www.dynamicpapers.com

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2014 series

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 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.

CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

www.dynamicpapers.com

Depth Study A: Germany 1918–1945

1 (a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question [0]

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences unsupported from the source e.g. egalitarian; beneficial; built patriotism and confidence. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. 'all social classes'; 'new skills', 'strong and healthy'; 'faith in the future', 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 Increased membership; means for military training and indoctrination; popular aspects; became compulsory.

No Not full youth membership even when compulsory; indoctrination not total success; resentment of some as too demanding. [3–5]

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

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

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

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One is an eyewitness account 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 2014

www.dynamicpapers.com

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

Level 1 – One mark for each aspect to a maximum of two e.g. subsidised leisure activities such as theatre tickets, sport; educational courses; holidays; cheap travel, etc. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects. Lost jobs, wartime employment. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail.
e.g. removed to provide jobs for men and become mothers; wage discrimination; 1 year labour service for under 25s, from 1936 voluntary, and 1939 compulsory; need for munitions' workers brought into 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. fear of punishment, Gestapo etc.; divided, isolated groups; popularity of policies; effective propaganda. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes – consistent anti-semitism; no – total control. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of main aim OR other aims, single factor given e.g.
Main Hitler's one consistent aim from 1920; Himmler etc.; Aryan supremacy; increasing persecution/restrictions from 1933; escalation during war, spread throughout conquered territory; increased despite cost, etc.

Other Only decided in 1942, Hitler not at Wannsee; Slavs and other minorities equally persecuted; another aim more important – e.g. overturning Versailles; expansionism; total social control; dictatorship, etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of main aim OR other aims with multiple factors. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

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 main aim AND other aims must be addressed. [6–8]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

www.dynamicpapers.com

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905–1941

2 (a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question [0]

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source. e.g. Russia has been hit by disasters; having to change economic strategy. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. the disasters of war and ruin have disrupted industrial life and economic planning so that the Communist government must change strategy to a capitalist version of smaller industries. [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 Trotsky and Lenin defeated by Politburo who saw it as vital tool to win the civil war.

No Discontent, military costs, Trotsky and Lenin tried to change it. [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 Lenin 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 2014

www.dynamicpapers.com

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

Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. As Secretary General has unlimited authority; unsure he will use it with caution; danger of split with Trotsky; 'too rude', so should be removed as Secretary General. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies views e.g. Socialism in One Country and World Revolution. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes the views. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect, correctly linked to each, and described in additional detail e.g. Stalin wanted to concentrate on the development of communism in USSR to consolidate; Trotsky felt it was necessary to have a world revolution to keep momentum and protect Russia. [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. NEP smacked of capitalism; to establish his grip on the economy; wanted to replace Leninism with Stalinism; to increase production for defence; to sell abroad for funds; to establish a truly socialist economy. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
No, it was because people did not like him. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of brilliance OR other reasons, single factor given, e.g.
Bril Trotsky's efforts in the war saved the revolution but made enemies among those who'd stayed behind – jealous or feared his popularity with the Red Army; alliances developed behind his back, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Stalin, etc.

Other Not popular because of his arrogance, sarcasm and late arrival as Menshevik and closeness to Lenin; jealous also of his negotiations leading to Brest-Litovsk; machinations of Stalin, developing power base as General Secretary, etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of brilliance 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 brilliance AND other reasons must be addressed. [6–8]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

www.dynamicpapers.com

Depth Study C: The USA 1919–1941

3 (a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question [0]

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in source, no inference made. [1–2]

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences unsupported from the source.
e.g. had economic grounds for confidence; taking risks; greedy; foolish; puzzled. [3–4]

Level 3 Supports valid inferences with reference to the source. e.g. 8 years of prosperity; 'gamblers'; lure of quick profits; listening to rumours; forcing pace; 'no-one knows'. 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 Aware of pessimism; worried by effects of businesses stalling; began cooperation with businesses and States; need to sustain consumer spending; avoid suffering; choice of language to reassure.

No No worse than earlier market falls; pessimism unnecessary; business has only 'hesitated'; cooperation only voluntary; confident measures taken are sufficient; rising agricultural prices. [3–5]

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

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

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

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One is a journalist and the other is a politician; from same year, 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]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

www.dynamicpapers.com

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

Level 1 – One mark for each valid project to a maximum of two, e. g. Federal road-building; Boulder Dam; flood control; harbours; Brooklyn Navy Yard; public buildings. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects. Attacked by government troops; dispersed. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. Republican Senate refused to agree Congress vote for immediate payment in June 1932; July – Hoover ordered camps demolished; MacArthur's armed troops used tanks and teargas, burnt tents; riots; 2 marchers killed; dispersed; Democrat support; huge publicity, 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. Policies themselves limited – by Republican resistance, 'rugged individualism'; commitment to balanced budgets; lowering taxes did not stimulate demand; raising tariffs counterproductive; cutting government expenditure did not restore confidence; sheer scale of problem – unemployment rose from 3% to 25% in 3 years; longstanding problems, etc.

