

EXAMINATIONS COUNCIL OF ESWATINI

EGCSE

EXAMINATION REPORT

FOR

HISTORY (6891)

YEAR

2020

Table of Contents

Subject Code: Name of Component: Page No:

6891 History P1 3 - 14

6891 History P2 15 - 20

EGCSE HISTORY

Paper 6891/01

International Relations and Depth Studies

Key messages

- It is important that candidates fully understand that the part (a) questions do not require a conclusion. These type of questions only require candidates to describe factors by providing relevant, specific details.
- In the part (b) questions candidates should identify the factors and then support with specific relevant evidence. The evidence should be elaborated in relation to the question.
- Candidates should follow the instructions to avoid rubric infringement. For instance, in the part (b) questions candidates were required to provide two explanations but some candidates ignored the instructions and provided more than two explanations.
- It is essential that both teachers and candidates fully understand that evaluation forms an essential element of essay writing in History. Candidates are therefore required to write their conclusive arguments (evaluation). The part (c) questions are incomplete without the evaluation.
- In Section B, both teachers and candidates should fully understand that source interpretation and analysis is essential for candidates to successfully answer source questions. Candidates should desist from using the statement given in the part (d) question to answer the other questions in the section.

General comments

Candidates demonstrated a general understanding of the demands of the questions. Some were able to give attention to the key words in the questions. However, other candidates wrote responses that were unnecessarily lengthy which still failed to address the demands of the question. In Section A, the responses provided by the candidates were mostly fully developed. Candidates were able to provide evidence to support their arguments. In Section B, most candidates struggled to develop their responses as they were unable to apply the skill of source interpretation. A majority of candidates were only able to interpret the sources at the sub-message level. Candidates often used all details from the sources without selecting relevant

information as developments of their assertions or arguments. This often led to candidates scoring lower marks as the development failed to support the main argument or assertion.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A: International Relations, 1919-c.1989

Question 1

- (a) This part question required candidates to describe any three territorial terms of the Treaty of Versailles. Most candidates failed to select the specific and relevant territorial terms of the Treaty of Versailles, instead gave all the terms of the treaty. This led to them scoring very low or no marks in the question. Candidates that were able to adhere to the demands of the question were able to score maximum marks.

An example of a correct response showing identification and development:

The territorial terms of the Treaty of Versailles were that Germany lost Alsace and Lorraine to France. The Saar region was placed under the control of the League of Nations for fifteen years. Germany's overseas colonies were to be run by the League as mandates.

- (b) This part question required candidates to explain two reasons why the war guilt clause was imposed on Germany. Candidates were able to identify the two reasons, however most struggled to develop their reasons with the relevant evidence. Other candidates used the same evidence to develop two separate identified reasons. Some candidates failed to address the question on the 'war guilt clause' and instead gave a narration of either the 'causes' or the 'course' of the First World War.

A correct answer showing the two explanations:

The victors blamed Germany for her aggression in causing the outbreak of World War I. She invaded France through Belgium thus making the French allies to mobilise their armies and declared war on Germany.

They wanted to compel Germany to pay reparations. Germany caused a lot of destruction on French land hence they had to pay for the damage that occurred in France.

- (c) Candidates were required to evaluate the payment of reparations imposed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles. Most candidates were able to give valid explanations on both sides but had a challenge in coming up with proper evaluations. Most of the invalid evaluations were one-sided while others failed to exalt one point over the other.

A correct answer showing the two sides of the argument with an evaluation:

The German invasion of France led to massive destruction to human life and infrastructure thus she had to pay reparations in order to compensate and rebuild the French economy. However, the payment of reparations by Germany only was unfair since all the other countries were to blame for the outbreak of the war as they formed rival camps like triple entente and triple alliance.

EVALUATION: *All in all, as much as Germany had to pay reparations for the destruction in France, it was unfair that only Germany and her allies were made to pay.*

Question 2

- (a) This part question required candidates to describe the agreements of the Locarno Treaties of 1925. A majority of candidates were unable to recall specific content about the Locarno Treaties. Most candidates used content about the Treaty of Versailles, Potsdam Conference or aims of the League of Nations to respond to the question.

