

# PRINCIPAL EXAMINER'S REPORT



BOTSWANA  
EXAMINATIONS  
COUNCIL

## BGCSE HISTORY

2023

## History: 0583 / 01

### Section 1: General Comments

The overall performance of the 2023 candidature was a near duplicate of the 2022 cohort. Like in previous years, outstanding performances, average performances and below-par performances were noticed across all Centres. As in previous years, a not so sizeable number of candidates infringed the rubric either by answering all questions in Section A or more than three questions in Section B. The following were the most popular questions across all Centres this time around: 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

### Section 2: Comments on Individual Questions

#### Section A

1 This was a popular question across all Centres.

- (a) What does Source A suggest about the way of life of the Khoikhoi before 1800? Explain your answer, referring to the details of the source.**

This part question was based on a pictorial source within which different aspects of the social and economic way of life of the Khoikhoi were on display. Across all Centres there was a mixture of outstanding performances and below par performances. Candidates who performed in an outstanding manner were those who were able to extract two correct messages from the source and support each with correct evidence from the source. In some instances, some candidates scored two marks on account of failure to support their answers with evidence from the source. This was noticeable across all Centres. Although rare, some candidates across multiple Centres provided answers which were in the form of what they saw in the source. Centres are encouraged to equip candidates with the requisite source interpretation skills.

- (b) Explain any two aspects of the political organisation of the San before 1800.**

The part question was well answered by most candidates across a broad spectrum of Centres. Candidates who did well in this part question, that is those who scored six marks, were those who could identify, describe and explain any two political aspects of the San. Candidates whose answers were mere descriptions of historical facts could not progress beyond two marks. Although not so prevalent, in some Centres, candidates appeared unable to draw a distinction between what constituted the social, economic and political aspects of the life of the San. Centres are advised to pay attention to this as they prepare candidates for their terminal examination.

2 This was not a popular question across all Centres.

**(a) What does Source B suggest about the economic way of life of the Ovaherero? Explain your answer, referring to the details of the source.**

Across all Centres some candidates satisfied the requirements of the part question while others did not. Candidates who satisfied the demands of Level 4 (6 marks) were those who were able to extract two correct messages from the source and support their answers with correct information from the source. Such correct information was and should be in the form of direct quotation from the source. Candidates at Level 2 (2 marks) fell short of supporting their answers with evidence from the source. Some candidates across all Centres did not progress beyond Level 1 (1mark). This was the case as they merely rewrote and/or paraphrased the source. Centres are advised to expose candidates to textual sources at regular intervals to help perfect their source interpretation skills.

**(b) Explain any two differences in the political organisation of the Tswana and Wayei before 1800.**

This part question turned out to be inaccessible to candidates across all Centres. Candidates were required to tease out differences between the political structure of the Tswana and the Wayei. As an example, candidates could indicate that the Tswana had a standing army while the Wayei had a temporary army. Once this was done, candidates were then expected to account for these differences. Across all Centres, candidates' responses took the form of a one-sided description and evaluation of aspects of the political structure of mostly the Tswana. It appears candidates did not have knowledge of the political organisation of the Wayei. Centres are advised to expose candidates to all specific objectives in the assessment syllabus.

## Section B

3 The question was popular across all Centres.

**(a) Describe the cultural explanation of the Herero on the origins of humankind.**

A sizeable number of candidates across multiple Centres performed well in this part question. Candidates who reached Level 3 (4 marks) provided two correct descriptions of the Herero mythology. Much as this was a low order question, some candidates could not score decent marks in the question. Candidates who performed dismally in this part question could not make a distinction between the Herero and the Hambukushu.

**(b) Explain any two ways in which the increased brain size of Homo erectus influenced its lifestyle.**

This part question was well answered by candidates across most Centres. Candidates who reached Level 4 (6 marks) provided two distinct correct points on how the increased brain capacity of the Homo erectus influenced its lifestyle. This was in line with the demands of the part question. In some instances, there were, however, candidates in some Centres who could not progress beyond Level 3 (4) marks. Such candidates provided multiple benefits the Homo

erectus derived from the use of fire. The use of fire was therefore not treated as a distinct point.

