UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2006 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 students, 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.

The grade thresholds for various grades are published in the report on the examination for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses.

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2006 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

UNIVERSITY of CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

This Paper is marked out of a maximum of 40 marks. Candidates must choose ONE Depth Study to attempt. Questions and Marking Schemes for each Depth Study have been developed to follow a pattern. In every case, part (a) questions concentrate on source material provided in the Paper and are worth a total of 20 marks. Part (b) questions deal with subject matter closely related to the source material and also have a total value of 20 marks. Whilst marking schemes are based on the same model, they have been printed separately to allow exemplars of skill and information levels which candidates may use. These exemplars are not intended to be exclusive or exhaustive.

All marking should be undertaken in red ink and when a candidate reaches his/her highest Level, that Level should be recorded in the right hand margin of the script (e.g. L2). After this you must decide the mark to be awarded from those available for that Level and record it next to the Level given (e.g. L2/4). Always mark positively and never deduct marks. Ignore errors but indicate you have spotted them by circling. Be prepared to underline key phrases or ideas to help with your evaluation of answers. When in doubt always opt for the higher mark. If candidates attempt more than one question please mark them all but only record the best mark on the front of the script. Write "Rubric Offence" on the front of the script next to the mark given.

If you have any doubts or queries whatsoever please contact your team leader.

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918 – 1945.

(a)	**(i)**	Level 1	Repeats material stated in source, no inference made.	**[1 – 2]**
		Level 2	Makes valid inferences, not supported from source e.g. They were disappointed by the outcome of the Conference etc.	**[3 – 4]**
		Level 3	Supports valid inference(s) with reference to the source e.g. They went in a spirit of compromise and good sense but made bad mistakes in spite of this etc.	**[5 – 6]**
	(ii)	Level 1	Agrees OR disagrees with no support from the source.	**[1 – 2]**
		Level 2	Agrees OR disagrees, supported from the source e.g. Yes, horror, outrage and anger, felt the treaty being imposed. No, did not fully understand Germany's military situation, misunderstood the ceasefire arrangements 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 – Both sources are British so they could both be biased/unreliable	**[2]**
		Level 3	Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information.	**[3 – 5]**
		Level 4	Choice made on the grounds of reliability. Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability. 6 marks for one source 7 marks for both.	**[6 – 7]**

(b) (i) One mark for each valid power to a maximum of two e.g. Head of State; Commander-in Chief; emergency powers to suspend individual rights and take measures as necessary; appoint Chancellor etc. Allow Article 48. **[1 – 2]**

(ii) Level 1 Identifies revolt. Socialist revolt in Berlin. **[1 – 2]**

Level 2 Describes revolt. Award an extra mark for each valid factor described in additional detail e.g. Soviet-style rising to create a socialist Germany; prepared to use force; occupation of key Berlin buildings; regular army unsure about putting down revolution – Freikorps did the job; contributions and fates of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg 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. Inflationary problems existed before the invasion of the Ruhr by French and Belgian troop to secure reparations. Cost of war and loss of confidence in economy. Passive Resistance by workers saw the government trying to pay workers on strike. Printed money on a massive scale – unsupportable either by reserves or income from Ruhr production etc. **[2 – 6]**

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions.
Yes, everyone got richer. **[1]**

Level 2 Explanation of effectiveness OR lack of effectiveness, single factor given:

Yes: Economic improvements – American loans, new currency, called off Passive Resistance, restarted reparations, improving employment; allow foreign policy initiatives which saw Germany again seen as trustworthy.
No: Actions caused tensions with the extreme Right and Left; economic measures too heavily reliant on foreign loans; inherent weakness of Weimar constitution in the face of a world economic downturn. **[2]**

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

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905 – 1941.