An example of a correct response showing identification and development is:

Germany finally accepted that the Rhineland would remain demilitarised. France and Germany agreed to settle any future disputes through the League of Nations. Germany finally accepted the borders with France and Belgium as stated in the Treaty of Versailles.

- (b) This part question required candidates to explain any two reasons why the League of Nations failed to get international agreement on disarmament. Few candidates were able to provide proper explanations on the reasons for the failure of disarmament by the League of Nations. Most candidates were only able to explain reasons for the failure of the League of Nations as a whole without being specific to the failure of the League to achieve disarmament.

A correct answer showing the two explanations:

The League failed to get international agreement on disarmament. In 1923, the League drafted its first disarmament treaty. France and other countries accepted it but Britain rejected it leading to countries losing faith on disarmament.

Leading members of the League made secret treaties that encouraged rearmament. Britain and Germany signed a Naval Agreement in 1935 allowing Germany to rebuild her navy to only 35% of the British navy thus making it difficult for the League to force countries to disarm.

- (c) Candidates were required to evaluate the reasons for the League's failure to stop the Abyssinian invasion by Italy. Candidates were expected make an assertion towards the statement or hypothesis, identify valid reasons on both sides, bring specific evidence, elaborate and then evaluate. The performance in this part question was generally below average. Few candidates were able to provide reasons why Italy as a major member of the League caused the failure of the League in Abyssinia. Candidates had a challenge in explaining the significance of Italy as an important member of the League in causing the League to fail in the Abyssinian crisis. Some candidates also used the challenges faced by the League in other events to argue why they may disagree with the statement. Other candidates also justified Italy's action in Abyssinia.

An ideal answer for this question:

Britain and France were not willing to risk war with Mussolini because Italy had a strong army and was a member of the Council. No other member of the League had the strength to take Mussolini on, thus the League was unable to stop the invasion of Abyssinia.

However, the League enforced meaningless and ineffective sanctions on Italy. The members of the Assembly organised sanctions against Italy which excluded oil, steel and charcoal yet those were essential for Italy waging war.

EVALUATION: *All in all, Italy's strength as a strong and important member of the League even overshadowed the decision making in the assembly as no country was willing to seriously confront her.*

Question 3

- (a) This part question required candidates to describe any three things on the events of the Saar in 1935. This question was fairly popular among candidates but the performance was below average. There were candidates that were able to recall specific content on the events of the Saar in 1935. However, most candidates were not able to select information that occurred in the specified time period stated in the question. Some candidates used content about the Saar region when discussed at the Treaty of Versailles. Other candidates used the terms of the Treaty of Versailles to respond to the question.

An example of a correct response showing identification and development:

The League of Nations held a plebiscite in 1935 where German people voted whether or not to return to German rule. The plebiscite was legal as it was promised at Treaty of Versailles. 90% of Germans voted in favour of a return to German rule (Dev).

- (b) This part question required candidates to explain any two reasons why Britain and France allowed Germany to remilitarise the Rhineland. Most candidates were able to explain two reasons why Britain and France allowed Germany to remilitarise the Rhineland. Some candidates identified reasons but failed to bring relevant evidence for developing their points. Other candidates explained reasons why France and Britain followed the policy of appeasement.

A correct answer showing the two explanations:

The Rhineland was widely regarded as Germany's backyard. Both the British and French leaders realised that it was unwise to risk European peace over whether or not German troops should return to a part of their own country. Therefore, they decided to allow German troops to occupy the Rhineland.

French leaders were not prepared to act on the German reoccupation of the Rhineland. The French leaders were reluctant to involve France in conflicts fearing losing elections at home hence they took no action and allowed Hitler to remilitarise the Rhineland.

- (c) Candidates were required to evaluate Hitler's foreign policy as the main reason for the outbreak war in 1939. They were expected to make an assertion, identify valid reasons on both sides, bring specific evidence, elaborate and then evaluate. A majority of candidates were able to explain both sides of the argument but could not provide proper evaluations. Most of the invalid evaluations were one-sided while others failed to exalt one point over the other.

A correct answer showing the two explanations:

Hitler's desire for a living space for the German people threatened European peace as he wanted to carve out an empire in Eastern Europe. He invaded Czechoslovakia and that gave him confidence to invade more territories in Europe. This caused great alarm among the other countries and made them to get ready for a war against Germany.

