

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) Which extract in Source A was more anti-Japanese in tone? [3 marks]

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

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

Extract 1

- e.g. - 'It hurts! It hurts!'
- '... putting Japan to death.'

* Candidates in general will choose Extract 1 to be more anti-Japanese in tone. However, marks will be awarded to answers that choose Extract 2 and are presented logically.

(b) Two characteristics of the Hong Kong Chinese merchants regarding their reaction towards the May Fourth Incident at the time [4 marks]

Two marks for each valid characteristic plus a relevant clue.

Characteristics:

- e.g. - Aligning themselves with the anti-Japanese activities in mainland China ('an anti-Japanese boycott is in full swing')
- Concerning the attitude of the Hong Kong government ('...unwise... put the British authorities in a rather awkward position')

(c) Whether 'Chinese in mainland China and Hong Kong shared similar views on major events that happened in China in the 20th century.' [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]

Possible events to discuss:

- e.g. - May Fourth Movement
- Sino-Japanese War (1937-45)
- Founding of the PRC
- Cultural Revolution

2. (a) Conclude from Source C one problem that might have hindered Japan's development [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]

Problem:

e.g. - Many Japanese still stuck to the mentality of reviving the old Japan.

Explanation:

e.g. - The mentality of reviving the old Japan just kept the people looking backward, as on the issue of Seikanron. Japan needed to look ahead to the future, not looking back to its history of being a first-rate nation.

(b) Do you think the author of Source C would have agreed to Japan's hosting the Olympic Games, as mentioned in Source D? [4 marks]

L1 Vague explanation and ineffective use of the Source. [max. 2]

L2 Clear answer with effective explanation with reference to the Source. [max. 4]

The answer is affirmative.

Explanation:

e.g. - Source C: Japan should no longer seek to revive its old glory; it should focus on creating a high-quality standard of living.
- Source D: the Olympic Games helped improve urban life for years to come.

(c) How important was the domestic factor in bringing about Japan's economic miracle? [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]

Domestic factor:

e.g. - Media urged for the improvement of quality of life. (Source C)
- The Japanese government made huge investment to modernise Japan's infrastructure. (Source D)

Other factors:

e.g. - Favourable policies of the USA. (own knowledge)
- Favourable international circumstances during the Cold War period. (own knowledge)

3. (a) What was the cartoonist's view towards the USA? [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 USA was hypocritical.

Explanation:

e.g. - Kennedy blamed Khrushchev for putting missiles at the doorstep of the USA, but he himself did exactly the same – with even more missiles – at the Soviet doorstep.

(b) How did the USA's participation in foreign wars affect its budget? [4 marks]

L1 Vague explanation and ineffective use of the Source. [max. 2]

L2 Clear answer with effective explanation with reference to the Source. [max. 4]

e.g. - 1950-55: the mounting figures of national defence and growing deficit budget reflect the military expenditure involved in the USA's participation in the Korean War.
- 1959-70: the mounting figures of national defence and growing deficit budget reflect the military expenditure involved in the USA's participation in the Vietnam War.

(c) Why did détente take place between the USA and the USSR in the late 1960s and 1970s? [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]

Sources:

e.g. - Armament race and nuclear proliferation led to fear of war between the two superpowers. (Source E)
- Mounting military expenditure. (Source F)

Own knowledge:

e.g. - Continual involvement in overseas wars led to policy review.
- China broke with the USSR and sought a close relationship with the USA.
- Change of leadership (President Richard Nixon) facilitated new diplomatic policies.

4. (a) What was the main message of the cartoon in Source G? [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]
- Main message:
e.g. - The victors of the Great War made exorbitant demands on Germany.
- Explanation:
e.g. - The goose (Germany) was too small to produce a golden egg the size required by France and Britain.
- (b) What was the attitude of Clemenceau towards the French government regarding its execution of the Treaty of Versailles? [4 marks]
- L1 Vague answer, ineffective in using the Source. [max. 2]
- L2 Clear answer with good reference to the Source in making explanation. [max. 4]
- Attitude:
e.g. - Discontented
- Explanation:
e.g. - Language: 'Incredible, yet true!' '... Treaty of Versailles to a state of nullity'
- Argument: '... every day something of the burden of defeat will be transferred from Germany to France...'
- (c) Whether 'As a factor in determining Europe's international relations in the 1920s, the Treaty of Versailles became less and less important.' [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]
- Agree:
e.g. - The occupation of the Ruhr, as a result of Germany's repeated failures to pay the indemnity, marked the climax of Germany's worsening relationship with the European countries. Later on, the Treaty of Versailles, which was too harsh and impractical to Germany, was actually revised by more lenient agreements and plans (such as Dawes Plan), which resulted in drastic cut in Germany's indemnity as seen in Source H. (Source H and own knowledge)
- Not agree:
e.g. - Source G shows that Britain and France were harsh to Germany when implementing the Treaty of Versailles. Later on, considering that the Treaty was too harsh to Germany, more sympathy was given to it by signing new international treaties like the Locarno Treaty and admitting Germany to the League of Nations. In other words, the harshness of the Treaty of Versailles always played an essential role in shaping the new policies. (Source G and own knowledge)

