

Marking Schemes

This document was prepared for markers' reference. It should not be regarded as a set of model answers. Candidates and teachers who were not involved in the marking process are advised to interpret its content with care.

PAPER 1 (DATA-BASED QUESTIONS)

1. (a) What made the Western countries strong? [2 marks]
- one relevant clue plus elaboration max. 2 marks
- e.g. - Having a constitution
- Having the power of both the ruler and the people limited
- (b) Compare the views of Kang Youwei and Zou Rong regarding the prospect of revolution in China [4 marks]
- L1 Attempts to draw comparisons, but vague in explanation with reference to the Sources. [max. 2]
- L2 Able to draw valid comparisons with effective explanation with reference to the Sources. [max. 4]
- Similarity:
e.g. - Both Kang and Zou noted that revolution might lead to damage.
- Difference:
e.g. - Kang stressed that revolution would lead to national disintegration, whereas Zou thought that it would China independence and freedom.
- (c) Whether 'Revolutions are violent, but they can be an effective means of strengthening China.' [8 marks]
- L1 Vague answer, ineffective in using both the Sources and own knowledge. [max. 2]
- L2 Lack in balance, effective in using *either* the Sources *or* own knowledge only. [max. 4]
- L3 Sound and balanced answer, effective in using *both* the Sources *and* own knowledge. [max. 8]
- Revolution: violent?
e.g. - Blood would be shed and flow like rivers and many people would die like flies. (Source A)
- Revolutions might lead to destruction. (Source B)
- Sun Yat-sen's revolution took eleven uprisings to overthrow the Qing Dynasty. (own knowledge)
- Revolution: an effective means of strengthening China?
e.g. - Revolution would produce new problems and huge casualties. (Source A).
- Revolution would eliminate absolutism and slavery and bring about progress. (Source B).
- Social and cultural changes took place after the 1911 Revolution. (own knowledge)
- However, after the 1911 Revolution, there were attempts of monarchical recovery and continual foreign aggression such as the Twenty-one Demands. (own knowledge)

2. (a) What was the cartoonist's view on the prospect of peace? [3 marks]

L1 Vague explanation and ineffective use of the Source. [max. 1]

L2 Clear answer with effective explanation with reference to the Source. [max. 3]

View:

e.g. - The three peacemakers at the Paris Peace Conference only made symbolic peace, but the prospect of peace was not optimistic.

Explanation:

e.g. - Although the Jail Bird, which symbolised peace, was set free, she was shackled to an iron ball inscribed with 'Treaty 1919', meaning that the Treaty of Versailles was a huge block to the prospect of peace.

(b) Infer one principle that Clemenceau upheld at the Paris Peace Conference as reflected in Source D [3 marks]

L1 Attempts to infer, but marred by weak explanation. [max. 1]

L2 Valid inference with good explanation referring to Source D. [max. 3]

e.g. - Treaty terms should be dictated to the Germans ('one must never negotiate with a German or conciliate him; one must dictate to him).
- Germany should not be ready for economic recovery ('a peace of magnanimity... could only have the effect of shortening the interval of Germany's recovery...')

(c) Do you think that the criticisms of the peacemakers at the Paris Peace Conference contained in Sources C and D were fair? [8 marks]

L1 Vague answer, ineffective in using both Sources and own knowledge. [max. 2]

L2 Lack in balance, effective in using Sources *or* own knowledge only. [max. 4]

L3 Sound and balanced answer, effective in using *both* Sources *and* own knowledge. [max. 8]

Criticisms:

e.g. - The peacemakers could not make real peace after the Great War. (Source C)
- Clemenceau was too harsh to Germany. / Clemenceau only considered the issue of peace in terms of France and Germany, not of humanity. (Source D)

Were they fair?

e.g. - They were fair. This led to many harsh treaty terms, such as the war guilt clause, which provoked German anger and sowed the seed of revenge. (own knowledge)
- They were not fair. Prevention of another rise of Germany was key to the maintenance of peace. Moreover, Britain and France had good relationship with Weimar Germany under Stresemann, and Germany was admitted to the League of Nations in 1926. (own knowledge)