However, the Great Depression affected the work of the League. Britain did not want to get involved in sorting out international disputes while its economy was suffering. As a result, the League failed to stop the Manchurian invasion prompting other countries to invade other countries thus causing the war.

EVALUATION: *All in all, Hitler's aggressive foreign policy would not have succeeded had it not been for the Great Depression as Britain's reluctance in sorting out international disputes was precipitated by the need to recover from the effects of the Great Depression.*

Most candidates were unable to provide proper evaluations; despite that they were able to explain both sides of the argument. Some candidates that scored low marks used content about Hitler's foreign policy to explain the other side of the argument. For instance, a candidate would agree that Hitler's foreign policy was behind the outbreak of the war in 1939 and go further to use the Nazi-soviet Pact to disagree with the statement, whereas

the Nazi-Soviet Pact was part of Hitler's foreign policy. This resulted in candidates scoring low marks as the explanations were one-sided.

Question 4

- (a) This part question required candidates to describe the relationship between the USA and Cuba. A majority of candidates were able to recall the relationship between the two countries before the stipulated time period hence they were unable to score maximum marks.

An example of a correct response showing identification and development:

The USA broke off diplomatic ties with Cuba. Fidel Castro took over American-owned businesses in Cuba. J F Kennedy supported Cuban missiles in an attempt to overthrow the Castro led government.

Responses that scored low marks failed to recall any specific content relating to the relationship between the USA and Cuba. Some candidates also described the relationship between the two countries before 1959 which led to them earning no marks.

- (b) This part question required candidates to explain reasons why the USA was worried about the missiles that were placed by the Soviet Union in Cuba. Most candidates struggled to come up with clear explanations on the reasons why the USA was worried about the missiles that were placed by the Soviet Union in Cuba. Often, candidates used content about the containment policy as one reason for the USA's worry about the missiles in Cuba.

A correct answer showing the two explanations:

There was the potential for a nuclear war that would have destroyed the USA. Cuba was only 90 miles from the USA. It had always been regarded as a country that fell within the USA sphere of influence. By placing the missiles in Cuba, the Soviet Union could destroy the US cities with only a five-minute warning.

The USA was also worried that the USSR was trying to draw them into a nuclear war. The USSR had secretly shipped nuclear weapons into Cuba, within reach of the USA which meant that a possible nuclear war could break out. This made the USA worried given the destruction that could be brought by such a war.

A noticeable number of candidates could not provide two valid explanations in this question. Such candidates were only able to explain reasons for the USA's worry in relation to the proximity of the USA to where the missiles were placed in Cuba.

- (b)** Candidates were required to evaluate the results of the Cuban missile crisis. The general performance in this question was average. Some candidates mistook Khrushchev as a leader of the USA which was historically incorrect.

An ideal answer for this question:

Kennedy came out of the crisis with a greatly improved reputation in his own country and throughout the West. He had stood up to Khrushchev and had made him to back down. The missiles were returned to the USSR.

However, Khrushchev won the Cuban missile crisis. He had achieved both his aims; America never bothered Cuba again as it stayed communist and the US missile sites in Turkey were dismantled in November 1962.

EVALUATION: *Overall, Khrushchev achieved more than Kennedy after the Cuban missile crisis. Khrushchev got a communist satellite state near the US and the removal of missile in Turkey while Kennedy only achieved an improved reputation at home.*

Section B: Depth Study
Russia, 1905 - 1941

This was a compulsory source based section and the candidates' performance was average. Most candidates were unable to interpret the sources at the big message level. Candidates could only process the sources at sub-message and surface message levels. Some candidates did not attempt to interpret the sources but used the statement in the part (d) question to answer the part (a), (b) and (c) questions.

- (a)** This question required candidates to interpret the big message of Source A, select relevant evidence from the source to support the big message and provide an elaboration. Most candidates were only able to interpret the message at the sub-message level. Very few candidates were able to interpret the source at the big message level. Candidates also struggled to select the relevant evidence to support the big message and also to provide the elaboration. Candidates simply brought details of the source as they were as evidence supporting the big message. It is essential to note that candidates need to carefully sift and select relevant evidence from the source to support its message.

