

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME for the November 2005 question paper

HISTORY

0470/04 (Alternative to Coursework)

Paper 4

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 initially instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began. Any substantial changes to the mark scheme that arose from these discussions will be recorded in the published *Report on the Examination*.

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 minimum marks in these components needed for various grades were previously published with these mark schemes, but are now instead included in the *Report on the Examination* for this session.

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the November 2005 question papers for most IGCSE and GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

Page 1	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – November 2005	0470	A

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.

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918 – 1945.

- | | | | |
|----------------|---------|--|---------|
| (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. the event is clouded in mystery etc. | [3 – 4] |
| | Level 3 | Makes valid inferences, supported from source e.g. this may be cold-blooded murder as no evidence of a conspiracy has yet been produced etc. | [5 – 6] |
| (ii) | Level 1 | Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from source | [1 – 2] |
| | Level 2 | Agrees OR disagrees, supported from the source e.g. yes, there was the Rohm/Schleicher plan. No, no opposition to Hitler's orders to deal with the alleged conspirators; dangerous to be in opposition 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 source is British, the other is from Hitler 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]

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – November 2005	0470	A

- (b) (i) One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. no parties, no freedom, no democracy, total allegiance to Fuhrer, state comes first etc. [1 – 2]
- (ii) Level 1 Identifies aspects e.g. Nazi rally, bringing all members together. [1 – 2]
- Level 2 Develops aspects e.g. pride and power, propaganda tool, to announce policy, to keep the faithful informed, under control etc. [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. needed a body of support for the future, influenced them at school and in Hitler Youth etc; they spied on parents, teachers; soldiers and mothers of the future; to keep the movement going etc. [2 -6]
- (iv) Level 1 Simple assertions.
No, they used violence. [1]
- Level 2 Explanation of lawful OR unlawful methods, single factor given.
Yes, appointment as Chancellor, Enabling Law, death of Hindenburg.
No, Reichstag Fire?; threats and violence; Night of the Long Knives etc. [2]
- Level 3 Explanation of lawful OR unlawful methods, 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 lawful AND unlawful methods must be addressed. [6 – 8]

N.B. Note the dates for this question.

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. many were hurt etc. [3 – 4]
- Level 3 Makes valid inferences, with reference to the source e.g. shock at the realisation that the Tsar was responsible; future change inevitable etc. [5 – 6]
- (ii) Level 1 Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from source. [1 - 2]
- Level 2 Agrees OR disagrees, supported from the source e.g. Yes, painful day, how sad, acknowledges casualties. No, events linked in with trivial family diary. [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 source is from Father Gapon, the other is from the Tsar 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]

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – November 2005	0470	A

- (b) (i) Award one mark for each valid example to a maximum of two e.g. Bolsheviks, Mensheviks (Social Democrats), Social Revolutionaries, Nihilists etc. [1 – 2]
- (ii) Level 1 Identifies elements e.g. Defeat in war, working conditions, poverty, no voice etc. [1 – 2]
- Level 2 Develops elements. Award an extra mark for each point that is developed further or put into context. [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. retained the support of the Army and Okhrana, October Manifesto, no unified leadership among opponents, some fled into exile, promises etc. [2 – 6]
- (iv) Level 1 Simple assertions. Yes, they all wanted to fight for him. [1]
- Level 2 Explanation of loyalty OR lack of loyalty, single factor given e.g. Yes, early popularity of the war, Stolypin's reforms, military and bureaucracy on his side, unified against a common enemy etc. No, the reforms were not overly successful, Stolypin's 'necktie'. Tsar implicated in Stolypin's death; old problems of land, hunger, living and working conditions still there; lack of voice; revolutionaries in exile, still criticism at home. [2]
- Level 3 Explanation of loyalty OR lack of loyalty, 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 loyalty AND lack of loyalty must be addressed. [6 – 8]

