

HISTORY

Paper 2171/01
Multiple Choice (Paper 1)

<i>Question Number</i>	<i>Key</i>	<i>Question Number</i>	<i>Key</i>
1	A	21	C
2	B	22	A
3	B	23	B
4	C	24	B
5	C	25	A
6	C	26	D
7	A	27	C
8	C	28	B
9	C	29	B
10	D	30	C
11	B	31	C
12	A	32	C
13	B	33	C
14	D	34	C
15	A	35	C
16	D	36	B
17	D	37	C
18	D	38	B
19	D	39	D
20	D	40	C

General comments

The strongest responses were seen in the Brunei section, with many candidates demonstrating a good range of knowledge of this topic. In previous years the Malaya section has often been well-answered, this year it was answered less successfully. The weaker responses did less well in answering the questions on the Philippines. Overall, the mean mark dropped from 22.4 in 2019 to 20.66 in this series.

Comments on specific questions

It continues to be the case that candidates in this examination are most secure when asked questions about their home country. Four questions on **Brunei** produced 80 per cent or more correct responses with almost all candidates being aware of the fact that Brooke was Governor of Sarawak (**Question 3**) and the role of the Hamba in early Brunei society (**Question 1**). Weaker responses were less secure in their understanding of the role of the Brunei State Council under the Residential System. (**Question 6**).

Candidates were less secure in their knowledge of the main events in the history of **Malaya**, demonstrated by the low proportion of correct answers to several questions within this section. There were less than 35 per cent of correct responses to the questions about the formation of the Federated Malay States (**Question 16**),

measures to deal with the fall in tin prices (**Question 17**) and measures taken by the British during the Emergency (**Question 35**). In contrast, 70 per cent of candidates could correctly identify Perak as the first Malay state to have a British Resident (**Question 14**).

Performance in the **Indonesia** section was more secure, with most questions resulting in a majority of correct responses. Weaker responses struggled to identify the year in which membership of the Volksraad increased (**Question 24**) but there were more than 75 per cent correct responses which required candidates to identify the aim of Partai Nasional Indonesia (**Question 25**).

In the **Thailand** section, candidates scored well, with no questions producing a minority of correct responses.

Responses to the questions in the **Philippines** section were weaker than other topics within this section of the syllabus. Whilst there was good knowledge demonstrated of the causes of the Tayabas Mutiny (**Question 34**), there was much less understanding of Katipunan (**Question 35**), the 1898 revolutionary government (**Question 36**), the first American Governor-General of the Philippines (**Question 37**) and the appointment of Laurel as President of the first independent Republic of the Philippines. (**Question 38**).

HISTORY

Paper 2171/02
Paper 2

General comments

Many candidates provided responses that were well-constructed, articulate and thoughtful. In the strongest responses this was particularly evident when answering part-questions **(d)** and **(e)**, which require understanding as well as knowledge. More modest were often characterised by securing marks for their knowledge in answering part-**Questions (a), (b) and (c)**, rather than developing explanations in parts **(d)** and **(e)**.

Responses demonstrated a continued improvement in examination technique. Fewer candidates use lists of bullet points, and more often now write in continuous prose. This naturally helps them to explain more fully how and why particular events or developments took place, which is necessary to achieve higher marks when responding to part-**Questions (d)** and **(e)**.

Candidates also demonstrated that they were reading the questions in full before writing, as indicated by an improvement in the deployment of knowledge to the appropriate part-question. Weaker responses found this more challenging when responding to **Questions 1(d)/1(e)** and **3(d)/3(e)**. However, most candidates applied their knowledge to the relevant part-questions. Weaker responses could be improved by ensuring that the knowledge provided is used to address the specific terms of a question. For example, when asked to explain why the Sultans were dissatisfied with the Federated Malay States (**Question 4(e)**), stronger responses make explicit reference to the focus of the question, rather than just generally describing the defects of the FMS.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: History of Brunei, 1800 – 1967

Question 1

The reign of Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddien III

A majority of candidates had difficulty in answering **Question 1**. Some very strong responses were seen in repose to this question, but weaker responses demonstrated an unfamiliarity with this topic content.

Question 1 is the compulsory question, so candidates could not turn to any alternative choice to compensate for their difficulties.

- (a) Name three 'proposed new industries which aimed to diversify Brunei's economy'.**

Very few responses were able to name any 'proposed new industries'.

