

# CONTENTS

---

FOREWORD .....	1
HISTORY (CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN AFRICA) .....	2
Paper 2160/01 Paper 1 .....	2
Paper 2160/02 Paper 2 .....	4

## FOREWORD

---

This booklet contains reports written by Examiners on the work of candidates in certain papers. **Its contents are primarily for the information of the subject teachers concerned.**

# **HISTORY (CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN AFRICA)**

---

## **GCE Ordinary Level**

**Paper 2160/01**

**Paper 1**

### **General comments**

This report covers the work of candidates whose scripts were marked in the UK. As the entry was appreciably larger than in recent years, the Examiner saw a useful range of response (of considerably varying quality) as well as answers to nearly all topics in the question paper. Some excellent work was offered, with accurate detail, orderly presentation and concentration on the questions as set.

The common weakness which hindered many candidates arose from their inability to select material to fit the specific question asked; such answers seemed indirect and irrelevant, despite a page or more of historically 'correct' facts. In too many instances one was offered the 'write-all-you-know-about-Shaka' kind of answer. (In fact this was precisely so in **Question 14**.)

The standard of English was in almost all cases clear and comprehensible, though a very small number of scripts caused problems for the Examiner on grounds of legibility. A few candidates unfortunately wrote only one-and-a-half or two answers (three are required), and a number of entrants offered a very short answer (only half a page of writing) to all of their three questions.

On the matter of the rubric and other formalities, several candidates chose three questions from one section only and could be scored for only two of them. Candidates are reminded that they should number all their questions (the wording of the question need not be copied out), and should include their personal examination number at the top of their script.

As has been observed before in these reports, candidates seem to have had little or no preparation to answer questions from **Section A**; with one or two exceptions, scores for that section were all low. Additionally, candidates choosing to answer questions in **Section B** should remember to use material relevant to *Central* African history and not answer from a South African viewpoint; the latter cannot be properly rewarded. The same comment applies when Central African history is used for questions from **Section C**.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### **Section A**

In this section of the paper, answers to **Questions 1, 2, 3** and **6** were seen. Essays were mostly short and generalised in nature.

#### **Question 1**

Four or five states were correctly identified and a few features offered in some scripts. Several answers were written in the present tense, with contemporary descriptions and material (such as the oil industry in Libya) inappropriate for the 'early nineteenth century'.

#### **Question 2**

No answer scored more than a handful of marks; all essays were vague and generalised. The term 'legitimate trade' was misunderstood in several scripts.

### **Question 3**

Answers were again vague and irrelevant. No candidate mentioned Bishop Crowther or any location in Nigeria.

### **Question 6**

Answers on Haile Selassie failed to score but answers on Kenyatta were much better. One such essay contained much biographical detail and a well-balanced assessment of Kenyatta's importance.

### **Section B**

In this section, **Questions 7, 9 and 11** were frequently chosen, while **Questions 8, 10 and 12** produced relatively few answers. Candidates and their teachers were clearly aware of the usefulness of 'standard' topics (as in **Questions 7 and 11**), but not all answers could adjust to the specific requirements of the questions set for November 2004.

### **Question 7**

This was the most popular in the paper with nearly two-thirds of entrants offering an answer. A handful of excellent essays were awarded the maximum mark. In contrast, about one-sixth of the answers failed to gain any significant score, being vague and incorrect. The second part of the question ('notable contributions') was often ignored. Perhaps it seemed difficult to these entrants; very few could give useful cultural illustrations of the Lunda-Kazembe legacy. Wider issues such as centralised government, tributary chiefdoms and the benefits of long-distance trade, were mostly well-described.

### **Question 8**

Only a few candidates attempted these topics but all had the historical detail necessary to score well. Exceptionally full answers were seen on the Bisa and Rozwi, including clear estimates of their importance.

### **Question 9**

A third of the candidates chose this question; regrettably a number failed to score at all. Many answers comprised a lengthy account of *all* Portuguese activities in the Kongo area, leaving the Examiner to select the relevant material. This method produced many middling answers and there were few full and accurate scripts. Long introductions and detailed backgrounds were unnecessarily included, while some answers concentrated incorrectly on the 'prazo' system relevant to early Portuguese colonisation of the Zambezi Valley.

### **Question 10**

Not many answers were offered; most of them could barely score as they lacked both relevance and accuracy. Superior answers weighed up Lewanika's work and importance with great care, but another candidate wrote entirely on Lobengula and the Ndebele.

