

HISTORY

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 11	12 - 24	25 - 35	36 - 47	48 - 58	59 - 68	69 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 11	12 - 24	25 - 34	35 - 46	47 - 59	60 - 70	71 - 100

Higher and standard level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 8	9 - 11	12 - 13	14 - 15	16 - 20

The range and suitability of the work submitted

Most of the schools moderated this session complied with the format for the internal assessment although it seems that some new centres are not very well acquainted with the IA requirements. In general terms, it appears that the IA is working well for both teachers and candidates. The necessary skills for the historical investigation show signs of improving with each session. Almost all the selected topics were suitable and appropriate, mostly 20th century history, candidates are phrasing the theme of investigations in terms of questions, and it was noted that many are using themes related to P.2. As always some of assignments were very good, some were poor. The majority of the problems observed were in relation to analysis and evaluation of sources, and with the lack of interaction/ coherence between A, B, and D. The marks were entered without a problem. Most concerning however, were queries from team leaders about some assertions that some of their examiners were making. For example: if the two sources that are going to be evaluated are not discussed (named) in A only one mark could be given; if the candidate is using only internet sources F will get 0; if the bibliography is not clearly divided into a format which separate internet sources and reading sources F will get 0. The sources of these incorrect assertions are rather puzzling but examiners, as well as teachers, should be familiar with the IA guidelines to prevent misinformation about the procedures.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A

Many candidates scored well in this criterion. As usual some lost marks because of the methodology or scope were not clearly explained or developed. The formulation of the research topic as a question has certainly improved the focus of the investigation.

Criterion B

In this criterion, the scores were satisfactory. Some problems such as the lack of references remain. A generic source such as Wikipedia continues to be a favourite. In some cases the information does not seem to be completely related to the topic under investigation.

Criterion C

In several cases the candidates references to the origin, purpose, value and limitation was rather restricted although better than in previous years.

Criterion D

Very few candidates reached top marks here. The main problem seems to be making a difference between B and D. Many candidates repeated the information described in B without any analysis. References were scarce here also. Analysis is a skill that needs more training

Criterion E

No significant problems in this area.

Criterion F

This section also showed some improvement, with very few candidates going over the word limit. Bibliographies with appropriate format were the rule.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- It will be useful if teachers will review the guidelines for IA, and be aware that for the May 2010 session new guidelines are in place for the IA.
- Suggest the use of appropriated sources and skills, such as the use of end/footnotes within the summary of evidence and analytical approaches for D.
- The teaching of historical analysis and evaluation of sources should be encouraged and practiced.

Higher and standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 2	3 - 5	6 - 8	9 - 11	12 - 15	16 - 18	19 - 25

General comments

The G2 forms sent to IBCA by the schools indicated that the May 2009 Paper One was well received. 6 centres found it easier than May 2008, 144 thought it was of a similar standard, 58 found it a little more difficult and 7 centres found it much more difficult. In terms of the suitability of the question paper 1 school found it too easy, 128 found it appropriate and 26 centres found it too difficult. 251 schools found the syllabus coverage satisfactory or good, 14 found it poor; 254 found the clarity of wording satisfactory or good (11 found it poor); and 264 schools found the presentation satisfactory or good (1 found it poor). The comments that were received were also, generally speaking, highly complementary. “The test was overall fair” (22); “Questions were appropriate in topic” (11); “Excellent for the candidates” (5); “The test appropriately reflected the subjects outlined in the curriculum” (12), etc. There were one or two detracting comments - “Candidates found the sources on this paper much more demanding”(11); The Prescribed Topics were harder than previous versions”(3); “sources too lengthy” (2). It was clear that the vast majority of centres found the Paper fair and appropriate. There were one or two comments that did not make much sense as some centres commented that a question on Stalin’s foreign policy was unfair. This is the last bullet point under the prescribed subject 1 (p. 9) in the present History Guide. As usual Stalin was the most popular choice, followed by The Cold War and Mao. It is important to note that the Prescribed Topics for May 2010 will change to those outlined in the new History Guide.

The areas of the programme and examination that appeared difficult for the candidates

Examiners reported that the paper did not present major difficulties as a whole and problems which candidates had with individual questions will be dealt with below. Three main areas of concern were noted. Firstly, in questions 3, 7 and 11, many candidates seemed unaware of the need to focus on the primary sources in question, rather than on the secondary works or websites from which they were reproduced. Secondly, many candidates concentrated on the origin and limitations of the sources and did not acknowledge purpose which is a crucial part of the question when it comes to assessing the values and limitations of a source. Finally, there were some very lengthy answers to questions 1, 5 and 9, which often included significant quantities of own knowledge that were irrelevant to the question.

The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

In general candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of their chosen topic, and could put the sources in their correct historical context. The more successful candidates grasped the meaning and significance of the detail of the sources and so were able to utilize it accurately. Candidates were good at exploring the message and meaning in sources, especially in questions involving written sources. Candidates were particularly strong in the “compare and contrast” questions where most responses demonstrated the ability to convey this in a clear and straightforward manner, some of which demonstrated extended knowledge and understanding. Time management did not seem so much of a problem this time around, with fewer examiners reporting that candidates failed to reach the fourth question.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Question 1, 5 and 9

Question 1

- a) Most candidates were able to identify two of the reasons advanced by ‘some politicians’, though these views were often wrongly attributed to Stalin himself.
- b) Done well. Many full marks.

Question 5

- a) Done well in most cases.
- b) Many candidates were unable to go beyond a single comment about the weather.

Question 9

- a) Done well by most candidates. Many full marks.
- b) This was mostly well handled, although some candidates did not understand the cartoon in 9 (b).

Questions 2, 6 and 10

Question 2

Overall this was done well. In terms of comparisons, many candidates were quick to identify Stalin’s mistrust of the West. Weaker answers failed to identify Stalin himself as one of the dictators mentioned in source C, and they also did not seem to appreciate the contrasting approaches to diplomacy outlined in the two paragraphs of source B. Much more successful were answers which noted that Source B dealt with the Soviet position up to the winter of 1938-39, while the focus on Source C was very much on 1939 itself.

Question 6

Many candidates were able to compare and contrast D and E well, but some candidates just described the content of each source. Candidates were generally better at drawing comparisons rather than contrasts between the two sources, with the focus mainly being on the failures of the Leap

Question 10

Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources B and E about the tensions between the superpowers during the 1970s. *[6 marks]*

Many candidates were able to compare and contrast B and E well, but some candidates just described the content of each source. Candidates seemed happier handling the comparisons between the two sources, especially in the general areas of the deterioration in U.S. - Soviet relations. End-on answers, where the first source was examined and the second source was then dealt with separately, did not achieve high marks. This has been identified as an area needing improvement in many Subject Reports.

Questions 3, 7 and 11**Question 3**

In general, source E presented fewer problems than Source D, where far too many candidates chose to focus on Lynch's book, rather than the Pact itself, and so failed to produce comments of any relevance to a question that focused on relations between the USSR and Nazi Germany. Strangely enough many of these candidates did not repeat the same mistake when analysing the origin of the cartoon.

