CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2

0470 HISTORY

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

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

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

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the 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 from the economically important.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the

[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 Obliged to pay reparations; had some military and financial impact; transferring wealth to France; only a 'suspicion' that could not pay debts etc.

No Not as weak as France; industrial areas had not been affected; politicians could have avoided inflation; chose not to make payments 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

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 – A, British; B, French 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 based on valid evaluation of the source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 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 signatories of the Armistice in 1918; the politic Ebert and SDP; betrayed the army and na settlement; 'criminals' to right-wing leaders bec

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects, e.g. right-wing attempt to ov Berlin workers' strike ended it. **[1–2]**

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in additional detail e.g. Luttwitz & Kapp determined to resist dissolution of Freikorps; Marine Brigade march on Berlin; Army refusal to resist; government moved to Stuttgart; appealed for general strike; massive support; Luttwitz and Kapp fled to Sweden, 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. e.g. reduced reparation payments; French left Ruhr; American $200m loan strengthened finances; helped to restore stability and rebuild economy; basis for Stresemann reforms, etc. **[2–6]**

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions. e.g. Yes, weakened government; No, Versailles; hyperinflation, etc. **[1]**

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

Political violence – One aspect of right or left wing disorder and its support's effect on government.

Other – Blame for Versailles; occupation of Ruhr; hyperinflation; problems of Constitution and coalition governments; conservatism more entrenched; lack of Army support; international weakness, etc. **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of political violence OR other problems with multiple factors. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

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

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of political 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 number of prisoners; an awful effect on conditi

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences, with reference numbers from 300 to 17 000, thus overcrowding so no one dared leave their spot; shortages of food; outbreak of dysentery from appalling conditions 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 Stalin had worked with Lenin in this field during the Civil War and had been fully involved in the crushing of anti-Bolshevik forces etc.

No developed his own tactic of terror, exile and death in the anti-kulak campaign; during the purges he killed leading communists, whereas Lenin terrorised anti-communists etc. **[3–5]**

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

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

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

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One source is from an American and the other is British so they could both be biased/unreliable. **[2]**

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

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

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

Level 1 – Award one mark for each valid aspect to Prosecutor; ranted at suspects as confessions close ally of Stalin etc.

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

Level 1 – Identifies function e.g. Propaganda convictions

Level 2 – Describes functions. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. Propaganda convictions and (Stalin's enemies); to provide legitimacy to convictions; 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. By 1929 Stalin began to feel at risk; Old Guard seemed his death but was defeated in the Politburo; 1934 Party Congress Kirov got more votes than Stalin for General Secretary; Kirov assassinated on Stalin's orders, and used the death as an excuse to purge anyone his paranoia told him was dangerous e.g. Old Guard; about a million lower party members; NKVD; Military officer class; intellectuals; managers etc. **[2–6]**

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions, e.g. Five Year Plans were great. **[1]**

Level 2 – Explanation of industry OR other achievements, single factor given e.g.

Industry – Five Year Plans had not reached their targets but had raised production enormously; armies of volunteers and Pioneers to establish new cities – esp. in Urals – for industrial production; raised USSR to be second only to USA in production of heavy goods; enough resources to resist Germany in the war etc.

Other – After initial famines during collectivisation, agricultural production increased in animals and grain; use of fertilizers and tractors etc.; better housing; many more literate; position of women etc.

Level 3 – Explanation of industry OR other contributions 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 industry 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 source, no inferenc

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s) unsupported from th illegal.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to th income over $100 million; 'racketeer', bootlegging'. **[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 immigrant communities; upper and working class; more speakeasies.

No flouted more than opposed; gangsters favoured rather than opposed it; created jobs. **[3–5]**

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

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

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

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – A from a gangster, B from one city 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 based on valid evaluation of the source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 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 pledged not to drink alcohol and campaigne century; Anti-Saloon League & Women's C 1920 many rural States already 'dry'.

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects – e.g. Agents; Coast Guards

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. Prohibition Bureau Agents; federal powers; Customs Agents and Coast Guards; 3 mile limit increased to 12; destroyed stills; prosecution; imprisonment. **[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. sheer scale of avoidance; insufficient funding for enforcement; power of organised crime/corruption; legalising would increase tax revenue, create jobs; aspect of FDR policy. **[2–6]**

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions. e.g. Yes, women had more rights; No, no change for racial minorities. **[1]**

Level 2 – Explanation of progress for all OR no progress/continuity for all, single factor given e.g.

Progress – Women gained vote; labour-saving devices; cars; job opportunities; profits increased; criminals did well; entertainment for leisure time.

No Progress/ Continuity – Farmers – falling prices/demand; Southern blacks & immigrants still faced discrimination; workers' rights remained limited; wages not increasing at same pace as profits. **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of progress OR no progress/continuity, with a range of valid aspects given.