### **Question 11**

Nearly one-third of entrants chose this question but few had mastery of both the causes and the results. No outstanding answers were offered; too many were incomplete or showed confusion between the 1890, 1893 and 1896 Wars. Much time was pointlessly spent on details of the Jameson Raid.

### **Question 12**

Some serious essays scored well on this topic. There was good understanding of the position of all three components of the Federation, and in the best essays – the importance of external factors (such as the UK government) was not neglected.

### **Section C**

Both **Questions 13** and **14** attracted a large response with **Question 14** producing by far the better result for most candidates. **Questions 16, 17** and **18** produced small entries and, surprisingly, nothing was seen on **Questions 15** and **19**.

#### **Question 13**

This was not well-answered – disappointing, as the topic follows a well-trodden path. There were too many long diversions about early Dutch contacts and also numerous descriptive ‘way-of-life’ answers on the San and Khoikhoi. Some essays ranged far beyond 1800 and many failed to identify specific reactions by the local people. However, competition over the use of land (the key factor in the conflicts) was properly related to the topic in the better essays.

#### **Question 14**

This question was ably tackled by many candidates and produced a high proportion of successful scripts, both as to the ‘causes’ and the ‘results’. A small number of scripts approached the maximum mark, with excellent detail on African dispersal and European expansion. But many essays wasted far too much time on Shaka’s background and reforms: neither aspect is totally irrelevant, but more balanced answers used a selection of appropriate material.

#### **Question 16**

Several candidates produced sound answers but unfortunately a small number of other essays showed no knowledge whatsoever of the Uitlanders and their problems. More than one answer focused on the causes of the Great Trek, an event of forty years or so earlier.

#### **Question 17**

Only a quarter of the minority that attempted it tackled this topic with any certainty. Most answers were like those generally offered in **Section A**; very vague and containing general platitudes. One response was devoted entirely to David Livingstone and another concentrated on activities in Central rather than Southern Africa.

#### **Question 18**

Few candidates (amongst the small number who answered this question) both perceptively explained the purpose of apartheid and also gave clear examples in the legal, political and social fields.

**Paper 2160/02**

**Paper 2**

### **General comments**

This report relates only to those scripts marked in Great Britain. This represents a sample of scripts from a variety of countries.

The standard of English observed in this paper continues to be very high. This is an important feature as it enables all candidates to express themselves effectively and so gain the maximum number of marks commensurate with their historical knowledge.

Candidates continue to exhibit a high level of preparation for this paper. This would appear to be a result of both good quality teaching and good motivation by candidates. As a result only a very few candidates scored zero marks.

Rubric infringements were rare in this examination sitting. No candidate attempted more questions than were asked and very few attempted only two questions. Candidates offering only two questions were, invariably, weak candidates who appeared to be making little effort.

Examination technique, though clearly very well taught in some Centres, is still weak in others. Candidates must read the question carefully and only give answers to the question that is set – no marks are awarded for irrelevant material, no matter how well written it may be. Some topics appear to lend themselves to the “all I know about...” mode of response – to write a page or more of irrelevant material is a waste of precious time and weakens the overall performance of the candidate. A further element of examination technique that could be improved is the allocation of time in approximately equal parts to each question. It is obvious that some candidates are denying themselves the ability to score the maximum marks possible on their final question due to self-inflicted pressures of time.

The ability of candidates to write three full answers is considerably improved. This may reflect on a broader spread of topics being covered in the teaching of the syllabus or more diligent revision by candidates. This is a welcome development that reflects well in the marks that candidates score.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### **Question 1**

This continues to be a popular area. The vast majority of candidates had a good grasp of the security needs of Germany at unification and how Bismarck responded to those needs with a series of alliances. A few candidates focused on the internal security of Germany and received full credit for the material presented. The fall from office of Bismarck was less well known, though most candidates were aware of rift between Bismarck and the Kaiser.

#### **Question 2**

There were many good, comprehensive and high scoring answers to this question. A few candidates insisted, incorrectly, that the murder of the Archduke was a long-term cause of the war. The aftermath of the assassination was almost universally well known and presented. Only a small proportion of candidates appreciated the reasons for the failure of the Schlieffen Plan.

#### **Question 3**

For candidates who read the question carefully and answered the parts of the question systematically this was a high scoring question. There was a good appreciation of the 14 Points and good outlines of three of the points – encouragingly, candidates chose a wide selection to outline. Surprisingly, many candidates gave only the Treaty of Versailles as dealing with the defeated states, omitting those that dealt with Austria, Hungary, Turkey and Bulgaria. Territorial losses were usually well known.