3. (a) What was Matsushita's dream for Japan? [3 marks]

L1 Vague explanation and ineffective use of the Source. [max. 1]

L2 Clear answer with effective explanation with reference to the Source. [max. 3]

- e.g. - To make Japan a strong country ('revitalise the new Japan')
- To build a new Japan with advanced technology ('Bringing the happiness of using electric devices to this generation and its people')

(b) Whether 'Japan's economic development after the Second World War up to the 1980s was primarily influenced by internal factors.' [8 marks]

L1 Use of Source only *or* effective use of some own knowledge only, and/or weak in arguments. [max. 3]

L2 Unbalanced arguments with effective use of own knowledge only *or* good use of Source with some own knowledge. [max. 5]

L3 Sound and balanced arguments with effective use of *both* Source *and* own knowledge. [max. 8]

Internal factors:

- e.g. - Collective spirit as reflected in Matsushita's company management. (Source C)
- Nationalism and bushido facilitated economic development. (own knowledge)

External factors:

- e.g. - Economic aids and support from the USA, such as during the Allied Occupation. (own knowledge)
- Favourable international circumstances. (own knowledge)

4. (a) **Two characteristics of the Cold War as reflected in Source F** **[4 marks]**

one characteristic plus relevant clue

max. 2 marks

- e.g. - Existence of two camps (the garden being divided into two parts)
- Both camps extended their influence that annoyed one another (tree branches extending over the garden wall making the two gardeners looking offensive to one another)

(b) **Which country – the USA or the USSR – do you think was more threatening to peace in the Cold War period?** **[7 marks]**

L1 Vague answer, ineffective in using both Source and own knowledge. *[max. 2]*

L2 Lack in balance, effective in using Source *or* own knowledge only, and /or Merely discusses the USA or the USSR, or Fails to present a clear viewpoint after comparing the USA and the USSR. *[max. 4]*

L3 Sound and balanced answer, effective in using *both* Source *and* own knowledge. *[max. 7]*

The USA:

- e.g. - Branches from the 'US bases' were far longer and bigger than those of the USSR. (Source F)
- The USA was 'ready to doom all mankind to the catastrophe of war.' (Source G)
- The USA was active in European politics, for example, it was behind the formation of the NATO. (own knowledge)

The USSR:

- e.g. - The branch 'Cuba' extended into the sphere of the USA. (Source F)
- The USSR made serious accusations against the capitalist world. (Source G)
- The USSR was behind the formation of the Warsaw Pact and communist regimes such as the PRC and Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea). (own knowledge)

PAPER 2 (ESSAY-TYPE QUESTIONS)

General Marking Criteria for Essay-type Questions

(Note: In the assessment process, markers should first determine an appropriate grade for an answer based on 3 factors, viz. understanding of the question, contents, and presentation, and then convert that grade into a corresponding mark according to the following table.)

Criteria	Highest band of performance	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Showing a clear grasp of the significance of the question. - Balanced contents, with appropriate and effective use of relevant material. - Well organised, clearly presented and fluent. 	A	14-15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Showing an awareness of the significance of the question. - Fairly balanced contents, with reasonably accurate use of relevant material. - Reasonably well organised, understandable and fairly fluent. 	B	12-13
	C	10-11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Showing a general understanding of the question. - Generally narrative in presentation, and containing some irrelevant or wrong material. - Not well organised, but fairly understandable. 	D	8-9
	E	6-7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Showing inadequate understanding of the question, with little distinction made between relevant and irrelevant material. - Containing few relevant and important facts. - Poorly organised and barely understandable, with conspicuous mistakes in writing/spelling personal and place names. 	E / F	5
	F	3-4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Showing little understanding of the question, with no distinction made between relevant and irrelevant material. - Containing very few relevant facts. - Very poorly organised and difficult to understand, with annoying mistakes in writing/spelling important personal and place names. 	U	0-2

