CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2

0470 HISTORY

0470/42 Paper 4 (Alternative to Coursework), maximum raw mark 40

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

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

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the 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 stated in the source, no infer

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported fro
organised; anti-Communist; assertive; success

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to th
marches and brown battalions; anti-Communist with Red Front; assertive as all stand ready for the struggle 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 Stood against inflation and foreign banks; pro-workers; protectionism for the farmers etc.

No Used nationalism; anti-Versailles; anti-corruption; implies very weak government 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 German song and the other is a Nazi manifesto 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 party to a Democratic Party (SPD); Communists (KPD); National People's Party (DNVP).

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

Level 1 – Identifies policies e.g. Tried to reduce reparati and wages.

Level 2 – Describes policies. Award an extra mark for each policy described in extra detail e.g. Negotiated with US; Presidential decrees to implement policies to avoid Reichstag opposition; cut unemployment benefit and public sector wages; increased direct and indirect taxes; distribution of land to rural unemployed; banned SA and Red Front 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. Commanded respect; re-elected vs. Hitler; willing to over-ride Reichstag with emergency powers; part in appointment and falls of Chancellors – under influence of von Schleicher; resisted, then accepted Hitler; signed Enabling Act etc. **[2–6]**

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, opponents killed; No, won votes. **[1]**

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

Threat Intimidation of KPD/SPD/Centre; increased violence between SA and Communists; SA became special police; anti-unions; concentration camps; setting/exploiting Reichstag Fire against Communists; Night of the Long Knives etc.

Other Legally appointed Chancellor; electoral success March 1933; Reichstag passed Enabling Act; 'legality' of banning other parties/unions; imprisoning opponents; popular support over unemployment – see three elections in 1930 and 1932; popular support; propaganda; Party organisations; divisions among opposition; miscalculations of von Papen, the army etc. **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of threat and 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 threats and violence AND other factors 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
bad and the Bolsheviks have a firm grip etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the
the Bolsheviks' and Lenin's policies have been disastrous for the Russian people; forced labour is common, and workers are threatened because only the Red Guards are armed 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 peasants are delighted by the Reds' triumph; they got rid of the Tsarist regime and got Russia out of the First World War etc.

No The consequences of the Civil War are disastrous; the country is now faced with starvation 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 British refugees, the other is from a modern 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 – Award one mark for each valid commander to
Kolchak, General Denikin, General Yudenich.

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

Level 1 – Identifies Terror e.g. Protection of the Bolshevi

Level 2 – Describes Terror. Award an extra mark for eac
detail e.g. Carried out by Cheka; arrest, torture, execute opponents and enemies of the Bolsheviks; nationwide intimidation; many informed to settle old scores 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. High inflation meant that money paid to peasants was worthless, so disinclined to produce more than they needed; towns suffered from food shortages; requisition squads of soldiers led by ruthless Cheka men to take surplus food from peasants; compulsion and violence upset peasants; lack of production and two poor harvests led to famine 1921/2 – 5 million died etc. **[2–6]**

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, he won the war. **[1]**

Level 2 – Explanation of Trotsky OR other contributions, single factor given e.g.

Trotsky Led in Petrograd after Lenin fled in July 1917; contribution to Bolshevik uprising; negotiations at Brest-Litovsk; brilliant leadership and discipline during Civil War; put down the Kronstadt rising etc.

Other Contributions of Lenin and other Bolsheviks; questioning whether Trotsky had much option over Brest-Litovsk; Trotsky's advantages in Civil War; mistakes by opponents; Cheka etc. **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of Trotsky OR other 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 Trotsky AND other contributions 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 from enterprise; lenient on wealthy; low taxation Republican etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Taxes 'discourage business'; high taxes are an 'injustice'; those 'already prosperous 'not to be destroyed 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 Growth stupendous; affordable products; could afford loans to Europe; factories working constantly; only 6 per cent unemployed; unparalleled wealth etc.

No European market in trouble; 2 million unemployed and without money; falling demand implied 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 the President and the other is from a New Deal Agency representative 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 maxi instalments aided demand; stimulated prod usually a small percentage down pa instalments etc.

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

Level 1 – Identifies changes e.g. Radio and cinema popu

Level 2 – Describes changes. Award an extra mark to each aspect described in additional detail e.g. Most could afford a radio, from 60 000 to 10 million in a decade; number of radio stations increased, 1921–22 from 1 to 508; Hollywood, 1927 talkies; cinemas in every town; jazz clubs not only blacks 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. Prices fell – middle class could afford; 1 in 5 had a car by end of 1920s; Henry Ford, economies of scale; production line speeded efficiency; government aid for road building; US had oil etc. **[2–6]**

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, over-production; No, textile workers had a bad time. **[1]**

Level 2 – Explanation of agricultural workers OR other workers, single factor given e.g.

Agricultural Mechanisation had led to increased production – less work for labourers; competition from Canada; war had over-stimulated; demand from Europe fell; Prohibition lowered the demand for barley; prices fell c.50%; farm bankruptcies increased throughout the 1920s; sharecroppers suffered the worst; no government aid; evictions; few amenities in rural areas etc.