Question 7

Candidates were able to identify the purpose of Deng Xiaoping's talk to the young in Source A, and the value and limitations of his speech. There were some comments about the website on which these remarks appeared which added nothing to the discussion. The handling of Source B was less successful, with too many candidates choosing to comment on the content of the source rather than analysing the book from which it was drawn.

Question 11

Neither source presented great difficulties for most candidates, though some did choose to concentrate on the website from which Carter's views were taken, rather than on Carter himself. The values and limitations of hearing from the principals involved at the time were generally well appreciated, but only the better answers noted that Carter's views were not given until 1997 at which point he might still have had reasons for concealing or misdirecting information. Weaker candidates confused the politburo with the Soviet people in Source C.

Questions 4, 8 and 12**Question 4**

Most candidates understood this question and used source references well. Some candidates displayed quite extensive own knowledge where there was a good understanding of the history of Soviet-German relations going back to the early 1920's, though the relevance of this to Stalin's foreign policy was not always explained.

Question 8

Most candidates were able to answer this question quite well using their own knowledge and the documents. Better responses focused narrowly on evaluating the results of the Leap. The word 'unmitigated' proved difficult to handle for some candidates. The detail of the sources was for the most part used effectively and some candidates used Source B to support a counterclaim to the question as it did not actually deny that the Leap was a disaster.

Question 12

The best answers picked up on the key phrase 'outside Europe' in the question and were able to analyse the global impact of events on détente. Weaker responses included considerable detail on the Cuban crisis that was not relevant to the era of détente, which is usually dated from the early 1970's. There were some peculiar geographical claims here - East Germany and East Berlin being "outside Europe".

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

This section is going to be structured according to the types of questions which are usually set on the Prescribed Topics. First a general comment. There was more evidence this year of a significant number of candidates choosing to answer the questions in reverse order, presumably in the belief that this meant that sufficient time would be guaranteed for the essay question which is normally tackled last. It is by no means clear that this approach is of benefit since following the usual order allows the candidate to build familiarity with the detail of most or all of the sources, which can then be employed in dealing the essay question.

Questions 1, 5 and 9

Candidates should be guided to identify 3 separate points for the first part of the question. Where they are unable to do so, they should attempt to develop the 2 points that are perhaps more obvious. Candidates should be guided by the fact that an 'a' or 'b' question is worth 2 marks and so must attempt to make 2 clear points about the message or points being made.

Questions 2, 6 and 10

A significant number of candidates did not seem to understand the different requirements of questions 2/6/10, which focus on the content of the extracts, and 3/7/11 which focus on the provenance of the works from which they are taken. It is essential that candidates be taught how to structure a comparative response. Practicing identifying themes between sources is also important. Candidates must be taught to consider both similarities and differences when comparing and contrasting sources.

Questions 3, 7 and 11

Bullet point, grid or note form answers must be discouraged by teachers. Candidates are unlikely to reach the highest levels if they answer these questions in that format. There is no possible advantage in choosing to treat the sources together, especially if this leads to any comparative assessment of reliability. Also, in the analysis of primary sources the focus must be on the *originators* of the material and not on the secondary work in which it appears. Pointing out that the source is an extract or that it has been translated will not result in the awarding of marks, since it distracts from the much more important task of dealing with the origin and purpose of the particular source in question.

Questions 4, 8 and 12

The main issue with the mini-essay question is the synthesis of the source material with a candidate's own knowledge. Again practice of these skills is essential. It would also be useful for candidates to make a brief essay plan for this question, in which they note down the sources to be used in support of their own knowledge. It is extremely rare to see any sort of outline. In cases where there may be time issues for candidates this would be extremely valuable for an examiner to see.

Higher and standard level paper two - timezone 1

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 4	5 - 9	10 - 13	14 - 17	18 - 22	23 - 26	27 - 40

General comments

The number of G2 forms received from centres, as of June 9th and the beginning of the Grade Award for the May 2009 session was 133. Respondents in these G2s considered that this year's paper, in comparison with last year's, was largely of a similar standard. With reference to the 'level of difficulty', the overwhelming majority of respondents

(125) found the paper 'appropriate'. In terms of syllabus coverage, clarity of wording and presentation of the paper there was general acknowledgement that the paper was 'satisfactory' to 'good'- with approval ratings of 95%, 96% and 100% respectively in these categories.

Practising teachers commented on the adequacy of the question balance and accessibility of the paper for candidates. Comments ranged from the complimentary: – 'Excellent, wide-ranging questions', 'This paper was fantastic', to the less so: – "The paper was vague and not very specific', 'Too much depth required for several questions'.

Each year the comments seem to be less a reflection on the nature and quality of the tasks themselves as a reflection on the satisfaction of the teacher as to whether his/her candidates have emerged from the examination content or disconsolate with the choice.

As in previous examination sessions (whether May or November) and regardless of TIME ZONES, the popular topic areas remain Topics 1, 3, and 5. A few centres show evidence of some specialisation in areas of study relevant to Topic 2 (South Asian nationalism in particular- with particular emphasis on Gandhi and the achievement of independence /partition of the subcontinent in 1947)). Topic 6 in TIME ZONE 1 produced more responses. Topic 4 attracted responses which were largely focused on the League of Nations or the U.N.O. - and a handful of (sometimes thoughtful) responses on the efficacy of democratic government in the twentieth century.

Rubric offences were rather more common this session with candidates choosing two questions from the same topic area / answering questions without a focus on the twentieth century/failing to observe the need to provide examples from different regions. **Teachers need to acquaint candidates with the 'rules' surrounding responses to questions.**

On the whole it may be observed that the level of historical knowledge was often no more than adequate in topic areas one would have expected to have been mainstream areas for study in Paper 2. All too frequently the ability to select and deploy accurate and sufficient historical detail in a relevant fashion to meet the demands of the task was disappointing. Specific comments on the treatment of individual questions (below) may help clarify this point.

Every year/session there is a comment on the use and abuse/misuse of historiography. It remains the case that some centres still seem to encourage candidates to shoehorn into their responses as many references to historians as possible. This **is not a guarantee that the answer will attain higher grade bands- indeed often the opposite is the case.** Below is repeated the standard comment upon the 'historiography issue'. It still applies.

*"Historiography remains problematic. Many candidates continue to name drop or summarise 'schools of historiography' in the belief that this in itself constitutes a sound answer to the tasks set. Topic 5 in particular seems to be an area in which 'orthodox', 'revisionist' and 'post-revisionist' schools are described regardless of the need for detailed consideration of historical events/developments in the period. Parroting historians **is not** what is required. The provision of considered judgement/critical comment on the part of the candidate, based on accurate and relevant historical knowledge, **is**. As one examiner pointed out:*

'The best answers were often devoid of any historiography' and were distinguished by the fact that 'candidates focused on the question and drew on their own knowledge of the events' "

The areas of the programme and examination that appeared difficult for the candidates

There was a noticeable concentration on relatively few questions in the paper. What might be considered 'mainstream' topics are studied but **not always to a satisfactory depth of understanding.**

For too many candidates the approach to this paper is to paint with the broadest of brushstrokes. The result is the production of sweeping and very generalized essays which lack specific detail and sufficient accurate historical knowledge.