- (c) **‘The theory of evolution is more convincing than other theories in explaining the origins of humankind’. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.**

The part question was inaccessible to a vast majority of candidates across all Centres. To arrive at Level 4 (8 marks), candidates were required to explain in one or two ways how the theory of evolution was a convincing explanation on the origins of humankind and explain how one or two other theories were not convincing. These other theories could either be cultural or religious explanations. Across all Centres a vast majority of candidates responded to the question as if they were required to explain why Africa was thought of as the cradle of humanity. On the other hand, a handful of candidates across all Centres responded to the part as though the question required them to describe the evolutionary stages of the development of humankind. To forestall this calamitous occurrence from recurring, Centres are advised to expose candidates to the various question formats that can be crafted from this content area.

- 4 This was a popular question amongst candidates across all Centres.

- (a) **State any four artifacts that can be found in an Iron Age site.**

Candidates across all Centres found the part question accessible given that they were able to provide (four) 4 correct artifacts. Be that as it may, there was a handful of candidates across multiple Centres who could not provide more than two (2) correct points. Such candidates could only score half of the total marks allocated the part question. Centres are advised to present candidates with opportunities to make a distinction between artifacts associated with each of the phases of the development of humankind, that is, the Stone Age and Iron Age.

- (b) **Explain any two ways in which cattle influenced the social way of life of Iron Age societies before 1800.**

A sizeable number of candidates across multiple Centres found the part question accessible. Candidates who fully fulfilled the requirements of this part question were those who were able to identify, describe and explain in two distinct ways the influence of cattle on the social way of life of Iron Age societies. Although in the minority, some candidates across all Centres could not establish a link between cattle ownership and the social welfare of Iron Age societies. The responses proffered were merely descriptions, and occasionally, explanations of aspects of the social way of life of Iron Age societies. Centres are advised to in future expose candidates to questions similar to this at regular intervals.

**(c) Was one of the following factors more important than the others in the development of the Sotho – Tswana before 1800:**

- (i) arable farming;**
- (ii) mining;**
- (iii) trade?**

**Explain your answer referring to (i), (ii) and (iii) above.**

Across almost all Centres, candidates were able to respond correctly to the part question. Candidates who scored eight (8) marks, that is, those who reached Level 4, were able to explain the importance of each one of the factors in the part question. It is, however, worrisome that some candidates across all Centres could not correctly appraise the importance of mining among the Sotho – Tswana. Such candidates' responses were blemished by references to the mining of minerals such as diamond, coal and platinum, among others, and the creation of employment opportunities. Centres are advised to instil in candidates the understanding that historical content and analysis is confined to appraisal of events that happened in the human past.

5 The question was popular across multiple Centres.

**(a) Name any four leaders of the Boer Trek.**

The part question was not accessible to a significant proportion of candidates across all Centres. Candidates struggled to provide the correct names of leaders of the Boer Trek. In most instances, candidates could either provide the correct first name and not the surname, or vice versa. Centres are advised to give serious attention to all content in the History Syllabus, including content from which low order items can be developed.

**(b) Explain any two effects of the Boer Trek on the indigenous people of Southern Africa.**

This part question was not accessible to a vast majority of candidates across most Centres. Candidates' responses were predominantly descriptive in nature even though the part question required them to explore the effects of the Boer Trek on the indigenous people of Southern Africa. Instances of candidates across all Centres providing responses which described reasons for the Boer Trek were also noticed. This was a clear display of lack of content on the part of such candidates. Centres are advised to invest significant amounts of time not only on equipping candidates with analysis and evaluation skills but also on entrenching them.

(c) **'The following factors were equally important in the expansion of the Cape Colony from 1652 to 1800:**

- (i) **mixed marriages;**
- (ii) **orphan girls;**
- (iii) **trekboers.'**

**How far do you agree with the statement? Explain your answer, referring to (i), (ii) and (iii) above.**

To reach Level 4 (8 marks), candidates should have correctly described the factors given in the part question as well as explained how each one of the factors contributed to the expansion of the frontiers of the Cape Colony. However, not many candidates across all Centres were able to do this. The responses proffered showed a lack of content mastery on the part of candidates across the Centres. As an example, candidates could not draw a distinction between the Trekboers and the Boer Trek or orphan girls and French Huguenots. On the rare occasions that candidates were able to correctly describe the factors given in the question, they were unable to show the contribution of the factors towards the expansion of the borders of the Cape Colony. Centres are implored to devote attention to this content in future if the foregoing is anything to go by.