Other Traditional industries like textiles and coal mining; poorer workers; blacks/immigrants; Southern states in general; some areas of agriculture did well e.g. fresh vegetables and fruit etc. **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of agricultural workers OR other workers 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 agricultural workers AND other workers 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 enthusiastic; blind followers of instructions etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to t loyal and enthusiastic followers of Mao that they would follow his instructions even in they did not understand them 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 Mantra of denouncing by words and not by violence; opting out Red Guards and people saved indicates some believed Mao was opposed to violence etc.

No It would appear that the number of deaths and the continuation of unpunished attack, despite Chou's statement, that Mao wished the violence to continue; hidden message of getting Chou to announce Mao's views 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 was more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. **[1]**

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One is from British book and the other has 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 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 maxim Mao for his 'capitalist leanings'; under hou meetings; worked in a tractor factory; punishm accepted criticism and punishments without co

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

Level 1 – Identifies impact e.g. Destructive and violent c

Level 2 – Describes impact. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in additional detail e.g. Closed all schools; destroyed libraries and old buildings; 'olds' were attacked; brought teachers, professors, scientists to humiliating denunciation meetings; torture and death; students refused to take examinations; many felt uneducated after it was all over 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. It had run its course and Mao had many of his opponents locked up or dead; disruption caused by Red Guards was affecting transport, food and industrial production; population frightened by excesses; would the Party be able to retain control and direction?; army called upon to restore order and Red Guards dispersed into the countryside etc. **[2–6]**

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Despite famines, some progress had been made. **[1]**

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

Some Despite the terrible interruptions, China had made huge progress in food production and was beginning to address industrial production; steel and oil industries developing; base laid for China to become a nuclear power; better on consumer goods than USSR at the same time; more unified and a fairer society; progress on women's issues, health and education etc.

Little Country in a confused and run-down state in 1949; kept changing the agricultural organisation; famine and poor industrial development during Great Leap Forward; deaths; chaos of the Cultural Revolution, closure of schools; attacks on teachers, scientists. Most of rural China was still backward; withdrawal of Soviet aid in 1960s etc. **[2]**

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

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

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of progress AND lack of progress 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 fro inferiors; made trade unions militant; employ

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Blacks inferior as they were controlled, prevented from selling land; trade unions militant as 'they have nothing to lose but their chains'; whites benefited as they 'controlled industries'; whites ruled through 'racist ruling class' 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 Security police; detention; deaths; torture; no prosecution etc.

No An educated white man of principle; organised black union and mass protests; number at funeral implies government was ineffective; singing revolutionary songs; Stay Away day etc. **[3–5]**

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

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

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

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One is from a trade union leader and the other is from a memorial address so they both may 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 aspect to a ma individual or group attending meetings, w permission needed to move; no appeal etc.

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. Riots; police and army t

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. March of 15 000 schoolchildren; organised by Students' Representative Council; protesting about Afrikaans teaching; defying ban; police opened fire, 97 killed in 3 days; violence escalated 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. Racial supremacy; economic benefits; fear of majority rule; fear of communism; saw 'separate development' as viable; religious conviction that white was superior to and should control black etc. **[2–6]**

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, still no majority rule. **[1]**

Level 2 – Explanation of change OR no change, single factor given e.g.

Change After 1983 referendum a tri-cameral parliament, giving Coloureds and Indians separate representation in government; Blacks allowed to buy homes; more spent on education; black unions legalised; job colour-bar relaxed; 1985/6 Mixed Marriages Act and Pass Laws repealed. Did too much for some – National Party split, Treurnicht formed the Conservative Party etc.

No Black franchise not granted; only made reforms to 'petty apartheid' – e.g. relaxed segregation of amenities; Group Areas Act, Bantustans remained; 'Total strategy' strengthened police; BOSS and army; emergency powers remained; De Klerk did far more etc. **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of change OR no 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 no change 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
speaking for all Arab countries; speaks with em

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to t
appointed himself spokesman for all Arab countries – 'the problem before all Arab leaders'; speaks in hateful mode about Israel using the language of extermination 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 million more refugee Palestinians under Israeli rule and all that implies; 350 000 other refugees, heading for camps etc.

No Arab states had lost land ('occupied territories'); Jordan had more refugees to accommodate; at least the Palestinians had realised that they would have to rely on themselves in future ('Arab governments would never defeat 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 is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. **[1]**

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One is from President Nasser 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 maxim been Syrian, and used to observe and bom after Israel had captured them, they could no Israel to watch Syrian movements, with the to it etc.

