HISTORY (BRUNEI)

Paper 2171/01
Multiple Choice

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

General comments

This was the second 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, but the questions on the Second World War in Asia were answered significantly less well. The overall mean mark for the paper was a little more than a mark down from last year at 19.5. It was noticeable that several of the items found most difficult by candidates included a negative in the question.

Comments on specific questions

On the History of Brunei, **Questions 2**, **5** and **10** were found the easiest, each being answered correctly by more than 70 per cent of the candidates, though why rubber prices rose in the late 1930s (**Question 8**), and which of a list of events was not an achievement of Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddien III (**Question 15**), were known by relatively few. In this section, three questions proved particularly difficult and discriminated poorly between candidates. On **Question 6**, very few candidates knew the age of Sultan Ahmad Tajuddin at his accession (11 years), with more than half of the answers choosing 21 years, and a good number of better candidates opting for 31 years. On **Question 9**, far more thought Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddien III was the first monarch to travel to the West than those opting for the correct answer, Sultan Ahmad Tajuddin, which was known by only a quarter of candidates. On **Question 13** (the Second National Development Plan), answers split almost equally across the four options, with even better candidates uncertain about the correct answer.

On the History of Malaya, performance across the questions was more consistent, with fewer questions found particularly easy or hard. **Questions 16** (the Pangkor Engagement) and **21** (Guillemard's reform of the Federal Council) were not known well, even by better candidates, but **Question 20** (the 1909 Bangkok

© 2024

Treaty) was the least successful question, with candidates again splitting almost equally across the four options, indicative of them having to resort to guessing.

On the Second World War in Asia, even though answers were generally weaker than on the other sections, there were still a couple of questions that proved very straightforward, notably **Question 34** where almost all candidates knew what the Kempeitai was. This section did, however, include several questions that were both difficult and discriminated poorly between better and weaker candidates. In part, this seemed simply to reflect the fact that the factual material on this section was less well known. It was also the case that several of these questions were amongst the last few items on the paper, suggesting that candidates were perhaps experiencing time pressures. **Questions 26**, **36**, **37**, **38** and **40** 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 the stronger candidates.

© 2024

HISTORY (BRUNEI)

Paper 2171/02
Paper 2

General comments

On the whole candidates appeared to be aware of the requirements of the new syllabus and the format of the examination paper, with its differently structured questions. There were few rubric errors, though some candidates seemed to encounter difficulties with time management, and a significant number did not fully complete **Question 7**.

With **part (b)** questions stronger 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 described events rather than explained why something happened. 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)** *Sultan Abdul called his chiefs to a meeting in February 1885 because he was concerned about…*

Stronger candidates were aware of the need to offer balanced comments in response to **part (c)** questions. Some of these responses revealed clear exposition, 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 half of the answer starting with 'However…' or 'On the other hand, I disagree with the statement because…'. However, although this style was seen, responses which approached the questions in this way were still in a minority. Less successful responses struggled to display the knowledge and skills required for these questions. It is important to stress there is no 'correct' answer to this type of question. Candidates can come to different conclusions, and they are rewarded for the quality of the arguments that lead them to that conclusion.

Another area where candidates did not always perform to their best advantage was in responding to **Question 6**. Some responses did not engage fully with the sources on the question paper, and in some cases made no reference at all to the sources. Further comments will be made in the appropriate section, but as a starting point candidates need to be aware that they will be unlikely to gain marks if they completely ignore the sources.

Obviously, some of the above concerns are due in part to the unfamiliarity of the new exam format, and it is hoped the following comments will help candidates in future years to approach the exam with a greater degree of confidence and competence.

Comments on specific questions

Section A History of Brunei, 1800 – 1984

Question 1

(a) This poem was not generally well known, although some candidates were aware that it was written following the British acquisition of Labuan and that it was written by Pengiran Indera Mahkota.

(b) Many candidates were aware of the Oath of Amanat, who attended the meeting and of lands which Brunei had lost before February 1885. Descriptive answers such as these remained in Level 2 as they did not address why the meeting was called. Those answers which explained the fears which

© 2024

Sultan Abdul Momin had, about the possible extinction of Brunei as a sovereign state unless land losses ceased, were able to progress to a higher level.

(c) Most candidates were able to describe some rebellions and rivalries within the royal family and some were also aware of the involvement of European powers, particularly that of Britain. However, most responses were not able to progress to the higher levels because they did not explain the ways in which rebellions and rivalries were harmful to Brunei, nor how European influence weakened Brunei and led to territorial losses.