6 This was among the most popular questions across all Centres.

(a) **State any four Nguni groups that fought in the Mfecane wars during the 1800s.**

A fair number of candidates satisfied the demands of this part question. The part question merely required candidates to provide a name list of Nguni groups which fought in the Mfecane. However, there were instances where candidates in all Centres provided incorrect answers which were in the form of non-Nguni groups which were involved in the Mfecane wars. Centres are advised to put measures in place which would enhance candidates' mastering even of recall content.

(b) **Explain any two ways in which the Mfecane influenced the economic activities of Basotho under Moshoeshe.**

This part question turned out to be inaccessible to a vast majority of candidates across all Centres. Candidates' responses were predominantly in the form of measures Moshoeshe used to build the Basotho kingdom. The part question required candidates to explain in two distinct ways how the Mfecane influenced the economic activities of the Basotho. By way of an example, candidates could link cattle raiding activities of the Basotho to the Mfecane. Centres are advised to expose candidates to the multiple probable items that can be formulated from this content.

- (c) **‘Tribute was the most important factor in the development of the Ndebele kingdom under Mzilikazi’. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer using two other factors as well as the one stated in the question.**

In relative terms, candidates across the Centres found the part question accessible. Candidates who fall in this category were able to explain in three distinct ways the factors on which the development of the Ndebele state were anchored. Centres whose candidates satisfied the requirements of this part question are commended for a job well done. On the flip side, candidates in some Centres could not explain the contributions of other factors other than the one given in the question. Such candidates could only reach Level 3 (4 marks). Also noticeable across Centres was the inability of droves of learners who could not proffer responses which could be characterised as explanations. It is on this basis that Centres are advised to invest effort in equipping candidates with skills which would enable them to respond accordingly with questions of this format.

7 This was not a popular question across all Centres.

- (a) **Describe any two reasons for the failure of Lord Carnarvon’s federation scheme.**

To reach Level 3 (4 marks), candidates had to describe two reasons for the failure of Lord Carnarvon’s federation plan. A handful of candidates who attempted this part question fell miles away from Level 3 on account of lack of content. Centres are advised therefore to give candidates the opportunity to explore all contents of the assessment syllabus.

- (b) **Explain any two reasons for the British annexation of the Transvaal in 1877.**

For candidates to reach Level 4 (6 marks), they had to explain two factors which contributed to the British annexation of the Transvaal. The few candidates who attempted this question could only go as far as Level 2 (2 marks). This was the case because the responses provided were descriptive in nature. Once again, Centres are advised to devote adequate time to all of the objectives of the assessment syllabus.

- (c) **‘The mineral revolution brought only negative effects to the indigenous people of Southern Africa.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.**

In this part question, candidates were required to provide a balanced appraisal of the effects of the mineral revolution on the indigenous people of Southern Africa. Such an appraisal had to be in the form of both negative and positive effects. Across all Centres, candidates were however unable to satisfy this requirement. The candidates’ responses were unbalanced in two ways: an appraisal of the negative effects only; or an appraisal of the positive effects only. It is for this reason therefore that candidates could not progress beyond Level 4 (6 marks). Centres are implored to highlight this requirement as they prepare candidates for their terminal assessment.



8 This was not a popular question across all Centres.

**(a) Describe any two reasons for the scramble for Africa.**

Candidates were required to describe any two reasons for the scramble for Africa, and in the event it was done, candidates would score the full four (4) marks allocated to the part question. It is a truism that candidates who attempted this part question displayed not mastering of the content but also the requisite achievement criteria. Centres are commended for a job well executed.

**(b) Explain any two social developments in Bechuanaland from 1885 to 1966.**

A handful of candidates who attempted this part question fared well as they reached Level 4. All that was required of the candidates was to evaluate two social developments that took place between the periods 1885 and 1966. Any other social development that fell outside the stipulated time strictures was not credited. Much as most candidates were able to access the part question, it should be noted that in some cases, there appeared to be blurred lines between the social and economic effects of development. It is this lack of discernment that directly contributed to candidates being unable to score decent marks in this part question.