- (b) What 'important developments in the offshore oil industry' took place in 1959 and 1963?**

Candidates did not appear to understand the term 'offshore' and wrote about the discovery of oil in Brunei in the early twentieth century. This term is key vocabulary for the topics relating to the oil industry. Stronger responses wrote about the use of mobile drilling platforms and the discovery of the south west Ampa oil and gas field in 1963.

- (c) How did Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddien III show 'concern for the welfare of his subjects'?**

Some good responses were seen to this question, but there were still a large number who were unfamiliar with Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddien's support for various disadvantaged groups. The strongest answers also pointed out the Sultan's concern that development projects should bring equal benefit to urban and rural inhabitants.

(d) Explain how Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddien III 'gave greater attention to religious education'.

Candidates had a clearer understanding of this question, but weaker responses wrote in very general terms without specific details of measures implemented by the Sultan. Some weaker answers also wrote at length about the Sultan's wider policies to promote and protect the Islamic faith, material that would have been better applied to the following part-question.

(e) Describe how the Sultan's 'influence was a major factor in protecting and promoting the Islamic faith in Brunei'.

Many answers saw the importance of the 1959 Constitution in establishing Islam as Brunei's state religion, and the significance of the Omar Ali Saifuddien mosque as a symbol of the Sultan's personal commitment to promoting Islam. The strongest responses also included the bodies set up to deal with religious administration, in which the Sultan played a major role. Although this question was clearly focused on the reign of Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddien III, weaker responses described the work of earlier Sultans in previous centuries.

Question 2

Causes and effects: Seizure of Limbang

A majority of candidates did well on part-Questions (a) to (d) but found part-Question (e) more challenging.

(a) State three ways in which Sultan Hashim showed his opposition to the seizure of Limbang.

Most candidates were able to name at least two of the ways in which Sultan Hashim expressed his displeasure at the loss of Limbang.

(b) Why was the loss of Limbang bad for Brunei?

Many responses explained the harmful impact of the loss of Limbang well. Stronger answers not only concentrated on the economic losses, but also included the political damage to Brunei's territorial integrity. A small number of weaker responses confused the loss of Limbang with the earlier loss of Labuan to James Brooke.

(c) What did the British government do in response to Brunei's protests about the seizure of Limbang?

This question was well answered. Many responses appreciated that the British had no single answer to Brunei's protests, and that British responses varied over the passage of time until finally in 1895 the British announced that 'the matter was closed'.

(d) Explain why Sultan Hashim rejected the Trevenen Report, 1891.

There were some clearly written answers which explained why the unrepresentative nature of Trevenen's meeting with local chiefs raised questions over his Report, making it unacceptable to Sultan Hashim. Weaker responses could have been improved by focussing on explaining the Sultan's response to the Report, rather than simply describing the meeting.

(e) Describe the steps that led to the signing of the Supplementary Protectorate Agreement, 1905 – 06.

This question required candidates to show how the various steps were connected to each other, so that a clear thread emerges, showing how one event led to the next. Candidates did less well on this question, partly due to their not seeing the whole picture. Modest answers did select a few relevant events, but they did not explain how those events were linked. The most successful answers showed how the British interception of the letter seeking help from the Sultan of Turkey

after the loss of Limbang alarmed the British, who feared intervention from other foreign powers. As a result of McArthur's investigation the British realised the extent of the threat to Brunei's survival, and, more importantly, its potentially wealthy oil reserves. Thus, McArthur proposed a new Supplementary Protectorate Agreement, finally agreed after the British accepted the Sultan's conditions.

Question 3

The Japanese occupation and its effects on society

Question 3 was the more successfully answered question in **Section A** and it was attempted by almost three-quarters of the candidates. **Unlike** Question 2, **it was** part (e) **where candidates performed best**.

- (a) **Name three areas of Borneo that the Japanese brought together as one territory called 'MiriShyu'.**

This question was well answered by the majority of candidates.

- (b) **Why, at first, did some Bruneians welcome the Japanese occupation?**

Many candidates appreciated that, at first, Bruneians accepted the occupation as a form of liberation from British rule, referring in their answers to the slogans that expressed that view.

- (c) **How did the Japanese attempt to exploit Brunei's economic resources?**

Some weaker answers talked about Japanese appropriation of food and medical supplies rather than the exploitation of Brunei's oil and coal reserves. The best answers commented on the degree to which those attempts were successful.