Question 2

(a) The majority of responses were able to score a mark as they were aware that the police had responsibility for law and order and tackling crime. The most successful responses focused on the new responsibilities which the Brunei police force was required to carry out after 1922. These involved acting as fire fighters, staffing the telephone exchange and the licensing of firearms.

(b) Many candidates were able to describe the condition of the roads prior to the improvements of the 1920s and 1930s and in some cases, knew what improvements were made such bridge maintenance or asphalted roads. However, very few went on to explain why such improvements were needed. For example, '*the BMPC took over the maintenance of bridges along the beach road because the building of the oil refinery at Miri, necessitated better road transport facilities'.*

(c) Nearly all candidates were aware that they had to discuss both education and health reforms. Unfortunately, not all had noted the dates in the question '**1925 to 1941'** and a number wrote about education and health improvements after 1941 which could not be credited. There was some very good, detailed knowledge of the education and health reforms which were carried out between 1925 and 1941 but not all candidates went on to explain the '***effects'*** which these reforms had, and this prevented them accessing the higher levels. For example, '*Midwives were appointed, and the Maternity and Children's Clinic was set up. This was important because it reduced the infant mortality rate by 50 per cent by 1959. Before these reforms, one in ten babies died before their first birthday.'* Such a comment would have been awarded a Level 3 response for the health side of the argument.

Question 3

(a) Stronger responses were aware that developments in civil aviation were linked to the construction of Berakas airport which was started in 1953 and then further developments in the airline industry, such as the routes established in the 1960s by Cathay Pacific and Malayan Airways, to Hong Kong and Singapore. However, less successful responses did not link 'civil aviation' to air transportation and thus failed to answer the question.

(b) Many responses displayed factual knowledge about Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddien III's overall desire to modernise Brunei and diversify its economy; others were able to describe what changes took place. However, most answers remained in Level 2 as the responses did not explain the link between the Sultan's aims and how he intended to achieve these aims. For example*, 'the Sultan aimed to diversify Brunei's economy away from its dependency on oil and to achieve this, schemes were set up to promote the fishing, aluminium and cement industries'.* Such a response would have been awarded in Level 3.

(c) Most responses described the building of mosques and particularly the magnificent Omar Ali Saifuddien built in 1958. Some also described other measures such as the establishment of religious schools and scholarships and the setting up of the Department of Religious Affairs. The most successful responses attained Level 3 because they explained how a specific measure had strengthened Islam in Brunei. For example*, 'the Sultan was concerned about the lack of time given to religious instruction in schools and established religious schools in the afternoon. This helped to strengthen Islam in Brunei because it increased the amount of time given to religious education'.*

Section B **History of Malaya, 1874 – 1963**

Question 4

(a) Several responses confused the terms of the 1902 Anglo-Siamese Declaration with those of the 1909 Bangkok Treaty and thus could not be rewarded. Some were aware that the Declaration

© 2024

allowed Siam to retain control over the four northern states and that Britain was given influence over the area, but few specific details of the Declaration were given.

(b) The clear focus of this question was why the northern Malay states were not included in the Federated Malay States, although a few candidates concentrated on why Britain wanted the Federated Malay States and thus could not be rewarded for these comments. Many were able to name the four northern states and knew that they were closely linked to Siam rather than Britain. Stronger responses reached Level 3 by arguing that trade was important to Britain and explaining that Britain wanted to retain Siam's support to protect the trade routes through the Malacca Straits and thus did not interfere in the northern states.

(c) Many responses described the terms of the Bangkok Treaty and gave details of Britain's £4 million loan to Siam to finance the railway and how Siam was no longer responsible for the finances of the four northern states. To achieve the higher levels, it was expected that candidates would be able to explain what either country had gained from the treaty and a response which explained the gains of both countries would have been awarded at Level 4. Candidates were also credited if the explained how either country had suffered losses from the treaty.

Question 5

(a) There were some good answers to this question with most candidates knowing that the Peace-living Certificate was introduced by the Japanese to control the Malayans and restrict their movements. Some also identified that it was issued to the head of the household and others knew that a breach of the rules would bring punishment.

(b) Many candidates were aware of the main ethnic groups and most knew that the Chinese were the ones most harshly treated. Some also described the treatment given to the Indians and Malays. However, the focus of this question was **why** ethnic groups were **treated** differently. The stronger responses were able to explain why a particular group was treated differently and support this with specific examples of the treatment given to that group.