A correct message of the source:

The message of the source is that life in Russia was difficult such that Russians were becoming increasingly unhappy with the government. The source states that week by week food became scarcer and there was bitter discontent amongst Russians. This shows that Russians suffered and were unhappy about these developments.

Most candidates were only able to interpret the suffering and hardships faced by Russians but failed to interpret the reaction of the Russian people.

- (b)** Candidates were required to interpret Sources B and C and compare these two sources for agreement and disagreement at the point of view level. The question then demands that the candidates select relevant evidence from each source to support the agreement and disagreement. Most candidates were only able to compare the sources at the sub-message level or surface details of the sources. Other candidates made invalid

comparisons where they either used one source and not the other source, or comparing unrelated details of the sources. For instance, candidates would compare 'food scarcity' and the 'popularity of the Bolshevik party'. Some candidates compared Sources A and B instead of Sources B and C. Other candidates failed to use transitional conjunctions to show comparison.

A correct comparison:

Source B agrees with Source C because they both talk about the collapse of the Provisional government due to opposition from the Russians. Source B states that soldiers and sailors took to the streets of Petrograd and they were joined by workers resulting in riots while Source C states that the Bolsheviks were dedicated to the revolution.

The sources disagree about the reasons of the collapse of the Provisional government. Source B says that the Provisional government itself was responsible for its collapse. On the other hand, Source C blames the Bolsheviks for the collapse of the Provisional government.

Candidates who scored low marks described the surface details of the both sources without making any comparisons, compared the provenances or compared the sources at the sub message level. Other candidates failed to use the transitional conjunctions in their arguments while others brought evidence from only one source instead of both sources.

- (c)** Candidates were required to interpret the big message of Source D and then find its purpose. Candidates also need to detect the biasness/ propaganda in the source. The usefulness of the source based on its purpose. The performance of this question was relatively higher than other questions in Section B. Candidates were able state the usefulness of Source D based on its purpose in a single sentence. There were other candidates however, who were only able to state the usefulness of the source based on information from the source, valid sub messages or contextual knowledge. Very few candidates described surface details of the source.

A correct response showing usefulness of the source based on it's purpose:

Source D is useful in showing the use of propaganda by the Bolsheviks to encourage Russians to support them and bring down the Provisional Government. The source shows a slogan used by Lenin and the Bolsheviks promising peace, land and bread to Russians if they vote for the Bolsheviks. I also know that the Bolsheviks used propaganda to influence the Russian people to support them in bringing down the Provisional Government.

Candidates who scored low marks mainly stated the usefulness of Source D based on the use of contextual knowledge which only scored them a maximum of two marks out of eight marks. It should be noted that the use of contextual knowledge is meant to support the information in the source.

- (d)** This question required candidates to synthesise the sources based on a given hypothesis/ statement. Candidates were expected to declare the stand of the source towards the given statement, select evidence from the source to support the stand of the source and explain the selected evidence in relation to the statement. Candidates are further required to evaluate a minimum of two sources for biasness to earn the maximum marks allocated. Most candidates were able to synthesise the five sources. Candidates demonstrated understanding that the question required evidence to support before providing explanations to link to the statement. They were also able to evaluate Sources A, D and E for biasness, however, some could not explain the biasness of the sources. It is important to note that identifying the sources by name enabled candidates to track their arguments.

However, some candidates failed to select the appropriate evidence from the source to support their arguments. Instead, candidates repeated all the details from the sources as evidence to support their arguments, which led them to scoring low marks. Other candidates selected evidence that did not align with the assertion they had made, therefore resulting in them making invalid explanations. Some candidates could not attain maximum marks because they combined the sources. It is essential that candidates treat each source separately.

A correct synthesis response:

Source A disagrees with the statement. The source shows that in Russia food became scarcer week by week which means that the Provisional government collapsed because of the food shortages. However, Source A is biased in that it is written by an American who may have been against the Provisional government.

Source B disagrees with the statement. The source states that the Provisional government collapsed because of poor decision making as the decision to continue with the war backfired on them.

