

**CAMBRIDGE**  
INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

**June 2003**

INTERNATIONAL GCSE

MARK SCHEME

MAXIMUM MARK: 40

SYLLABUS/COMPONENT: 0470/04

HISTORY

Paper 4 (Alternative to Coursework)



<b>Page 1</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE EXAMINATIONS – JUNE 2003</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>4</b>

### Depth Study A: Germany, 1918 – 1945

**(a) (i)**

- |         |  |
|---------|--|
| Level 1 | Repeats material stated in source, no inference made, e.g. firearms could be used. (1-2)   |
| Level 2 | Makes valid inference, not supported from source, e.g. violence was an acceptable tactic. (3-4)  |
| Level 3 | Makes valid inference(s) with reference to source, e.g. violence was an acceptable tactic and Goering actively encouraged its use. (5-6) |

**(ii)**

- |         |   |
|---------|---|
| Level 1 | Agrees OR disagrees that it explains why people voted for Nazis, with no support from source, e.g. it is alarmist. (1-2)  |
| Level 2 | Agrees OR disagrees that it explains why people voted for Nazis, supported from source, e.g. Yes, it appeals to those who fear communism. No, appeals specifically only to farmers, allegations without proof, etc. (3-5) |
| Level 3 | Agrees AND disagrees, supported from source. Addresses the issue of 'How far?' (6-7)  |

**(iii)**

- |         |   |
|---------|---|
| Level 1 | Not useful - Choice made on the basis that that one is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. (1)   |
| Level 2 | Not useful - Both sources are from Nazis so they 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 which 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. rule by decree, dictatorial powers, no need to consult Reichstag, make alliances, etc. (1-2)

**(ii)**

- |         |   |
|---------|---|
| Level 1 | One mark for each valid element to a maximum of two, e.g. SS to kill 400 SA, including Rohm, and other enemies (1-2)                  |
| Level 2 | Award an extra mark for explanation of reasons or outcomes of the actions, e.g. ambitions of Rohm, army loyalty to Hitler, etc. (2-4) |

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE EXAMINATIONS – JUNE 2003</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>4</b>

**(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. decisive handling of SA persuaded army to support Hitler becoming President as well as Chancellor, oath of allegiance, no opposition, only political personality seen as capable of leading Germany forward.	(2-6)

**(iv)**

Level 1	Simple assertions. Yes, they controlled everything.	(1)
Level 2	Explanation of control OR lack of control, single factor.	(2)
Level 3	Explanation of control OR lack of control, multiple factors given. Allow single factors with multiple reasons, e.g. Yes, control by terror; propaganda, popularity, etc.; No, Still some opposition groups - young, Churches etc. Shambles of Nazi duplications of control agencies <b>OR</b> Underdeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB - Balanced but Brief)	(3-5)
Level 4	Answers that deal with 'How secure?' was Hitler's control. BOTH control AND lack of control must be addressed.	(6-8)

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE EXAMINATIONS – JUNE 2003</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>4</b>

### Depth Study B: Russia, 1905 - 1941

**(a) (i)**

Level 1	Repeats material from source, no inference made, e.g. Stalin is untrustworthy, etc.	(1-2)
Level 2	Makes valid inference(s) but not supported from source, e.g. Stalin frightens people, etc.	(3-4)
Level 3	Makes valid inference with reference to the source, e.g. Stalin has a clever political brain as he has made it difficult for opponents to attack him, etc.	(5-6)

**(ii)**

Level 1	Agrees OR disagrees about propaganda failure, no reference to the Source, e.g. everyone is bored with it.	(1-2)
Level 2	Agrees OR disagrees about propaganda failure, supported by the source, e.g. Yes, people are 'sick' of it; No, acknowledges some approval of Stakhanov, source provenance, etc.	(3-5)
Level 3	Agrees AND disagrees about propaganda failure, supported from source. Addresses the issue of 'How far?'	(6-7)

**(iii)**

Level 1	Not useful - Choice made on the basis that one is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information.	(1)
Level 2	Not useful - they are from enemies 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 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>(b) (i)</b>	One mark for each valid group to a maximum of two, e.g. Old Guard, military, intellectuals, minority nationalities, etc.	(2)
----------------	--	-----