Question analysis and task identification remain areas which still require attention if the candidate is to provide a relevant and focused response instead of the provision of a 'learned response' which the candidate is determined to write regardless of the actual demands of the question.

The **necessity of planning** needs to be reinforced to candidates. Note the advice provided in previous Reports in relation to the importance of planning/structuring an essay answer:

"Candidate performance in all essay responses could be improved significantly by taking time to plan the answer- where possible organising the response into suitable themes rather than producing narrative /descriptive accounts. Candidates might be encouraged to present their plans in their answer booklet (making sure to draw a line through them at the end) as they can be helpful to the marker. Five to ten minutes drawing up an essay plan is time well spent despite what many candidates may think in their eagerness to address the question".

Every session it is necessary to point out that too many candidates in writing answers in Topic 3, fail to read the question carefully and confuse **rise/rule** resulting in candidates losing marks. **'In power'** and **'rise to power'** are not synonymous - and it is dispiriting to read responses which, though very knowledgeable, are largely irrelevant to the question. Question 11 which was popular in relation to Castro was a **rise to power** focus. A ruler of a single-party state refers to the **period of rule** of that individual - especially worth noting in relation to Topic 3, Questions 14 and 15 this session.

Knowledge of chronology remains weak in far too many cases – or simply non-existent. Without knowledge of the chronological development of events it is difficult to see how candidates can, with any confidence, effectively establish links between causes and consequences/results.

Dates do count- and accurate knowledge of events and their timing is important in the structuring of convincing argumentation.

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

The best performances, as always, were characterised by good planning and the provision of specific, accurate, detailed and relevant historical knowledge. Thematic responses and running comparisons/contrasts were often undertaken with very positive results.

Higher awards also tended to go to those candidates who were able to **define/explain** effectively **key terms** at the outset. The possession of a sound historical vocabulary base aids greatly in formulating focused responses. Terms such as 'declared ideology', 'guerrilla warfare' for example need to be learned, understood and accurately applied to the task presented.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Topic 1

Question 1

The First and Second World Wars do **not** constitute valid examples of civil wars despite what a considerable number of candidates seemed to believe. Neither is the American Civil war a relevant example. This was not a particularly popular question and the most popular examples tended to be China, Spain and Russia. Better answers dealt with the question thematically by identifying areas for investigation- ideology, economic/social causes etc. rather than end-on or sequential treatment.

Question 2

A popular question though relatively few candidates were able to go beyond largely descriptive accounts of guerrilla war. The political aspects of such irregular warfare were not well known. Better answers were able to go beyond narration of methods and discuss/assess the significance of guerrilla warfare in relation to other factors in the selected wars. Most popular choices were China and Vietnam (for Asia) and the USSR and Cuba for other regions.

Question 3

This was very popular indeed as a choice. Some candidates treated it as a two part essay-a) and b). Others identified long/short term results (up till 1935) in an extended prose essay style. Given the extent and importance of the First World War it was gratifying to see that candidates were not always limited to a standard 'Treaty of Versailles/Rise of Hitler' narrative. The better answers identified economic, social, territorial, political and, technological results, illustrating these with a wide/global range of examples.

Question 4

Vietnam and Korea (especially the former) were both dealt with by many who attempted this question as little more than descriptions of the origins, course and outcome of the conflict. There was far too little concentration on the social and cultural changes and when answers did focus on any such changes it was disappointing to find that there was no real knowledge or understanding of the nature and extent of the conflict on either the Vietnamese (or S.E. Asian) populations or the Korean people. Often only the USA was seen as having been affected by the wars in social and economic terms. That being said, there were some excellent responses which were knowledgeable and balanced.

Question 5

The question quite clearly stated 'war in the air' was the focus. Some candidates simply read it as the 'nature of war' and wrote accordingly- and unsuccessfully. As always there were responses which revealed a great deal of knowledge of the technical and strategic developments during the time period but they were relatively infrequent. Not a popular choice.

Topic 2

There were few attempts at answering questions in this topic area. Of the questions which were addressed, Questions 7 elicited some attempts. It is worth emphasising that the choice of Cuba under Castro or China under Mao does not constitute a valid choice of examples for Q., 8 or 9. These were **not** 'new states. Neither was Castro's movement nor the CCP an 'independence movement' (Q.6)

Topic 3

Question 11

This was one of the most popular questions on the paper. Castro was by far the most selected alternative. The question focused on methods used to **obtain power** and the coverage of Cuba post 1959 was often irrelevant. It was a similar case with Peron where candidates crossed from rise to rule without any real awareness of the demands of the question. Though many wrote about Castro not much was known in real depth about conditions in Cuba pre-1959, nor Castro's programme. It appeared that many attributed his obtaining of power to 'charisma' (never explained/developed) and to one speech (though no knowledge of the content of 'History will absolve me' was present). Much more was necessary in terms of detailed historical knowledge to satisfyingly answer this question for either Castro or Peron.

Question 12

Quite a popular question but too few candidates actually defined what the 'declared ideology' of the chosen ruler was. Without this definition, trying to assess the extent to which the individual was consistent in terms of the application of the ideological principles – or was pragmatic (for whatever reason) was difficult. There was more to National Socialism than anti-Semitism and attempted genocide.

Question 13

Hitler's domestic policies proved a great attraction for many candidates. As noted above however there was more to National Socialism than anti-Semitism and graphic descriptions of the Holocaust were not sufficient to answer this question successfully. At the top end there were some excellent answers which dealt with different aspects of domestic policy- ranging from the establishment of the totalitarian state to the economic recovery. One suggestion - if candidates do wish to use terms like Gleichschaltung/Volksgemeinschaft/Führerprinzip etc. then please learn to spell these terms properly.

Question 14

Stalin, apparently, had no foreign policy according to many candidates - erroneous to say the least. When candidates did deal with Stalin most seemed unaware that anything occurred after 1941. Hitler, Castro, Mussolini, Lenin were all common choices. Interestingly few pointed out that foreign policy **ultimately** proved a disaster for both Hitler and Mussolini as well as their respective ideologies- and indeed for the nations of Germany and Italy which were to suffer great physical destruction.

Question 15

Candidates appeared to know more about 'education' in their chosen examples (schooling/Youth movements etc). The coverage of the 'arts' was often very generalised with references to censorship and propaganda but details of artists/forms of art both promoted and banned was slight in many cases. In some cases the candidates needed to go beyond 'education as indoctrination'. The single-party state also promoted literacy/areas of study which were 'useful' for the state in scientific/technological terms for example.