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 inferences, not supported from the source e.g. new industries saw spectacular growth; increased demand created jobs etc. [3 – 4]
- Level 3 Makes valid inference(s), supported from source e.g. trebling of car ownership; massive increase in communications – radio and telephone; Membership of Trades Unions down by 33% meant workers felt more secure? [5 – 6]
- (ii) Level 1 Agrees OR disagrees with no support from source. [1 – 2]
- Level 2 Agrees OR disagrees, supported from the source e.g. yes, jobs; better wages; business profited, more goods available. No, wages had not kept pace with profiteers; could not afford new luxuries; omits major groups who did not benefit; danger for future – “reckless speculation”. [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 source is statistics, 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 mark for one source, 7 marks for both. [6 – 7]

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – November 2005	0470	A

- (b) (i) Award one mark for each valid development to a maximum of two e.g. Concentration in Hollywood; 'stars'; 'talkies'; increase in number of cinemas. [1 – 2]
- (ii) Level 1 Identifies effects e.g. more spending; more debt. [1 – 2]
- Level 2 Develops effects e.g. stimulated manufacture of consumer goods; increasing personal debt; development of the 'credit' industry; 'never-never' overconfidence; fuelled speculation and buying 'on the margin'; mortgages. [2 – 4]
- (iii) Level 1 A 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. overproduction; falling prices, especially cotton and corn; tariffs; foreign competition especially Canada and Europe; debt/mortgages. [2 – 6]
- (iv) Level 1 Simple assertions
Yes, there were more jobs and goods. [1]
- Level 2 Explanation of success OR failure, single factor given e.g.
Yes, markets continued to expand for cars/consumer goods; building boom; electricity and mass production improved efficiency and lowered costs; industrial production doubled 1919-29; US most powerful economy; no Government interference; protection; Unions weaker; major creditor nation.
No, tariff war; farms; unequal distribution of wealth – 1926 5% receiving 30% of personal income; insufficient purchasing power; overproduction; older industries suffering; unemployment – no national insurance; personal debt; weaknesses in banking system; personal debt. [2]
- Level 3 Explanation of success OR failure, 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 success AND failure 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, unsupported from source e.g. huge undertaking, very difficult task etc. [3 – 4]
- Level 3 Makes valid inference(s), with reference to the source e.g. from the host of workers, it is labour intensive; from the simple tools, machines are lacking; from the smiles, they appear enthusiastic etc. [5 – 6]
- (ii) Level 1 Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from source. [1 – 2]
- Level 2 Agrees OR disagrees, supported from the source e.g. Yes, it says so, and the planned increases are too ambitious. No, admits common sense 1949 – 1957; provenance 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 a photograph, the other is a Soviet publication 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 – 8]

- (b) (i) One for the concept, one for development to a maximum of two e.g. larger unit than collectives to organise work, local government. Up to 75 000, agriculture and industry, special projects. Schools, crèches, hospitals etc. [1 – 2]
- (ii) Level 1 Identifies elements e.g. an invitation to appeal to intellectuals. [1 – 2]
- Level 2 Develops elements e.g. pleased with progress to 1957, the Government invited constructive criticism to improve relations between the Party cadres and intellectuals. More criticism than expected so the campaign was called off. Some said it was Mao's way of uncovering opponents. [2 – 4]
- (iii) Level 1 A 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. inexperienced managers, small scale steel furnaces, bad harvests, withdrawal of Soviet support, lack of technology etc. [2 – 6]
- (iv) Level 1 Simple assertions
Yes, food production rose. [1]
- Level 2 Explanation of improvement OR lack of improvement, single factor given e.g.
Yes, despite setbacks, food and industrial production rose; improvements for women and other social reforms; reform of land system; a national, unified government system etc.
No, most Chinese still very poor; incompetence and cliquishness in the Party; numbers who had died in upheavals; famines; business/landowners lost 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 Answers that address the issue of “How far?”
BOTH sides of improvement AND lack of improvement 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. they want equal treatment urgently etc.	[3 – 4]
	Level 3	Makes valid inference(s), with reference to the source e.g. Boesak shows link between Church and UDF; immediate (NOW) changes needed 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, shows he was willing to relax apartheid laws, make whites pay for reforms, even risked splitting the party. No, only granted limited franchise, not willing to extend it to black majority, only relaxed worst aspects of apartheid laws; wanted to divide opposition; appeal to black middle class.	[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 from a member of the United Democratic Front, the other is from an Afrikaner, so both could be biased/unreliable.	[2]
	Level 3	Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information.	[3 – 5]
	Level 4	Choice made on the grounds of reliability. Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability. 6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both.	[6 – 7]