Source C agrees with the statement because it says that the Bolsheviks had a huge following and had support from the army and sailors. This means that the Bolsheviks were behind the collapse of the Provisional government. However, Source C also disagrees because it shows that the leadership of the Bolsheviks was divided. The source says that some Bolsheviks felt a revolution was not the right way to get rid of the Provisional government. So the collapse of the Provisional Government may have not been due to the growing power of the Bolsheviks.

Source D agrees with the statement. The source shows a campaign by the Bolsheviks that won them support against the Provisional government. However, Source D is a propaganda used by Lenin to gain support for the Bolsheviks. The fact that they had to use propaganda shows that the Bolsheviks did not have much support in Russia to cause the collapse of the Provisional Government.

Source E disagrees with the statement. The source says if the Bolsheviks would take power now, the majority of the soldiers would not support them. This means that the Bolsheviks were not entirely responsible for the collapse of the Provisional government. However, the source agrees in that the majority of workers and the large part of the army were for the Bolsheviks. This shows a large support base for the Bolsheviks as they try to get rid of the Provisional government.

EGCSE HISTORY

Paper 6891/02

Aspects of the History of Southern Africa

Key messages

- Candidates should ensure they read the questions carefully and understand the key words in order to adhere to the demands of the questions.
- In the part (a) questions it is essential that candidates identify the factors then develop them by providing relevant, specific details.
- In the part (b) questions candidates should identify the factors and then support with specific relevant evidence. The evidence should be elaborated in relation to the question.
- Candidates should follow the instructions to avoid rubric infringement i.e. candidates should carefully read the instructions in order to answer the required number of questions.
- It is essential that both teachers and candidates fully understand that writing in continuous form is a requirement of essay writing in History. Candidates should avoid writing in point form.

General comments

There was little evidence of candidates misunderstanding the concepts and most showed a good understanding of the demands of the questions. However, some candidates missed the key words in the questions. For example, 'Battle of Bop' in Question 4(a) which was mistaken for the Bisho incident. It was pleasing to see some candidates applying a higher-level skill by describing and explaining factors as well as providing evidence in elaborating the factors provided. Some candidates, however, were unable to support their explanations with the relevant evidence. Other candidates committed rubric infringement even though the instructions are clearly stated. Some just ignored the instructions and answered all the questions instead of choosing one question from Section A and one from Section B. There were some candidates that did not write in a continuous form, they even used sub topics and bullets instead of writing in paragraph.

Comments on specific questions**Section A: Swaziland, 1945 -1995****Question 1**

- (a) This part question required candidates to identify and describe any four political changes brought by the British Administration in Swaziland before 1960. Most candidates were able to describe the political changes. However, some were describing social and economic changes yet the focus on the question was on political changes.

An example of a correct answer showing identification and description:

‘The status of the king as *Ingwenyama* was changed to that of a paramount chief. He was placed under the British Residence Commissioner since the British believed that there was only one king in the British empire’.

An example of a social and economic change that was given by some candidates:

‘The British administration implemented the Land Partition Proclamation act of 1907. This act divided Swaziland into three sectors, one third of the land went to the British, one third was given to the Swazi’s and the other became Crown Land.

- (b) This question required candidates to explain three reasons why there was an increased spirit of nationalism in Swaziland in the 1960s. A majority of candidates were able to identify and explain the three reasons. However, some candidates provided narrations instead of explanations whereas other candidates explained one or two reasons which made them fail to get the maximum marks. Other candidates misinterpreted the question as if it required reasons why ‘Imbokodvo’ movement was popular.

An example of a correct answer showing identification and explanation:

‘The spirit of nationalism in Swaziland in the 1960s was greatly influenced by the return of the Swazi men who fought in the Second World War. The war exposed these Swazi men to different ideologies, culture and beliefs such as equality and liberation. These ideas enlightened them thus they influenced the Swazi people to begin calling for their liberation and independence hence the spirit of nationalism increased’.

An example of wrong response/ misinterpretation:

'The spirit of nationalism increased because the Swazi people wanted to make Siswati an official Language as they loved their culture. This therefore increase the spirit of nationalism'.

Question 2

- (a) This part question required candidates to describe any four challenges faced by the agricultural industries in Swaziland from independence up to the 1990s. The candidates' performance was below average as most candidates failed to identify relevant challenges in agriculture and those who were able to describe them only came up with one or two challenges which made them fail to get the maximum marks.