(a)	**(i)**	Level 1	Repeats material stated in source, no inference made.	**[1 – 2]**
		Level 2	Makes valid inferences, not supported from source e.g. Trotsky was over-confident etc.	**[3 – 4]**
		Level 3	Makes valid inference(s) with reference to the source e.g. Underestimated Stalin and thought him a joke etc.	**[5 – 6]**
	(ii)	Level 1	Agrees OR disagrees, with no support from source e.g. Lenin always believed Trotsky should succeed him etc.	**[1 – 2]**
		Level 2	Agrees OR disagrees, supported from source e.g. Yes, Stalin incautious, Trotsky 'most capable man' etc. No, Stalin has unlimited authority, Trotsky preoccupied with administration 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 Marxist and the other is from Lenin so they could both be biased/unreliable.	**[2]**
		Level 3	Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information.	**[3 – 5]**
		Level 4	Choice made on the grounds of reliability. Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability. 6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both.	**[6 – 7]**

(b) (i) One mark for each valid element to a maximum of two e.g. Prison/labour camps; extremes of temperature; harsh discipline; shortages in food and often in life expectancy etc. **[1 – 2]**

(ii) Level 1 Identifies policy. Stalin's policy for Communism in the short term. **[1 – 2]**

Level 2 Develops policy. Stalin believed that there was a need to establish Communism in USSR before exporting it. Trotsky wanted to foster an immediate world-wide revolution. Part of the leadership contest strategy. **[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. paranoid distrust of Old Guard, the Army, intellectuals, managers etc. He feared anyone he imagined might overthrow him. 'Pour encourager les autres?' **[2 – 6]**

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions.
Yes, everyone benefited. **[1]**

Level 2 Explanation of benefit OR lack of benefit, single factor given e.g.
Benefit: Became world power, second only to USA in heavy goods production, low unemployment, regular pay, average harvests, able to defend against Germany etc.
Lack: Economy centrally directed, little incentive, punishments, few consumer goods, criticism discouraged, food often in short supply, censorship, propaganda and terror etc.
NB. Accept as valid observations regarding different treatments and experiences of different 'peoples' in the USSR. **[2]**

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

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919 – 1941.

(a)	**(i)**	Level 1	Repeats material seen in the source, no inference made.	**[1 – 2]**
		Level 2	Makes valid inference, not supported from source e.g. They are enemies, Democrats are damaged etc.	**[3 – 4]**
		Level 3	Supports valid inference(s) with reference to the source e.g. A barrier between them, hurt Democrats as donkey is bandaged, the Supreme Court is like a ghost haunting FDR etc.	**[5 – 6]**
	(ii)	Level 1	Agrees OR disagrees with no support from source.	**[1 – 2]**
		Level 2	Agrees OR disagrees, supported from source e.g. Yes, controlled Louisiana, developed popular economic schemes, could have challenged FDR etc. No, one state only, 7 million supporters big but not enough to win, not popular with the rich 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 specify what information.	**[1]**
		Level 2	Useful/not useful - One is a cartoon, the other is American so they could both be biased/unreliable.	**[2]**
		Level 3	Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information.	**[3 – 5]**
		Level 4	Choice made on the grounds of reliability. Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability. 6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both.	**[6 – 7]**

(b) (i) One mark for each valid policy to a maximum of two e.g. The NRA, AAA. **[1 – 2]**

(ii) Level 1 Identifies plan. To secure more co-operative Supreme Court. **[1 – 2]**

Level 2 Develops plan. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect of the plan described in additional detail e.g. To appoint judges more co-operative to FDR; encourage judges to retire at 70 – if they refused, the President to have the right to appoint up to 15 more judges; Congress refused this power but the Supreme Court gave no more rulings against FDR. **[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. Bowing to the pressure from big business; belief that the recovery was under way – number of unemployed had fallen to 7.7m; index of manufacturing output rising; frightening cost of relief and unbalanced budgets etc. **[2 – 6]**

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions.
Yes, policies were compulsory. No, measures temporary. **[1]**

Level 2 Explanation of attacks OR other purposes, single factor given e.g.
Attack: Over-rode state rights with policies such as TVA, NRA; obliged employers/ees to pay social security; tax payers felt attacked.
Other: Policies were emergency, short-term measures. Democrats were as opposed to socialism as Republicans.
NB. Allow comments that some felt that the 'attacks' did not go far enough. **[2]**

Level 3 Explanation of attacks OR other purposes, 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 attacks AND other purposes must be addressed. **[6 – 8]**

Depth Study D: China, 1945 – c.1990.