PAPER 2 (ESSAY-TYPE QUESTIONS)

Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education Examination

History

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 | 23-25 |
| <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 | 20-22 |
| | C | 17-19 |
| <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 | 14-16 |
| | E | 11-13 |
| <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 | 9-10 |
| | F | 5-8 |
| <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 | 0-4 |

1. To what extent did Hong Kong undergo transformation in the period 1967-97? Explain your view with reference to its socio-economic and political developments in that period.

| Criteria | Highest band of performance | Marks |
|---|-----------------------------|-------|
| - Coherent presentation with excellent analysis Hong Kong's transformation and change/continuity, supported by solid historical data that stretch over a considerable period of time. | A | 23-25 |
| - Shows a good understanding of the question, clearly examines Hong Kong's transformation and change/continuity. Historical data stretch over a considerable period of time. | B | 20-22 |
| - Shows a good understanding of the question, and produces a good attempt of examining Hong Kong's transformation and change/continuity; but discussion is obviously lopsided to transformation or change/continuity, and/or contains underdeveloped arguments (e.g. no obvious attempt to explain views such as 'large extent' and 'small extent'). Historical data cover a considerable period of time. | C | 17-19 |
| - Shows a general understanding of the question, and discussion focuses merely on the transformation; or attempts to tackle both but marred by rough content. | D | 14-16 |
| - Shows an awareness of the question, and discussion is merely about the transformation, marred by rough content; or attempts to tackle both, but marred by rough content and lopsidedness. | E | 11-13 |
| - Same as Band E, but marred by obvious factual errors and/or overgeneralisation, or - Primarily a general history of Hong Kong of the period concerned, with only one or two lines that causally touch upon how Hong Kong had transformed, or - Discussion is solely based on change/continuity. | E/F | 9-10 |
| - A general history of Hong Kong of the period concerned, without discussing Hong Kong's transformation. | F | 5-8 |
| - 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 | 0-4 |

The following aspects may be covered:

- Political aspect: e.g. introduction of direct election in the LegCo, increasing political participation of the Hongkongers, continuous British colonial rule until 1997.
- Social aspect: e.g. rise of Hong Kong identity, with new 'heritage' items of Hong Kong characteristics; Westernised way of life being more popular since the 1970s.
- Economic aspect: e.g. decline of industry and rise of tertiary sector of economy.

2. 'Both the late Qing Government (1901-12) and the Nanjing Nationalist Government (1928-37) aimed at promoting economic more than political development.' Do you agree? Explain your view.

| Criteria | Highest band of performance | Marks |
|---|-----------------------------|-------|
| - Coherent presentation with excellent comparison of the aims of the two governments, substantiated by solid historical facts. | A | 23-25 |
| - Shows a good understanding of the question, clearly comparing the aims of the two governments, substantiated by relevant historical facts. | B | 20-22 |
| - Shows a good understanding of the question, and produces a reasonable comparison of the aims of the two governments, but discussion is obviously lopsided and/or contains underdeveloped arguments. The answer is supported by relevant historical facts. | C | 17-19 |
| - Shows a general understanding of the question; makes a serious attempt to compare the aims of the two governments, but the answer tends to be narrative. | D | 14-16 |
| - Shows an awareness of the question; attempts are made to compare the aims of the two governments, but the answer is narrative with factual errors and/or omissions. | E | 11-13 |
| - Primarily a narration of facts about developments during the two governments, with one or two lines that casually touches on their aims. | E/F | 9-10 |
| - A narration of facts about developments during the two governments, without any attempt to compare their aims. | F | 5-8 |
| - 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 | 0-4 |

The following aspects may be covered:

- 1901-12: e.g. institutional reforms (e.g. abolition of the Six Boards, 9-year constitutional preparation program), economic reforms (e.g. establishing the Ta Ching Government Bank).
- 1928-37: e.g. institutional reforms (e.g. constitutional tutelage according to Sun Yat-sen's three-stage plan of achieving democracy), economic reforms (e.g. monetary reform, *fabi*).