Topic 4

Candidates scour this topic area in search of the 'failure of the League of Nations' question and when it cannot be found they often tend to write about it anyway.

Question 16

'Aims' were a little limited for many candidates. Apart from 'collective security' (not always a term known by candidates) there were other aims relating to disarmament and the functionalist aims of the organisation undertaken by its agencies and specialised committees/commissions.

The problem for many was the chronological restriction - i.e. dealing with the League up to 1930. Manchuria, Abyssinia, Hitler's foreign policy were all irrelevant.

There were few attempts at other questions on this section though there were some perceptive attempts at Q. 18.

Topic 5**Question 21**

As ever, a popular choice on the early stages of the Cold War. Once again it resulted in many candidates reproducing standard responses on the origins of the Cold War based upon regurgitation of 'Orthodox', 'Revisionist', 'Post-revisionist – and now, 'Realpolitik'-interpretations which, presumably, are intended to show the candidate's 'sound grasp' of historiography.

A reminder from a previous year's report:

"Where candidates used historical detail of the period, rather than regurgitating 'historiography' the results were significantly better in producing focused and convincing responses."

Too little was known (by too many) about the context of Yalta and Potsdam, what the issues were and what the grounds for disagreement were. Candidates were determined to write a standard response on the origins of the Cold War despite the question's focus. The best responses, understandably, had a good grasp of the issues, the participants, the fears, aims and misunderstandings at both conferences and how this affected East-West relations.

Question 22

Candidates were invited to define and analyse the importance of two from four issues/themes. The majority chose the formation of NATO, the Warsaw pact – or by far the most popular, Détente. On the whole most candidates made a decent attempt at this question and were stronger perhaps on the definition rather than the significance/importance of the selected area.

Question 23

Candidates saw the ‘fear and suspicion’ phrase and in some cases wrote extensively about the origins of the Cold war pre- 1953. While some of this was relevant background, the question did emphasise the period 1953-1975. One problem with candidates having a hazy knowledge of chronology was the tendency of some candidates to go into too much detail about things which were not encompassed in this period. Neither the outbreak of war in Korea, nor the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan was needed. For some candidates the only event of any significance was the Cuban Missile Crisis. Some responses indeed saw this, wrongly, as an invitation to narrate the origins and course of the Crisis to the exclusion of all else.

There were candidates who did reveal a good knowledge of events in the period and were able to point out the role of fear and suspicion in exacerbating tensions as well as alleviating them in the later 60s, early 70s.

Question 24

No answers seen in relation to the effect of the Cold war upon social and gender issues in two countries, each chosen from a different region.

Question 25

For the most part candidates were able to deal with the question’s demands. At times some candidates appeared a little reluctant to move beyond a long pre-1950 background and thus left insufficient time to deal with the globalisation of the East-West conflict after 1949/50. End points selected varied from Vietnam (1975), to Afghanistan (1979+), to Eastern Europe and the decline of the USSR.

On the whole, candidates who tried to trace and explain the geographical extension of hostility over a variety of continents were successful.

Topic 6

There were relatively few takers for questions in this section. Where some attempts were made, the responses on the whole tended to reflect highly generalised, often poorly supported work. Candidates who try the questions in this section often seem to be struggling to find something on the exam paper to write about. Often the comments seem to be gleaned from personal experience or a lightweight understanding, at best, of the topics. Occasionally there is a genuine and insightful response to questions in Topic 6- but these are few and far between unfortunately.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Below are recommendations for improving candidate performance made in relation to previous examination sessions.

Rather than re-inventing the wheel, these points still stand as a guide for candidates hoping to successfully address the demands of this particular paper.

“Each year the recommendations concerning guidance for future candidates are remarkably similar, and one hopes that centres/teachers do read these and try to adapt teaching methods and candidates’ approaches to dealing with the tasks set in the examination paper.

*Although the followings suggestions may appear repetitive- they are worth repeating- **and making available to candidates** in order to inform candidates what examiners are looking for in the essay questions set.*

*Every essay provides a specific task for the candidate. Candidates need to identify the key terms in the question and plan an effective and relevant response accordingly. **Question analysis** means reading the **entire** question, breaking down the task into constituent parts or themes and then avoiding the temptation to produce an avalanche of information whose relevance to the specific demands is quite marginal.*

*5-10 minutes writing a **plan** of the response is time well spent and can aid in providing a coherent and focused answer. Encourage candidates to include the plan within the exam answer booklet- having made sure to draw a line through the plan to indicate it is not part of the essay answer obviously*

*In questions relating to **Topic 3** - candidates must exercise great care in identifying whether questions are asking candidates to focus on **rise or rule** of single-party leaders - **or both!** Marks are lost by candidates who fail to identify the scope of these questions.*

A thematic approach to essays, when appropriate, usually produces a more successful outcome. The chronological narrative often tends towards descriptive writing and curtails analytical treatment of topics.

*Opinions need to be supported by relevant, accurate historical knowledge if candidates wish to achieve the higher grade bands. **There is no substitute for mastery of the material** and its focused deployment in the attempt to meet the demands of the task.*

***Define** terms which appear in the questions – not only for the sake of examiners but in order to clarify the task at the outset for the candidate- ‘ideology’, ‘limited warfare’ for example - need to be explained at the outset.*

***Historiography** is not the be-all and end-all of history essay writing: it should not be a substitute/ replacement for solid factual knowledge, accurate chronology and sequencing which must form the basis of any effective essays.”*

Reiteration, ad nauseam, of these points over the years has, in some cases produced a significant improvement in the way in which candidates approach question types- especially notable here being the improvement in the structuring of ‘Compare/Contrast’ questions. Much still needs to be done. Candidates must learn to focus on the specific task, must learn to read the question and answer **that question and not another!** Many candidates do indeed have a mastery of historical information - it is a pity to see this being squandered by a failure to think about the question and plan accordingly at the outset.

Higher and standard level paper two - timezone 2

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 4	5 - 9	10 - 13	14 - 17	18 - 22	23 - 26	27 - 40

General comments

The total number of candidates taking Paper Two History (Higher and Standard Level) in the May 2009 examination session in both time zones showed an increase of 10% over the numbers for 2008. The number of G2 forms received from centres taking the Time Zone 2 examination, as of the beginning of the Grade Award for the May session was 119.

Of those who submitted G2s, a total of 57 teachers considered the paper to be of a “similar standard” to that of 2008. A total of 23 found it to be “a little more difficult” and 8 “a little easier”. In terms of suitability, a majority of 108 found the level of difficulty to be “appropriate” and 73 considered the syllabus coverage to be “good”. A similar majority considered the clarity of wording and the presentation of the paper to be “good”.