**(ii)**

Level 1	Identifies elements, e.g. Propaganda to keep Stalin at forefront of people's thinking, etc.	(1-2)
Level 2	Describes elements. Award an extra mark for each element described in additional detail, e.g. nature of posters, statues, town names, etc.	(2-4)

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE EXAMINATIONS – JUNE 2003	0470	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. improve output, use machinery, get rid of Kulaks, establish a more communist system after NEP, increase control of population, etc.	(2-6)

**(iv)**

Level 1	Simple assertions. Yes, it was a fairer society.	(1)
Level 2	Explanation of improvement OR lack of improvement. Single factor.	(2)
Level 3	Explanation of improvement OR lack of improvement, multiple factors. Allow single factors with multiple reasons, e.g. Yes, jobs, 'equality', safer country, unity of purpose, etc.; No, still grinding poverty, consumer goods took second place to heavy industry, people serve state rather than state serves people, etc. <b>OR</b> Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB - Balanced but Brief)	(3-5)
Level 4	Answers that deal with 'To what extent?' BOTH sides of improvement AND lack of improvement must be addressed.	(6-8)

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE EXAMINATIONS – JUNE 2003</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>4</b>

### Depth Study C: The United States, 1919 - 1941

**(a) (i)**

- Level 1 Repeats material stated in source, no inference made, e.g. Measures are not ruining the country, etc. (1-2)
- Level 2 Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from source, e.g. Government determined to continue, etc. (3-4)
- Level 3 Makes valid inference with reference to the source, e.g. Hopkins defends against criticism that the government has been dictatorial, communistic, etc. (5-6)

**(ii)**

- Level 1 Agrees OR disagrees about understanding, no reference to source, e.g. there are many problems. (1-2)
- Level 2 Agrees OR disagrees supported from source, e.g. Yes, lists problems of education, poverty, etc.; No, talks about one area only, does not mention lack of demand for agricultural products, etc. (3-5)
- Level 3 Agrees AND disagrees, supported from source. Addresses the issue of 'How far?' (6-7)

**(iii)**

- Level 1 Not useful - choice made on the basis that one is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. (1)
- Level 2 Not useful - one is from a government agent and the other is from a government agency 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 the 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 reason to a maximum of two, e.g. control floods, fire prevention, reforestation, fish stocks, create jobs for young men, etc. (1-2)

**(ii)**

- Level 1 Identifies aims and methods. One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two. (1-2)
- Level 2 Describes aims and methods. Award an extra mark for each aspect described with additional detail, e.g. Aims: raise farm prices/incomes, create demand, educate, etc.; Methods: destroy or store surplus, compensate farmers, local deals to reduce production or enforce reduction, etc. (2-4)

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE EXAMINATIONS – JUNE 2003</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>4</b>

**(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. traditionally migrant workers went to California for harvests, chance of land/jobs, small tenant farmers had lost land by accepting AAA terms, Dust Bowl - drought 1934/6 and poor farming methods had created Okies and Arkies.	(2-6)

**(iv)**

Level 1	Simple assertions. Yes, it created jobs.	(1)
Level 2	Explanation of agreement OR disagreement with the statement. Single reason given.	(2)
Level 3	Explanation of Agreement OR disagreement with the statement. Multiple factors given. Allow single factors with multiple reasons. Yes, in 10 years area changed from most depressed to a showpiece of progressive agriculture, sheer scale - 40 000 sq. miles in 7 states, electrification and flood control, etc.; No, AAA more successful at cutting production to allow recovery, TVA did not stop eviction, many could not afford electricity, etc. <b>OR</b> undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB - Balanced but Brief)	(3-5)
Level 4	Answers that deal with BOTH sides of the argument. TVA success must be compared to that of other agencies.	(6-8)

<b>Page 7</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE EXAMINATIONS – JUNE 2003</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>4</b>

### Depth Study D: China, 1945 - c.1990

**(a) (i)**

Level 1	Repeats material stated in source, no inference made, e.g. 13 000 deserted	(1-2)
Level 2	Makes valid inferences, not supported by source, e.g. the army was not loyal	(3-4)
Level 3	Makes valid inference(s) with reference to the source, e.g. the deserters were from all ranks and a valuable source of weaponry to the communist side.	(5-6)

