

HISTORY (BRUNEI)

Paper 2171/01
Multiple Choice

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

Key messages

General comments

This was the third year of the revised examination. Performance of candidates on the questions on the History of Brunei and on the History of Malaya was broadly similar in quality to that of previous years, but the questions on the Second World War in Asia were answered less well. The overall mean mark for the paper was a little more than a mark down from last year at 17.46. As in previous examinations, some candidates performed less well on items that contained a negative in the question.

Comments on specific questions

On the History of Brunei, **Question 2, 6, 7, 10** and **12** were found the easiest, each being answered correctly by more than 60 per cent of the candidates, though **Question 14** on the expansion of healthcare services in Brunei was the least well answered.

On the History of Malaya, performance across the questions was consistent, with seemingly fewer questions found particularly easy or hard. **Question 16** and **18** were the most successfully answered, while **Question 17** and **25**, on the establishment of a Resident in Pahang in 1888 and the Quota system restricting the movement of Chinese males into Malaya respectively, were the least successful items in this section.

On the Second World War in Asia, even though answers were generally weaker than on the other sections, some questions discriminated well and were effectively answered. **Question 28** and **32** were notably successful. Evidence from previous series would suggest that the factual material on this section was less well known: **Question 31, 36, 38** and **39** were all answered correctly by no more than a third of the candidates, and in each instance the correct answer was chosen by few of what seemed to be the stronger, higher-scoring candidates.

HISTORY (BRUNEI)

Paper 2171/02
Paper 2

General comments

On the whole candidates demonstrated increased awareness of the requirements of the structured questions in **Sections A** and **B**, and **Question 7** in **Section C**. Not all candidates were able to perform to their best advantage when responding to **Question 6**. Some demonstrated only limited engagement with the sources, and a few did not use any of the sources in their responses to this question. Further comments will be made in the appropriate section though as a starting point, it is important to emphasise that candidates will be unlikely to gain marks if they do not use the relevant source(s) as directed in the question.

There were few rubric errors, though some candidates seemed to encounter difficulties with time management as a significant number did not fully complete **Question 7**, whilst there were others who did not attempt any part of this question.

With **part (b)** questions some responses were aware of the need to explain rather than just describe and this was shown in the way answers were structured and used language such as *'this showed that'* or *'this meant that'*.

Many responses struggled to attain marks in the higher levels of **part (b)** questions because they did not demonstrate the necessary knowledge to link general comments to the question or were focused on description rather than explanation. It is good practice and will help candidates to remain focused, to begin their response by turning the question into an introductory statement. For example, in **Question 1(b)** *'British ships attacked Brunei in 1846 because James Brooke ...'*

Many candidates were aware of the need to offer balanced comments in response to **part (c)** questions. Some of these responses revealed clear structure, organisation and a good range of supporting material. Such responses usually started with an explanation of why they agreed with the statement, supported by relevant knowledge. The balance in such responses was often sign-posted by the second part of the response starting with *'However...'* or *'On the other hand, I disagree with the statement because...'*. It was encouraging to see that most responses attempted to address both sides of the argument, and some were able to give a valid explanation on one side of the argument. The higher levels in this part question can be attained when responses provide an explanation on both sides of the argument. It is important to note that there is no 'correct' answer to this type of question as candidates can come to different conclusions and be rewarded for the quality of their arguments.

Comments on specific questions

Section A History of Brunei, 1800–1984

Question 1

- (a) Most candidates showed some knowledge of why James Brooke became involved in Brunei affairs and there were some detailed responses centred around why Pengiran Muda Hashim wanted help from James Brooke.
- (b) Some candidates were aware of the murder of Pengiran Muda Hashim and his family. Descriptive answers such as these remained in Level 2 as they did not address why these events led to British ships attacking Brunei in 1846. Those answers which explained why James Brooke saw Pengiran Muda Hashim's murder as a personal insult and a challenge to Britain's authority, were able to progress to a higher level.

- (c) Most candidates were able to name some parts of Brunei's land which had been seized by either James or Charles Brooke, often naming Labuan and Limbang and there was also some knowledge as to how James Brooke became Governor of Sarawak. However, some responses could not progress to the higher levels because they did not explain how or why they had been supported by the British. There was also limited knowledge about which attempted actions by either James or Charles Brooke had not been supported by the British.