Comments received from teachers indicated that this was considered to be a “fair, good exam” with questions, “...that focused on important areas” offering, “...something for everyone”. Conversely, there was some criticism of the “openness” of the questions that sometimes made it harder for candidates to focus on relevant areas. This is a complaint that is often made of Paper 2 although it must be said that “breadth” and “openness” are also characteristic of the assessment of this core paper. It is well established that each Topic contains questions that are general as well as those that ask for specific knowledge. The purpose of the general “open” questions is to allow candidates to apply the knowledge they have regardless of which wars or single party leaders, for instance, that they have studied.

As in previous examination sessions the popular topic areas remain Topic 1, 3 and 5. There were very few responses to Topic 2 and 6 but the question(s) on the League of Nations in Topic 4 proved very popular.

There were very few rubric offences with only a very small number of candidates answering too few questions, or choosing questions from the same topic.

The areas of the programme and examination that appeared difficult for the candidates

It was noteworthy this year that many of the candidates included some indication of planning along with their answers. This often contributed to better answers that were quite well structured. The level of analysis remains quite limited and there is still a tendency to describe or narrate events. What this often means is that candidates run out of time and so not only is there an absence of analysis, there is also, overall, a failure to include a good coverage of the topic. This was particularly the case in Question 1 where candidates would launch into a description of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles only to find that they had no time to discuss the events of 1939. In Topic 3, there were far fewer candidates this year that confused the rise to power with the consolidation of power by single party leaders and so most answers did include relevant knowledge. There is still the usual problem with chronology however and the need to include dates and to be clear on causation remains fundamental to the construction of a good, well-supported argument.

On the whole, candidates used historiography sparingly and to support rather than to replace accurate, factual evidence. This is a distinct improvement on the previous May session and it does tend to be weaker candidates who now fall back on the rote learning of different historians' interpretations especially on the origins of the Cold War. In fact, it was a pity this session that so few of the very good essays had references to historiography it may be time to re-introduce it with the proviso that it not take on a life of its own and overwhelm essays as it has done in the past.

Once again, abbreviations were endemic this year with many candidates using TOV in place of Treaty of Versailles and LON in place of League of Nations. It is understandable that, in haste, candidates will resort to such devices but it has become the practice to do so from the outset of an answer, and this should be discouraged.

One last point, Paper 2 is a global paper and it is a good idea to encourage candidates, where possible, to think outside their "regional study". Whereas in the past, a complaint that was often made about Paper 3 was that candidates resorted to using their knowledge of the Paper 2 course to pad out questions on the regional paper, it appears that the opposite is now the case. Too often, candidates did not venture outside of Europe or Asia and their answers sometimes lacked the breadth that could be expected. As a general guideline, it is a good idea to encourage candidates, when planning their answers, to consider whether or not some relevant information from another region may be included. This is especially relevant when answering questions, for example, on the two world wars or the Cold War.

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

There were some excellent answers and many were very good indeed. Candidates who scored in the top mark band demonstrated sound knowledge and sound understanding of the topics. In some cases, there was also evidence of wide reading and an ability to produce well focused, nicely structured answers. Where historians were quoted, the best answers used such information judiciously and, indeed, quoted academic historians rather than authors of school textbooks. It may be timely for teachers to point out the difference to their candidates.

As mentioned earlier, it was gratifying to see how many candidates did take the time to think through and plan their answer. In the majority of cases, candidates did refer to the question when writing their introductions and, moreover, would refer back to the question as they moved from one argument to the next. This made answers seem far more focused and relevant. It was clear that candidates, in most cases, were familiar with the kinds of questions that would come up on the exam paper and were well prepared. The downside of this is that in rather too many instances, candidates wanted to answer the question they had prepared for rather than the question on this paper. This is not a good strategy as, to score well, the answer has to be focused and to include relevant material. Examiners do not and cannot reward answers to questions that may have been practiced in class but are not on the paper.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

The majority of candidates answered from a narrow range of questions and these will be discussed below.

Topic 1

Question 1

Not unexpectedly, a very popular question. The causes of the Second World War were well known and almost all candidates divided them into short and long term causes and so structured the answer appropriately. In some cases, candidates confined their answers to a narration of Hitler's rise to power and an outline of his foreign policy but neglected other relevant issues. Also, unfortunately, most answers were very Euro-centric and made little or no reference to Asia or Africa. As this is a global paper, it is a pity that few candidates included any mention of the Japanese invasion of China.

There were very few references to historiography although the Taylor thesis, at least, ought to be well known. Perhaps we have gone from one extreme to the other and answers laden with historiography (and little less) have now given way to answers with none whatsoever.

Question 2

Quite popular with candidates who had some idea of "limited war" and included a definition. Most chose Korea and some argued their case quite well indicating the use only of conventional weapons, limited aims etc. Weaker candidates focused on narrating their chosen war. Some candidates chose to explain why either World War One or World War Two was partly total and partly limited. This was quite acceptable as long as the focus was on "limited" war as opposed to simply explaining which aspects were "total" with barely a mention of "limited". It is likely that in this case, candidates had hoped for a question on "total" war. Indeed, among the teacher comments on the G2 forms was regret that there were no questions this year on either "total war" or "guerrilla war" and it could be that some candidates had not foreseen this possibility.

Question 3

There were very few answers to this question and most candidates who chose it had difficulty determining what could be considered “social” issues. In most cases, they resorted to discussing political issues. It is likely that one question in each Topic will focus on some aspect of “social” history so it is worthwhile explaining to candidates how this differs from economic or political history.

Question 4

This was not a very popular question, which was quite surprising as it has come up quite often in previous exam sessions. There were some good answers on the role of foreign powers in the Spanish Civil War but even so, most candidates rather neglected “outcome”. Also, there was only limited use of supporting detail. As for the Vietnam War, most answers narrated the role of the USA, for instance, often from 1954 onwards but, again, neglected “outcome” and, in most cases, mentioned only very briefly the involvement of China and the USSR.

Question 5

Only very few answers were seen to this question varying from the very general to the quite knowledgeable.

Topic 2

Very few answers were seen to Q. 6 – 10.

Topic 3**Question 11**

This was quite a challenging question and some teacher comments on the G2 forms suggested that the wording may have posed problems but, in practice, it was very popular and most candidates who chose it answered it quite effectively. Even weaker answers were able to address “to what extent” and to challenge the assertion quite well. Mostly, candidates chose at least one single party state and, in some cases, were a little overly ambitious mentioning all the single party rulers they had studied. The best answers included more than just an outline of the rise to power of a single party leader and there was some good, well supported analysis. A few candidates did choose Stalin although, as he was not responsible for the “formation” of a single party state, he was not a valid example.

Question 12

A very popular question with both Lenin and Mussolini being chosen in more or less equal numbers. Lenin was handled better, on the whole, with some good analysis of the methods used to establish the control of the Bolsheviks and the setting up of the Soviet state. Most candidates discussed the closing of the Constituent Assembly, the civil war, the economic policies etc. to good effect. Mussolini was a little less well handled with a rather limited narrative of his policies in most cases and fewer links to the question.