Or Undeveloped suggestions of BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – balanced but brief). **[3–5]**

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument. BOTH sides of progress for all AND no progress/continuity must be addressed. **[6–8]**

Depth Study D: China, 1945–1990

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 th
Chinese; Mao hoped any changes would help

Level 3 Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. influence of Soviet thinking and practices from 1930s; Mao thinking that there may be a better Chinese way which would deliver a classless society as well 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 Could not accept truth accompanied by criticism of him, or from his political rivals; had to come on own terms, etc.

No It had to come from political innocents who were no threat to him, etc. **[3–5]**

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

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

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

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One is from a British person and B 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]**

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

Level 1 – Award one mark for each valid benefit to a arranged and child marriages, infanticide and g

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

Level 1 – Identifies changes e.g. Made Chinese aware hygiene.

Level 2 – Describes changes. Award an extra mark for each change described in additional detail e.g. Street cleaning committees to tidy up communities; also to arrange for clean water supplies; campaigns against killer diseases of cholera, typhoid and tuberculosis – successful; barefoot doctors for rural communities; all health care free; Chinese methods alongside Western medicine; huge role for women in all of these. **[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. e.g. not so much abandoned but replaced with new targets; Mao was worried that the revolution was losing pace and settling back into bad old ways with 'experts' running factories, businesses, hospital and universities; an elite class was emerging; felt that USSR going the same way, esp. after the death of Stalin; Mao wanted a new revolution with workers and peasants in control; new higher targets were set for agriculture and industry etc. **[2–6]**

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions, e.g. to Mao, it was always a

Level 2 – Explanation of food OR other focus, single fact

Food – given to peasants during Civil W attacks on landlords – 'speak persuaded to work in co-operativ the Great Leap Forward comm being food producers, large scale works (dams, irrigation, etc.) and some industry (back yard furnaces) aided agriculture.

Other – Early problems included the state of the country, currency, law and order, health campaigns, women etc.; Russian aid and expertise had completed about 150 projects (largely industrial) by 1960; Chinese industrial production dropped 75% between 1959 and 1960 as USSR withdrew its goodwill and expertise; men taken from agriculture to build infrastructure during Great Leap Forward, and families had individual back yard furnaces where often metal tools melted down on fires fuelled by wood from tools etc. **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of food production/agriculture OR other focus 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 agriculture AND other focus 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 t
Church; devious; unwilling to admit responsibili

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference
unacceptable'; 'no instructions….congratulated'; 'refused to attend'. **[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,

Yes e.g. explosions; bombing army bases and power plants; began a military campaign; admits killings.

No only reprisal for deaths caused by government; regrets the 'accidental' casualties; SA government acting in an independent state. **[3–5]**

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

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

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

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – A is from a member of the government, B from the ANC leader 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 based on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this level answers which 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
Angola; Zambia; Zimbabwe.
Accept Botswana.

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects, e.g. sale of arms banned; e

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail, e.g.1977 UN arms ban; 1986 – US banned trade in goods such as steel; cut airline links; refused to invest; EU banned import of iron, steel, Krugerrands from SA and export of arms to it. **[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. in 1983, to unite all black resistance groups and other opponents of apartheid; to oppose new constitution in 1984; to try to end friction between Inkatha and ANC; calm violence in townships; influence of World Council of Churches, Trade Unions and young; Rev. Boesak, Archbishop Tutu. **[2–6]**

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions. e.g. yes, they were the most popular; no, De Klerk began the process. **[1]**

Level 2 – Explanation of Mandela/ANC OR other aspects, single factor given e.g.

Mandela /ANC – International reputation; long campaigns; willing to negotiate; link of ANC and MK; kept up pressure from neighbouring states; other ANC leaders – e.g. Sisulu, Lutuli, Tambo, Slovo.

Other – Gradual dismantling begun in the 1980s by Botha and then de Klerk; international pressure; economic effects of sanctions; role of Black Consciousness; UDF; PAC; Inkatha; escalating violence and cost. **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of Mandela/ANC OR other aspects with multiple factors given.
Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

Or Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief).
NB question is on both Mandela and ANC. **[3–5]**

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument. BOTH sides of Mandela/ANC AND other aspects must be addressed. **[6–8]**

Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians, 1945–1994

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 t
had plans that clashed over timing; President o

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Both countries wanted to attack with the sun behind them which would mean different start times; they were able to come to an agreement on the plan through discussion; Syria made the compromise on timing at 1400 hours, 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 it had a three-pronged strategy; a full time and substantial air force; it had a standing army and reserve backup; it had intelligence, etc.

No the standing army was small; had to rely on quick call up of reservists; intelligence was incomplete in 1973, etc. **[3–5]**

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

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

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

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One source is British, the other is from an Israeli 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 any 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 correct leader to Assad (must be in the correct order).

