CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2

0470 HISTORY

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

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

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2013 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 seen in the source, no infere

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from dictatorship, suppressive and restricted groups

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to t uniforms, Hitler's aggressive manner and gesture, groups banned and gagged – repressive, smug faces show general contempt 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 Economically; leisure pursuits; pride; gained territory; political approval signifies contentment etc.

No Loss of trade union powers; concentration camps; sham consultations with votes after events 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 an American cartoon 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 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
away Jewish political rights; Law for the Pr
Honour made sexual relationships between Ar
to employ Aryan women under 45 years of age

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. Anti-Jewish; window bre

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in additional detail e.g. SS, SA and Hitler Youth attacks on Jewish businesses, synagogues, property; 90+ murdered; many sent to concentration camps 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-Semitism; fanaticism of Hitler; Himmler; logical conclusion to earlier actions and words; huge numbers of captured Jews, Wannsee; efficiency; to hide evidence of ethnic cleansing as enemy armies approached etc. **[2–6]**

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, bombing; No, still very controlled. **[1]**

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

Change Early successes possibly increased support; focus on munitions led to shortages/rationing; women re-employed; conscription took male workers; greater direction of labour; SS expanded; propaganda increased; persecution developed into extermination; bombing; evacuation; some opposition developed etc.

Lack Workers' rights already lost; much of development was in conquered territories; Ministries/Hitler Youth continued; Hitler still supported; no real change during the first half of the war 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 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 inference(s), unsupported from th was a frenzied killing of animals; the villagers farming methods etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Killing animals done in secret at night; feel that the state has no right to the animals so are killing them; do not think much of the new collective farms 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 No more famines; more food grown; 30 to 40 million tons grown each year; countryside transformed etc.

No Ignoring the cost of human life and misery; caused great famines at the time 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 Russian 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 source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. **[6–7]**

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

Level 1 – Award one mark for each valid group to a m military, managers, intellectuals, NKVD m individuals but NOT Kulaks etc.

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

Level 1 – Identifies Cult e.g. Method of presenting Stalin of the nation etc.

Level 2 – Describes Cult. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in additional detail e.g. Propaganda in art, statues, literature, photos (real or falsified), film, street and town names to make Stalin appear omnipresent, omniscient, an understanding father figure 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. Industry was the first priority and agriculture had to serve its needs; essential to grow enough grain to feed the growing towns, and to trade it for industrial and technical goods and advice; larger farm units under central direction and the use of machinery would increase production; 1917 Land Decree had virtually nationalised land but the peasants never appreciated this; famine of 1921 brought NEP; Stalin wanted rid of this capitalist system; to rid himself of kulaks etc. **[2–6]**

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

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

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

Fear Punishments; withdrawal of privilege; knock at the door at night; activities of NKVD; people denounced and disappeared; work camps; gulags; prison; transportation; threats to family; Show Trials etc.

Other Genuine enthusiasm – see Pioneers, and pride in completing tasks like Magnitogorsk and the Moscow Metro; so many volunteers to work in appalling condition to establish towns, factories and transport links in difficult areas; some persuaded by propaganda; many convinced and devoted communists etc. **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of fear OR other factors with multiple factors given. 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 fear AND other factors must be addressed. **[6–8]**

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919–1941

3 (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 inference(s), unsupported fro humiliated, large numbers, resentful etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the accept any job at all; humiliated as forced to plead; large number so not enough to go round; resentful as he had kept to all the rules 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 Many banks failed so bankers lost jobs; could not regain capital; customers had lost trust in bank and bankers etc.

No Bankers' own fault for gambling; food and raw materials' businesses already suffering and continued to do so; investors lost money; government unlikely to help any sector of workers 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 recollection by a worker, the other is an American book so they could both be biased/unreliable. **[2]**

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

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

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

Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to maximu aspect) e.g. shanty towns that grew up aro unemployed, migrants, those that had lost th the President etc.

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

Level 1 – Identifies policies e.g. Raised tariffs; withdrew l

Level 2 – Describes policies. Award an extra mark for each policy described in additional detail e.g. 1930 Hawley-Smoot Act raised tariffs to record levels; Federal Home Loan Bank; 1931 'Give a Job' scheme; 1932 Reconstruction Finance Corporation; lowered taxes; some public works – Hoover Dam; some agricultural surpluses bought up, loans 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. New Deal promises; personality; success as New York's governor; had united Democrats for once; Hoover's policies inadequate; treatment of Bonus Marchers; lacklustre Hoover campaign; unemployment about 25% – 13 million. **[2–6]**

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, confidence shattered; No, economy had long standing weaknesses. **[1]**

Level 2 – Explanation of the Crash OR other causes, single factor given e.g.

Crash About 1 million investors, many small, suddenly lost fortune; had bought on credit, could not repay banks; lost homes and businesses; confidence did not recover; multiplier effect etc.