[2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, no social security. No, FDR offered hope. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of despair OR other consequences, single factor given e.g. Despair Scale of unemployment; homelessness; begging; charity and state relief insufficient; borrowers' and savers' losses; distrust of banks; Hoover's 'prosperity just around the corner' did not reassure; treatment of Bonus Army; lack of social security; remained for much of 1930s despite New Deal, etc.

Other WSC affected relatively few and share prices bounced back for a while; middle/upper classes did not suffer as much as poor; WSC not direct cause of weaknesses already evident by end of 1920s in agriculture, over-production, etc.; loss of confidence rather than despair; positive effect as Roosevelt's November 1932 campaign and victory gave hope, etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of despair OR other consequences with multiple factors given. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

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 despair AND other consequences must be addressed. [6–8]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

www.dynamicpapers.com

Depth Study D: China, 1945–c.1990

4 (a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question [0]

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. highly qualified to be a leader; wants to match economic progress of other countries. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. has held a number of important posts in Party, has created supporters; aware of progress of neighbours such as Japan, 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 Most ordinary Chinese probably agreed; accepts the idea of incentives as useful.

No Some feared return to class injustice, unemployment and inflation; only 'probably' agreement so doubt remains about support. [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 – both are British but one quotes Deng 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 2014

www.dynamicpapers.com

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

Level 1 – Award one mark for each valid Modernisation to a maximum of two e.g. agriculture; industry; science; defence. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies methods e.g. Western-style systems of pay, capitalistic. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes methods. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail, e.g. piece work; overtime and bonus payments; profit sharing; 'responsibility' payments in factories; tax incentives. [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. Since 1978 there had been a reversal of many of the Cultural Revolution measures and opening up to world trade (IMF and World Bank) as Deng sought Western money and expertise; Chinese impatient for political freedoms; students' 1986 demonstration for Deng and modernisations; some concessions promised; argument in Politburo; in such numbers thought the Party could not refuse, etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions, e.g. Yes, much better off with Western goods. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of benefit OR lack, single factor given e.g.
Benefit Opening up to greater western contact, investment etc. had given Chinese, especially in cities, access to consumer goods, fashion, etc.; incentives at work increased personal wealth; more shops and jobs; competition in commerce reduced prices, etc.

Lack Party's hold on power barely wavered; Deng a strong authoritarian – removed Democracy Wall in 1979; Tiananmen Square protest quashed; poor human rights record; doubtful that countryside Chinese felt any great difference, etc. [2]

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

OR Undeveloped arguments 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 2014

www.dynamicpapers.com

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

5 (a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question [0]

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no inferences made. [1–2]

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences unsupported from the source e.g. stubborn; ungrateful; distrusted by the British; popular; committed Christian; crafty; selfish. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. 'won't speak our language'; 'forgets all we have done for him'; 'Uncle Paul'; 'very religious'; appears poor only on surface; 'looks after his own'. [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 Hatching a conspiracy; able to ban weapons for others in Transvaal; anti-British throughout SA; militarily skilled and underestimated by GB.

No Outnumbered; British ambitions open and a threat; only suspected of opposition. [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 – Both British 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]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

www.dynamicpapers.com

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

Level 1 – One mark for each aspect to a maximum of two, e.g. end of First Anglo-Boer War; Transvaal's 'independence'/self-government recognised but British suzerainty/control of foreign relations reserved; shaky compromise. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects. Attempt to support Uitlanders and overthrow government. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. secret conspiracy Rhodes/Chamberlain; financed Captain Jameson's 500 armed police crossing from Pitsani, Bechuanaland into Transvaal; Uitlander revolt did not materialise; did not reach Johannesburg; lasted 4 days; quickly surrounded, defeated, captured and imprisoned; confirmed Boer suspicions of British/Rhodes, 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. Strategic/trade route to India; gold and diamond mining; railways; base for imperial ambitions in whole continent; influence of Rhodes; rivalry with Germany; Boers' mistreatment of Uitlanders/blacks, etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, they lost militarily. No, Afrikaner nationalism strengthened. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of failure OR success, single factor given e.g.
Failure Military defeats; costs; concentration camps' suffering; Cape and Natal Dutch gave scant support; no support from European powers; terms of Vereeniging: Boer independence lost, to accept Edward VII as sovereign and part of British Empire, etc.

Success Early military successes; commando raids; costs to British – financial and diplomatic; Vereeniging concessions – Transvaal and OFS to have local self-government; an 'eventual' Union; no Boer to lose property or freedom; UK to pay £3 million compensation; Dutch as well as English to be taught; no black or Coloured franchise in Boer states; Milner's scheme failed; Boer nationalism increased; Botha and Smuts political power by 1910, etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of failure OR of success with multiple factors 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 failure AND success must be addressed. [6–8]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

www.dynamicpapers.com

Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians, 1945–c.1990

6 (a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question [0]

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. Seems to plan policy for Palestine on American electoral issues; USA has many Jews so policy based on their interest. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Truman apologising to Arabs; aware of significance of Jews and Zionism; no Arabs means they are considered of little importance. [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 Kissinger's efforts in 1974; American encouragement led to Sadat visiting Israel; Camp David; agreement led to Israeli withdrawal from Sinai which must reduce tension.