- (d) **Describe the impact of Japanese rule on how Brunei was governed.**

This question was responded to in a variety of valid ways. One way was to focus on the military nature of Japanese rule under the Japanese 37th Army, implemented by the Kempetai, with the resulting impact that Bruneians lived in fear of atrocities. Another approach was to consider the administrative aspect of Japanese rule, whereby the Japanese made use of existing government offices and officials, with the consequent impact being the growth of nationalism. Some answers pointed out that the impact was minimal in the interior areas, which the Japanese largely ignored. Japanese rule also had an impact on the British Resident and the Sultan, who had constituted Brunei's government before the war. The strongest responses commented on several of these aspects.

A number of weaker responses identified that the candidates had not read the whole question and concentrated on the Japanese policy of 'nipponisation', which **part (e)** asked for. Candidates should be advised that, in the event of such a mistake, they should repeat the material in the correct place to be rewarded for their knowledge.

- (e) **Explain how the Japanese imposed the policy of 'Nipponisation' on the people of Brunei.**

Apart from some **part (a)** questions, this was the most successfully answered question on the exam paper. Candidates appear to find this an interesting subject, and demonstrated a good level on knowledge concerning it.

Section B: History of Malaya, 1800 – 1963

Approximately 60 per cent of candidates answered **Question 4**. The level of performance was comparable in both **Question 4** and **Question 5**.

Question 4

The Federated Malay States, 1896

Answers were rather broad and generalised and tended to lack specific detail.

- (a) **Apart from Pahang, name the three other states that joined to form the Federated Malay States in 1896.**

A majority of candidates named all three correctly.

- (b) **What were the financial difficulties experienced by Pahang before the formation of the Federated Malay States?**

Many more modest responses were characterised by talking in general terms about Pahang being poor and less developed. They also lacked more specific information about the Straits government being unwilling to loan money to solve Pahang's excessive expenditure. Some also commented on the effect of rebellions in the 1850s and 1890s upon Pahang's finances.

- (c) **How were the Federated Malay States administered?**

This was reasonably well-answered, with knowledge of the administration correctly deployed.

- (d) **Describe the economic successes of the Federated Malay States.**

The best answers not only described the impressive economic successes of the Federated Malay States (FMS), but also explained how economic progress was made possible by the co-ordinating role of the Federal Public Works Department. However, weaker responses lacked any level of detail.

- (e) **Explain why the Sultans were dissatisfied with the Federated Malay States.**

As commented in the introduction, candidates need to apply their knowledge to the specific nature of the question. Many candidates described the defects of the FMS, but did not always link the information to the dissatisfaction of the Sultans.

Question 5

The Formation of Malaysia, 1963

Parts (a), (b) and (c) were quite well-answered, but parts (d) and (e) less so.

- (a) **Name the three Borneo territories which Tunku Abdul Rahman wanted to become part of Malaysia.**

This was the most successfully answered of all the **part (a)** questions. Some weaker responses did not notice that the question specified 'Borneo' territories and incorrectly included Singapore in their answer.

- (b) **What were the economic reasons for the formation of Malaysia?**

Many candidates put forward valid economic reasons, but some strayed into a discussion of political factors, which were not valid in answering this question.

- (c) **Why did Singapore agree to join Malaysia?**

This question was well-answered. Many candidates were able to suggest at least two or three valid reasons.

(d) Explain why Britain supported the proposals for the formation of Malaysia.

The strongest answers accurately explained Britain's support for the formation of Malaysia. A majority of weaker responses thought that Britain's motives were largely imperialistic, and that the formation of Malaysia would somehow increase Britain's dominance in the region.

(e) Describe the work of the Cobbold Commission.

Candidates either knew about the work of the Cobbold Commission in detail or were largely ignorant of its role in bringing about the formation of Malaysia, thus scoring higher marks on one hand, or very low marks on the other.

Section C: History of Southeast Asia, 1800–1950

Just below half of the candidates answered **Question 7**, which was slightly better-answered than the other questions in **Section C**. **Question 8** attracted more responses than **Question 6**, though the level of performance was comparable on both.

Question 6

Indonesia: Nationalism

Whilst there was a minority of excellent responses, the majority of answers indicated that candidates were less secure in their knowledge of the specific factual content of this topic.

(a) Apart from Budi Utomo and Sarekat Islam, name three nationalist groups or parties in Indonesia before 1935.