1. Trace and explain the political development of Hong Kong in the second half of the 20th century up to 1997.

Criteria	Highest band of performance	Marks
- Coherent presentation with balanced treatment of 'tracing' and 'explaining' the political development of Hong Kong in the second half of the 20 th century up to 1997. Able to periodise when tracing the development, and to provide corresponding explanation for each sub-period. Discussion is supported by solid historical examples that cover most of the period.	A	14-15
- Shows a good understanding of the question; able to provide a generally balanced treatment of 'tracing' and 'explaining' the political development of Hong Kong in the second half of the 20 th century up to 1997. Able to periodise when tracing the development, and to provide corresponding explanation for each sub-period. Historical examples cover a considerable part of the period, possibly marred by minor lopsidedness.	B	12-13
- Shows a good understanding of the question; able to 'trace' and 'explain' the political development of Hong Kong in the second half of the 20 th century up to 1997, but contains lopsidedness and/or obvious weakness in periodisation. Historical examples cover a good part of the period, possibly marred by minor lopsidedness.	C	10-11
- Shows a general understanding of the question, and the answer focuses primarily on either 'tracing' or 'explaining' the development; or attempts to tackle both but marred by very rough content.	D	8-9
- Shows an awareness of the question; discussion focuses on either 'tracing' or 'explaining' the development, with noticeable factual errors, or - Focuses on only part of the development but manages to trace and explain it.	E	6-7
- Primarily a narration of major events concerning the political development of Hong Kong in the second half of the 20 th century, without conscious attempts to 'trace' and 'explain' such a development.	E/F	5
- A loosely organised account of facts about Hong Kong's politics in the second half of the 20 th century, without any attempts to 'trace' and 'explain'.	F	3-4
- Shows little understanding of the question, with no distinction made between relevant and irrelevant materials. - Containing very few relevant facts. - Very poorly organised and difficult to understand, with annoying mistakes in writing/spelling important personal and place names.	U	0-2

The following aspects may be covered:

- Political events: Young Plan, global wave of decolonization after the Second World War, 1967 Riots, modernization attempts such as the establishment of City District Office and the ICAC, Sino-British talk on the future of Hong Kong, crisis of confidence, June Fourth Incident's impact on Hong Kong, etc.
- Political institution: localization, District Board, Sino-British Joint Declaration, Basic Law, direct election, Chris Patten's political reforms, the PRC 'starting a new kitchen', the transfer of sovereignty in 1997, etc.

2. Select one of the following historical figures, and discuss whether his impact on China's development was more positive than negative.

- (a) Sun Yat-sen (Sun Yixian)
- (b) Chiang Kai-shek (Jiang Jieshi)
- (c) Mao Zedong
- (d) Deng Xiaoping

Criteria	Highest band of performance	Marks
- Coherent presentation with reasonable analysis of the extent of positive and negative impact made by the chosen figure on China's development, supported by solid historical examples of different aspects.	A	14-15
- Shows a good understanding of the question, clearly examines the extent of positive and negative impact made by the chosen figure on China's development. Historical examples cover reasonably diverse aspects.	B	12-13
- Shows a good understanding of the question, and produces a good attempt to examine the extent of positive and negative impact made by the chosen figure on China's development; but obviously lopsided to either positive or negative impact, and/or contains underdeveloped arguments. Historical examples cover reasonably diverse aspects.	C	10-11
- Shows a general understanding of the question, and the discussion focuses merely on the positive or negative impact made by the chosen figure on China's development; or tackles both but marred by rough arguments.	D	8-9
- Shows an awareness of the question; the discussion attempts to tackle the positive or negative impact made by the chosen figure on China's development, but marred by rough arguments; or attempts to tackle both, but marred by rough arguments and lopsidedness.	E	6-7
- Same as Band E, but marred by obvious factual errors and/or overgeneralization, or - Primarily a narration of facts about the chosen figure, with only one or two lines that casually touch upon his positive and/or negative impact on China's development.	E/F	5
- A general narration of facts about the chosen figure without discussing his positive and negative impact on China's development.	F	3-4
- Shows little understanding of the question, with no distinction made between relevant and irrelevant materials. - Containing very few relevant facts. - Very poorly organised and difficult to understand, with annoying mistakes in writing/spelling important personal and place names.	U	0-2