Question 2

- (a) Many candidates were able to score one or two marks as they were aware that the coal industry led to an increase in employment and population in the town of Muara. There was limited knowledge on other benefits which the coal industry brought to the town such as the development of postal services and shopping facilities. Some candidates described developments within Brunei which could not be credited as the question focus was specifically on how the coal industry affected the town of Muara.
- (b) This question was generally well answered as many candidates were able to describe the use of cutch in the fishing and leather industries and that it was exported to several countries. Some went on to explain its importance in providing employment. For example, *'the cutch industry employed 700 workers in cutting down and transporting mangrove barks and another 150 worked in the factory to process the barks. This was important because it provided a secure livelihood for the locals.'*
- (c) Nearly all candidates were aware of the many improvements in Brunei which were financed by its oil revenue. There was some very good, detailed knowledge of the economic impact on Brunei's finances, as well as descriptions of improvements which were made to roads, telegraph services, the water supply and reforms in education and health care. There was less awareness of improvements to housing and where accurate detail was given on new housing, few were able to explain the **'importance'** which these changes had, and this prevented them accessing the higher level on this side of the argument. For example, *'Brunei's oil revenue meant that it became one of the wealthiest countries in the world and this was important because it was now able to pay off its debt to the Federated Malay States.'* Such a comment would have been awarded a Level 3 response for the other side of the argument.

Question 3

- (a) This question was very well answered with most candidates showing very good knowledge of 'nipponisation' and many who answered achieved full marks on this part question. There was an awareness of how Bruneians were forced to adopt Japanese culture and language and that they had to use the Japanese calendar and fly the Japanese flag. Many also commented on how Bruneians had to show respect by bowing whenever they met a Japanese soldier.
- (b) Many candidates knew that a key reason for the Japanese invasion of Brunei was because they wanted to exploit Brunei's oil resources. Others mentioned 'Asia for Asians' and 'The Greater Asia Co-Prosperity Plan'. However, most answers remained in Level 2 as the responses did not proceed to explain why the Japanese needed Brunei's oil. For example, *'the US embargo on oil supplies had forced the Japanese to invade Brunei and other countries as they needed alternative sources of oil which was essential for their expansionist policy.'* Such a response would have been awarded in Level 3.
- (c) Nearly all candidates were able to describe the suffering and hardship which the Japanese occupation caused the people of Brunei. There was good knowledge shown about the brutality of the occupation with examples of how Bruneians were harshly treated. However, only some responses were able to attain Level 3 because not all responses went on to explain the impact such treatment had on the people. For example, *'the people were physically assaulted and did not have sufficient food or medical supplies. This meant that they lived in constant fear of their Japanese rulers and suffered from malnutrition and disease.'* Many were aware that the Japanese occupation did have some positive effects for Bruneians and commented on how it inspired nationalist feelings, though few were able to fully explain why and how this occurred.

Section B History of Malaya, 1874–1963

Question 4

- (a) This question had a mixed response from candidates. Some candidates gave good descriptive accounts of how the Larut wars arose because two Chinese secret societies, the Hai San and Ghee Hin, were fighting for control of the tin mines. A few were also aware that the succession dispute led to the Sultans seeking support from the secret societies. However, there were several responses which struggled to attain more than one mark, and this was often awarded because the wars were linked to disputes over tin.
- (b) The clear focus of this question was why Britain changed from a policy of non-intervention to one of intervention in Malaya, although a few candidates concentrated on why Britain did not want to intervene in Malaya and thus could not be rewarded for these comments. Many commented on the turmoil caused by piracy and the Larut wars, and the British fear of competition from other European countries. Some were aware that trade was important to Britain and that the Suez Canal had opened in 1869. This point could have been developed into a Level 3 response by explaining that Britain needed more influence over Malaya to protect its sea route to the Far East.
- (c) This question was generally well answered as many candidates were able to describe in considerable detail the reasons for James Birch's unpopularity among the Perak chiefs. Debt slavery was understood and there were frequent references to Birch's arrogance when dealing with the chiefs and his ignorance and dismissal of Malay customs. To achieve the higher levels, it was expected that candidates would explain why the Sultan and Perak chiefs resented Birch's actions on debt slavery and what impact its abolition had on them. Responses which then explained a different reason for Birch's unpopularity would have been awarded at Level 4. For example, '*Birch changed how taxes were collected and said that only he had the authority to collect taxes. Tax collection had been a main source of income for the Sultan and chiefs, who bitterly resented the significant decrease in their income.*'