Other Crash affected relatively few directly; Hoover cutting taxes failed to stimulate the economy; recalling loans to Europe and tariffs damaged world trade generally; industry and construction slowing by 1927; agriculture had not shared in the boom; prices now collapsed; over-production; inequalities of income; lack of social security etc. **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of the Crash OR other causes with multiple factors. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). **[3–5]**

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of the Crash AND other causes 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 inference(s), unsupported from trust China and its record; sees China's strategy etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. USA sees China's actions as part of a grand strategy to make South-East Asia become communist; evidence can be seen in Tibet, in South Vietnam and all over the world 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 Went to war with India; prepared to fight over disputed borders; had won military success etc.

No Just a brief war; did not follow up the success; withdrew from areas where they felt they had no legitimate claim etc. **[3–4]**

Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from the source. Addresses the issue of 'How far?' **[5–6]**

(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 President, 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 source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. **[6–7]**

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

Level 1 – Award one mark for each valid colony asp Beginnings of closer relationship between diplomatic contacts; increasing weakening of this etc.

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

Level 1 – Identifies relationship e.g. Tibet independent Tibet part of China etc.

Level 2 – Describes relationship. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in greater detail e.g. Chinese troops marched in 1950; annexed in 1951, Tibet remained autonomous; in 1959 the fourteenth Dalai Lama gave up futile attempts at co-operation and left with 100 000 followers for India; since then China has attempted to integrate Tibet, suppressing the language and culture; human rights violations against monks 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 explanation e.g. Conflict between Mao and Khrushchev, and between USSR and China over the leadership of the Communist World; USSR system industry based whereas China was largely agricultural; China accused USSR of being Capitalist Roaders as it had elite managers groups; USSR would not share nuclear secrets with China; increasing insults and hostility led to USSR's withdrawal etc. **[2–6]**

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, much more involved with the rest of the world. **[1]**

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

Change Very much more involved with agencies like UNO and World Bank; freer markets; needs western markets; friendlier terms with surrounding countries; since the fall of the USSR and its European empire, China sees no rival in the Communist World; more responsible and less bellicose etc.

Lack Still considerable tension about human rights after Tiananmen Square; tensions over trade and tariffs; secretive about ambitions and plans; Party still controls; Tibet; unwilling to abandon support for North Korea; Taiwan – some negotiations; still has massive military forces 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 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 inference(s), unsupported from principles; honourably conducted; British impre

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Principled over sacred right, best in human progress; honourably treated wounded, tended with care; impressed with admiration for fighting skills, use of Commandos 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 Economic cost of blockhouses and trains; military/political – could not completely break the Boers, even with African support; weakened confidence etc.

No Boers losses greater; land ruined; women and children dying; long campaign – British using attrition 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 British 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 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 commander to a maximu
Wet, Steyn, de la Rey, Joubert, Hertzog, Cronj

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. Boers accepted defeat;

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark
additional detail e.g. Boers to acknowledge Edward VII as sovereign and be part of the British Empire; Transvaal and OFS to have local self-government; an 'eventual' Union; no Boer to lose property or freedom; Britain to pay £3m compensation; Dutch as well as English to be taught; no black or coloured franchise in Boer states 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. Milner's economic absorption plans had not worked; too few British immigrants; Liberals in Britain sympathetic to Boers; Botha and Smuts moderates; Kruger/Milner gone; voting system to favour rural Boers etc. **[2–6]**

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, it caused the second war; No, Afrikaner nationalism was more important. **[1]**

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

Gold Control of the gold fields crucial; power of Randlords; resentment of immigrants in Transvaal; railway development.

Other Boer nationalism already present in first war; diamonds from 1969; strategic importance of SA for Britain; Kruger versus Rhodes/Milner; German support for Transvaal; differences over treatment of non-Europeans etc. **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of gold OR other reasons 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 gold AND other reasons 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 inference(s), unsupported from th
growing numbers leaving Palestine etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to
thousands had become refugees from the Israeli/Palestinian battles; when other Arab armies joined the war more refugees were created 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 A reconciliation committee of Arabs and Jews to consider problems, especially the refugees; Arabs said refugee problems solution would be basis for peace; agreements in the May protocol accepted the return of the Palestinians and return of their property etc.

No Israelis said that the refugee issue should be left until a final peace agreement was made; confusion on that stance which clashes with the Israeli acceptance of the May protocol and its reference to refugees; confusion 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 and Israeli the other is from a Palestinian so they could both be biased/unreliable. **[2]**

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

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

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

Level 1 – One mark for each valid country to maxim
Jordan, Iraq.

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

Level 1 – Identifies events e.g. an attack on British Milita

Level 2 – Describes events. Award an extra mark for additional detail e.g. Irgun terrorists, dressed as Arabs, found a way into the hotel, planted bombs in milk churns; an attack on the British HQ; 88 killed (73 Britons and Arabs, 15 Israelis) etc. **[2–4]**

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

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

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. Support from UN Resolution 29/11/49 recognising the State of Israel; immigration had given numbers; originally poorly equipped, they acquired guns from Czechoslovakia; fighting for a homeland; unity of purpose; good commanders; sympathy of the world after the Holocaust; poor leadership and disunity among Arab forces and states etc. **[2–6]**

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
No, they just do not like the idea of the State of Israel. **[1]**

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

Yes After 1948/9, Suez, Six Day War and Yom Kippur, Egypt (Sadat) decided to make overtures, visited Jerusalem, Camp David, (Carter) and acknowledged Israel in 1978; continued after Sadat's death by Mubarek; after talks in Madrid, Moscow, Oslo and the intervention of President Clinton, the PLO and Arafat recognised the State of Israel in September, 1993; Jordan completed a peace agreement with Israel in 1995 – negotiations had been ongoing since 1970s etc.