An example of a correct answer:

'One of the challenges faced by the agricultural industries in Swaziland are the natural disasters such as drought. Due to water shortages this result in low yields of the crops as the farmers cannot irrigate their crops.'

An example of wrong response:

'One of the challenges faced by the agricultural industries in Swaziland is shortage of land. The Swazis did not have enough land which was taken by the whites and Swazis were pushed into infertile land which was not productive for agriculture'.

- (b) This part question required candidates to explain any three ways in which the government tried to address the problems faced by the agricultural industries in Swaziland up to 1995. This question was not well answered by most candidates as they did not stick to the period specified on the question. They provided solutions which go beyond 1995.

An example of a correct answer:

'The Government of Swaziland has created more reservoirs in an attempt to deal with the problems faced by the agriculture industries in Swaziland. These helps the farmers to have water reserves to use for irrigation during drought and these helps them to get good yields to sell for profits.'

An example of a wrong response:

'The government of Swaziland has created dams like Maguga Dam. This has helped farmers to irrigate their crops' this response is wrong because Maguga dam was built in 2001.

Section B: South Africa 1948 –c.1995 and Zimbabwe, 1951-c. 2002

Question 3

- (a) This question required candidates to describe any four ways in which the Nationalist Governments apartheid policies impacted on the lives of Africans in South Africa. This was a popular question among the candidates although some did not give the impact but they described the apartheid laws only. This affected them because they did not address the question.

An example of a correct answer:

'The apartheid policies deprived Africans of political rights. This was done through the Suppression of Communism Act of 1950 which banned communism and any other political group that aimed to bring about political change'

An example of a wrong response/ description of an apartheid law:

'The Group Areas Act of 1950 gave the government the power to declare some areas for whites only and blacks were moved out of these areas'.

- (b) This part question required candidates to explain any three ways in which the creation of homelands affected the Africans in South Africa. Most candidates who chose this question failed to give relevant information and misinterpreted the creations of homelands to the reforms by the ANC. Some candidates were just describing the effects of any apartheid laws and how Africans were affected by these laws.

An example of a correct answer:

'The effects of the creation of homelands on the Africans was that they were overcrowded in the reserves, a large population was forced to settle on a very small area. This often resulted in the spread of diseases due to poor sanitation caused by overcrowding'

An example of a wrong response:

'With the creations of homelands Africans found themselves living in better houses. These were the RDP's which were provided by government.

Question 4

- (a) This part question required candidates to describe any four things about the events that took place at the battle of Bop in Bophuthatswana in 1994. This question was not popular, even those who chose it failed to display knowledge and understanding on the content of the battle. Some candidates tended to describe events such as the battle of Bisho and some described the repression measures used by the apartheid government during the apartheid period e.g. murder, banning orders and other measures.

An example of a correct answer:

'There were violent protests after Mangope, the President of Bophothatswana announced that his subjects would boycott the South African general elections 1994.'

An example of a wrong response:

'Many Africans demonstrated without carrying their passes. They were against the government policies which forced them to carry passes. The police shot at the demonstrators killing a number of them'.

- (b) This part question required candidates to explain any three reason why apartheid collapsed in South Africa in the early 1990's. Most candidates failed to demonstrate understanding of the question and content required. They could not explain why apartheid collapsed instead they gave reforms introduced by F.W. De Klerk.

An example of a correct answer:

'The international community had begun to take notice of the brutality of the apartheid regime especially after the Sharpeville massacre in 1960. The United Nations Organization led the call for sanctions against the South African Government. This led to many large multinational companies withdrawing from South Africa. By the late 1980s, the South African economy was struggling with the effects of the internal and external boycotts.'

An example of a wrong response:

'There was increase in violence in South Africa which led to De Klerk freeing political prisoners. People like Nelson Mandela were set free and later he became the first President of liberated South Africa'.

Question 5

Only two candidates attempted questions on Zimbabwe. Their performance on this question was below average. They demonstrated lack of content and used information on the content on South Africa in answering the questions hence they could not get marks.

Question 6

There was no candidate who attempted this question.