3. Why did militarism rise in Japan in the 1930s but not earlier? Justify your view.

Criteria	Highest band of performance	Marks
- Coherent presentation with balanced treatment of both periods, able to focus the argument on their favourability to the rise of militarism in Japan. Discussion is supported by solid historical examples that cover most of the period.	A	14-15
- Shows a good understanding of the question; able to provide a generally balanced treatment of both periods and focus the argument on their favourability to the rise of militarism in Japan. Historical examples cover a considerable part of the period, possibly marred by minor lopsidedness.	B	12-13
- Shows a good understanding of the question; able to handle both periods, but contains lopsidedness. Historical examples cover a good part of the period, possibly marred by minor lopsidedness.	C	10-11
- Shows a general understanding of the question; only tackles one period, or attempts to tackle both but marred by rough content.	D	8-9
- Shows an awareness of the question; only tackles one period, marred by minor mistakes, or attempts to tackle both but containing obvious mistakes and rough contents.	E	6-7
- Primarily a narration of militarism in Japan, with only one or two lines concerning its causes.	E/F	5
- A narration of militarism in Japan without any efforts to discuss its causes.	F	3-4
- Shows little understanding of the question, with no distinction made between relevant and irrelevant materials. - Containing very few relevant facts. - Very poorly organised and difficult to understand, with annoying mistakes in writing/spelling important personal and place names.	U	0-2

The following aspects may be covered:

- Unfavourable conditions before the 1930s: party politics, pro-Western diplomacy, steady economic development, etc.
- Favourable conditions in the 1930s: failure of the party government to solve economic crisis, success of military campaigns, decline of European democracies leading to loss of appeal of democracy, etc.

4. In what ways was the Second World War a turning point of modern Western history? Limit your discussion up to the 1960s.

Criteria	Highest band of performance	Marks
- Coherent presentation with reasonable and balanced comparison of the periods before and after the Second World War, with effective explanation about the ways in which the turning point had marked profound changes for modern Western history. The answer is effectively substantiated.	A	14-15
- Shows a good understanding of the question; able to explain the ways in which the turning point had marked profound changes for modern Western history, but marred by slight lopsidedness in the period before or after that. Historical examples are generally relevant.	B	12-13
- Shows a good understanding of the question; clearly discuss the periods before and after the Second World War and shows the ways in which they were different, but weak in explaining why the Second World War served as a turning point. Historical examples are generally relevant.	C	10-11
- Shows a general understanding of the question, with some success to relate the subsequent developments to the Second World War, but without any attempts to compare such developments with those that took place before the War, or - Attempts to discuss the periods before and after the Second World War, marred by lopsidedness. Historical examples are generally relevant, but contain vagueness.	D	8-9
- Conscious to show what changes occurred after the Second World War, but without any attempts to relate to the War.	E	6-7
- A general account of events relevant to the Second World War, occasionally with casual remarks on its impact.	E/F	5
- A general narration of events relevant to the Second World War, without any efforts to discuss its impact.	F	3-4
- Shows little understanding of the question, with no distinction made between relevant and irrelevant materials. - Containing very few relevant facts. - Very poorly organised and difficult to understand, with annoying mistakes in writing/spelling important personal and place names.	U	0-2

The following aspects may be covered:

- Women's rights, nuclear weapons, communism, Cold War, relative strength of the USA and Europe, superpowers, colonialism and independence, etc.