3. 'Decolonisation in Southeast Asia was primarily caused by the Japanese occupation during the Second World War.' Do you agree? Explain your view.

| Criteria | Highest band of performance | Marks |
|--|-----------------------------|-------|
| - Coherent presentation with excellent analysis of the relative importance of the Japanese occupation and other factors in causing decolonisation in Southeast Asia, supported by solid historical data that stretch over a considerable period of time. | A | 23-25 |
| - Shows a good understanding of the question, clearly examining the relative importance of the Japanese occupation and other factors in causing decolonisation in Southeast Asia. Historical data stretch over a considerable period of time. | B | 20-22 |
| - Shows a good understanding of the question, and produces a good attempt of examining the relative importance of Japanese occupation and other factors in causing decolonisation in Southeast Asia; but discussion is obviously lopsided to the Japanese occupation or other factors, and/or contains underdeveloped arguments (e.g. no obvious attempt to explain views such as 'large extent' and 'small extent'). Historical data cover a considerable period of time. | C | 17-19 |
| - Shows a good understanding of the question, and discussion focuses merely on the Japanese occupation; or attempts to tackle both but marred by rough content. | D | 14-16 |
| - Shows an awareness of the question, and discussion is merely about the Japanese occupation, marred by rough content; or attempts to tackle both, but marred by rough content and lopsidedness. | E | 11-13 |
| - Same as Band (E), but marred by obvious factual errors and/or overgeneralisation, or - Primarily a narration of decolonisation in Southeast Asia, with only one or two lines that casually touch upon how Japanese occupation contributed to such developments, or - Discussion is solely based on other factors. | E/F | 9-10 |
| - A narration of decolonisation in Southeast Asia without analysing its causes, or - Detailed narration of other factors of decolonisation in Southeast Asia without presenting any arguments. | F | 5-8 |
| - 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 | 0-4 |

The following aspects may be covered:

- Japanese occupation: promoting anti-Western ideology, Asia for the Asians, etc.
- Other factors: rise of local leaders, decline of previous colonial masters after the Second World War, etc.

4. 'Nazi aggression was more important than the appeasement policy in causing the Second World War.'
Do you agree? Explain your view.

| Criteria | Highest band of performance | Marks |
|---|-----------------------------|-------|
| - Coherent presentation with reasonable analysis of the relative importance of the two factors, supported by solid historical examples of different aspects that cover a considerable period of time. | A | 23-25 |
| - Shows a good understanding of the question, clearly examining the relative importance of the two factors. Historical examples cover a considerable scope and period of time. | B | 20-22 |
| - Shows a good understanding of the question, and produces a good attempt to examine the relative importance of the two factors; but obviously lopsided to either one, and/or contains underdeveloped arguments. Historical examples cover reasonable scope and a good part of the period. | C | 17-19 |
| - Shows a general understanding of the question, produces separate accounts of factors about the importance of the two factors without making any comparisons. | D | 14-16 |
| - Shows an awareness of the question; discussion attempts to tackle the importance of one factor only; or attempts to tackle both, but marred by rough arguments and lopsidedness. | E | 11-13 |
| - Same as Band E, but marred by obvious factual errors and/or overgeneralization, or - Primarily a narration of factors about the two factors with only one or two lines that casually touch upon their relative importance. | E/F | 9-10 |
| - A narration of facts about the two factors without discussing their relative importance. | F | 5-8 |
| - 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 | 0-4 |

The following aspects may be covered:

- Nazi aggression: militarisation, territorial expansion, etc.
- Appeasement policy: sanctioning Nazi aggression, reflecting weakness of the democracies, etc.

5. To what extent was the end of the Cold War due to Mikhail Gorbachev's liberalisation policy? Explain your view.

| Criteria | Highest band of performance | Marks |
|---|-----------------------------|-------|
| - Coherent presentation with excellent analysis of the liberalisation policy and other factors in terms of their relative importance in leading to the end of the Cold War, supported by solid historical data that stretch over a considerable period of time. | A | 23-25 |
| - Shows a good understanding of the question, clearly examining the relative importance of the liberalisation policy and other factors in leading to the end of the Cold War. Historical data stretch over a considerable period of time. | B | 20-22 |
| - Shows a good understanding of the question, and produces a good attempt of examining the relative importance of the liberalisation policy and other factors in leading to the end of the Cold War; but discussion is obviously lopsided to the liberalisation policy or other factors, and/or contains underdeveloped arguments (e.g. no obvious attempt to explain views such as 'large extent' and 'small extent'). Historical data cover a considerable period time. | C | 17-19 |
| - Shows a general understanding of the question, and discussion focuses merely on the liberalisation policy; or attempts to tackle both but marred by rough content. | D | 14-16 |
| - Shows an awareness of the question, and discussion is merely about the liberalisation policy, marred by rough content; or attempts to tackle both, but marred by rough content and lopsidedness. | E | 11-13 |
| - Same as Band E, but marred by obvious factual errors and/or overgeneralisation, or - Primarily a narration of the last decade of the Cold War, with only one or two lines that casually touch upon how Gorbachev's liberalisation policy contributed to the end of the Cold War, or - Discussion is solely based on other factors. | E/F | 9-10 |
| - A narration of the last decade of the Cold War without analysing its causes, or - Detailed narration of other factors leading to the end of the Cold War without presenting any arguments. | F | 5-8 |
| - 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 | 0-4 |