**(ii)**

Level 1	Reliable OR unreliable with no reference to source, e.g. everybody knows he was a bad leader.	(1-2)
Level 2	Reliable OR unreliable supported from source, e.g. Yes, criticism of a frustrated ally, not anti-Communist from an American, valid criticism supported by developed contextual knowledge; No, over criticism by an ally. Was he there? Was it 1948 detail? Valid criticism supported by developed contextual knowledge.	(3-5)
Level 3	Agrees AND disagrees, supported from the source. Addresses the issue of 'How reliable?'	(6-7)

**(iii)**

Level 1	Not useful - choice made on the basis that one is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information.	(1)
Level 2	Not useful - they are both by Americans 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 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>(b) (i)</b>	One mark for each valid group to a maximum of two, e.g. industrialists, landowners, rich, most senior military personnel.	(1-2)
----------------	---	-------

**(ii)**

Level 1	Identifies elements.	
	Award one mark for each valid element to a maximum of two.	(1-2)
Level 2	Describes elements.	
	Award an extra mark for each element described in additional detail, e.g. brought landlords before assemblies of peasants, peasants listed landlords' crimes, sentencing, redistribution of land, etc.	(2-4)



<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE EXAMINATIONS – JUNE 2003</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>4</b>

**(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. centre of resistance to the People's Republic, comparative economic performances/standard of living, example of capitalism, military tension, international interests, etc.	(2-6)

**(iv)**

Level 1	Simple assertions. No, there were many important issues.	(1)
Level 2	Explanation of importance OR lack of importance. Single factor given.	(2)
Level 3	Explanation of importance OR lack of importance, with multiple factors given. Allow single factors with multiple reasons. Yes, need to keep peasant support, raise production, land the basis of Chinese communism, etc.; No, condition of China after war, industrial production, health, education, investment, foreign interference, etc. <b>OR</b> Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB - Balanced but Brief)	(3-5)
Level 4	Answers that a comparative assessment. BOTH sides of importance AND lack of importance must be addressed.	(6-8)

<b>Page 9</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE EXAMINATIONS – JUNE 2003</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>4</b>

### **Depth Study E: South Africa in the Twentieth Century**

#### **(a) (i)**

- Level 1 Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made, e.g. it had had bad election results, etc. (1-2)
- Level 2 Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from source, e.g. the government had reached crisis point, etc. (3-4)
- Level 3 Makes valid inference with reference to the source, e.g. The government was in such crisis that it had been forced into meetings with its sworn enemy, etc. (5-6)

#### **(ii)**

- Level 1 Agrees OR disagrees, with no reference to the source, e.g. the ANC frightened many groups in South Africa. (1-2)
- Level 2 Agrees OR disagrees supported from source, e.g. Yes, the list of ANC actions would intimidate any group; No, Buthelezi is standing up to them and publishing details, etc. (3-5)
- Level 3 Agrees AND disagrees, supported from source. Addresses the issue of 'How far?' (6-7)

#### **(iii)**

- Level 1 Not useful - choice made on the basis that one is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. (1)
- Level 2 Not useful - one is from a British book, the other is from an opponent of the ANC 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 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) (i)** Award one mark for each valid example to a maximum of two, e.g. Power sharing for 5 years; job security for police, armed services and civil servants; strong local and regional councils. (1-2)

#### **(ii)**

- Level 1 Identifies aspects of involvement. One mark each to a maximum of two. (1-2)
- Level 2 Describes involvement. Award an extra mark for aspects described in additional detail, e.g. regarded by government as an ally which wanted to play off Inkatha against ANC; he was unreliable; did not attend CODESA meetings; tried to ally with Conservative Party; encouraged supporters in violence; talked of civil war. ANC strengthened as a result; finally came to agreement with ANC to curb violence. (2-4)

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE EXAMINATIONS – JUNE 2003	0470	4

**(iii)**

Level 1	Single reason. One for reason, one for explanation.	(1-2)
Level 2	Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained, e.g. trusted de Klerk and Mandela; saw negotiations as preferable to disorder; proposals safeguarded white interests; disapproved of far right AWB/ Terre Blanche; some had always opposed apartheid. NB. - 85% of whites voted, 69% supported reform.	(2-6)