**(c) 'The following factors equally hindered development in Botswana since independence:**

- (i) drought;**
- (ii) HIV/AIDS**
- (iii) lack of skilled manpower.'**

**How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer referring to (i), (ii) and (iii) above.**

To reach Level 4 (8 marks), candidates had to evaluate the extent to which each one of the given factors hindered development in Botswana. Candidates who attempted this part question proffered responses which were in line with the demands of the question. Be that as it may, it should be noted that some candidates could not progress beyond Level 2 (2 – 3 marks) on account of them providing answers which were descriptive in nature. Such candidates could not provide a correlational analysis of the factors and the stifling of development. Centres are advised to invest effort in equipping candidates with interpretive and analysis skills given that the vast majority of items in the paper test such skills.



## History: 0583 / 02

### Section 1: General Comments

The 2023 paper was of the same level of difficulty as that of the previous year, 2022. The questions were very clear, addressed syllabus objectives and were up to the standard of the candidates. There were no ambiguous questions which could have disadvantaged the candidates. The syllabus spread was satisfactory. The language used especially in textual sources could easily be comprehended by the candidates. The duration of the paper has been increased from **1 hour 45 minutes to 2 hours**. With this change, it has been observed that most candidates spent more time in Section A than Section B. This was evident in the lengthy writings that candidates submitted in Section A compared to Section B. It was clear that candidates had time to interrogate the sources for better comprehension compared to the previous years. For the first time most candidates did well in Section A than Section B. There were instances where candidates scored between 18 and 20 out of 30, but scored far less than half of the marks in Section B.

The pictorial sources were also very clear and none of them had confusing features which could not be interpreted by candidates. Just like in the previous years, pictorial sources were easily referenced to, compared to textual sources. Compared to 2022, with 2023 cohort there were few bizarre writings from candidates. Some of them identified in some Centres include the following:

- In some Centres, most candidates' work was limited by their ability to follow the rubric. The candidates failed to follow the instructions in the paper. They either answered only one question in Section B or in Section A they answered only one or two parts of question 1, for example they will answer **1(a), (b) and (e)** only.
- In one Centre, one candidate wrote about their History teacher, naming the teacher and saying they didn't not like History, the teacher didn't teach them, etc.
- In one Centre, a candidate had used an 8 page Answer Booklet but nothing was written inside the booklet except question numbers only.

Most of the 2023 candidates showed some strength in answering source-based questions as displayed in their responses. Some could display skills of answering high order questions of interpretation, analysis and evaluation. But in some instances, where they needed to refer to the sources, they tended to give general historical information without referencing.

The other observation made was that the questions in Section A (compulsory section) were from a familiar topic; CAUSES OF WORLD WAR I. In most Centres there were indications that the topic was taught in detail as candidates could bring historical knowledge, but failed to link it with the sources, thus scoring low marks. Weaker candidates were able to score 5/30 by just giving surface description of the sources. Majority of candidates who did well ranged between 15/30 and 21/30. Centres are encouraged to teach the candidates how to handle source-based questions. The idea is that candidates should not have seen the source to answer the question, they should have historical knowledge and the technique of answering source-based questions. It does not serve any purpose to equip candidates with historical knowledge with no skills of interpretation, analysis and evaluation.

In Section B, the popular questions were Question 2, 3, 4, 8 and 12, but majority of Centres went for questions 2 and 3. Just like in 2022, question 8 and 12 was not popular with the 2023 cohort compared to the past years where most Centres attempted it.

The questions were set to the level of the candidates, there were no ambiguous questions, or double-barrel questions. Sadly, just like in the previous year 2022, candidates performed poorly on this section, especially question **2(a)**, **3(a)** and question **4(a)**. The question that was well done by those Centres who attempted it is Question 12. In Section B, for example, some candidates who attempted Question **2(a)** wrote about the general effects of the Paris Peace Treaties or the Versailles Treaty. Most candidates in answering the **(b)** parts gave general information instead of explaining three factors. For some good candidates, they showed their historical knowledge in question **2(b)** and **3(b)** by explaining more than three factors, thus wasting time and unable to finish other questions. Centres should advise candidates to provide only three factors on the **(b)** parts. This will save time and candidates will be able to have time for other questions.