- (b) (i) Award one mark for each valid group to a maximum of two e.g. State President chosen by Electoral College of 50 members of the House of Assembly (white), 25 members of the House of Representatives (Coloureds), and 13 members of the House of Delegates (Indian). [1 – 2]
- (ii) Level 1 Identifies actions e.g. provided camps and weapons. [1 – 2]
- Level 2 Develops actions e.g. Angola provided guerrilla training bases/refuge for exiled ANC supporters. Mozambique a base for ANC to attack SA; both provided weapons e.g. rockets; as Marxist governments they had Russian finance for ANC – SA's stated view. [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 the reason explained e.g. violence between blacks becoming uncontrollable; State of Emergency not effective; Botha's 'Crossing the Rubicon' speech; B and M in negotiation; Russia's decline made ANC less suspect; 1989 election results; de Klerk's 'calling from God'; to use Mandela's reputation; to play off ANC and Inkatha. [2 – 6]
- (iv) Level 1 Simple assertions. Yes, there was a ban on trade. [1]
- Level 2 Explanation of external OR internal pressure, single factor given. Yes, UN economic sanctions; USSR/some African states supporting ANC; international campaigns for Mandela's release; USA + EEC sanctions 1985; falling international markets and falling gold price weakened economy. No, Pressure from black/Indian groups; increasing violence; Church support against apartheid; National Party losing white support for apartheid; Conservative Party support limited; Botha and de Klerk negotiate with ANC; Joe Slovo compromise suggestion. [2]
- Level 3 Explanation of external OR internal pressure 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 if external AND internal pressure 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, unsupported from source
 e.g. they are very serious etc. [3 – 4]
- Level 3 Supports valid inference(s) with reference to the
 source e.g. impatient for action and for end of
 talking; regaining ‘their land’ vital to Egypt 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, both superpowers had supplied arms, and
 nearly became ‘directly involved’.
 No, implies client states did the fighting;
 Superpowers backed away from nuclear war; Arab
 use of oil weapon. [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 from Sadat, 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]

- (b) (i) Award one mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. Day of Atonement, the most holy day of prayer and fasting in the Jewish religious calendar etc. [1 – 2]
- (ii) Level 1 Identifies actions e.g. met and decided to cut oil production and supplies etc. [1 – 2]
- Level 2 Develops actions e.g. brought pressure on USA and European countries, friendly to Israel. Oil shortages caused price rises. OPEC then decided to raise prices again. Caused inflation and an energy crisis among the world's industrial countries. [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 the reason explained e.g. attacked on Yom Kippur, Israelis otherwise engaged; Russian tanks and amphibious equipment with surface to air missiles gave Egypt an edge; airfields better protected by Migs; better trained and disciplined troops; Arab leaders were cooperating. [2 – 6]
- (iv) Level 1 Simple assertions.
No, the Israelis are very good fighters. [1]
- Level 2 Agrees OR disagrees, single factor given e.g. Yes, strong Jewish lobby in USA would influence US government to supply arms, give financial and economic support, promote the Israeli case on world stage; put pressure on the UN.
No, Israel had shown before that she could fight alone; government policy to maintain the state of Israel against all threats; USA and Russia joined UN to set up cease fire; Camp David outcome? [2]
- Level 3 Agrees OR disagrees, 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 Agrees OR disagrees, with multiple factors given. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.
OR Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). [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, unsupported from source e.g. it was all very disgusting and degrading etc. [3 – 4]
- Level 3 Supports valid inference(s) with reference to the source e.g. insanitary because of damage and decay in buildings; shortage of toilet facilities; comparison with life of pigs 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, some had flushing toilets, cesspits and sewers provided. No, human waste sometimes found its way into the water supply of the population; only mentions middle-class benefits 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 than the others, but does not specify what information. [1]
- Level 2 Useful/not useful – Source A is from a socialist writer, B is from a history textbook and C is a picture 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) (i) Award one mark for each valid example to a maximum of two e.g. Spinning Jenny, Mule, Power Loom, steam engine etc. [1 – 2]
- (ii) Level 1 Identifies difference e.g. domestic on a family scale, at home; factory on large scale in purpose built factories. [1 – 2]
- Level 2 Develops differences e.g. by location, power source, tools and machines, limitations etc. [2 – 4]

