CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Educatio

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 2014 series for most Cambridge IGCSE®, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

® IGCSE is the registered trademark of Cambridge International Examinations.

Depth Study A: Germany 1918–1945

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

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the
moving from autocracy to democracy; seeking

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the
show progression from autocracy to democracy; armistice to Versailles peace
show desire for peace, 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 Workers and soldiers taking over across the country; essential basis for the new government; new democracy; Bavarian soviet, etc.

No Maintaining property, and law and order; betrayed workers by use of army; violence of Freikorps and victory of old order, 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 facts from an encyclopaedia and the other is from a Communist 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 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
1918 Wilhelmshaven sailors refused to attack
20 000 sailors and workers at meetings deman
up Sailors' Council; triggered revolt across the

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

Level 1 – Identifies revolt. Communists in Berlin; defeate

Level 2 – Describes revolt. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail, e.g. January 1919, led by Luxembourg and Liebknecht, despite initial reluctance, occupied Berlin newspaper, government offices and rail stations; Ebert and Groener pact used Freikorps to defeat and kill, 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. 'Stab in the back'; War Guilt clause; loss of territory; scale of reparations; 'never defeated'; not part of the negotiations; reductions in military forces; right wing used it against the socialists, etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, hyperinflation ended. No, depended on American loans. [1]

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

Stab 'Golden Years'; ended passive resistance in the Ruhr; new currency; Dawes/Young Plans, American loans; reduced reparations; foreign investment; increased employment/wages/ exports; no further Putsches; peaceful elections; Marx and Luther Chancellorships with DVP, DDP, Centre support, Muller 1928–30 added SDP, etc.

Lack Stresemann only Chancellor for August to November 1923; too reliant on foreign loans and investment; agriculture and middle class not as prosperous; weaknesses in Constitution and coalition governments – average span only 9 months; rightwing increasingly popular; violence of paramilitary groups; continued opposition to Versailles settlement, etc. N.B. – Focus is IN Germany. [2]

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

OR Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). Need to cover both economic and political aspects. [3–5]

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

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905–1941

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

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the
food reward; violence used to encourage obedi

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the
way of bread was dependant on fulfilling quotas of work; work very hard when prisoners were undernourished; violence by beating to encourage work and obedience, 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 Industrial development better than capitalist countries in modern equipment methods; faster rate of development; able now to move forward from heavy to light industry to produce consumer goods, etc.

No Has not yet overtaken rivals in terms of consumer goods; urgent to move on; desire and sacrifice will be needed to benefit the population directly, 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 ex-prisoner, the other is from Stalin 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
the working-class assuming power and using t
socialist society in our country without the victo
in other countries. (Stalin's own definition.)

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects. To create the omniscient an

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail, e.g. Propaganda to create the father figure of the nation; his picture appeared everywhere – schools, offices, stations, factories, town halls, streets. Roads and towns named after him; supposed to be the cause of every success; slogans, songs, pictures (real or fabricated), cinemas, radio, school books, art and poetry, 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. Bolshevik support usually found in towns with soldiers and workers; agriculture was spread across the country. Under NEP peasants had been able to make a profit; collectivisation meant greater state control over peasants; kulak opposition; needed education in new methods. Industry could more easily be controlled and supervised; genuine support; fear of NKVD drove people on; intimidation, etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, everyone feared the knock on the door at night. [1]

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

Terror History of intimidation under Tsar's regime; Cheka; now NKVD checked on people, workers; targets unfulfilled or any indiscipline meant Gulag term or worse; Gulag inmates used as labour for large projects; purges and Show Trials, etc.

Other Genuine enthusiasm for Communism and solving its problems; propaganda – Cult of Personality; in favour of a system that brought better education, health and housing; chances for promotion of ordinary workers; pride in achievements, etc. [2]

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

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919–1941

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

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the Republican; influential; callous; non-interfering; etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source, e.g. Years in office; laissez-faire; anti-labour; not seeing Depression coming, 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 US problems had already been resolved; foreign over-production; price falls; financial crises; lack of demand etc.

No Frivolous speculation at the expense of real investment; over-optimistic that US problems were already resolved; fear; lack of confidence; voluntary cooperation insufficient to cope with the scale of suffering, 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 from the President himself so both could be biased/unreliable. [2]

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

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of 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
10% of cost; borrowing balance in the expectat
brought in small investors; banks used the met
Crash ruined most of the small investors etc.

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects. Share prices collapsed; Wal

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail, e.g. Monday 21st October large scale selling, much by big investors; confidence falling; Black Thursday 24th – c. $9 billion fall in value; banks intervened, prices stabilised over the weekend; by 28th banks selling, c. $14 billion lost; Black Tuesday 29th complete panic selling, c. 15 million shares losing $32 billion in value, etc. [2–4]

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

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

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained, e.g. To win the election; Hoover's policies were not working; unemployment worsening; banking crisis; recreate confidence; FDR intervention in New York State had been effective; 'to restore America to its own people', etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, began relief. No, piecemeal efforts.