Many responses often struggled to name more than two nationalist groups. Weaker responses gave the names of later groups which were outside of the date range given in the question.

(b) How did Raden Kartini raise political awareness among Indonesians?

Many responses included details of Kartini's work to providing education for women, though not all showed how her reforms helped to promote political awareness.

(c) How did the Volksraad help to encourage nationalism in Indonesia?

Weaker answers often lacked specific detail and were limited to general comments about the provision of political experience. Stronger responses demonstrated knowledge of the increase in the number of Indonesians in the Volksraad in 1925, or its increase in powers in the same year.

(d) Explain why some people believed that Budi Utomo was not a nationalist party.

This part-question was less well answered than others in this question. Weaker responses believed that Budi Utomo was a person rather than a political party, in spite of its description as such in the question. Better answers pointed out that Budi Utomo was almost exclusively Javanese rather than Indonesian, and that its membership was made up of educated classes, having little contact with workers and peasants. Some also commented that it had no clear political policy. A small number of the strongest answers impressively knew that its very name represented a more abstract philosophy rather than a practical programme of reform.

(e) Describe how the aims of Sarekat Islam changed in the period from 1911 to 1917.

Candidates often knew fragments of relevant knowledge, but very few answers were able to provide a coherent description of the progression from the economic and commercial aims of 1911 to the more revolutionary communist-inspired demands for full independence in 1917. Many responses were limited to stating only that the party aimed to promote Islam.

Question 7

Thailand: The reign of King Chulalongkorn

Most parts of **Question 7** were well answered, with the exception of **part (d)**.

- (a) **Name three ways in which communications were improved in Siam during the nineteenth century.**

The question asked candidates to identify improvements such as the building of canals, roads, and railways. Weaker responses did not understand the question and wrote about treaties, social reforms and political developments in the twentieth century.

- (b) **How did relations between Siam and France change in 1893?**

Stronger responses knew that relations with France deteriorated in 1893 and a good number provided supporting detail to explain why. Weaker responses were confused with earlier territorial changes during Mongkut's reign.

- (c) **How was slavery brought to an end in Siam?**

Many candidates answered this question well, demonstrating good knowledge.

- (d) **Explain how Siam's financial administration changed during the reign of King Chulalongkorn.**

Generally, this question was less well-answered. The strongest answers did not only name relevant reforms, they showed how they changed Siam's financial administration from its previous chaotic state to a much improved and efficient system.

- (e) **Describe the steps taken by King Chulalongkorn to improve education in Siam.**

There were some very thorough and factually detailed answers. A common feature of weaker responses was to confuse Chulalongkorn's reforms with those of Mongkut and Vajiravudh.

Question 8

Philippines: The Japanese invasion and occupation

As with **Question 6**, there were a number of very strong responses to this question. Weaker responses could have been improved with a greater knowledge of specific factual detail.

- (a) **Name three places in the Philippines where Japanese troops landed.**

Manila, Vigan and Lingayen were the most frequently suggested correct answers, along with Mauban and Bataan.

- (b) **Why did the Japanese invade the Philippines?**

Most answers focussed on the Japanese wanting access to the Philippines' food resources. Although correct, fewer answers put the invasion in the wider context of Japan's plan for total domination in Southeast Asia. Thus, the primary aims in invading the Philippines were to prevent the USA from using its bases to resist the Japanese advance, and to safeguard the route to Indonesia's oil supplies.

- (c) **What was the role of Kalibapi in the Japanese occupation of the Philippines?**

Stronger answers understood that the Japanese set up Kalibapi as a propaganda exercise to promote the illusion of self-rule, but weaker answers believed it was a Filipino resistance movement.

(d) Explain why some Filipinos cooperated with the Japanese during the occupation.

A good number of answers knew that Filipino leaders in exile had advised cooperation, rather than futile resistance, to avoid unnecessary harsh treatment and suffering. Cooperation in administration and government could also reveal information to Filipinos that would help resistance forces. Some Filipinos cooperated for financial gain, and many candidates commented on these 'peso millionaires'. A number of weaker answers argued that cooperation was a means to gain independence. However, for the most part there was no great resistance to American rule, as the USA had already promised the Filipinos independence.

(e) Describe the work of Hukbalahap in resisting the Japanese.

The part-question was less well answered than others in this question. In many cases, answers were too brief to gain many marks.