Question 13

This question was not very popular and, for the most part, answers focused on both success and failure. All answers that were seen used rulers from different regions with Mao, Nasser, Hitler and Stalin being most popular. While there was some good analysis of Nasser and Hitler, there was less sure handling of Mao and Stalin with most candidates assuming that they had little in the way of foreign policy. Oddly enough, few candidates made any mention of Stalin's foreign policy after 1945.

Question 14

This was quite popular and, generally, candidates who chose Nasser did rather better than the candidates who chose Castro. As is so often the case, candidates have a fair knowledge of Castro's rise to power and the Cuban Missile Crisis but their knowledge of his post-1962 policies is rather limited. Consequently, answers were rather too limited in scope.

Question 15

This was quite a popular question with Hitler, Mao and Stalin being the most popular choices of single party leaders. Unfortunately, the knowledge demonstrated was rather limited and although there were some relevant reasons given for the support and censorship of the arts, these were not supported with detailed knowledge of artists, musicians, writers etc.

Topic 4**Question 16**

This was a very popular question with many candidates making use of the opportunity to use their knowledge of the League of Nations. Despite the concerns expressed in some teacher comments on the G2 forms, there was no error in the wording of the question and the intention was that candidates would have the opportunity to write a focused response on the activities of the League of Nations during the 1920s. Many candidates used their knowledge quite effectively and were able to discuss not only political issues but also the work carried out by the League to help refugees, to try and improve health and working conditions etc.

Question 17 a and b

This was also a very popular question and, for the most part, it was the League of Nations that was chosen as the example. It is possible that candidates put off by the 1920 -30 time limit on Q.16 chose this question instead. Mostly, both parts were addressed and attempts made to describe the structure and organization of the League although many candidates focused on narrating the Manchurian and Abyssinian Crises rather than linking such events to the weaknesses in the structure and organization of the League.

Questions 18 - 20

There were no answers seen to Q. 18 -20

Topic 5**Question 21**

This was a popular question and the reasons for the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan were quite well known and the results outlined. Most answers resisted the temptation to turn this into an “origins of the Cold War” response and many candidates focused well on the period 1945-47 giving a focused and quite well supported analysis of the reasons why the United States chose a policy of containment. Most mentioned Greece and Turkey and went on to interpret the Marshall Plan as an economic extension of the Truman Doctrine. Again, for the most part, the reasons were quite well outlined although the plight of a war-ravaged Europe could, in some cases, have been stated more clearly. Perhaps it was poor time management that prevented rather a lot of candidates from outlining the results of the Marshall Plan although many did make some reference to the Berlin Blockade. There were relatively few references to the ERP or concrete examples of the impact that the money had on countries that benefited.

Question 22

This was a straightforward question and quite popular question with candidates mostly choosing “containment” and “east European satellite states”. Definitions were given and attempts made to explain and analyse the importance of both although with rather limited effect.

Question 23

Very few answers were seen to this question and, for the most part, the social and economic impact was not well known.

Question 24

Rather surprisingly perhaps, only a few answers were seen to this question. The candidates who did attempt it focused rather too much on the Cuban Missile Crisis and rather neglected détente. There were only a few good answers discussing “mutual distrust” and covering the whole period from the end of the Korean War to the end of the Vietnam

Question 25

There were a few attempts at this question and although almost all the candidates did attempt to address both the beginning and the end of the Cold War, only a few explained explicitly why Europe was central to both parts. Generally, there was better knowledge of the origins than the end of the Cold War.

Topic 6

There were very few attempts at Q. 26 – Q. 30.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

As this was the last May session paper set according to the current curriculum, advice on future teaching may be a little redundant. Even so, it is worth noting that candidates are doing a far better job now of addressing the question and of planning their answers. The first exams on this curriculum were sat in 2003 and, over the past 7 years, there has been a growing familiarity with the kinds of questions that are asked. Consequently, it appears that candidates have been encouraged to revise thoroughly for questions on the rise to power of a single party leader, for instance, or the origins of the Cold War and this has been reflected in their ability to write better answers. Structure has also improved and candidates are able to use a comparative framework, for instance, when asked to do so.

Of course, there is no substitute for sound knowledge, as this is the foundation of all good essays answers. The best of these demonstrate a very good command of detailed knowledge, although, having said that, not always of wide reading. It is perhaps a symptom of the age of the internet that candidates spend less time reading books, preferring to “Google” specific questions. In doing so, however, there is a risk that their overview of a topic, although very precise, will also be very narrow and so lack a breadth of understanding. This observation will hold good despite the forthcoming changes in the curriculum, along with all the comments that have reflected on the good practice already out there in the teaching of this component. As mentioned earlier, historiography was used very sparingly this session and while this is a welcome move away from the rote learning of the “orthodox, revisionist and post-revisionist” interpretations of the Cold War, it should not be abandoned all together. It is important for candidates to know where historical knowledge comes from and also that interpretations do change. Relevant historiography should be integrated into the course rather than added on as an afterthought and so make its way more holistically into the exam answers.

Higher level paper three - Africa

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 7	8 - 15	16 - 22	23 - 28	29 - 33	34 - 39	40 - 60

General comments

The paper was taken by 141 candidates. There were fewer than 5 answers except to questions on which comments are made.

The areas of the programme and examination that appeared difficult for the candidates

Questions on nineteenth century topics continue to be far more popular, reflecting the emphasis on these in schools. Fewer candidates than usual this year attempted to answer post-independence questions on topics that are not often taught. Topic 1 is still not taught in sufficient depth. Otherwise the weaknesses of the candidates were not related to particular areas of the programme.

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

There was a clear range of ability all the way to the high mark bands. Few candidates wrote unfocused narrative answers and the main requirements of most answers were understood. Many answers were well structured and showed the ability to analyse, evaluate, assess, compare and contrast and looked at other factors in answering “to what extent” questions. Answers to questions 1, 2, 12 and 14 lacked balance because candidates clearly knew much more about Islam in West than in East Africa, Ethiopia than Sudan, British than French administrative systems, Tanganyika than Uganda. The major weakness remains the tendency of some candidates to make vague generalizations and sweeping assertions without supporting evidence.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Question 1

Very few candidates had adequate knowledge of Islam’s expansion in East Africa and almost none referred to the impact of the establishment of the Omani Sultanate in Zanzibar.

There was a greater knowledge of the Jihads in West Africa and of Samori Toure but evidence that this topic is not studied in sufficient depth.

Question 2

This was a popular question. Candidates were much more knowledgeable about the survival of Ethiopian independency and the contribution to it of Emperor Menelik than about the Sudan. Answers suggested incorrectly that the Sudan collapsed because of incompetence on the part of its ruler though few could name him. Answers were unaware of why Britain had shown little interest in the Sudan after their occupation of Egypt in 1882 and why they decided much later to embark on its full conquest. Better answers analysed not only Menelik’s victory at Adowa but his diplomacy after which secured the recognition by European powers of Ethiopian independence.