No USA and USSR do not want to be dragged into war; Western powers worried about Arab oil weapon [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 Truman 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 any 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 2014

www.dynamicpapers.com

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

Level 1 – Award one mark for each correct group to a maximum of two e.g. Hezbollah, Hamas.

[1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies methods e.g. diplomacy and violence. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes methods. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. diplomacy – contacts with other sympathetic countries and organisations; led to Arafat speaking to UN in 1976; UN Resolutions, UN peacekeepers and UNWRA. Violence – raids from Jordan, Lebanon till expelled; radical elements attack people and property, etc. [2–4]

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

Level 1 – 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. supported the Palestinians when they could embarrass Israel; camps in Arab countries were difficult to handle – raids on Israel brought retaliation; extra burden on Arab countries; felt that camps were a state within a state; Palestinians were seen as irresponsible at times; expelled from Jordan, removed from Lebanon; created civil wars in countries, etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, they have still not got their own country. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of little improvement OR much improvement, single factor given e.g.
Little Still without their own unified state; camps in Arab world not popular with Arab states; attracted Israeli retaliation; camps awful despite UNWRA; PLO recognised as speaking for Palestinian people but PLO divided, seen as terrorists by some; intransigence of Israel; Israeli settlements, etc.

Much Recognition by UNO; Resolutions for a two state solution (242); recognition of PLO; talks between Arab states and Israel; recognition of PLO by Israel after the rise of Hamas; Oslo Accords and Gaza-Jericho Agreements gave a kind of self-rule to Palestinians in Gaza and West Bank. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of little improvement OR much improvement 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 little improvement AND much improvement must be addressed. [6–8]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

www.dynamicpapers.com

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

7 (a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question [0]

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences unsupported from the source e.g. debilitating; incessant toil governed by machinery; noisy; young workers. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. 'claims the operative's thinking powers'; no 'opportunity for the muscles'; 'not work but tedium', 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 Pleasant; good companionship; healthy; well-paid.

No Hints at long hours; repetitive; children still employed; only compares with the idle rich and poorest. [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 – A is from a reformer; B later, rose-tinted interpretation. [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 2014

www.dynamicpapers.com

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

Level 1 – One mark for each valid detail to a maximum of two: reforming factory owner; model factory at New Lanark 1800–1825; schools, welfare and decent housing; New Harmony, USA; socialist sympathies; trade unionism supporter – GNCTU. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects, e.g. Applied to textile mills; limited child labour. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. did not include lace and silk mills; no children under 9; max. hours 9 for 9–13, 12 for 13–18; no night work for under 18s; 2 hours education; general working day limited to 5.30–20.30; four inspectors to ensure compliance. [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. employers self-interest in profit; provided regular employment; well-paid in comparison to other employment; reformers focused on worst aspects of industrialisation; trade unions wanted bargaining rights; Parliament equivocal, etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, wages increased. No, many strikes failed. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of benefit OR lack of improvement, single factor given.
Ben Regular work and wages; sometimes housing provided; cheaper goods; helped in improved communications; fostered trade unionism; superior to agricultural workers' situation, etc.

Lack Workers soon laid off if orders sank; most housing poorly built and overcrowded; poor drainage; effects of pollution; weakness of trade unions; limited regulation, etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of benefit OR lack of improvement with multiple factors.

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 improvement must be addressed. [6–8]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014

www.dynamicpapers.com

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

8 (a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question [0]

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences unsupported from the source e.g. acts in best interests of local areas; not expansionist; wary of competitors. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. 'no wish to disturb your rule'; 'protection'; 'no other nations should take them'. [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 Weapons; opposition of natives not equal; superior military skills in Nigeria.

No African leaders signed away their rights and territories; self-interest in local disputes and exploiting European rivalry. [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 – A is a formal British response; B is a modern assessment 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 2014

www.dynamicpapers.com

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

Level 1 – One mark for each aspect to a maximum of two, e.g. first recoil mechanism enabled rapid firing – c. 600 rounds per minute; patented 1883; forerunner of the machine gun; highly effective against lightly armed natives. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects, e.g. Used local rulers and officials; loose supervision. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. developed by Lord Lugard in Nigeria and quickly spread; British District Officers to co-operate with paramount chieftains/rulers to modernise/extend efficient administration; aid peaceful local control; basis for social reform – in theory; imperial control of military and foreign relations, 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. potential markets and resources – e.g. diamonds and gold, more attractive in period; new Germany and Italy ambitious to match empires of the older states; part of the Great Game; technology, etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, more territories. No, expensive. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of benefits OR weaknesses single factor given.
Ben Gained in prestige; more markets; Belgium and Congo; Britain had bulk of African trade if fewer territories than France; trade routes, Suez; satisfied Christian evangelism and anti-slavery groups; partition, etc.

Weak Costly to build infrastructure, station troops, fight local wars; unhealthy ‘white man’s grave’; caused friction between European powers, etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of benefits OR weaknesses with multiple factors.

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 benefits and weaknesses must be addressed. [6–8]

© Cambridge International Examinations 2014