(a)	**(i)**	Level 1	Repeats material seen in source, no inference made.	**[1 – 2]**
		Level 2	Makes valid inferences, not supported from source e.g. They actively supported the Red Army etc.	**[3 – 4]**
		Level 3	Makes valid inference(s) with reference to source e.g. They aided the Red Army by helping them with telephone wires, capturing airmen etc.	**[5 – 6]**
	(ii)	Level 1	Agrees OR disagrees with no source support	**[1 – 2]**
		Level 2	Agrees OR disagrees, supported from source e.g. Yes, The Prime Minister said so; the garrison commander's intentions. No, evacuations; PM and government had fled; appeal of leading citizens.	**[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, the other is 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]**

(b) (i) One mark for each valid element to a maximum of two e.g. Naval protection, arms, money, advisers. Equipment, diplomatic support etc. **[1 – 2]**

(ii) Level 1 Identifies elements. Home for Nationalists after Civil War defeat. **[1 – 2]**

Level 2 Describes elements. Award an extra mark for additional description of each valid element e.g. A base from which to continue the ideological struggle; different economic policies; thorn in the side of communist China; seat on Security Council at UNO 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. Character of Jiang Jieshi, corruption of regime, behaviour of KMT troop (as compared to CCP troops' behaviour); failure to oust Japanese; land issues important to peasants; brilliance and success of Red Army commanders etc. **[2 – 6]**

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions.
Yes, land was at the front of everyone's thoughts. **[1]**

Level 2 Explanation of land issue OR other issues, single factor given e.g.
Land: Needed to sort this out to retain peasant support; peasant oppression by landlords; need to boost food production to end shortages; full stomachs help to reduce political opposition etc.
Other: Country in a terrible state after war; need to get industry moving; transport system destroyed; leaking waterways; currency; establish law and order; establish new government, social legislation etc. **[2]**

Level 3 Explanation of land issue OR other issues 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 land issues AND other issues must be addressed. **[6 – 8]**

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 inferences, not supported from source e.g. It was dangerous, people died or were injured etc.	**[3 – 4]**
		Level 3	Makes valid inference(s) with reference to source e.g. Quantifies difference in pay between races, detail the dangers and compensation etc.	**[5 – 6]**
	(ii)	Level 1	Agrees OR disagrees with no support from source.	**[1 – 2]**
		Level 2	Agrees OR disagrees, supported from source e.g. Yes, brought industry to standstill; united to hold a 2-month strike; government sufficiently worried to use troops etc. No, defeated by force; could not protect against job losses and pay cuts; source only gives one example of action	**[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 British, the other is of memories so they could both be biased/unreliable.	**[2]**
		Level 3	Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information.	**[3 – 5]**
		Level 4	Choice made on the grounds of reliability. Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability. 6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both.	**[6 – 7]**

(b) (i) One mark for each valid example to a maximum of two e.g. South African Party (Smuts); the National Party (Hertzog); the South African Labour Party. **[1 – 2]**

(ii) Level 1 Identifies aspects. Afrikaner nationalist organisation. Self-help. **[1 – 2]**

Level 2 Develops aspects. Award an extra mark for each aspect developed with additional detail e.g. Founded in 1918 by H J Klopper; secret society from 1921; stood for racial purity and cultural identity – founded Afrikaans equivalent of Scouts, Students' Union. Members to be white, male, Afrikaans speakers. Dutch Reformed Church, financially sound; many members were teachers; also Dr Malan. **[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 the reason explained e.g. Fragmented. ANC, small, peaceful persuasion of whites; leaders were of professional groups; most black groups of 20s divided, poorly run e.g. Industrial and Commercial Workers' Union – did not recruit black Rand miners. Pass laws. 1927-30 – government repression against meetings and movement, force against strikers. Influence of Church. **[2 – 6]**

