

## **MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2007 question paper**

### **0470 HISTORY**

**0470/04**

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.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- CIE will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2007 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2007</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>04</b>

**Depth Study A: Germany, 1918–1945.**

- (a) (i)** Level 1 – Repeats material stated in source, no inference made. (1–2)
- Level 2 – Makes inference(s), unsupported from source e.g. The Nazis thought that they were superior to all races etc. (3–4)
- Level 3 – Makes valid inference, supported from source e.g. The Nazis were dismissive and showed contempt for other races etc. (5–6)
- (ii)** Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from source. (1–2)
- Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from source e.g. Yes, sees Hitler as a hero for solving the unemployment crisis, and for ‘caring’ etc. No, says he disapproved of the Nazi attitude towards the Jews etc. (3–5)
- Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from 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 writer, the other is from a Nazi 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>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2007</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>04</b>

**(b) (i)** One mark for each valid example to a maximum of two e.g. Gypsies, homosexuals, mentally ill, communists, socialists, Jehovah's Witnesses etc. (1–2)

**(ii)** Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. Nazi inspired attack on Jewish property. (1–2)

Level – 2 – Develops aspects. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in extra detail e.g. Revenge attack on synagogues, Jewish shops and homes in Germany and Austria. 101 synagogues attacked, 76 demolished. 7 500 stores destroyed and looted. 35 Jews killed, 20 000 arrested. (2–4)

**(iii)** Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for explanation. (1–2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. Sanctioned by the Wannsee Conference Jan '42. No recorded orders or signature by Hitler. Long term plan or pragmatic decision? Hitler hated Jews. With Allies invasion of Germany, Nazis needed to destroy all the evidence of systematic killing. Be prepared for controversial assertions. (2–6)

**(iv)** Level 1 – Simple assertions.  
Yes, at the end there was little by way of normal life. (1)

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

Yes. After Stalingrad'42, life became increasingly difficult as with each allied victory the enemy came nearer to home. Shortages, recruitment, death, bombing, tighter security, arrests, paranoia etc.

No. In the early days of the war, there was little to change to the normal way of life. It all seemed to be one victory after another. Few shortages, just a country on a war footing. Much euphoria. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of change OR lack of change 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 address the issue of 'How far?'  
BOTH sides of change AND lack of change must be addressed. (6–8)

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2007</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>04</b>

**Depth Study B: Russia, 1905–1941.**

- (a) (i)** Level 1 – Repeats material stated in source, no inference made. (1–2)
- Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from source e.g. Life was precarious, and many died etc. (3–4)
- Level 3 – Makes valid inference with reference to the source e.g. Compares the tyranny and atrocity of Germany/Kaiser in World War I with that of Lenin and Trotsky; more deaths than that of First World War etc. (5–6)
- (ii)** Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from source. (1–2)
- Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from source e.g. Yes, intellect, powers of explanation, man of the people etc. No, appearance, body, clothing etc. (3–5)
- Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from 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 British minister, the other is from an American journalist 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 sources 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>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2007</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>04</b>

**(b) (i)** One mark for each valid element to a maximum of two e.g. Period of demonstrations against the Provisional Government, Lenin hesitated to call for overthrow, Kerensky ordered the arrest of Bolshevik leaders, Lenin fled to Finland in disguise etc. (1–2)

**(ii)** Level 1 – Identifies elements.  
One mark for each valid element to a maximum of two. (1–2)

Level 2 – Describes elements. Award an extra mark for each valid element described in extra detail e.g. Kornilov, C-in-C of the army, tried to overthrow Kerensky but his troops were persuaded by workers (Red Guards) to turn back. Railway workers refused access to railway. Kerensky armed Red Guards to defend the state – Bolsheviks claimed to have saved Russia from counter-revolution. (2–4)

**(iii)** Level 1 – Single reason.  
One for the reason, one for explanation. (1–2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for the reason, one for the reason explained e.g. Still in war, not dealt with land issues or elections. Shortages, famine and war deaths. Actions of Bolsheviks. Slogans. Increasing importance of soviets. No effective leadership from the Provisional Government etc. (2–6)

**(iv)** Level 1 – Simple assertions.  
No, millions starved during the Civil War. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of gain OR lack of gain. Single factor given e.g.