## Section 2: Comments on Individual Questions

1 The question is compulsory question.

### CAUSES OF WORLD WAR I

**(a) Study Source A. What is the message of the source? Explain your answer using the source and your knowledge.**

It was a pictorial source. The question was fairly done by majority of the candidates. The demand of the question was such that candidates were to make use of the pictorial source provided to show the message of the source and use their historical knowledge. Candidates were expected to have two points. They should be able to pick two actions going on in the source and support it with historical knowledge or pick one action in the source and support it with historical knowledge and bring relevant historical information related to the source to have two points. Most candidates dwelt much on the events of the First Moroccan Crisis than the Agadir crisis which means they misinterpreted the source. Those who managed to interpret the source well were able to identify only one point and developed it and reached Level 3, where they scored 3 out of 4 marks. Some desperate candidates who lacked historical information resorted to paraphrasing of the source. This is supposed to be a low order question which should be accessed by majority of candidates.

**(b) Study Source B. Do you believe the claims made in this source? Explain your answer using the source and your knowledge.**

It was a textual source. The language used was simple and could be comprehended by candidates. The question was fairly done across Centres. Candidates were expected to pick two claims from the source and support the claims with correct historical information. Candidates were rewarded with 1 mark for taking a stand, e.g. YES, I BELIEVE THE CLAIMS or NO, I DO NOT BELIEVE THE CLAIMS. Some candidates took a stand of Yes or No and paraphrased the source instead of providing historical information. This means they scored between 1-2 marks out of 5. Some candidates could not pick the claims from the source and

instead gave general information on the naval rivalry between Britain and Germany, the arms race and alliance system, which put them at Level 2. Some candidates managed to give historical information attached to the source with two claims and thus scoring high marks. Their evaluation of these events showing the rivalry between Germany and Britain, the building of the Dreadnought etc took them to Level 3 and Level 4, depending on the strength of their answers. Overall, the question was fairly done.

**(c) Study Source C. Why was this cartoon published in July 1914? Explain your answer using the source and your knowledge.**

It was a pictorial source. It seemed a rich source on the 1914 events leading to World War I with many details to pick. The contents of the picture were clear. It seemed to be accessible to most candidates. Most candidates comprehended the source as they gave very good historical information on the Sarajevo incident and alliance system and how they led to World War I. Some gave very good historical information but failed to reference the source, thus reaching Level 2 only. Candidates were supposed to discuss two issues from the source and relate them to the outbreak of World War I. Some candidates picked one issue from the source, for example, the common one was the alliance system. This means they could only go up Level 3, 3 or 4 marks. They had information on the Sarajevo incident and the 'blank cheque' but failed to provide detailed information as per the demands of the question. Overall, the question was fairly done by majority of candidates across Centres.

**(d) Study Sources D and E. Which source provides more convincing evidence about the causes of World War I? Explain your answer using both sources and your knowledge.**

These were textual sources. The language was clear and could be comprehended by candidates. The question required candidates to compare two sources. Just like in the previous years, there is still a challenge on this question as some of candidates still fail to compare two sources and instead evaluate only one source though there was a slight improvement in the 2023 cohort. Some take a standby stating which source they think is convincing or reliable, e.g. Source D is convincing and can score only 1 mark out of 6 marks. Most candidates identified the most convincing source, but many of them failed to come up with historical facts to explain why the source was convincing. There was a lot of paraphrasing of the sources just like in the previous year. Most candidates across Centres evaluated Source D fairly well. It seemed like they comprehended it well as they could relate it the Bosnian Crisis, the conflict between Serbia and Austria-Hungary and colonial rivalry like the Moroccan Crisis to the causes of World War I. This means by evaluating one source, candidates could only reach Level 3 scoring 3/7. Source E was poorly evaluated by almost all candidates as they gave brief information on 'blank cheque' or unconditional support that Germany gave to Austria-Hungary. Some preferred to paraphrase the source. Some candidates mistook the source to the terms of the Versailles treaty, especially the War Guilt Clause. Historical facts were scanty in Source E. In some cases, candidates gave historical information without attaching it to any source, leaving them at Level 2.

Candidates failed to realise that in comparing the two sources, they are both correct, provide reliable or convincing information but there is always one source which provides more convincing information than the other on the causes of World War I.