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions. Yes, better wages but whites did better. **[1]**

Level 2 Explanation of benefit OR lack of benefit, single factors given e.g.
Yes: Much more work in mining and manufacturing; Depression over quickly, demand for gold/diamonds increased; increase during WWII when wages rose for all races; poor whites get jobs; better conditions; black workers did better than anywhere else in Africa etc.
No: Agriculture fell behind; machinery cut jobs; drought and starvation 1942-3; blacks still earned less and job colour bar (only relaxed during war) meant low skilled work only available; recruiting foreign workers kept wages down in mining; overall, wages fell 10% for blacks, rose 10% for whites. **[2]**

Level 3 Explanation of benefit OR lack of benefit with multiple factors given. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.
OR Undeveloped suggestion on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). **[3 – 5]**

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

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

(a)	**(i)**	Level 1	Repeats material stated in source, no inference made.	**[1 – 2]**
		Level 2	Makes valid inferences, not supported from source e.g. Every Arab hated him etc.	**[3 – 4]**
		Level 3	Supports valid inference(s) with reference to the source e.g. Hatred of his actions unified Arab countries and Palestinian movement, and ultimately led to his death. This caused celebration throughout the Arab world etc.	**[5 – 6]**
	(ii)	Level 1	Agrees OR disagrees, with no support from source.	**[1 – 2]**
		Level 2	Agrees OR disagrees, supported from source e.g. Yes, Sadat and Carter appear happy and content with the success. No, Begin is pretending – ink. Allow comments on provenance.	**[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 British and the other is a cartoon so they could both be biased/unreliable.	**[2]**
		Level 3	Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information.	**[3 – 5]**
		Level 4	Choice made on the grounds of reliability. Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability. 6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both.	**[6 – 7]**

(b) **(i)** One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. Presidential retreat, often used for delicate discussions with foreign leaders or delegations etc. **[1 – 2]**

(ii) Level 1 Identifies elements. Framework for peace between Israel and Egypt. **[1 – 2]**

Level 2 Describes elements - Award an extra mark for each element described in additional detail e.g. 5-year plan for gradual withdrawal of Israel from Gaza and West Bank; withdrawal of Israeli troops from Sinai within 2/3 years; Israel granted free passage through Suez Canal and Straits of Tiran. **[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. Domestic disputes at home required Sadat's attention and time. Money needed to be spent domestically rather than on conflict. Unrealistic expectations of military success against Israel; fear of Israel; wanted his territories back etc. **[2 – 6]**

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions.
Yes, Camp David Agreements helped. **[1]**

Level 2 Explanation of help OR lack of help, single factor given e.g.
Help: USA very influential superpower; influence on and financial, economic and military aid enabled Israel to survive. A balance against Soviet influence with Arabs; a balance of seeking an agreement but offering Israel security.
Lack: US policies appeared to be appeasement to Jewish lobby in America; distrusted by Arab states and USSR; appeared to be above UN or make UN appear to be a US agency. Appeared at times to enable Israel to ignore UN resolutions etc. **[2]**

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

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 inferences, not supported from source e.g. Railways opened a whole new world to the poor etc.	**[3 – 4]**
		Level 3	Supports valid inference(s) with reference to the source e.g. It forced all classes to make contact, talk and improved understanding etc. Inferences from language -'humbler classes' - should be rewarded.	**[5 – 6]**
	(ii)	Level 1	Agrees OR disagrees with no support from the source.	**[1 – 2]**
		Level 2	Agrees OR disagrees, supported from source e.g. Yes, all classes are on a train going to a sporting and social event; fresh air and large numbers etc. No, they are segregated (although you cannot prove there are no upper class people in 3rd Class carriages and vice-versa); behaviour in 3rd hardly qualifies as 'social improvement'; contrast in attitude and body language 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 article in one magazine, the other is an illustration from a magazine so they could both be biased/unreliable.	**[2]**
		Level 3	Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information given.	**[3 – 5]**
		Level 4	Choice made on the grounds of reliability. Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability. 6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both.	**[6 – 7]**