**(iv)**

Level 1	Simple assertion. Yes, he was very famous.	(1)
Level 2	Explanation of importance OR lack of importance, single factor given.	(2)
Level 3	Explanation of importance OR lack of importance with multiple factors. Allow single factor with multiple reasons, e.g. Yes, authority/reputation and continued commitment to Freedom Charter; prepared to acknowledge white fears, seek compromise, patient negotiator; No de Klerk began process in 1990, role of economic/international pressures, other negotiators roles, impact of violence. <b>OR</b> Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB - Balanced but Brief)	(3-5)
Level 4	Answers that deal with BOTH importance AND lack of importance to arrive at a balanced judgement	(6-8)

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE EXAMINATIONS – JUNE 2003	0470	4

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

**(a) (i)**

- Level 1 Repeats material stated in source, no inference made, e.g. propaganda was both Nasser's strength and weakness, etc. (1-2)
- Level 2 Makes valid inference(s), not supported from source, e.g. propaganda was of crucial importance in the crisis. (3-4)
- Level 3 Makes valid inference with reference to the source, e.g. Propaganda created expectation to a level where it drove policy. (5-6)

**(ii)**

- Level 1 Agrees OR disagrees with no support from source, e.g. Yes, Nasser hated Israel. (1-2)
- Level 2 Agrees OR disagrees with support from source, e.g. Yes, his words show aggressive intent; No, merely rhetoric in his parliament, etc. (3-5)
- Level 3 Agrees AND disagrees, supported from source. Addresses the issue of 'How far?' (6-7)

**(iii)**

- Level 1 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 Not useful - one is from a British textbook, the other is from Nasser so they could be biased/unreliable. (2)
- Level 3 Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must state 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 reason to a maximum of two, e.g. surprise to gain military advantage; prevent pre-emptive strikes from Egypt, Syria and Jordan's superior air power; secure space for use of tanks; advance to more easily defensible frontiers, etc. (1-2)

**(ii)**

- Level 1 Identifies tactics. Allow one mark for each aspect identified to a maximum of two. (1-2)
- Level 2 Describes tactics. Allow an extra mark for each tactic described with additional detail, e.g. Massive air strikes on 17 Egyptian airfields (300 planes destroyed); napalm; rocket attacks on Jordan; tank attack across Sinai destroyed 7 Egyptian divisions. (2-4)

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE EXAMINATIONS – JUNE 2003	0470	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 to defend the occupied buffer zone; they wanted to protect their land and religion; asked for Western military aid developed strategies to limit Arab support for refugees, the acts of Al Fatah; appeals to UNO; Arabs would not accept their defeat, had access to Russian arms.	(2-6)

(iv)

Level 1	Simple assertions. Yes, he went to Israel.	(1)
Level 2	Explanation of change OR lack of change. Single factor.	(2)
Level 3	Explanation of change OR lack of change with multiple factors. Allow single factor with multiple reasons, e.g. Yes, used war popularity to open negotiations with Israel. Accommodation needed to recover Sinai - impossible by war; Knesset '77. Camp David '78/'79; No, always anti-Israel. Any change still aimed at restricting Israeli expansion; '67 War made him popular. Even when Suez Canal reopened Israeli ships could not use it. Deteriorating relations between Egypt and other Arab countries. <b>OR</b> Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB - Balanced but Brief)	(3-5)
Level 4	Answers that deal with the issue of 'How far?' BOTH sides of change AND lack of change must be addressed.	(6-8)

Page 13	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE EXAMINATIONS – JUNE 2003	0470	4

### Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

**(a) (i)**

- Level 1 Repeats material stated in source, no inference made, e.g. there were no drains. (1-2)
- Level 2 Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from source, e.g. towns were very unhealthy places. (3-4)
- Level 3 Makes valid inference with reference to the source, e.g. there appears to be a link between the large number of deaths and the filthy conditions, etc. (5-6)

**(ii)**

- Level 1 Agrees OR disagrees with no support from the source, e.g. Yes, all builders were unreliable. (1-2)
- Level 2 Agrees OR disagrees with support from the source, e.g. Yes, building industry connived with others to cut costs; No, there was no legal compulsion to reach standards, owners of land equally to blame, etc. (3-5)
- Level 3 Agrees AND disagrees with support from the source. Addresses the issue of 'To what extent?' (6-7)