**(e) Study all the sources. How far do these sources support the view that Germany caused World War I? Explain your answer using all the sources and your knowledge.**

This is a summative question. The candidates are expected to answer the question by giving a summative evaluation of all the sources. The assumption is that some sources show how Germany caused World War I while others do not. Therefore, candidates were expected to be in a position to identify sources that support and those that do not support the two sides of argument. To reach at least 7marks both sides of the argument should be discussed. Reference to the source is still important but candidates were expected to just simply write “as in Source A” or “as suggested by Source C” because the assumption is that all the sources have been interpreted in the previous questions.

As is the case with the previous years, this part of the question was poorly done but the 2023 cohort. Most candidates across Centres were not able to analyse the individual sources as per the requirements of the question. There were a lot of descriptions of the sources without linking it to the question. In some instances, candidates paraphrased the sources, thus low marks as they could only reach either Level 1 or 2. Some gave general information on the causes of World War without showing the role played by Germany or without attaching it to any source, which put them at Level 2 of the answer. On average most candidates evaluated 1 to 2 sources only, scoring between 4 and 5 marks out of 8. Where they failed to grasp the message of the source like in Source E, it had a ripple effect into this part of the question as they lacked the skills to transcend to higher levels. Desperate candidates who lacked historical information on the role played by Germany in causing World War I resorted to re-writing the textual sources or paraphrasing or simple description of the sources. Candidates who attempted to reach a conclusion only summarised previous point (repetition) without evaluation.

## Section B

### Instructions for (a) questions

**1 – 2 marks for each relevant point in the answer**

**1 mark for identification of a point.**

**1 mark for each point developed.**

### Instructions for (b) questions

- **Level 1: Description/identification of factors/General information [1 – 3 marks]**
- **Level 2: Explains one factor [4 – 5 marks]**
- **Level 3: Explains two factors [6 – 9 marks]**
- **Level 4: Explains three factors [10 – 12 marks]**

The popular questions were questions 2, 3 and 4. Just like in the previous year, question 8 and question 12 were not popular across Centres. But those few Centres who attempted question 12 did extremely well, on both **(a)** and **(b)** parts. With question 8, candidates still have a problem of understanding the difference between “application” and “influence” of Pan Africanism. The remaining questions were attempted by few desperate candidates who failed to score significant marks on them. It was clear they had no historical information on those questions.

**2** A very popular question across Centres. Part **(a)** was poorly answered, and part **(b)** was fairly done by the candidates.

**(a) Describe the effects of the Treaty of Trianon signed with Hungary in 1920.**

The question was clear and specific to the Treaty of Trianon and the time frame was provided. Most candidates did not do well on this question. They confused the Treaty of Trianon with the treaty of St Germain or the Treaty of Versailles. This means they failed to bring out the effects and territories lost by Hungary. Some were too general, for example, giving effects like loss of territories, reduction of army without being specific about such territories and how that affected Hungary. They scored between 2 and 4 marks out of 8 marks. There were a few Centres where candidates were able to identify and outline most factors, scoring between 6 and 7 marks.

**(b) Explain the reactions of the Germans to the terms of the Treaty of Versailles.**

A very popular question across Centres. Most candidates in certain Centres did well in this question and in some Centres were able to raise their answers to Level 3 and Level 4, thus scoring very good marks. They were able to explain the terms and how the Germans reacted in detail. It is safe to say that most candidates were familiar with the historical facts on the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. Some candidates in certain Centres described the terms of the treaty without showing the reaction, reaching Level 1 only. Overall, the performance on this question was good.

**3** Another popular question across Centres but not well answered on both parts. Candidates still struggle with high order questions of explaining the facts on the B parts.

**(a) Describe the Bulgarian Crisis of 1925.**

The question was fairly done by most candidates. Candidates mostly confused the Bulgarian crisis with the Bosnian crisis of 1908 or the Second Balkan Wars. It was noticeable in almost all Centres. Some wrote on the views of Woodrow Wilson at the Paris Peace Conference. Most candidates scored between 4 and 5 marks out of 8 marks. But there were a few candidates who did fairly well and scored between 6 and 7 marks.

**(b) Explain the successes of any three agencies or commissions of the League of Nations.**

The question was fairly done. Most candidates confused agencies with success of the League in the 1920's. Some explained the political successes of the League of Nations. Some candidates simply described the agencies and failed to explain them. The point here is candidates were supposed to identify the agencies and where and how they were successful.

As per instructions of the questions, only three (3) points are needed for explanation. This was supposed to be a very familiar topic, but some candidates seemed to be struggling with content.