Question 5

- (a) This question was misunderstood by some candidates who described **why** Britain wanted to form the Malayan Union rather than the actual question focus of **how it was formed**. Others were aware that the Malayan Union was to be one single administrative unit, excluding Singapore and that Sir Harold MacMichael was involved. Most responses to this question attained one or two marks.
- (b) Many candidates were aware that the Malays felt there had been a lack of consultation and that they were unhappy with the proposed changes to citizenship. Some also gave detailed descriptions of the ethnic composition of Malaya at that time. Most responses were awarded a Level 2 mark. Answers which had correctly identified proposed changes to citizenship as a cause of opposition, often did not explain why. For example, '*Chinese in Malaya would qualify for citizenship and in some areas would outnumber Malays. Many Malays feared that Malaya could become a country politically dominated by non-Malays and opposed the Malayan Union because of these fears.*' Such an explanation would have been awarded Level 3.
- (c) This question was generally not well answered, and most responses were awarded within Level 2. There was some description of Dato Onn bin Jaafar as the first President of UMNO. However, it was rare to see an explanation of how Dato Onn and UMNO contributed to Malayan independence. Most candidates attempted to look at other reasons for Malayan independence such as the nationalist feelings inspired by the harsh Japanese occupation. Perhaps surprisingly, not many mentioned Tunku Abdul Rahman, though a few who did were able to attain Level 3 on this side of the argument with an explanation of how important he was to Malaya achieving independence in August 1957.

Section C Second World War in Asia, c.1929–53

Question 6 This question was about the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

While many candidates sought to engage with the sources, some made only passing reference to them or ignored them completely. Answers which did not use the sources often demonstrated sound knowledge of the attack on Pearl Harbor but could not be rewarded as it was not linked to an analysis of the sources. It is possible that candidates have misunderstood the instruction '*to use your knowledge*' and perhaps assumed that using only their knowledge was an acceptable alternative to an analysis or evaluation of the sources. '*Use your knowledge*' means that candidates should use their knowledge of the topic to **understand, interpret and comment upon the source material**. This means that the candidates' use of

knowledge should be evident in a valid interpretation of the source material, and in their ability to comment meaningfully on the sources.

It would be productive for candidates to focus on the instruction in each of the part questions within **Question 6** which tells them to explain their answer **'using details from the source'** and your knowledge'. The fact that the phrase **'using details from the source'** is the first part of this instruction conveys the **importance of source analysis and evaluation** in all the part questions within **Question 6**.

- (a) This question asked candidates to study **Source A** which was **an official US Navy photograph** showing Pearl Harbor after the Japanese attack. Unfortunately, a significant number of candidates used the Background Information, rather than the Source, to attempt to answer this question and therefore could not be awarded any marks.

This question asked candidates what they could learn about the attack on Pearl Harbor from the photograph in Source A. To answer this type of question effectively, candidates should first identify what they can see in the photograph and what the photograph shows them about the attack. This then directs them to draw a **valid inference** from the photograph. An inference being something which is suggested by the photograph but is not explicitly shown. The inference, if valid, constitutes a Level 2 response.

It was possible to draw various inferences from the photograph in Source A. The two most used inferences in candidate responses noted how the source showed that the Americans were not expecting the attack on Pearl Harbor and that the Japanese inflicted devastating damage during the attack on Pearl Harbor.

To attain Level 3, responses need **to support their inference with details from the source and/or from contextual knowledge.**

For example, *'From the source I can learn that the Americans were not expecting the attack on Pearl Harbor. This is obvious because of the damage we can see, with all three ships burning and two, the USS Arizona and the USS West Virginia, have been sunk.'*

For example, *'From the source I can learn that the Japanese inflicted devastating damage as I know that 19 ships in total were hit, with over 2,400 killed. The USS Nevada, Oklahoma and California were also damaged.'*

- (b) This question asked about the utility of Source B which was a short account from Rear Admiral Galbraith who was stationed in the Philippines in 1941 during the attack on Pearl Harbor. He was recollecting in 1984 what he remembered about the attack.

It is expected that candidates explain why the source is useful and why it is not useful. Responses which look at one aspect would be awarded within Level 2. Responses which made valid comments on how Source B was useful **and** why it was not useful would be awarded within Level 3. There will always be information in the source which candidates can use to explain why it is useful.

It is good practice to start with how useful the source is about the topic.