Yes. Out of First World War, were rid of two incompetent regimes, land issue partially addressed, NEP etc.

No. Civil War. War Communism. Red and White Terrors. Starvation, summary execution etc. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of gain OR lack of gain 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 address the issue of ‘How far?’  
BOTH sides of gain AND lack of gain must be addressed. (6–8)

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2007</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>04</b>

**Depth Study C: The USA, 1919–1941.**

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from source e.g. Resented expense; system could not cope with costs etc. (3–4)

Level 3 – Makes valid inference with reference to source e.g. Could not cope with spiralling cost (quotes costs); resents incomers; should be a national burden, not a local one; the County to appeal etc. (5–6)

**(ii)** Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from source. (1–2)

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from source e.g. Yes, does not cover a full range of policies; still 9 million unemployed; WPA covered only a third of unemployed; no national relief provision and Social Security Act flawed; damage to agricultural workers. No, had implemented major legislation to aid a variety of aspects; still benefiting FDR in terms of popularity; only one effect of AAA. (3–5)

Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from source. Addresses the issue of ‘How far?’ (6–7)

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

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One source is from an American newspaper, the other is from a British school book, so they could both be biased/unreliable. (2)

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

Level 4 – Choice made on 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>Page 7</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2007</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>04</b>

**(b) (i)** One mark for each valid reason to a maximum of two e.g. To build dams to control flooding; generate hydro-electric power; improve agriculture across seven states; provide cheap electricity to modernise farms. (1–2)

**(ii)** Level 1 – Identifies aspects. (1–2)

Level 2 – Develops aspects. Award an extra mark for those described in additional detail.

Huey Long – Confiscation of large fortunes; minimum wages; pension schemes; veteran’s bonuses.

Father Coughlin – State ownership of banks and natural resources; large scale Government spending to create jobs; Mussolini style state structure. (2–4)

**(iii)** Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for the explanation. (1–2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for the reason, one for the reason explained e.g. Some had benefited from the New Deal; effective campaign; Fireside Chats; Republican candidate Landon had no real alternative policy to offer; Huey Long assassinated in 1935 so removed threat of split Democratic vote. Supreme Court opposition seen as Republican/elite sympathy. NB. 1936 (2–6)

**(iv)** Level 1 – Simple assertions. Yes, so many admired FDR. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of success OR lack of success, single factors given e.g.

Yes. Unemployment had fallen considerably from 25% of workforce in 1933; TVA, CCC, WPA, NRA etc had many positive and long-lasting results. Social Security Act a major innovation; given the 1933 base, even partial recovery seemed a major success; confidence increased.

No. 17% still unemployed in '39 – higher than '36 + '37; overseas markets not regained; war finally solved problem; policies had flaws; cut in spending in '37 – increased again in '38 as economy insufficiently restored; freedom compromised. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of success OR failure, with multiple factors. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

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

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument on ‘How successful?’ BOTH sides of success AND lack of success must be addressed. (6–8)

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2007</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>04</b>

**Depth Study D: China, 1945–c.1990.**

- (a) (i)** Level 1 – Repeats material stated in source, no inference made. (1–2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from source e.g. They did not like anything old, Western, different etc. (3–4)

Level 3 – Makes valid inference, supported from source e.g. Believes that Wang’s antiques, clothes etc are junk; tone shows dismissive attitude to older, civilised values etc. (5–6)

- (ii)** Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from source. (1–2)

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from source e.g. Yes, most were upset and able to avoid taking part; ‘saddest thing’ damage to the library etc.