- 4 Another popular question in some Centres but poorly attempted. Most candidates who answered it did not do well.

**(a) Describe the weaknesses of the constitution of the Weimar Republic.**

Candidates were challenged by this question as they ignored the key word “weaknesses” and instead brought in economic, political and social challenges of the Weimar Republic. Most candidates did not satisfy the requirements of the question leading to poor performance. In some cases, candidates wrote about Hitler’s rise to power. With this, they fetched low marks. It was clear that they lacked historical content. Overall, the question was not well done by most candidates.

**(b) Explain any three aims of Hitler’s foreign policy from 1933.**

The question was poorly done by majority of the candidates. They ended at descriptive level and scored low marks. It was clear most Centres have taught the topic on Hitler and Germany as candidates displayed knowledge on either Hitler’s rise to power, consolidation of power or his domestic policy which was irrelevant to the question. Some candidates were too general in an attempt to explain Hitler’s foreign policy. The key word “AIMS’ on the question was also ignored and instead candidates wrote on the events of Hitler’s foreign policy without explaining why. Most of them scored up to Level 2. Overall, the question was poorly done. There were very few candidates who clearly elaborated Hitler’s aims and scored good marks like reaching level 3.

- 8 It was not as popular as in the previous years. It was only popular with very few Centres. Candidates who attempted performed on average. It was evident from candidates’ responses that Centres hardly teach the topic on Pan Africanism. Where they teach it, the candidates are not given enough practice on how to answer questions on Pan Africanism.

**(a) Describe the concept of Pan-Africanism.**

Most candidates who answered this question performed fairly. They scored between 4 and 5 marks. In some Centres it was clear the topic was not taught in-depth as candidates displayed jumbled up information on either origins of Pan Africanism or how it is understood. In other cases, candidates simply identified the points without outlining them, thus scoring lower marks.

**(b) Explain the influence of Pan Africanism movement in Africa.**

This question was not popular except with few candidates from certain Centres where it was discussed as a topic. Some candidates confused the concept of “influence” and “applied”, which means they interpreted it wrongly; thus, they discussed how Pan Africanism was applied. They wrote about Pan Africanism in the Diaspora. A number of candidates who attempted this question also confused Diaspora with Africa. Where they were supposed to discuss the influence of Pan Africanism in Africa, instead they wrote on how it was applied in



the Diaspora. Some were able to identify the factors but failed to explain them, thus scoring lower marks.

**12** It was a very popular question with certain Centres where it was discussed as a topic. Most candidates who attempted it did very well.

**(a) Outline any four ways in which Cuba contributed to the development of Botswana.**

It was an open question, not specific to either economic or social. The question was very accessible to most candidates except where they wrote on agriculture and military assistance. In some Centres it was clear that the topic has been taught fully as they were able to identify and outline the factors, scoring between 7 and 8 marks. Some candidates resorted to giving general contribution of Castro in Africa, not being specific to Botswana. Very few candidates only listed the reforms without describing them. Overall, the question was fairly done.

**(b) Explain the relationship between Cuba and the United States of America from 1959 to 1962.**

Candidates in certain Centres did fairly well on this question. They were able to explain the relationship between Cuba and USA using examples such as the Cuban Missile Crisis and the U2 incident. In certain Centres, some candidates gave general information on Castro's policies without specifying how that affected her relationship with USA. There were very few instances where candidates listed the factors without explaining reasons. Overall, the question was well answered especially in Centres where it was clear that the topic was thoroughly covered. The candidates were able to reach Level 4, 10-12 marks. It was clear that in such Centres the topic was well taught, and candidates have had enough practice in answering questions from this topic.

**Questions 5, 6, 7, 10 and 11** –Very unpopular questions to majority of Centres.

Very few candidates answered these questions and none of them scored any significant marks. These were mostly desperate candidates especially from private Centres and it was clear they had no historical content on these questions. In some cases, these candidates even attempted all the questions but failed to score significant marks. Some would use the information from the textual sources in section A to answer these questions out of desperation and to satisfy the demands of the examination. It was clear such candidates had no historical content on these questions.

**NB: In Section B, the (a) parts mostly use key words like describe and outline. Candidates should be given more practise on these questions to avoid situations where they only give or identify, which are low order answers.**