(iii)	Level 1	A 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. expansion – growth of industry; near raw materials, power sources; near transport; workers attracted to jobs; ports etc. Lack of expansion – traditional industries; centres of agricultural counties; losing population to industry etc.	[2 – 6]
(iv)	Level 1	Simple assertions. No, more people living closer together means more births.	[1]
	Level 2	Agrees OR disagrees, single factor given e.g. Yes, reports and reforms throughout the century improved the lot of the population. Public Health acts, reforms of local government, from Public Baths Act to Artisans Dwellings Act all improved things. Reward detail of acts and outcomes. No, impact of better diet, better clothing, better housing materials, knowledge of disease and prevention all had an impact as well.	[2]
	Level 3	Agrees OR disagrees, 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 agreement AND disagreement 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, unsupported from the source e.g. it appeared to be much less self-centred etc.	[3 – 4]
	Level 3	Supports valid inference(s), with reference to the source e.g. Britain tried to maintain stability and invested in the Indian economy as well as trying to foster good relations to the benefit of all Indian citizens.	[5 – 6]

- www.PapaCambridge.com
- (ii) Level 1 Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from source. [1 – 2]
- Level 2 Agrees OR disagrees, supported from source e.g. Yes, Source B suggests that Indians were still a threat by their manners, and should be treated firmly. [3 – 5]
- No, Source C suggests that Indians were grateful that they could speak openly without fear. [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 than the others, but does not specify what information. [1]
- Level 2 Useful/not useful – Source A is from a history book, B is from a British army officer and C is from an Indian 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 ground 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) Award one mark for each valid viceroy to a maximum of two e.g. most prominent were Lord Canning (1856-62); Sir John Lawrence (1864-69); Lord Lytton (1876-80); Lord Ripon (1880-84); Lord Curzon (1899-1905). [1 – 2]
- (ii) Level 1 Identifies changes e.g. Government, control etc. [1 – 2]
- Level 2 Develops changes e.g. India now under Crown with a Viceroy; Secretary for India in Great Britain. Viceroy’s Cabinet, Council of India. Princes acknowledge supremacy of Queen (Empress) and Viceroy; accepted advice of resident British ministers; external relations controlled by Great Britain. British India ruled directly through civil service. [2 – 4]

Page 16	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – November 2005	0470	A

(iii)	Level 1	A 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. learned from mistakes. Reform of army, tighter control, better government, less attempt to impose Christianity. Conditions for many Indians improved although there was still much discontent and subdued nationalism, but the army was never in doubt again.	[2 – 6]
(iv)	Level 1	Simple assertions. Yes, everyone got on better.	[1]
	Level 2	Explanation of change OR lack of change, single factor given e.g. Yes, better government and law enforcement, allowing progress for educated Indians and better protection for ordinary Indians. Hindu National Congress, 1885. Mission to improve India etc. No, most Indians remained poor and uneducated; caste system; power of princes over local areas. For most, life barely changed etc.	[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]