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

Level 1 – Identifies actions e.g. took Israelis hostage and

Level 2 – Describes actions. Award an extra mark for additional detail, e.g. during the 20th Olympic Games Palestinian terrorists from Black September attacked the quarters of Israeli team in the Games village. Two Israelis were killed and nine taken hostage. In an effort to rescue them they were all killed, along with five terrorists. Remaining terrorists flown to Libya, 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. Israel had been taken by surprise by the attack and took casualties initially – proved that Israelis were not invincible; Egypt and Syria were badly beaten back and wanted a way out; Saudi Arabia co-ordinated the use of oil as a means of making the West stop Israel; oil and the fact that they could be backing a losing side made USA, USSR and UNO combine to put pressure on combatants; Sadat had got his long term goal of USA interest, etc. **[2–6]**

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions, e.g. no, there will never be a permanent peace. **[1]**

Level 2 – Explanation of opportunity OR little chance, single factor given, e.g.

Chance – Speed of the agreed truce and new attitude of the USA and USSR and oil weapon meant big powers put pressure on Israel and its Arab enemies; Kissinger shuttle diplomacy; start of removal of Israeli troops in June 1975 meant Egypt could clear and open Canal; Sadat to Jerusalem November 1977; Camp David agreements September 1978; March 1979 Sadat and Begin sign peace treaty in Washington recognising each country's border; all came out of the dangers seen of the Yom Kippur War, etc.

Little – Only Egypt made a treaty at this time; Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, Iran and Jordan still all had issues with the existence of Israel; no settlement for the Palestinians; Sadat assassinated by his own troops October 1981; how could there be a lasting peace while the Palestinian problem existed? **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of opportunity OR little chance wi factors with multiple reasons.

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

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument. BO chance must be addressed.

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 t than rural areas; poor worst affected; all soci imply poor health facilities; worrying Commissi

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source, e.g. specific examples of statistics. **[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 lower death rate statistics imply effective in some areas; had dealt with worst part of the city; rapid effect.

No only a few streets; no new housing indicated; very variable death rates; not an automatic effect; Birmingham may not be typical, 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 – Source A is from a general history, B does not indicate purpose, so they could be biased/unreliable. **[2]**

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

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of 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 disease a maximu typhus; TB; dysentery; scarlet fever; smallpox.

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

Level 1 – Identifies provisions, e.g. housing could be purchase.

Level 2 – Describes provisions. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail, e.g. local authorities enabled to condemn properties as slums; compel owners to sell to councils; must compensate owner; could demolish area and redevelop through commercial builders; borrow from government at lower interest rate to finance. **[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. poor quality housing; overcrowding; poor drainage; polluted water supply; bad air quality because of industry; poor working conditions in factories. **[2–6]**

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions, e.g. yes, they did not understand problems; no, some reformers. **[1]**

Level 2 – Explanation of ineffective OR beneficial, single factor given.

Ineffective – not working class; often had vested interests in industry and construction; growth unprecedented; town links with disease not understood; non-interventionist politicians.

Beneficial – some leading reformers such as Shaftesbury; special Commissions set up, such as 1884–5 on housing, recommendations implemented – to an extent, Public Health Act 1875; powers of local authorities extended; more urgent as century progressed – workers' vote from 1867, trade unions, Fabians were consideration for some politicians. **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of ineffective OR beneficial 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 ineffective AND beneficial 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 fro resentment of British rule; initial spark quic brought different religious groups together in c

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source, e.g. 'soon accompanied by rebellion of civil population'; 'first war of independence'; 'forged unshakeable unity', 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 not planned; directed only against Christians; not a challenge to East India Company or British administration.

No shook British confidence; internal differences too great to overcome. **[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 – the first source is by a Hindu and B is from a Sikh so they could both be biased/unreliable. **[2]**

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

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

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

Level 1 – One mark for each to a maximum of two, e.g. best known. Others – Sir Henry Hardinge; Marquess of Hastings.

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects, e.g. sepoys' anger at greas

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail, e.g. protective grease on the cartridges reputed to be a combination of cow and pig fat; sepoys had to bite cartridges before use and so would be defiled; cows holy to Hindus and pigs unclean to Muslims. **[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. fortunately for the British the Mutiny was almost exclusively confined to the Bengal Army; Madras and Bombay Armies were relatively unaffected; could deal with revolting areas separately; differences between religions too great for unity rebels; Punjabi Moslems and Gurkhas remained loyal; southern areas not involved. **[2–6]**

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions, e.g. yes, rural areas unaffected; no, government improved. **[1]**

Level 2 – Explanation of little change OR change, single factor given.

Little change – religious, regional and caste differences unaffected; independent princes remained.

Change – direct rule instead of East India Company; administration strengthened; British more wary of offending; implemented reforms & westernisation created job opportunities, education etc. for some; for others the atrocities committed by both sides left lingering doubts and enmities **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of little effect OR 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 ineffective AND beneficial must be addressed. **[6–8]**