No, some of the students (Red Guards) were taking part in the damage 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 source is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. (1)

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One source is from an ex-Red Guard and the other is from someone who left China, 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>Page 9</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2007</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>04</b>

**(b) (i)** One mark for each valid example to a maximum of two e.g. Lecturers, managers, scientists, intellectuals etc. (1–2)

**(ii)** Level 1 – Identifies elements.  
One mark for each general element to a maximum of two. (1–2)

Level 2 – Describes elements.

Award an extra mark for each valid element described in additional detail e.g. Those arrested by Red Guards were brought before a meeting where they would be harangued, shown error of their previous ways. Humiliation and usually physical damage done to those arrested and their property 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. To keep the revolution on a Marxist-Leninist course. To re-energise the revolution. To divert criticism of the failures of the Great Leap Forward. Right-wingers wanted to develop a class of experts to manage change – called revisionists by Mao. Mao's self-defence etc. (2–6)

**(iv)** Level 1 – Simple assertions.  
Most Chinese did not notice any change. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of improvement OR lack of improvement, single factor given:

Yes. Despite disasters, there was higher food and industrial production. Gone was the old, corrupt GMD government. Women, education, health reforms. More of a feeling of nationhood etc.

No. Disasters, deaths, famines. Failure of the Great Leap Forward and chaos of the Cultural Revolution. CCP riven with rivalries. Corruption and score settling among officials etc. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of improvement OR lack of 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 – Balanced answers that deal with the issue of 'How far?'  
BOTH sides of improvement AND lack of improvement must be addressed. (6–8)

<b>Page 10</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2007</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>04</b>

**Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century.**

- (a) (i)** Level 1 – Repeats material stated in source, no inference made. (1–2)
- Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from source e.g. Believes racial harmony possible as long as black Africans make the rules etc. (3–4)
- Level 3 – Makes valid inference supported from source e.g. Ambitious for black rule; disliked other tactics of other black organisations like ANC and PAC. (5–6)
- (ii)** Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. (1–2)
- Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from source e.g. Yes, approved of their militancy; saw them as future leaders etc. No, they were immature; needed to be coached and persuaded that ANC methods more effective; their exclusively black purpose did not accord with declared aims of ANC etc. (3–5)
- Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from source. Addresses the issue of ‘How far?’ (6–7)
- (iii)** Level 1 – Useful/not useful – Choice made on the basis that one source is more detailed/gives information, but does not specify what information. (1)
- Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One source is from a man on trial and the other is from a man who was in prison so they could both be biased/unreliable. (2)
- Level 3 – Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information. (3–5)
- Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.  
Discussion of utility must be based on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.  
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. (6–7)

<b>Page 11</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2007</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>04</b>

**(b) (i)** Award one mark for each valid example to a maximum of two e.g. Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Kwazulu, Ciskei, Kandebele, Gazankulu, Lebowa, Qwaqwa, Kangwane, Venda. (1–2)

**(ii)** Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. Direct action; Black Power; organised schoolchildren; led marches; opposed drink. (1–2)

Level 2 – Develops aspects e.g. organised children to oppose teaching in Afrikaans; school boycotts – classrooms empty for months; marches to oppose rent rises; persuaded workers to hold one-day strikes; attacked bottle store/beer halls; led riots. (2–4)

**(iii)** Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for the explanation. (1–2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for the reason, one for the reason explained e.g. Government policies on education, replacing urban authorities with local administration board with all costs falling on black residents; overcrowding; rent rises; fear of being 'endorsed out' to homelands; ANC/PAC had less influence; police repression. (2–6)

**(iv)** Level 1 – Simple assertions.  
Yes, the government repressed it. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of failure OR success, single factor given e.g.

Yes. BOSS/police powers and methods; banning orders/detention; SADF attacks on ANC bases in frontline states; assassination of leaders in exile; 1984 Accords with Angola and Mozambique; white support for government increased.