No Some states like Syria, Iraq and latterly Iran have always opposed the State of Israel; Syria often works through Lebanon and Palestinian Hamas; Saddam Hussein sent missiles against Israel; Lebanon at times hostile to Israel, at other times diffident; PLO and Arafat opposed for a long time but eventually negotiated recognition of both sides; Hamas disruptive and anti-Israel throughout etc. **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of acceptance OR non-acceptance 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 acceptance AND non-acceptance 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 inference(s) unsupported from th needed work they lived wherever they cou increase profit yields for builders etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. As families needed to work they had to accept any dwelling as housing had yet to be built so poor conditions; when a proprietor or speculator saw an opportunity to build, costs were kept to a minimum so more housing was evident etc. **[5–6]**

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

Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. **[1–2]**

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

Yes The Public Health Act provisions dealt with some failings; adoption of local building laws; high hopes of raised standards in new builds etc.

No Local building laws still ignored at the end of the century; some areas not under these laws; new districts of London regarded as 'potential slums' 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 report to the House of Lords, the other is 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 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 Chamberlain in Birmingham; Octavia Hill in 18 popularised Garden Cities; Industrialists built f – Sir Titus Salt at Saltaire and Lever Bothers a

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

Level 1 – Identifies Act e.g. Enabling local authorities improve housing etc. **[1–2]**

Level 2 – Describes terms of the Act. Award an extra mark for each term described in additional detail e.g. Enabled local authorities to condemn housing as slums, make compulsory purchases in order to improve housing and provide new rentable houses 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 the reason, one for the explanation e.g. Move from country to towns, especially in industrial north; for jobs, housing, hope of a better life; towns grew round the local industry; transport easier; growing population; not all towns grew – e.g. Norwich grew at a much slower pace; imports and exports so ports grew etc. **[2–6]**

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, more were surviving to adulthood. **[1]**

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

Better Health – some diseases now understood; led to changes in housing; sewerage project; public health recognised; Florence Nightingale and nursing; anaesthetics; education – compulsory schooling; wealth – most better off as had regular wage from factory; Unions had gained rights; railways etc.

Not Still many diseases not understood; general health of volunteers for Boer and First World Wars; huge disparities in wealth; born to rule upper classes; not all men had the vote, leave alone women; workers' rights still to be won; old age; no secondary education for the masses; workhouse; legal punishments still very harsh etc. **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of better life OR not better life with multiple factors. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the question (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). **[3–5]**

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of better life AND not better life must be addressed. **[6–8]**

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

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 inference(s), unsupported from required firm but fair handling; they could properly etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. The sepoys required firm but fair handling to gain their respect and then they would follow orders and even die for officers; if you treat them unfairly they are very difficult and become devils to handle 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 Smyth opinionated; tried to bring matters to a head on a full parade ground; junior officers aware but felt unable to interfere; court-martial shows ignorance/disrespect for religious taboos etc.

No Ordering and buying the cartridges had been done in Britain; Smyth and his unpopularity was at the centre of the rebellion 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 captain in the Indian army and the other is a modern book so they could both be biased/unreliable. **[2]**

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

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

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

Level 1 – One mark for each valid factor to a maximum
new Lee Enfield rifle were alleged to have be
grease which was mixture of cow and pig fat.
end of the cartridges this offended both Hindu

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

Level 1 – Identifies development e.g. Began in Meerut

[1–2]

Level 2 – Describes developments. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. Started in Meerut and then marched on Delhi which was taken; did nothing for three weeks which helped the British; siege of Cawnpore with many deaths as relief force approached; all sieges relieved; use of telegraph and loyalty of other Indian troops; much of life in India proceeded as normal 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. He believed that India was plagued by old superstitions and tried to eliminate them; he believed that India needed a western style government and justice; he aimed to give India better chances of improvement; improved communications to avoid famine; he did not try to convert Indians to Christianity – many believed he did etc. **[2–6]**

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, the cartridges were at the centre of the problem. **[1]**

Level 2 – Explanation of sepoys' grievances OR other factors, single factor given e.g.

Sepoys No doubt the unrest was caused by the cartridges and the way that was dealt with; it was the sepoys that started the rebellion; the treatment of sepoys by some officers over time and the decrease of white officers to sepoys were other factors etc.

Other There were other forces at work; there was a general dislike of change and westernisation; a fear that Indian religions and customs were being attacked; army was infiltrated by agitators whose aim was to undermine western influence etc. **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of sepoys' grievances 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 sepoys' grievances AND other factors must be addressed.

[6–8]