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

Level 1 – Identifies activities e.g. Propaganda tool; government mouthpiece etc. **[1–2]**

Level 2 – Describes activities. Award an extra mark for each activity described in additional detail e.g. Propaganda tool of Egypt; vast amounts of threatening broadcasts which raised the hopes and expectations of Arabs and their nations to the point where politicians had to deliver a war and victory 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. Throughout 1965 and 1966, the military wing of the PLO (Al-Assif(a) had attacked Israel from Syrian bases; Israel countered and war seemed likely so Syria needed an ally – Egypt; April 1967 Israel launched a reprisal raid for Syrian shelling from Golan Heights; Israeli planes attacked Damascus; Russian intelligence told Nasser that Israel would go to war with Syria; Syria and Jordan chided Nasser for inaction; Egypt asked UNEF to leave Sinai; Cairo Radio threats; Gulf of Aqaba closed cutting off Israel's shipping and supplies – tantamount to declaring war; international attempts to solve getting nowhere; Jordan and Egypt sign a defence pact; Israel decided on a pre-emptive strike etc. **[2–6]**

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
It was definitely air power that won it. **[1]**

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

Air Very important with Mirage fighters; caught other air forces on the ground and destroyed planes and airfields to give land forces support in Sinai; bombed retreating Egyptian army in Mitla Pass; war over in six days; Egyptian army back to Suez Canal etc.

Other Arab states had always had different agendas, despite uniting over the destruction of Israel; wanted to be rid of refugees; no unified command; United Arab Republic had only lasted two years because of divisions; suspicious of one another; false Soviet intelligence; Cairo Radio raising expectations and temperature; ambitions of Nasser etc. **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of air power OR other factors with multiple factors. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of Balanced but Brief).

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of air power AND other factors mu

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 seen in source, no inference made. **[1–2]**

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from the source e.g. Density building; in an industrial area; does not look very healthy etc. **[3–4]**

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Densely built as they are two parallel terraces; industrial area with belching chimneys in the background; unhealthy as there is an open sewer running between the terraces 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 Enlightened and enthusiastic town council could do as much as Parliament to improve conditions; wanted to sweep away slums to make things better; made sure of good and cheap supplies of water etc.

No Largely plans for the future rather than completed developments. Refers only to Birmingham **[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 drawing and the other is from a clergyman 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 Act to a maximum of 1875, Public Health Act, 1875; Sanitary Act 1 of the Working Classes Act 1890 etc.

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

Level 1 – Identifies Model Towns e.g. Towns espec particular factory/industry.

Level 2 – Describes Model Towns. Award an extra mark for each Town described in additional detail e.g. Many built in nineteenth century to provide workers with housing and all necessary amenities within a small town. Most famous are Saltaire by Sir Titus Salt 1853, Bourneville by Cadbury family in 1879 and Port Sunlight by Lever Brothers in Merseyside 1888. About 20 exist to this day. **[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 the reason explained e.g. Increasingly better health and hygiene; better sanitation; understanding of disease; rush to towns for work meant larger numbers in close proximity; natural causes; lack of effective contraception and contraceptive education etc. **[2–6]**

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, Victorian employers always wanted profits. **[1]**

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

Greed Employers wanted cheap labour and wanted and needed workers, housing close by; employers were unlikely to spend more than they had to on this; speculators saw the growing demand for housing and provided it as cheaply as possible; this meant poor quality materials and workmanship; the more being built in the smallest possible space meant larger profits etc.

Other Workers were not well paid and they needed to be close to work; could not afford the high rents of better houses; this encouraged low quality dwellings; often several families would occupy the same house to reduce costs, so even if the building started sound, overcrowding would quickly make it a slum; local and national government did little for a long time to prevent the growth of slums. **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of greed 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 greed AND other factors 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 inference(s), unsupported from t caused by people not understanding the reli the British had placed the locals in an impossib

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. The local troops were upset by the pig fat with which they had to make contact before loading; the British were not fully aware of the loss of caste the pig fat would bring 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 Deployment of troops to other areas had reduced the number of white officers; the Europeans in the Madras army were disrespectful to their sepoys; officers coming to India were enlisting for personal advancement rather than for altruistic reasons etc.

No Dalhousie's reforms were a root cause of dissatisfaction among the locals; the Indians wanted to continue with their traditions rather than benefit from modern, western reforms 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 old newspaper report and the other is from a book 150 years later 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 correct city to a maximum
Accept Delhi.

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

Level 1 – Identifies policies e.g. Attempts to westernise a

Level 2 – Describes policies. Award an extra mark for detail e.g. Banning suttee and thuggee; ending infanticide; attempts to improve infrastructure – railways etc.; reform of justice system and civil service 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 place to make one's fortune; plenty of influential people there to help with careers; lack of opportunity in Britain; romantic feeling that India had attractions and magic; East India Company was a huge employer; money and fortune etc. **[2–6]**

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, anyone with a brain could see it coming. **[1]**

Level 2 – Explanation of unavoidability OR other outcomes, single factor given e.g.

Unavoidable There were so many points of disaffection both within the army and outside that some 'explosion' was likely to happen; many foretold it; the attitude of the British towards the Indians had deteriorated and this was breeding resentment; westernisation, interference with local customs, was bound to be advanced and all this caused local resentment etc.

Other Some of the causes, like interference with religious customs, could have been avoided or moderated but the seeds of the rebellion would have remained; no local population would welcome control by an outside force for ever; in the event the majority of the Indian army and population did not revolt etc. **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of unavoidability OR other outcomes with multiple factor. 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 unavoidability AND other outcomes must be addressed. **[6–8]**