No. Black support continued to increase – UDF; militancy and guerrilla attacks; mobilised youth; AZAPO; major strikes; support from black Africa overseas reactions reduced investment; Botha's commissions to encourage cooperation; job creation and relaxing restrictions; education, increased spending on blacks; state of emergency by '85; Mixed Marriages Act repealed '85 + Pass Laws '86; de Klerk; Sisulu released 1989. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of failure OR success, 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 – Balanced arguments that address the issue of 'How far?'  
BOTH sides of failure AND success must be addressed. (6–8)

<b>Page 12</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2007</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>04</b>

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

- (a) (i)** Level 1 – Repeats material stated in source, no inference made. (1–2)
- Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from source e.g. shows determination to act against an enemy etc. (3–4)
- Level 3 – Makes valid inference supported by source e.g. After international diplomatic pressure failed, determined to act against Israel; tone ‘Go ahead, then’ etc. (5–6)
- (ii)** Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from source. (1–2)
- Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from source e.g. Yes, honourable, proud, active; been across the border, armed etc. No, remain guerrilla attacks, no mention of actual success etc. (3–5)
- Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from source. Addresses the issue of ‘How far?’ (6–7)
- (iii)** 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 – One source is British, the other is from an Al Fatah member 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>Page 13</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2007</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>04</b>

**(b) (i)** Award one mark for each valid example to a maximum of two e.g. Golan Heights, Sinai, West Bank, Jerusalem, some small areas of Syria. (1–2)

**(ii)** Level 1 – Identifies aspects. (1–2)

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in additional detail e.g. Knocked out Egyptian and Jordanian air bases; Attacked Syrian and Iraqi air forces; action in support of Israeli force in Sinai; blitzkrieg effect. (2–4)

**(iii)** Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for explanation. (1–2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons.

One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. Arab alliance. Syria, Jordan, Iraq, Kuwait, plus support from Algeria and Sudan. Anti-Israel and anti-West sentiments. Issues re Arab influence in the region, cultural differences, religious issues, anti GB and USA. Support from superpower USSR with submarines, MiGs, jet bombers, tanks and missiles. Oil issues. (2–6)

**(iv)** Level 1 – Simple assertions. Yes, about the same success in both. (1)

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, single factor given e.g.

Six Day War. Great success. Ignored UN demand to return territory, and created a buffer zone which made Israel easier to defend; much land taken; Nasser humiliated.

BUT Land taken on West Bank and Gaza – now had to rule and control many more people; USSR now to get involved to supply Arabs with weapons; Arabs still want Israel destroyed.

Yom Kippur. Glimmer of permanent peace; Egyptian and Israeli leaders in Geneva; cost to USSR and fears of USA re oil meant superpowers wanted less tension in region; hope for permanent state of Israel; Suez cooperation

BUT Arabs had found a weapon to pressure Israel's main ally, USA. (2)

Level 3 – Agrees OR disagrees, with multiple factors given. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

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

Level 4 – Answers that offer balanced argument and address the issue of 'How far?' BOTH sides of the Six Day War AND the Yom Kippur War must be addressed. (6–8)

<b>Page 14</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2007</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>04</b>

**Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society.**

- (a) (i)** Level 1 – Repeats material stated in source, no inference made. (1–2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from source e.g. mechanisation had improved the efficiency in the textile industry etc. (3–4)

Level 3 – Makes valid inference, with reference to the source e.g. Steam power had improved the efficiency of the cotton spinning industry, quotes examples of statistics in source etc. (5–6)

- (ii)** Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from source. (1–2)

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from source e.g. Yes, details of the deterioration of family life (esp. Source B). No, wages treated with care could provide 'decent comforts of life' (Source C) 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 source is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. (1)

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – A is from an old book, B is from a person we do not know and C is from an old pamphlet so they could all 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 responsibility.

Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A, B and C to show reliability.