Question 6

This question was quite well answered. Most candidates were aware of the main causes of the Mfecane but were much vaguer on the impact. Some were aware of why and how it led to the emergence of both aggressive conquest states and defensive kingdoms like Lesotho. Most were aware of how it facilitated Boer expansion but did not specify the areas affected. Most answers were balanced and explicitly analytical rather than narrative

Question 7

The partition of Africa is always a popular topic and this question attracted more answers than any other. Most were focused on the statement but some were unfocused essays covering all the causes of the quotation. The best answers were familiar with the historiography and /or were ready to challenge the quotation and showed historical understanding of the complexity of the partition. Most candidates explained, with varying degrees of supporting evidence, why certain events contributed to the flare-up of international rivalry which led to the partition of almost all of Africa between the European powers before 1914. As should be the case in a 'to what extent' questions there was appropriate discussion of other factors including economic interests though these too involved national rivalry.

Question 8

Candidates had at least a basic knowledge of the cause and results of the Maji Maji rising but did not cite examples of initial primary resistance to the imposition of German rule, e.g. Abushiri's rebellion at the coast and the Hehe rising led by Mkwawa. Answers tended to lack balance and were much briefer on the results than causes

Question 11

There were some very good answers to this question which showed a detailed knowledge of the racially segregationist legislation passed by the governments of Smuts and Hertzog. Answers were generally better informed on the reasons for the policies than on their results, for example their impact on the ANC and trade union movements and how they contributed to the rise of African independent churches.

Question 12

This was quite a popular question but the answers did not generally suggest that the topic had been studied in depth. There were many vague generalisations without supporting evidence and some inaccuracy. Answers tended to lack knowledge of local contexts in different parts of Africa which helped determine the specific nature of colonial administration.

Question 14

Answers lacked balance as they were much more knowledgeable about Tanganyika than Uganda. Candidates were familiar with the role of Nyerere and Tanu and Governor Turnbull, the relative absence of ethnic rivalry in Tanganyika, the impact of UN trusteeship status but they were much vaguer about the factors which delayed the achievement of independence in Uganda. There was a marked lack of specific knowledge of the rival political parties with different interests and of Britain's fear of an outbreak of violence related to ethnic and religious rivalry.

Question 18

Candidates varied in the depth of their knowledge of apartheid legislation. Some generalised without citing specific laws and most answers could have been more precise and detailed on the impact of apartheid on the African majority.

Question 21

Most answers were explicitly analytical of success and failure but there was considerable variation in the degree of precise knowledge of Nkrumah's rule.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

A new syllabus will be first examined in 2010 and that is taken into account in the following comments.

There will now be two questions on each of the twelve sections, so teachers can limit themselves to three sections. But the answers to this paper make it clearer than ever how important it is to cover every aspect of the section. Questions can be asked on any of the bullet points within a section but they can also combine several bullet points. It was evident this year that the history of Ethiopia was well taught but that of Sudan in less depth or not at all. The same applied to the achievement of independence in Tanganyika (well taught) and Uganda (hardly taught). In such cases candidates are seriously disadvantaged and will score much lower marks. It is not advisable to select more than three sections.

Candidates should be given exemplars of answers so that they can clearly understand the difference between narrative answers and those with explicit analysis. They should practice answering 'compare and contrast' questions on every topic taught. They should be reminded to make careful note of how many parts there are to a question to ensure balanced treatment of 'for what reasons and to what extent' or 'why and with what results' questions.

Teachers should discuss regularly with their candidates what is expected in answers to questions with such key words as 'analyse' and 'assess'. They should be encouraged when appropriate to challenge the assumptions behind questions which include a quotation.

Teachers should encourage their candidates to be careful in their choice of questions. They should be assured that there are two guaranteed questions on every section and that they will have a choice of questions. They should avoid answering questions on post-independence issues unless they have been taught those sections and should be reminded that vague generalisation based on their own knowledge, for example, of the role of women or urbanization in modern Africa or of missionary activity in the colonial period, will not score high marks. They should pay most careful attention to the wording of the questions.

Though the popularity of nineteenth century topics is understandable, teachers should consider teaching more twentieth century topics which overlap with themes in paper 2 especially the impact of the cold war in Africa, civil wars and wars of liberation, the rise of nationalism and the emergence of new states, one-party and authoritarian states and the emergence of South Africa as a multi-party democracy.

Higher level paper three - Americas

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 7	8 - 15	16 - 22	23 - 28	29 - 33	34 - 39	40 - 60

General comments

This session produced relatively higher marks than in previous session. The availability of more questions which provided candidates with an option of selecting the country within which to develop their knowledge seemed to slightly improve the quality of responses.

Given the rank of marks for this session and the comments provided by the teachers in the G2 Forms it seems that the paper worked well. The most popular questions were: **Q#5 Political causes of the US Civil War** (by far, it seems that almost every script included this question); **Q#13** with the United States as the country most frequently selected and with some examples of Argentina and Brazil; **Q#17** in which Cuba was the country of choice; **Q#21 Martin Luther King and Malcolm X**; and **Q#22 Reasons for the long survival of Castro**. Also popular questions were # 6, 11, and 20. Some examiners reported excellent responses about Canadian history.

The areas of the programme and examination that appeared difficult for the candidates

- Most questions to do with anything outside the USA, besides Castro. Most candidates had a reasonably good understanding of US history but when a question required a comparison with a place outside the USA weaker candidates had serious problems. More obviously needs to be done to integrate other countries in the Americas into the classes.
- General questions about economics give rise to the most unsubstantiated of generalizations.
- Reading and understanding the demands of the question
- Choosing examples from the appropriate region—Germany, USSR & even Japan were choices for questions 13 and 16 this year
- Specific knowledge of the subject and the ability to choose appropriate, specific examples as evidence
- Maintaining the focus of the question—candidates tended to stray into other general areas of the subject where they felt more confident
- There was a great deal of misunderstanding of Malcolm X and role of the Supreme Court during 50s/60s

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

- Most candidates did better at single idea questions, but questions with two ideas, such as "To what extent" or "Compare and contrast" did enable better candidates to write more perceptive answers. As usual, candidates were generally better at showing their knowledge than at evaluation.
- The stronger essays continued to be impressive in depth, breadth and quality of articulation.
- For the popular questions, factual knowledge was quite impressive.
- Good knowledge generally shown of FDR and the New Deal, causes of the US Civil War, Teddy Roosevelt and his "Big Stick", US foreign policy during the Cold War, Martin Luther King Jr.
- Most candidates attempted to construct an essay with an introductory paragraph and conclusion.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Question 1

Candidates who wrote on mercantilism usually had a good grasp of the economics aspects and were able to properly identify its application within both Br. and Sp. colonies. Differentiation was, however, sometimes weak.

Question 2

Very few answers to this question.

Question 3

Generally not well answered. Federalists and anti-federalists could be identified but the majority of answers couldn't go beyond the immediate period of the constitutional convention.

Question 4

Rarely done; when done, done badly.