Level 2 – Explanation of lessened impact OR not lessen

Less Reconstruction Finance Act, Federal R
many banks and companies; Home Loa
mortgagees in difficulties; increased ex
dams, etc. to increase employment; relief grants to local authorities; 1932 tax rise on higher incomes,etc.

Not Smoot-Hawley Tariff 1930 raised already high Fordney-McCumber to highest; loans to Europe withdrawn – exports to Europe fell from 1929 $2341 million to $784 million by 1932; blocked federal relief bill 1932; ordered dispersal of the Bonus Army; measures taken inadequate – initially lowering taxes; cutting government expenditure; focus on balanced budget; not tackling banks sufficiently; Party restricted options; 3% unemployment in 1929 – up to 25% in 1932; FDR 1933 policies had more direct effect: 100 Days Banking measures, FERA, NIRA, etc. N.B. final date is 1933. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of lessened impact OR not lessened 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 lessened impact AND not lessened must be addressed. [6–8]

Depth Study D: China 1945–c.1990

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

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the memories and resent some of their history; the similar histories, etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source, e.g. Chinese have a strong dislike of foreigners who have oppressed them in the past, especially Europeans and Americans; they have a strong sympathy with other oppressed and colonial countries wishing to be independent, 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 Soviet Union would not give weapons; accused of wanting to set up another Communist Party in Manchuria; emperor and subject; Mao worried about Soviet expansionism, etc.

No Regarded as China's big brother; model for Chinese social development; closest allies, 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 book, the other is from Mao's doctor so they could both be biased/unreliable. [2]

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

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

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

Level 1 – One mark for each valid example to a maximu
Vietnam.

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

Level 1 – Identifies support, e.g. Finance and experts.

Level 2 – Describes support. Award an extra mark for ea
additional detail, e.g. Soviet Union sent expert
considerable finance to build up the industries in China; to build China in the image of the Soviet Union; Mao decided that China's Communism would be better based on an agricultural model; hence jealousies on the Chinese side and increasing frustration on the Soviet side; aid withdrawn in 1960. [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. Personality clashes. Stalin kept Mao waiting several times, saw China as the junior partner; Khrushchev never understood Mao – both insulted one another on a regular basis. Disagreed about Korea; USSR wanted to be in a position to regulate Chinese actions. Russians withdrew aid etc. in 1960; Mao and USA getting closer; border clashes – mooning Chinese soldiers; USSR would not give China its nuclear secrets; rivals as leaders of the Communist bloc, etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, as China is getting involved with the rest of the world. [1]

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

Chan Needed financial and technical help from the West to modernise industry, agriculture, science and technology; loans accepted from foreign governments and banks; contracts with western companies for equipment and expertise; 1980 joined IMF and World Bank; closer economic ties led to closer political understanding, etc.

No Communist Party still very much in charge politically; risked world criticism to maintain Party control – Tiananmen Square brought huge criticism; closer ties seem to be very much on China's terms; almost secretive at times; most Chinese saw little change, but special zones did, 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 no change must be addressed. [6–8]

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

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

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the
them, women in OFS cannot; severe penalties;

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source, e.g. 'Can obtain exemption'; all black women; prison punishments; monthly cost; irony of 'Free', 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 Size of demonstration; spread of protest to all main areas; first passive resistance; lesson for future; laws relaxed; Bantu Women's League, etc.

No Limited to Pass Laws; arrests and prison sentences, hard labour; laws only 'relaxed'; one of few victories, 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 an activist, the other is from a South African historian so they could both be biased/unreliable. [2]

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

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of 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
rental of white land to black people was prohibi
black land ownership only in reserves; Commis
reserves (7% of land).

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

Level 1 – Identifies policies. Subsidies, grants, tax relief, restrictions on black ownership. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes policies. Award an extra mark for each policy described in additional detail, e.g. Subsidies for export crops; produce control boards paid at fixed price, sold at higher rate internally; 1937 Marketing Act; Natives Trust and Land Act 1936; black tenants' work doubled to 180 days = cheap labour, 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. Labour laws denied the recognition of black workers' rights; no solidarity from white unions; unclear objectives; poor finance and administration internal conflicts with Clements Kadalie; linked with Communists; failed to attract black Rand workers; difficult to organise protests because of pass laws, movement restrictions on leaders, etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, they all had jobs. No, black people had lower wages. [1]

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

Ben South Africans had low unemployment compared to the rest of the world; best wages in Africa; gold boom; job creation schemes; government investment and subsidies; foreign investment; SA now a manufacturing as well as a raw materials producer.

Lack Capitalists, large producers, white farmers/workers and government benefited most compared to poor whites/blacks who lost land; urban worker paid more for food; wage difference and colour bar on jobs; high taxation; poor living conditions; increased discrimination, etc. [2]

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

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

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

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the Sadat, etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the actions unified Arab countries and Palestinian movement, ultimately leading to his death. This caused celebration throughout the Arab 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 The right to live in peace with all neighbours; commitment to deal with neighbours as per UN Charter, etc.