(c) There were many descriptions of the Japanese slogan 'Asia for Asians', the resistance of the Malayan People's Anti-Japanese Army and of the harsh treatment of the Malayan people by the Japanese army. The focus of this question was the **impact** of the Japanese occupation **on the growth of Malayan nationalism** and the **impact on a different aspect of Japanese rule** for the other side of the argument. More successful responses attempted to **explain the impact**, but most answers were awarded in Level 2 because they tended to describe events in detail.

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

Question 6 This question was about the reasons for Japan's surrender in 1945

Stronger responses sought to engage with the sources, but weaker responses made only passing reference to them or ignored them completely. Even though such answers often demonstrated sound knowledge of the topic they could not be rewarded.

Some candidates appeared to have misunderstood the instruction to use *'your knowledge'* and perhaps assumed that this was an acceptable alternative to an analysis or evaluation of the sources. Use '*your knowledge'* means that candidates should use their knowledge of a 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 detail in all the part questions.

(a) This question asked candidates to study **Source A** which was **a cartoon** published in an American newspaper on 9th August 1945. Unfortunately, a significant number of candidates used the Background Information to attempt to answer this question and therefore could not be awarded any marks.

© 2024

To answer this type of question effectively, candidates should first identify the main message of the cartoon. What point is the cartoonist trying to make? This then directs them to draw a **valid inference** from the cartoon, an inference being something which is suggested by the cartoon but is not explicitly stated. The inference, if valid, constitutes a Level 2 response. It was possible to draw various inferences from the cartoon. The two most popular inferences noted that America dropped an atomic bomb on Japan and that the Soviet Union had entered the war against Japan. Other responses focused more on the Japanese flag and drew the inference that Japan was close to defeat.

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 Soviet Union had entered the war against Japan. I know this because in the source I can see the hammer and sickle which represent the Soviet Union.*

(b) This question asked about the utility of Source B which was a short account from a scientist who worked on the atomic bomb programme about why he believed Japan had surrendered. It is expected that candidates address why the source is useful and why it is not useful.

Many candidates stated that the source was useful because it tells us when the two atomic bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Some candidates also said that the source was useful because it tells us that it was the use of the atomic bombs that resulted in Japan's surrender.

Some candidates then went on to also consider why the source might not be useful on the grounds that it omitted important information and thus were awarded a mark within Level 3. These candidates suggested the source was not useful because it did not tell us about the large number of civilian deaths and the complete destruction of the two cities which were caused by the atomic bombs.

(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 simply to take each source in turn and consider whether it *supports or challenges the statement.* 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 could support either view. Some candidates said Source A supported the statement, referring to the depiction of the 'devastation' as evidence of the atomic bombs causing the Japanese surrender. Others referred to the huge size of the bomb compared to the size of Japan to show that the atomic bombs were responsible for Japan's surrender.

Several candidates explained that Source A also challenged the statement by saying that it was the Soviet Union's entry into the war which caused the surrender, supported by the cartoon's caption 'All This and Russia, Too!'

Source B supported the statement because 'Japan declared its intention to surrender' and the scientist said, 'I cannot believe that surrender would have come without the atomic bomb'.

Source C clearly challenged the statement and there several details in the source to show that it was not the dropping of the atomic bombs by America but the entry of the Soviet Union which caused Japan to surrender. *'The atomic bomb had little impact… the army denied …it had been an atomic bomb'.* Admiral Toyoda said, '*I believe Russia's entry…did more than the atomic bomb to bring about surrender'.* The army Vice-Chief of Staff said, '*Tokyo not directly affected…Russia's entry…a severe shock'.*

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.

© 2024

Question 7

(a) Candidates were generally aware that the League of Blood Incident was an assassination plot against wealthy businessmen. A few responses were also able to give details about the two victims and occasionally there was also mention of Nissho Inoue and the aim of the plot.

(b) There were some candidates who did not attempt this question. Many responses were able to show that Japan's withdrawal from the League of Nations was linked to the League's reaction to their attack on Manchuria and the Lytton Report. The most successful responses were able to explain why the Japanese refused to accept the League's decision and why the Lytton Report had offended them.

(c) A significant number of candidates did not provide a response to this question and some of those who did answer referred to Japan's expansionism in the 1940s rather than the 1930s as required by the question. The responses which focused on the 1930s were aware of the Great Depression and the reduction it caused to Japan's exports. Some answers also described Japan's need for raw materials and land to grow food. However, very few candidates were able to explain why the Great Depression led to the Japan's expansionist policy or why other factors contributed to their desire to expand and conquer other countries.

© 2024