www.dynamicpapers.com

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2012 series

0470 HISTORY

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

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

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

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2012 series for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

www.dynamicpapers.com

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918–1945

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. Faced armed violence; sympathetic to lawbreakers; resentment against peacemaking; widespread antagonism etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Faced armed violence from Kapp Putsch; sympathy to lawbreakers with banned Freikorps members allowed to join Operation Consul, and right-wing papers saying patriotic Germans approved of the assassination of Walter Rathenau etc. [5–6]

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. [1–2]

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

Yes Spartacists in Berlin; government needed Freikorps; widespread Communist impact from Bavaria to the Ruhr; increase in vote by 1924 etc.

No some early socialist opposition; Eisner's murder by right-wing; speedy defeats; scale of casualties; only 'attempted' in the Ruhr; SPD maintained its vote etc. [3–5]

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

(iii) 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 Briton and the other in from a Communist 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]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2012

www.dynamicpapers.com

(b) (i) Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. Refused to believe in the defeat until confirmed by Hindenburg and Ludendorff; initially refused to concede any powers; 1 October appointed Prince Max Imperial Chancellor; by the end of October he was a constitutional monarch; after Kiel Mutiny abdicated 9 November, and went to live in Holland etc. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. Head of State; Article 48, emergency powers. [1–2]

Level 2 – Develops aspects e.g. Elected Head of State; Commander-in-Chief; he appointed the Chancellor; maintain public order; Article 48, emergency powers to suspend individual rights and take necessary measures by decree etc. [2 –4]

(iii) 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. Already strong inflationary pressures because of war debt; scale of reparations; French/Belgian invasion of the Ruhr; economic loss; passive resistance and government printing money to pay striking workers; lack of reserves; loss of confidence in the currency etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, wars bring change both social and political. [1]

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

Cha No longer a monarchy; Weimar imposed upon Germany; Versailles brought political protest and social unrest; Stresemann and the Golden Years; Germans more confident in latter years of the 1920s; seemed to have beaten off right and left wing parties; impact of hyperinflation on savings/different classes; trade unions developed; architecture/ literature/cinema/radio; Berlin and its night life; American influence etc.

Lack Still very conservative in the countryside; Stresemann's authority seemed like an old style ruler – as did Article 48 powers; much disapproval of high life in Berlin and the loose morals; military; judicial and industrialists wanted no change etc.
NB The question refers to social and political change only. [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]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2012

www.dynamicpapers.com

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905–1941

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. Lenin had been ill; he had been outmanoeuvred but showed his authority again etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Lenin became exhausted at meetings because of his recent illness; Politburo members had tried to sneak votes past him in his absence; he re-asserted his authority by putting time limits on meetings etc. [5–6]

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. [1–2]

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

Yes Not deeply divided on issues; both industrialisers; not overly fond of peasants; disagreements less obvious than personality differences etc.

No Rivals over issues like industrialisation and peasants; Stalin was accused of stealing Trotsky's policy over rapid industrialisation; rank and file saw there were differences but not large ones etc. [3–5]

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

(iii) 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 America, 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]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2012

www.dynamicpapers.com

(b) (i) Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. Established as the newspaper of the Bolshevik Party with money from Gorky; Stalin a contributor; Bukharin was editor; Pravda means Truth etc. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies Rebellion e.g. Rebellion by sailors who set up their own soviet. [1–2]

Level 2 – Develops aspects of the Rebellion e.g. The Sailors in the Kronstadt naval base had been great supporters of the Bolsheviks in 1917; had become disenchanted with the results of War Communism; made demands, set up separate soviet; cruelly put down by troops led by Trotsky; helped influence Lenin to introduced the NEP etc. [2–4]

(iii) 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. Late convert from Mensheviks but outstanding achievements in negotiations at Brest-Litovsk and in the Civil War; brilliant speaker, he was the obvious choice to succeed; but he took things for granted, arrogant, not liked by fellow Bolsheviks; Stalin built support through position of Secretary-General of the Party; no-one took Stalin seriously; no-one had Lenin's nomination; Lenin's funeral; Stalin's role and speech at Lenin's funeral etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 - Simple assertions.
Yes, he was the obvious leader. No, he was paranoid. [1]

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

Sec He was leader; he had outmanoeuvred all rivals; Trotsky in exile; Five Year Plans and collectivisation were over early problems; Cult of Personality working well; art and literature was communist/Stalin propaganda etc.