5. Who – Yasser Arafat or Nelson Mandela – do you think was a greater leader? Justify your view.

Criteria	Highest band of performance	Marks
- Coherent presentation with reasonable analysis of the relative greatness of the two leaders, supported by solid historical example of different aspects that cover a considerable period of time.	A	14-15
- Shows a good understanding of the question, clearly examines the relative greatness of the two leaders. Historical examples cover a considerable scope and period of time.	B	12-13
- Shows a good understanding of the question, and produces a good attempt to examine the relative greatness of the two leaders; but obviously lopsided to either one, and/or contains underdeveloped arguments. Historical examples cover reasonable scope and a good part of the period.	C	10-11
- Shows a general understanding of the question, and discussion focuses merely on one leader; or tackles both but marred by rough arguments.	D	8-9
- Show an awareness of the question; discussion attempts to tackle one leader only, marred by rough arguments; or attempts to tackle both, but marred by rough arguments and lopsidedness.	E	6-7
- Same as Band E, but marred by obvious factual errors and/or overgeneralization, or - Primarily a narration of facts about the two leaders with only one or two lines that casually touch upon their relative greatness.	E/F	5
- A general narration of facts about the two leaders without discussing their relative greatness.	F	3-4
- Shows little understanding of the question, with no distinction made between relevant and irrelevant materials. - Containing very few relevant facts. - Very poorly organised and difficult to understand, with annoying mistakes in writing/spelling important personal and place names.	U	0-2

6. 'In the period 1945-2000, European countries became less dependent on the superpowers and more autonomous in their economic cooperation.' Do you agree? Justify your view.

Criteria	Highest band of performance	Marks
- Coherent presentation with logical and balanced discussion of European economic cooperation in terms of 'dependent on the superpowers' and 'autonomous', supported by solid historical examples that cover a considerable part of the period 1945-2000.	A	14-15
- Shows a good understanding of the question, clearly examines European economic cooperation in terms of 'dependent on the superpowers' and 'autonomous'. Historical examples cover a good part of the period 1945-2000.	B	12-13
- Shows a good understanding of the question, with a good attempt to discuss European economic cooperation in terms of 'dependent on the superpowers' and 'autonomous'; but discussion is noticeably lopsided and contains underdeveloped arguments. Historical examples cover a good part of the period 1945-2000.	C	10-11
- Shows a general understanding of the question, and discussion is obviously lopsided to 'dependent on the superpowers' or 'autonomous'.	D	8-9
- Shows an awareness of the question, and the answer only discusses 'dependent on the superpowers' or 'autonomous'.	E	6-7
- Primarily a narration of facts about European economic cooperation, with only one or two lines during discussion that casually discusses 'dependent on the superpowers' and/or 'autonomous'.	E/F	5
- A general account of facts about European economic cooperation without discussing 'dependent on the superpowers' and 'autonomous'.	F	3-4
- Shows little understanding of the question, with no distinction made between relevant and irrelevant materials. - Containing very few relevant facts. - Very poorly organised and difficult to understand, with annoying mistakes in writing/spelling important personal and place names.	U	0-2

The following aspects may be covered:

- Relationship of the European countries with the superpowers: NATO and Warsaw Pact, etc.
- Signs of autonomy in European economic cooperation: OEEC, ECSC, EEC, EU, etc.

7. Select any two countries, and discuss the factors that affected their relationship in the first half of the 20th century.

Criteria	Highest band of performance	Marks
- Coherent and clear discussion of factors that affected the relationship, supported by solid evidence that covers reasonably diverse aspects in the first half of the 20 th century.	A	14-15
- Shows a good understanding of the question, clearly discusses factors that affected the relationship, supported by solid evidence that cover reasonably diverse aspects, but marred by slight lopsidedness.	B	12-13
- Shows a good understanding of the question, clearly discusses factors that affected the relationship, but marred by noticeable lopsidedness and containing underdeveloped arguments. Evidence covers reasonably diverse aspects, but marred by noticeable lopsidedness.	C	10-11
- Shows a general understanding of the question; discusses limited factors.	D	8-9
- Shows an awareness of the question; discusses limited factors and contains factual errors.	E	6-7
- A factual account of the relationship with merely one or two lines that casually touch upon the factors that affected the relationship.	E/F	5
- A factual account of the relationship without any attempts to discuss the factors that affected the relationship.	F	3-4
- Shows little understanding of the question, with no distinction made between relevant and irrelevant materials. - Containing very few relevant facts. - Very poorly organised and difficult to understand, with annoying mistakes in writing/spelling important personal and place names.	U	0-2