#### **Question 4**

This was not a popular question and few candidates scored well. There was confusion of the 1911 and 1917 revolutions and little seemed to be known of the period between 1911 and 1917, not even of the wartime period. Candidates were a little more robust on the means used by the Bolsheviks to consolidate their power, but the reasons for the change from War Communism to the NEP were given scant attention.

#### **Question 5**

A popular question. Some very good material was seen on the weaknesses of Weimar. However, the second part of the question was less well done. A significant number of candidates wrote about the rise to power of Hitler before 1933 – and scored zero. Whilst many candidates wrote, with some gusto, about the techniques of the Gestapo etc., few were able to define the key to Hitler’s grasp of power in the Enabling Law.

#### **Question 6**

Mussolini continues to have large following. This question, above all others, tempted the candidates to write “all I know about...” – in this case, Mussolini. The question specifically confined the rise to power to begin in 1919, but few candidates took notice of this boundary. Very few candidates had any real grasp of what Fascism stood for – only that it was anti-communist and therefore supported by big business and the Church. Candidates were explicitly asked to outline only five measures introduced by Mussolini, but many answers gave a catalogue of all Mussolini’s activity. This question is an excellent example of the need for candidates to read the question carefully and only answer what is required by the question.

### Question 7

This was not a popular question. Of the parts, no answers were seen to sections **(b)**, **(f)**, and **(g)**. Appeasement, **(a)**, usually produced competent answers. The Battle of Britain, **(c)**, was known in general terms, but detail was often lacking. The entry of the USA into the war, **(d)**, was known in general terms, but the fact that Germany declared war on the USA following the US declaration of war on Japan was little known. The use of air power, **(e)**, was, again, known in a very general way, but candidates frequently failed to give any robust examples to support their ideas.

### Question 8

Candidates tended to “merge” the first and final parts of this question, a fully acceptable way of handling the question. The question specifically asked for actions that contributed to the *beginning* of the Cold War – whilst the Korean War was accepted as a manifestation of the Cold War in Asia, the Cuban Missile Crisis clearly came from a period in which the Cold War was well established and was, therefore, given no credit.

### Question 9

This question was both popular and often well done. There was a good appreciation of a number of elements of weakness in the UN – ranging from the need for political consensus to the lack of standing force and the weak financial arrangement for the organisation. A wide range of conflicts were used for illustrative purposes.

### Question 10

No answers were seen to this question.

### Question 11

Not a popular question, and one in which the candidates focused exclusively on the final three sections. The Cuban Missile Crisis was usually well known. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan was well known by a few candidates but others confused the Soviet invasion with the later American invasion to expel the Taliban. SALT I & II produced some very vague generalisations.

### Question 12

For the few candidates who attempted this question, and were well informed, this was a high scoring question. The “Red or Expert” dialogue was well understood as was the activity of the Red Guards. The largely negative impact on the economy and political process was also well understood. Not a question to be attempted by the faint hearted, but rewarding for those with appropriate knowledge.

### Question 13

Very few answers were seen to this question. Some were well informed about the French decision to abandon Vietnam after Dien Bien Phu and similarly about US efforts to support South Vietnam. Equally there were some answers that were based on little more than vague knowledge and perhaps watching films of the Vietnam war – these scored few, if any, marks.

### Question 14

No answers were seen to this question.

### Question 15

No answers were seen to this question.

### Question 16

A popular question in which candidates concentrated on the three civil war options. No response was seen on the OAU. Candidates usually exhibited good knowledge of the events in the civil wars, but gave little information the causes of the wars or the outcomes.

**Question 17**

A popular question. The majority of candidates selected the 1948 war of independence and the Suez War of 1956 to illustrate the conflict, and frequently gave well rounded answers outlining the causes and outcomes of the conflicts as well as the principal events. A significant group of candidates used the Yom Kippur War, but very few used the Six Day War for illustrative purposes. The invasion of Kuwait was usually dismissed in a summary manner as being part of the search for more oil resources.

**Question 18**

A question that enjoyed considerable popularity, with candidates concentrating exclusively on the first two options – population growth and declining natural resources. Whilst this type of question is always popular with weak candidates searching for a third question to answer – who often make only the most general remarks and score weak marks – it also attracted some very able candidates who gave full and thoughtful answers and who, accordingly, scored well.

**Conclusion**

Overall, candidates continue to respond very positively to the challenge of this paper across a wide spectrum of history. The evidence from this year's paper is that candidates are well able to cope with the three questions posed and are able to produce well informed and thoughtful answers.