No Would have to give up the Sinai buffer; concessions to the Palestinians, especially the right to establish their own state; difficult for Israel to guarantee solutions, given the history from 1947 to 1977, 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 journalist and the other is from a speech by Sadat 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 person to a maximum of tw
Prime Minister Menachim Begin. N.B. Must be

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects. Threatened Western econo

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for ea
additional detail, e.g. OPEC met and agreed to cut oil production by five per cent until Israel withdrew; Saudi Arabia placed a total ban on exports to USA and cut production by 10 per cent; price of oil rose dramatically; Western states now had a vested interest in a quick cease fire; Arabs realised they had an effective weapon, 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. Despite inconclusive military outcome, Sadat had restored Egyptian pride and shown that the Israelis were not unbeatable; had stopped the nervous state of neither war nor peace; the support of the Arab states and the oil weapon had Kissinger running around the Middle East in search of a settlement; gave hope to meaningful discussions with Israel at a later date, etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, they were talking and agreeing. [1]

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

Cha Camp David: Israel recognised and promised security; Egypt to regain Sinai after a phased Israeli withdrawal; Palestinians on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip to move towards a self-governing status. Washington Treaty: both agreed to recognise each other's right to live in peace with secure and recognised borders; Palestinian problem remained unsolved, etc.

Lack May have got Egypt out of the equation but other Arab states inflamed by agreements; treaty denounced and Sadat accused of selling out to Israel; Sadat's assassination in 1981; threats to Israel continued – fighting in Lebanon in 1982; Israel completely out of Sinai by April 1982; Palestinian problem no further forward, 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 G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

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

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the
hard for many hours with little time for breaks; f
night; some get enough to live on while others

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source, e.g. They work long and hard, getting up at five o'clock, working from 6am to 7pm or even longer; short breaks of about one and a half hours; some live with 'decent comfort', others have meagre wages, 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 Psychological strains; repetitive work, meaningless; being tied to a machine; skills disappearing, etc.

No Opportunities to rise to management despite lowly class; worker was not crushed and showed remarkable ability to adapt, 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 the nineteenth century and the other is from the twentieth century so they could both be biased/unreliable. [2]

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

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

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

Level 1 – One mark for each valid example to a maximu
Spinning Jenny; Arkwright's Water Frame; Cro
Power Loom, etc.

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

Level 1 – Identifies part played. Huge source of power a

Level 2 – Describes part played. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail, e.g. Great and vital – powered machines in textile mills; used variously in coal mines to assist with extraction of coal, ventilation, drainage; rail industry and shipping industry, 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. Cheaper than men; children useful for cleaning machines, size enabled them to get underneath; women more dextrous and able to tie threads; availability, etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, brought groups and classes together. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of transport improvements impact OR other factors, single factor given, e.g.

Trans Provided means to factories to increase production and so provide employment; new methods of work and hours of work meant family life had to adjust; community life; provision of food; suburbs and commuters; holidays; fresh food, etc.

Other Changes were taking place anyway; enclosures drove people to seek work; increase in birth rate had impact; inventions changed way of life; many took their rural habits and customs to town and acted like a pre-industrial group; health; dangers of living so close together, etc. [2]

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

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

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

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the prevent the unpredictable nature of the life of A quiet life one day, and then be ravaged by viol

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source, e.g. British imperialism will bring certainty to the lives of Africans by preventing the violent raids which cause many deaths, and stop the kidnapping of women; British imperialism will bring Africans the blessing of protection, 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 In the first and last lines the King asks for a priest to help his people find God and then repeats a similar message about the need for Christianity.

No He also expects to receive precious metals, clothing, arms and good houses from the contact with Britain, 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 man who worked in Africa and the other is from a local ruler so both could be biased/unreliable. [2]

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

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of 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
Lugard to keep down costs of rule in the Empir
maintain their rule as long as they accept Britis
their taxes, etc.

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

Level 1 – Identifies work. Spreading Christianity and savi

Level 2 – Describes work. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail, e.g. Spreading the word of God to heathen and savage folk; enlightening them to the life of Jesus; caring and education; side effects were exploration; trade; some say exploitation; health benefits, etc. [2–4]

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

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

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained, e.g. To settle differences and spheres of influence in Africa; to prevent hostilities between European imperial powers; to decide on the future of the Congo and East Africa; most European countries realised a 'scramble' would bring dangers etc.; other areas discussed were shipping navigation of rivers, etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, Africans were terribly exploited. [1]

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

Harm Africans often exploited as cheap labour; raw materials taken at low cost; local cultures ignored or deliberately attacked as 'barbaric'; Western ideas introduced by force rather than by assimilation, etc.

Not A form of justice delivered; government structures; protection from raids and other tribes; infrastructure with roads, harbours built; missionaries brought education; increased trade helped some locals, etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of harmful OR not harmful 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 harmful AND not harmful must be addressed. [6–8]