**(iii)**

- Level 1 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 Not useful - A is from a doctor, B is an artist's impression and C is from a complainer, so they could all be biased/unreliable. (2)
- Level 3 Choice made on the amount or nature 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, B and C to show reliability. 6 marks for one source, 7 marks for two or more. (6-7)

- (b) (i)** One mark each for each valid example to a maximum of two, e.g. Public Health Acts '48 and '72, Artisans Dwellings Act, Contagious Diseases Act, etc. (1-2)

**(ii)**

- Level 1 Allow one mark for each simple definition. (1-2)
- Level 2 Award an extra mark for each definition that is explained in additional detail. (2-4)

Page 14	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE EXAMINATIONS – JUNE 2003	0470	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. overcrowding, poor hygiene, bad building, water supply, lack of good sewers, ignorance, etc.	(2-6)

**(iv)**

Level 1	Simple assertions. Yes, everything was getting better.	(1)
Level 2	Explanation of progress OR lack of progress. Single factor.	(2)
Level 3	Explanation of progress OR lack of progress with multiple factors. Allow single factors with multiple reasons, e.g. Yes, legislation, better planning, sewers, better water supply, housing materials and building, better awareness, etc.; No, Improvement patchy, still much old housing stock remained, much still unplanned, without water supply or sewers, etc. <b>OR</b> 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 progress AND lack of progress must be addressed.	(6-8)

Page 15	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE EXAMINATIONS – JUNE 2003	0470	4

### Depth Study H: The Impact of Western Imperialism in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century

**(a) (i)**

- Level 1 Repeats material stated in source, no inference made, e.g. it was the will of the British people, etc. (1-2)
- Level 2 Makes a valid inference(s) not supported from the source, e.g. there was widespread pride in acquiring an empire, etc. (3-4)
- Level 3 Makes valid inferences with reference to the source, e.g. the empire was not acquired because some financiers saw it as a way to make money, the British people saw it as their destiny, etc. (5-6)

**(ii)**

- Level 1 Agrees OR disagrees with no support from source, e.g. Yes, the Europeans would always win as they had firepower. (1-2)
- Level 2 Agrees OR disagrees with support from source, e.g. Yes, the insistence of Pink Cheek; No, the actions of the elders, the tone of the storyteller. (3-5)
- Level 3 Agrees AND disagrees, supported from source. Addresses the issue of 'How far?' (6-7)

**(iii)**

- Level 1 Not useful - choice made on the basis that one is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. (1)
- Level 2 Not useful - one is from a colonial administrator, the other is from an African so they could be biased/unreliable. (2)
- Level 3 Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must state 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) (i)** One mark for each valid example to a maximum of two, e.g. Rhodesia, Uganda, Kenya. (1-2)

**(ii)**

- Level 1 Identifies system. Allow one mark for each aspect to a maximum of two. (1-2)
- Level 2 Describes system. Allow an extra mark for each aspect that is described in additional detail, e.g. system of colonial government which left the local chiefs in traditional control of local affairs, while Britain retained overall control. System was cheaper than the French system of direct rule that expensively imposed French culture and control. (2-4)



<b>Page 16</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE EXAMINATIONS – JUNE 2003</b>	<b>0470</b>	<b>4</b>

**(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. Prestige, markets, raw materials, Place in the Sun, White Man's Burden, religion, exploration, etc.	(2-6)

**(iv)**

Level 1	Simple assertions. No, it was a disaster for them.	(1)
Level 2	Explanation of benefit OR lack of benefit. Single reason.	(2)
Level 3	Explanation of benefit OR lack of benefit, multiple factors given. Allow single factors with multiple reasons, e.g. Yes, medicine, education, missionaries?, technology, jobs, etc.; No, destruction of culture, traditional rule, tribes; missionaries?, exploitation, etc. <b>OR</b> Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB - Balanced but Brief)	(3-5)
Level 4	Answers that deal with the issue of 'To what extent?' BOTH sides of benefit AND lack of benefit must be addressed.	(6-8)