(b) (i) One mark for each correct name e.g. (a) George Stephenson and (b) I K Brunel. **[1 – 2]**

(ii) Level 1 Identifies general purpose. To use railways to benefit the working man. **[1 – 2]**

Level 2 Develops purpose – Award an extra mark for each general point described in additional detail e.g. An attempt by Parliament (Gladstone at the Board of Trade) to regulate railways so there were benefits for working men – at least one train each day over the length of track at a fixed rate fare per mile. **[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. The law demanded it. Each railway needed parliamentary approval and, to judge its suitability, its aims, routes and 'business plan' had to be outlined in a prospectus. Also used to raise funds, but equally used at times as the basis of opposition. **[2 – 6]**

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions.
Yes, there were railways throughout industrial areas. **[1]**

Level 2 Explanation of growth of railways OR lack of growth of roads and canals, single factor given.
Railways: Speed, load, diversity of use. Rail companies bought up canal routes. Seems an obvious answer. Reward candidates who discuss the needs of industry in this context.
Canals & roads: Some canals survived carrying bulky loads where speed was not an issue, and silly to waste a network that was constructed especially to meet industrial needs. Long distance road travel suffered – speed, cost, comfort, safety. But roads at rail terminals remained, increased and improved to carry goods and people to final destinations. **[2]**

Level 3 Explanation of growth of railways OR lack of growth of canals and roads 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 the growth of railways AND the lack of growth of canals and roads must be addressed. **[6 – 8]**

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

(a)	**(i)**	Level 1	Repeats material stated in source, no inference made.	**[1 – 2]**
		Level 2	Makes valid inferences, not supported from source e.g. Surrounded but determined to compete etc.	**[3 – 4]**
		Level 3	Supports valid inference(s) with reference to the source e.g. Powerful enemies should not be seen as frightening but as a stimulus to compete with and beat Western countries etc.	**[5 – 6]**
	(ii)	Level 1	Agrees OR disagrees with no support from sources.	**[1 – 2]**
		Level 2	Agrees OR disagrees, supported from sources e.g. Yes, four major powers are seen as putting China 'in peril' (Source C). No, the photo in Source B shows educational/exchange links with USA.	**[3 – 5]**
		Level 3	Agrees AND disagrees, supported from sources. 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 – Source A is Chinese, Source B is a photograph and Source C is Chinese again so they could all be biased/staged/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) **(i)** One mark for each valid example to a maximum of two e.g. Great Britain, France, USA, Russia, Germany etc. **[1 – 2]**

(ii) Level 1 Identifies results. China weakened, Japan strengthened. **[1 – 2]**

Level 2 China seriously undermined, Japan now a major power in East. Treaty terms were not upheld by European countries. Japan resented lack of recognition, China resented lack of outside support 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. Trade, ports of call, spread Christianity, imperialism, status, raw materials, markets etc. Reward specific examples. **[2 – 6]**

(iv) Level 1 General assertions.
No, the Chinese were exploited. **[1]**

Level 2 Explanation of good OR not good, single factor given e.g.
Good: From a late nineteenth and early twentieth century European standpoint it would be seen as good, bring China into contact with 'superior' countries, cultures, law etc. Even some Chinese wanted the involvement as a means of progressing China – sparked revolutionary movements in early twentieth century.
Not good: Even Chinese supporters resented the dominance of Western powers. Problems with culture, religion, customs, history - Boxer Rebellion. Today, Europeans may well differ from earlier European views. Reward specific examples. **[2]**

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