Lack Largely his own paranoia made him see rivals everywhere; death of Kirov meant that he began the Great Purge of Old Bolsheviks, the military, managers, experts and 'slackers'; the very numbers purged show his lack of security etc. [2]

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

© Cambridge International Examinations 2012

www.dynamicpapers.com

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919–1941

3 (a) (i) Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made. [1–2]

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. Most groups benefited; variable impact; middle class overspending; greedy; conspicuous consumption etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Owners and investors doing very well with properties; middle class fairly well off but unused to controlling spending; skilled workers better off with higher wages; unskilled have progressed least but life is a little less intolerable etc. [5–6]

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. [1–2]

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

Yes Reduced tax and National Debt; benefits to trade and investment; 'freed' labour etc.

No Higher wages fuelled demand; confidence; large business more ethical etc. [3–5]

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

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

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One is from an American analyst and the other is from President Coolidge 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]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2012

www.dynamicpapers.com

(b) (i) Level 1 – One mark for each valid industry to a maximum of two e.g. Coal, iron, textiles, ship building etc. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies problems e.g. overproduction; debt. [1–2]

Level 2 – Develops problems e.g. Tariffs; competition from Canada especially in grain; overproduction; mechanisation; prices and incomes fell; debt and loss of farms etc. [2–4]

(iii) 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. Ford and production line assembly; economies of scale; prices falling with competition; demand increased; advertising; hire purchase; increased mobility of owners etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, more jobs. No, lacked rights. [1]

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

Ben Expansion of new industries created jobs; tariffs and trusts protected markets; could afford new consumer goods; some skilled workers had shorter hours etc.

Lack Wages not keeping pace with profits; no job protection; poor union organisation; unemployment remained high; new methods reduced the demand for labour; 42 per cent living below poverty line – largely the unskilled; problems of older industries, agriculture, immigrants, the South 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]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2012

www.dynamicpapers.com

Depth Study D: China, 1945–c.1990

4 (a) (i) Level 1 - Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made. [1–2]

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. The troops went around in small groups; they were unfamiliar with the towns; they seemed nice people etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. They were well-armed from a variety of sources; either Japanese weapons captured in battle or US rifles from deserting KMT troops; were polite with bows and smiles; unfamiliar with the area and had to ask for directions etc. [5–6]

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. [1– 2]

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

Yes KMT much better armed and equipped; KMT had the larger army; assistance from USA to transport troops to northern China etc.

No Red Army got to Manchuria first; did it without the help of fellow communists in USSR; Red Army still felt it could win as manoeuvring and fighting had already started etc. [3–5]

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

(iii) 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 German and the other is from a Chinese person, so they could both be biased/unreliable. [2]

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

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

© Cambridge International Examinations 2012

www.dynamicpapers.com

(b) (i) Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. Retreated with Nationalist supporters to Taiwan; an island off the coast of mainland China; always a threat to communist China because of its position; threats, alternative systems and support from USA etc. [1 – 2]

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies working e.g. Courts where landlords were brought. [1 – 2]

Level 2 – Develops working e.g. Courts where landlords were brought to receive allegations and both verbal and physical abuse for actions against the peasants over many years; land confiscated; landlords often executed etc. [2–4]

(iii) 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. USA hostile to communists; already had a problem with communist USSR and if China became communist it would threaten the whole Asian continent, where the USA had interests; fundamental rejection of anything that smelled of communism; had already invested much in keeping China nationalist and pliable, so must continue to invest etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.
No, the Communists definitely won it for themselves. [1]

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

KMT Exhausted fighting Japanese since 1931; despite much aid and support from USA, the KMT leadership, strategy and discipline were poor; KMT unpopular with peasants; many desertions with weapons etc.

Other Impact of long civil war and the war against Japan; efficiency, discipline and drive of CCP army and leadership; land issues; Chinese people largely wanted peace and did not mind which side delivered it etc. [2]

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

© Cambridge International Examinations 2012

www.dynamicpapers.com

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

5 (a) (i) Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made. [1–2]

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. Divided; urgent problems; some wishing to avoid apartheid; representation of blacks etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Dangerous situation brewing because of propaganda and actions; urgent action required for a more just solution; separation would undermine all races and the country as a whole; co-operation vital; an experienced white Senator etc [5–6]

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. [1–2]

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

Yes National Party had won voter support on a clear statement of its aim; Afrikaner dominance in government would give support; nothing new; most policies favoured segregation; ruthless intention gave confidence to supporters etc.