The following facts may be covered:

- Gorbachev's liberalisation policy: withdrawing army from Eastern Europe, allowing Russians to elect their own leaders, etc.
- Other factors: Ronald Reagon's policy of escalating the Cold War, fall of Berlin Wall, etc.

6. 'The United Nations was more successful in solving the apartheid in South Africa than the conflicts between Israel and the Arabs.' Do you agree? Explain your view.

| Criteria | Highest band of performance | Marks |
|---|-----------------------------|-------|
| - Coherent presentation with reasonable analysis of the apartheid in South Africa and the conflicts between Israel and the Arabs in terms of the degree of UN's success in solving them, supported by solid historical examples that stretch over a considerable period of time. | A | 23-25 |
| - Shows a good understanding of the question, clearly examining the degree of UN's success in solving the apartheid in South Africa and the conflicts between Israel and the Arabs. Historical examples stretch over a considerable period of time. | B | 20-22 |
| - Shows a good understanding of the question, and produces a good attempt of examining the degree of UN's success in solving the apartheid in South Africa and the conflicts between Israel and the Arabs, but discussion is obviously lopsided to either, and/or contains underdeveloped arguments. Historical examples cover a considerable period of time. | C | 17-19 |
| - Shows a general understanding of the question, and discussion focuses merely on either the apartheid in South Africa or the conflicts between Israel and the Arabs; or attempts to tackle both but marred by rough content. | D | 14-16 |
| - Shows an awareness of the question; discussion is merely on either the apartheid in South Africa or the conflicts between Israel and the Arabs, marred by rough content; or attempts to tackle both, but marred by rough content and lopsidedness. | E | 11-13 |
| - Same as Band E, but marred by obvious factual errors and/or overgeneralisation, or - Primarily a narration of historical facts about the two conflicts, with only one or two lines that casually touch upon the degree of UN's success in solving them, or - Discussion is solely based on other factors. | E/F | 9-10 |
| - A narration of historical facts about the two conflicts, without analysing the role of the UN. | F | 5-8 |
| - 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 | 0-4 |

The following aspects may be covered:

- Apartheid in South Africa: different types of interventions (condemnation and boycott), etc.
- Conflicts between Israel and the Arabs: US efforts more than the UN.

7. 'National interest may lead to war; it may also lead to mutual cooperation.' Elaborate this statement with two examples within your history course, one for each scenario.

| Criteria | Highest band of performance | Marks |
|--|-----------------------------|-------|
| - Coherent presentation with balanced and reasonable discussion of the two scenarios, supported by solid historical examples. | A | 23-25 |
| - Shows a good understanding of the question, clearly discussing the two scenarios in a generally balanced manner. Historical examples reflect adequate understanding of the question. | B | 20-22 |
| - Shows a good understanding of the question, and produces a good attempt to discuss the two scenarios, but obviously lopsided, and/or contains underdeveloped arguments. Historical examples reflect adequate understanding of the question. | C | 17-19 |
| - Shows a general understanding of the question, and the discussion attempts to deal with both scenarios, though in an unbalanced manner; marred by rough arguments and/or vagueness in discussing 'national interest'. | D | 14-16 |
| - Shows an awareness of the question, narrates on both scenarios in an unbalanced manner; attempts to deal with 'national interest', though marred by rough arguments and overgeneralisation; or - Discussion is merely based on either scenario, and attempts to deal with 'national interest', and contains obvious factual errors. | E | 11-13 |
| - Same as Band E, but marred by fundamental errors and other weaknesses; or - Primarily a general narration of conflicts and cooperation, with only one or two lines that casually touch upon 'national interest'. | E/F | 9-10 |
| - A general narration of conflicts and cooperation without discussing 'national interest'. | F | 5-8 |
| - 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 | 0-4 |