Many candidates stated that the source was useful because it tells us that the Americans were expecting the Japanese to attack the Philippines. Some candidates also said that the source was useful because it tells us that the Americans were not expecting an attack on Pearl Harbor.

Several candidates who had made a valid comment on why Source B was useful, then went on to also consider why the source might not be useful because it was missing important information about the attack on Pearl Harbor. These candidates suggested the source was not useful because it did not tell us why the Americans expected Japan to attack the Philippines rather than any other target in the region. Others said that it was not useful as it did not tell us that the three American aircraft carriers were unharmed because they were out at sea on manoeuvres.

- (c) It is important that candidates remember **to use all three sources** in their answer to this question as they are instructed to do. Some candidates attempted to answer this question by using contextual knowledge with only a generalised comment on one of the sources and thus remained in Level 1.

A straightforward approach would be for the candidate to take each source in turn and consider whether it **supports or challenges the statement that the attack on Pearl Harbor came as a complete surprise**. The candidate must then show **how** the source supports or challenges the statement **by using details from the source to support their argument**. Having done this with all three sources, the candidate should have produced a two-sided answer which would be awarded within Level 3.

Source A supported the statement that the attack came as a complete surprise.

Many candidates noted the level of destruction in Source A and argued that the Americans would have tried to stop this damage if they had known about the attack. Some candidates used the Background Information instead of Source A as they had done in their answer to **part (a)** and this could not be credited.

Source B clearly supported the statement that it came as a complete surprise and there were several details from the source which candidates could have used to show this. For example, Source B tells us that the Americans **'fully expected an attack on our bases in the Philippines.'** It also says, **'none of us had any idea that the Japanese would attack Pearl Harbor.'** Another detail from Source B which candidates could have used to show that this source supported the statement was **'we gave no thought to an attack on Pearl Harbor.... that came as a total surprise.'**

Source C clearly challenged the statement and there several details in the source to show why it should not have come as a complete surprise to the Americans. It says that they, **'intercepted a Japanese message that inquired about ship movements at Pearl Harbor.'** This should have warned the Americans to be ready. Another example which could have been used was, **'a radar operator saw a large group of airplanes on his screen heading towards Pearl Harbor.'** At the time a supervisor assumed they were US planes which was a mistake. A further detail from Source C which could have been used was the fact that the US aircraft carriers were not docked in Pearl Harbor and were out at sea. It is possible to infer that perhaps the Americans were expecting some form of attack.

In terms of reaching an overall conclusion, candidates should seek to weigh up their arguments by treating the sources as a body of evidence, comparing them and cross-referencing them with each other. Thus, in this way it is possible to assess which sources carry the greatest weight.

Question 7

There were a significant number of candidates who did not attempt this question at all and others who attempted only some of the three questions within **Question 7**.

- (a) There was a mixed response amongst those candidates who answered this question. Many confused the Northern Expedition of 1926-28 with the Long March and others with Chiang Kai-shek's extermination campaigns. Most responses were awarded one or two marks where candidates correctly identified that this was a collaboration between the Kuomintang and the Communists, its aim being to end the rule of the warlords. A few stronger responses were aware that it was led by Chiang Kai-shek and was supported by the peasants because they were promised land.
- (b) There were some similarities between responses to this question and to those for part (a), in that some candidates could not identify the correct campaigns. Some responses gave details of the Shanghai Massacre of 1927 and others wrote about the Purification Movement. Many were aware that the extermination campaigns took place because Chiang Kai-shek wanted to eradicate the Communists and most answers were awarded at Level 2. A few were able to attain Level 3 when they explained that Chiang Kai-shek was worried about the growth of Communism which he saw as a direct threat to the Nationalists and that action had to be taken to stop this threat.
- (c) The chronological focus of this question was 1937 to 1945, although a few responses concentrated on why the Communists defeated the Nationalists in the Civil War which followed Japan's defeat. Most answers were awarded a Level 2 mark for relevant description and identification, and such responses usually tried to describe a factor on both sides of the argument. Nationalist weaknesses such as corruption and ill-discipline were mentioned, alongside Communist strengths such as their

sympathetic treatment of the peasants. A few stronger responses attained a Level 3 mark with an explanation of one side. For example, *'the KMT did not take decisive action against the Japanese and lost control of significant parts of China. Many peasants believed this lack of action showed that the Nationalists were weak and unpatriotic and peasant support for the Nationalists decreased.'*