6 marks for one source, 7 marks for more than one source. (6–7)

<b>Page 15</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2007</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>04</b>

**(b) (i)** One mark for each valid example to a maximum of two e.g. Spinning Jenny; Crompton's Mule; power looms; steam engines etc. (1–2)

**(ii)** Level 1 – Identifies problems e.g. Flooding, gas, rock fall etc. (1–2)

Level 2 – Describes problems. Award an extra mark for details described in additional detail e.g. Types of flooding, types of gas, depth and raising of coal, transportation underground, geological faults, types of mine etc. (2–4)

**(iii)** Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for the reason explained. (1–2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. Availability of raw materials and labour; Inventions; Entrepreneurial outlook; ease of transport in fairly small country – rivers, large coastline, canals; capital available; captive overseas market; Europe badly affected by wars – economy mainly agricultural – difficulties of transport – many small countries without material or financial clout.etc.(2–6)

**(iv)** Level 1 – Simple assertions. Both, they are inter-linked. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of legislation OR individuals single factor given e.g.

Laws. Expect a variety of acts but especially the Factory Act of 1833, the Mines Act of 1842, the 10 Hour Act 1847. However, there were many smaller acts throughout the century which extended, refined or simplified legislation – all indicating that individuals and lawmakers realised that the people need protection.

Individuals. Much detail on Robert Owen, Sir Robert Peel, John Fielden (10 Hour Movement) and Lord Shaftesbury can be expected but these are famous individuals among many. Each individual and law was almost immediately out of date as technology changed manufacture and society realised that old and new practices needed laws to protect the workers. (2)

Level 3 – Agrees OR disagrees, with multiple factors given. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

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

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument and address the issue of 'How far?' BOTH sides of laws AND individuals must be addressed. (6–8)

<b>Page 16</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2007</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>04</b>

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

- (a) (i)** Level 1 – Repeats material seen in the source. (1–2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from source e.g. The source shows that the work of missionaries makes non-Europeans happier etc. (3–4)

Level 3 – Makes valid inference, with reference to the source e.g. The introduction of Christianity, the Western clothing and hairstyle appears to make the woman from New Guinea happier and more civilised etc. (5–6)

- (ii)** Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from source. (1–2)

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from source e.g. Yes, Comments in B about the savage and ignorant peoples; the right of civilised people to spread around the world. No, implicit message of second paragraph of B that civilised people should share and educate those who are less fortunate. (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 source is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. (1)

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – A is a picture, B is from a Frenchman and C is from a novelist so they could all 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, B and C to show reliability.  
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for more than one source. (6–7)



<b>Page 17</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2007</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>04</b>

**(b) (i)** One mark for each valid example to a maximum of two e.g. Disraeli, J. Chamberlain. Allow Palmerston and Rhodes. (1–2)

**(ii)** Level 1 – Identifies aims. (1–2)

Level 2 – Develops aims. Award an extra mark for each valid aim described in additional detail e.g. To convert, enlighten, improve indigenous peoples by the use of religion, education, medicine, administration and advice. Expect detail of different areas. White Man’s Burden. In the wake of trade and conquest etc. (2–4)

**(iii)** Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for explanation. (1–2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for the each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. Desire; sea-faring nation aided development of trade and exploration. Ambition – political, economic and social. Strength of navy and general military power. Had footholds from previous century. Comparative weakness of European rivals. Vulnerability of peoples being acquired etc. (2–6)

**(iv)** Level 1 – Simple assertions. Yes, they needed all the help they could get. (1)

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, single factor given e.g.

Yes. Help with education, medicine, administration, defence – expect many examples.

No. Destroyed many viable civilisations. Introduced Western values, systems, clothing, religion. Despoiled lands and cultures etc. (2)

Level 3 – Agrees OR disagrees, with multiple factors given. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

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

Level 4 – Balanced answers that address the issue of ‘How far?’ BOTH sides of bringing civilisation AND destroying civilisations must be addressed. (6–8)