No Narrow majority; Afrikaners only 12 per cent of the population; implies division among whites – United Party and British; scale of the task etc. [3–5]

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

(iii) 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 white South African 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]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2012

www.dynamicpapers.com

(b) (i) Level 1 – One mark for each valid group to a maximum of two e.g. Hertzog's Afrikaner Party; Malan's National Party; Pirow's New Order Party; Broederbond; Ox-wagon Sentinel (Ossewabrandwag); pro-Nazis; republicans; Communists (till 1941). [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. It increased membership; Youth League set up. [1–2]

Level 2 – Develops aspects e.g. Xuma president. 1940-49 revived it; national executive stronger; 1943 – new constitution, reduced power of chiefs; active recruitment, published Africans' claims; Youth League founded in 1944 by Lembede, Sisulu, Mandela, Tambo etc; support for Pan-Africanism; cooperation with NRC for anti-pass law campaign etc. [2–4]

(iii) 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 1945 it was producing 50 per cent of Allies' small arms/ ammunition; naval ship repairs; ports expanded as Suez/Med too dangerous; Britain carried most of the cost of SA military; SA government domestic investment increased; demand for gold; lack of imports stimulated domestic production; cheap labour etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, racial classification. No, continuation of earlier policies. [1]

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

Cha It designated the racial group of every citizen; mixed marriages ended; 1953 – segregated every aspect of facilities; forced removals, restricted blacks'/coloureds' town areas; black strikes prohibited; Bantu Education Act; suppression of communism; reactivated ANC; Treason Trials etc.

Lack Reserves/townships/Pass Laws already existed; white dominance; power of chiefs; opposition failed – Defiance Campaign/Freedom Charter; Afrikaner control tightened – Strijdom, Verwoerd; 1955 election 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]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2012

www.dynamicpapers.com

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

6 (a) (i) Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made. [1–2]

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. Decided to act from previous experience; outcome not always popular etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inference with reference to the source e.g. Eden decided that this 'dictator' would not be appeased; Britain had French and Israeli support; unpopular in British Commonwealth and among Britain's friends as well etc. [5–6]

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. [1–2]

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

Yes Dishonoured commercial agreements; many people in the audience would have agreed as a dictator must not be appeased; accepts that there is a chance he could attack neighbours and close the Canal etc.

No Had broken no treaties; does not rule by terror; got rid of corruption at home; land reform: had not turned on his neighbours and closed the Canal etc [3–5]

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

(iii) 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 British history book, the other is from a British newspaper, 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]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2012

www.dynamicpapers.com

(b) (i) Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. Secret plan between Britain, France and Israel for Israel to attack Egypt and advance on the Canal; Britain and France to demand that both sides withdraw 16km from the Canal; Britain knew Nasser would not comply so could invade under the pretext of taking 'police action' and, thus, secure the Canal Zone. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies roles e.g. both were angry and threatened action. [1–2]

Level 2 – Develops roles e.g. USSR threatened Britain with a missile attack – probably bluff and bluster to cover its own invasion of Hungary; USA stopped oil for Britain from its only available source in Latin America – the pound sterling collapsed etc. [2–4]

(iii) 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. Resented the foreign ownership of the Canal which had been dug using Egyptian labour with many lives lost; felt that Egypt should have more control of and revenue from the Canal; had received promises from USA, Britain and World Bank in December 1955 to finance the Aswan Dam; May 1956 Nasser recognised Communist China; July, West withdrew the offer of aid, hoping Nasser would fall; 26 July, Nasser announced his intention of nationalising the Canal as he would receive more revenue from tolls than from Western aid etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.
No, he lost money as he sank ships in the Canal. [1]

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

Triu Had humiliated Britain and France whose influence in the Arab world would be much diminished; his current backer, the USSR, became the sponsor to many Arab states; Nasser was stronger and more popular than ever; Israel gave back gains in Sinai in 1957; Nasser could claim that Israel had only won the military campaign as it had Britain and France to help it etc.

