. Britain driven by chaos and war weariness, and the need to concentrate on home affairs, handed the mandate to UNO. A commission sent to find a solution. Arabs saw this as foreigners interfering in their land. Proposed a two-state solution at UN. Arabs saw this as giving away Arab land. UN Assembly voted for the two-state solution but Arabs saw this was being done under USA pressure. Arabs objected, saying it would make the current terror situation turn into full scale war. Britain saw this as well. Arabs felt it wrong to give back to Jews land they had vacated 2000 years before. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, the USA had great influence [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of USA contributions OR others' contributions, single factor given e.g.

USA Declarations in the past had seemed to promise a separate state; immigration from wherever in the 30s and 40s; strong Jewish lobby in USA; actions and threats of President Truman etc.

Jews Strong physical protection of Jewish immigrants and their rights by terror gangs; strong argument and organisation of Jews in Palestine arguing for a separate state – Ben-Gurion opposed the terror but strong on the state; managed to declare the state and defend it by force against Arab nations and Palestinians; worldwide sympathy after the horrors of the holocaust became known etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of USA contributions OR others' contributions, 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 USA contributions AND others' contributions must be addressed. [6–8]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

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

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made. [1–2]

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from the source e.g. Workmen had been prevented in the past from negotiating; views appear to be changing etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. The Report favours non-interference between masters and men in negotiating wages and conditions; believes the Combination Laws are no longer needed 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 Source B is an extraction of an oath from workers not to join unions or to challenge hours, pay rates or working conditions.

No The extraction of the promise indicates there is a threat of losing control which is reinforced by Source C where dire consequences for industry, skill and capital are listed etc. [3–4]

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 – Source A is a Report, Source B is from the 'Document', and Source C is a presentation so they could all be biased/unreliable. [2)

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

Level 4 – Choice made on 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, B and C to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for more than one source. [6–7]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

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

Level 1 – One mark for each detail to a maximum of two e.g. in theory they were to apply to masters and workmen but the latter were affected in practice. Brought in during Napoleonic Wars to safeguard industry and prevent dangerous gatherings of work people. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies organisation. It was a trade union. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes organisation. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. Grand National Consolidated Trade Union. An attempt to create a cover-all working men's organisation to protect their rights, negotiate etc. Too diverse, lacking organisation and communication. Too many different trades to protect. Robert Owen founded it in 1833. Tolpuddle Martyrs' trial aided its demise. [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. Ostensibly, they were put on trial for taking illegal oaths under the law of 1797 passed at the time of naval mutinies. Really they were being attacked for perfectly legally forming a union – part of an employers and 'born to rule' conspiracy against working people; judge and jury prejudiced; 7 years transportation; helped to bring down GNCTU. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, they found it difficult to get better wages and conditions. [1]

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

Control Very little progress for workers; GNCTU had failed and workers punished (Tolpuddle Martyrs); employers hard to break down and had much influence in Parliament; very little by way of legislation although the 1833 Factory Act saw some progress; also some movement re Mines. Unions restricted and legal position still unclear.

Lack Increasingly, people of stature saw that hardships at the workplace were wrong and worked unceasingly to get changes made; more employers were coming to realise that contented workers often led to increased production. Foundations laid for the rise of New Unionism in the 1850s. [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]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

Depth Study H: The Impact of Western Imperialism in the Twentieth Century

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

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made. [1–2]

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from the source e.g. They were very violent and threatening; they wanted to hurt their enemies etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Very violently opposed to western influence as seen in the damage, murder and disfigurement to Christians; organised to distribute leaflets and go on marches 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 Reports from the coast became more alarming; Yu Hsien and the Empress Dowager appear to be firm supporters of the Boxers etc.

No Peoples of Shansi and the Christian elements were not supporters of the Boxers and feared their coming etc. [3–5]

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

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

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

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One source is from a Russian and the other is from a Chinese person so they could both be biased/unreliable. [2]

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

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. [6–7]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(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. Britain, Portugal, France, Germany. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies method. By the royal family and circle. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes method. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. Narrow ruling circle stemming from the Emperor. District governors had wide powers which were not always in accord with the Dragon Court. Warlords in outlying provinces who exercised much local power. Foreign countries had significant territorial and commercial footholds in various parts of China and interfered with central government to further own interests 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. Mainly failed because of European intervention, but also imperial viceroys in central Yangtze Valley and South China disobeyed government orders and put down anti-foreign risings. Boxers no match for western forces and weapons. International forces acted together against the rising. No broad general rising across China – easier to deal with the localised risings etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions
Yes, some dressed like westerners. [1]

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

West In areas where there was a western presence there was significant influence and many Chinese adopted western ways of life and in commerce. Many remained true to traditional Chinese customs even in these areas. Some attempts to modernise China after Boxer Rebellion and defeat against Japan but only moderate impact.

Lack In rural China there was little westernisation except that some missionaries there did change some things but only marginally. Most Chinese were barely affected at all – only cities with commercial centres affected to any extent. [2]

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

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011