Lack The Canal was closed with sunken ships; much of Egypt's Czech arms had been captured; Israel knew it could defeat Arab armies; nothing had changed in the domestic area of Egyptian politics – when popularity subsided, criticism would grow again etc. [2]

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

© Cambridge International Examinations 2012

www.dynamicpapers.com

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

7 (a) (i) Level 1 – Repeats material seen in the source, no inference made. [1–2]

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. The demand and use for steel gets greater and greater; the whole industry must be flourishing, providing jobs and creating wealth etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Demand and production of steel is climbing at a huge rate; production in 1913 is about twenty-five times as great as in 1870, in 1900 it was three times that of 1880; so there must be huge demand for steel in so many areas of construction etc. [5–6]

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. [1–2]

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

Yes Converter rendered wholly unfit for the envisaged process as there was too much phosphorus in the iron ore; failure had paralysed his energies; the press insulted him as a wild enthusiast etc.

No The concept of the process was fine but the iron ore spoilt it; in conception it would have produced huge masses of iron ready to be treated; if the phosphorus in the ore could be overcome he would have his crowning success; he is writing his autobiography so somebody wants to read about his Converter and his success etc. [3–5]

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

(iii) 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 graph and the other is from Sir Henry Bessemer 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]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2012

www.dynamicpapers.com

(b) (i) Level 1 – One mark for a valid example for each half of the question e.g. (i) Sheffield; (ii) Yorkshire, Durham, Newcastle areas. **NB. Question asks for English examples.** [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies problems e.g. Underground, difficult to get at. [1–2]

Level 2 – Develops problems e.g. Drainage, flooding, ventilation, explosions – gases e.g. fire damp; depth of mines, raising coal from the pit; transportation away from the pithead etc. [2–4]

(iii) 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. Demands of growing industry – for machinery and tools; expansion of the use of steam in factories and railways – engines and rails; improved technology meant the development of steamships and naval vessels driven by screw mechanisms; quality ever improving as problems of production were solved; mass production reduced the cost; domestic utensils etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.
No, both about the same. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of iron and steel OR coal, single factor given e.g.

I & S Without iron and steel industries there would not have been growth in machinery or the railways as both were major drivers of industrial expansion; there would have been slower transportation of goods, raw materials, food and people etc.

Coal Coal was the driving force behind increased production in iron and steel and for the steam industries; railways and steamships would have been severely restricted; domestic heating would have been badly hit.
NB – They are interdependent for growth – reward candidates who see this. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of iron and steel OR coal 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 iron and steel AND coal must be addressed. [6–8]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2012

www.dynamicpapers.com

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

8 (a) (i) Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made. [1–2]

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. Admired and envied; good role model of ruling; inspires imitation etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Growing empire with increasing colonial possessions; role model imperialist as governs well; inspires German rivalry etc. [5–6]

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. [1–2]

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

Yes Gave protection to both weak and strong; all else consolidates their conquests and victories etc.

No Justice and prudence; interest in material comfort; respect for local customs and religious beliefs inspires loyalty and acceptance of British rule etc. [3–5]

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

(iii) 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 a Frenchman, and the other is from a German so they could both be biased/unreliable. [2]

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

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

© Cambridge International Examinations 2012

www.dynamicpapers.com

(b) (i) Level 1 – One mark for each valid example to a maximum of two e.g. Namibia (German South-West Africa), German East Africa, Togoland, Cameroon (accept German spelling with 'K'). [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies motives e.g. Gain and reward etc. [1–2]

Level 2 – Develops motives e.g. A ready market for goods produced by the imperial and industrial nation; a source of cheap raw materials; a source of cheap labour for whatever industries established locally, a source of labour for other imperial tasks e.g. Indians used in South Africa; source of cheap and numerous troops to defend the empire and the imperialists' interests etc. [2–4]

(iii) 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. Wanted the prestige and recognition as a world power, not just a European one; envied earlier empire; a 'place in the sun'; believed economic advantages would accrue; a means of celebrating the union of German states through acquisition of territory; to prove Germany, as a state, had arrived etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, they took land and material and made fortunes. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of European benefit OR other factors, single reason given e.g.

Euro Gained empires, raw materials, markets; individual fortunes in South Africa and India; some altruistic missionaries, explorers gained if they achieved their missions; traders; government officials improved government and gained reputations – Lugard; countries increased prestige etc.

Other Native populations gained from law and order; justice; medicine and education, missionary work etc. but not always in these fields. Loss of local political organisation; break up of tribal groupings; interference in local customs and religions; ALSO not all European governments made great successes of empires; individual traders, missionaries, explorers met sad ends etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of European benefit OR other factors with multiple factors given. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

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

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of European benefit AND other factors must be addressed. [6–8]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2012