Question 5

This was perhaps the most popular question and produced a full range of answers. Many candidates chose to challenge the importance of political issues, but unfortunately without examining that element, this led to lengthy comments on the inherent N. - S. economic and social differences. For those who supported, or at least discussed the political aspects, most showed a sound grasp of the political controversy although there was a tendency to confuse Missouri Compromise and the Compromise of 1850 or to be unfamiliar with the specific terms and dates for the various agreements.

Question 6

Also a popular question. The latter subject was addressed most effectively by far. For the economy, S. agriculture was understood far better than the emergence of industry.

Question 7

Choices here included US, Canada, Mexico and Brazil but most answers were quite general.

Question 8

Wilson's foreign policy received excellent treatment, but there was limited knowledge of progressive legislation.

Question 9

Very few answers.

Question 10

Only one answer to this question.

Question 11

The dominance of economic motives was generally supported and with strong factual and analytical content - mostly using T. Roosevelt's Corollary and Taft's Dollar Diplomacy.

Question 12

Little accurate, detailed understanding of Pancho Villa's policies was demonstrated.

Question 13

Usually candidates dismissed the role of Hoover. The vast majority saw the response of FDR as assisting recovery, but cited WW II as the exit point. Factual support was generally good to excellent though seldom were individual programs assessed as to their particular degree of success. This topic stimulated some of the most advanced essays of the session when dealing with the United States and Canada. However, those who chose Argentina showed a significant lack of knowledge about this period in the country.

Question 14

Poorly done with minorities of Asians, natives, French-Canadians and Jews chosen.

Question 15

Very few answers to this question.

Question 16

The impact of WWII on the economy of the US was the typical approach. Many candidates, and some examiners, were uncertain to what extent content from the post-war period had relevance. When questions were asked the suggestion was to show some flexibility if the answer was answered with relevant facts. There were not many who chose to address the negative effects of the war-time period.

Most concentrated upon the preparedness aspects, assistance to the Allies and the war production/GDP boost to the economy. Answers about Argentina were very poorly done.

Question 17

Cuba was the choice here with only Castro covered. The better answers did manage to go beyond Cuban Missile Crisis to include support for communist regimes in Central America and Cuban involvement in Angola. Candidates need to pay better attention to the time frame of the question.

Question 18

Fewer than would have been expected and with less substantial knowledge than it was hoped, particularly as to the War on Poverty aspects. The civil right elements were better understood.

Question 19

Candidates had a very good grasp of Nixon's foreign policy, but knew fairly little as to Carter. Most did make an effort to compare/contrast.

Question 20

Some excellent essays were written on the Supreme Court's challenge to segregation and demonstrated knowledge far beyond the Brown case. However, the mediocre essays (and there were many), asserted that the Brown case had resolved segregation. There were a number of responses which showed confusion about the role of the court vs. the role of government [i.e. courts do not PASS legislation].

Question 21

A popular question, which was well done on the whole, although the bias in terms of material support and knowledge was very much towards Martin Luther King. Many candidates erroneously asserted that Malcolm X was the creator of Black Power and the head of the Black Panthers, very few were able to link him with Afro-American nationalism. The question tempted many weaker candidates to think they could get away with a series of generalizations about peace and violence.

Question 22

Castro's longevity was frequently addressed and with good balance as to his reforms as well as his repression. There were many good to excellent essays on this topic, although there were several anti-Castro editorial responses.

Question 23

Very few answers.

Question 24

Some good responses here with detailed understanding of key feminist figures and issues. The majority, however, confused the 1960s/70s with the earlier women's suffrage movement

Question 25

No answers reported.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Candidates need to learn how to construct a proper argument with supporting specific evidence. Too many essays are still overly general.
- Candidates need to become appreciative of the idea that they have to interact with the content they have learned. They are still writing all they know about a subject rather than entering into a debate with the question. They need to practice constructing frameworks that will facilitate an analytical enquiry to answer the question with specific supporting evidence.
- Candidates need a clear understanding of the chronological framework for the subjects. Timelines need to continue to be utilized to achieve this. There were many answers that confused presidents, wars, constitutional amendments etc.
- Some programs are particularly lacking in attention to writing skills and test-taking choices and procedures. Many of the essays which receive low marks seem to be hindered more by a failure to understand the demands of the prompt and the structure that is necessary to properly address a question than a lack of knowledge or of intellectual capacity.
- Teachers should integrate other countries in the Americas into the classes.
- Teachers need to explain the importance of relative evaluation of various factors in a question, and also that "region" means the Americas!

Higher level paper three – Asia/Middle East

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 7	8 - 15	16 - 22	23 - 28	29 - 33	34 - 39	40 - 60

General comments

Centres tend to go for questions based on their regions and are often prepared for questions they hope to see rather than the questions set. However the candidates did frequently display impressive detailed knowledge of their chosen areas. Some of them were able to use this very effectively and selectively to answer the questions.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Question 1

Knowledge of the history of the EIC was good but there was little exploration of a range of factors- particularly internal weaknesses and divisions which provided an opportunity for the EIC.

Question 2

No answers.

Question 3

Some answers were very good and really considered the issue of how successful the policies were from both the British perspective and the Indian perspective. For the most part there were narrative answers for the various governor generals and weaker candidates seemed to only know Dalhousie's policies.

Question 4

A limited number of responses to this question- but they displayed a reasonable knowledge of Muhammed Ali's policies but often failed to really consider the question of impact.

Question 5

There were very few responses to this question. It was not well done as there was little solid knowledge of European involvement or understanding of the reasons for it. Answers tended to drift into a description of Ottoman weakness and lots of vague references to the "sick man of Europe."

Question 6

No responses.

Question 7

There were quite a few answers to this question most of which showed detailed knowledge of the events and the settlement. Analysis of effectiveness was not always fully developed.

Question 8

This was quite a popular question. There was some effective comparing and contrasting. However many answers did not really highlight effectively the reasons for the emergence of the INC as response to British policies but vaguely referred to A.O Hume and safety valves.

They were for the most part very clear as to the reasons for the emergence of the Muslim League and also made the point that this was encouraged by the British.

Question 9

Very few responses often lacking any real detail.

Question 10

Had the same weaknesses as question 9.

Question 11

This was quite popular and quite well done with knowledge of the revolt and its impact on the overall course of the war in the Middle East displayed effectively in response to the question.

Question 12

Some responses not many but with reasonable knowledge of policies but limited assessment of impact.

Question 13

Some responses some had quite good knowledge but one or two classed Saudi Arabia in this group. In the programme Saudi Arabia is treated separately.

Question 15

This was one of the most popular questions on the paper. The material was well known for the pre-war mandate period but the post war period was less well known. Some answers had excellent analysis and argued that the mandate was weak from the beginning because of conflicting promises thus alienating the communities from the beginning.

Question 16

Again very popular indeed although many answers described Gandhi's methods and did not always make analytical comment about his contribution to independence.

Question 17

A few responses to this question with some comparison and contrast not always fully supported with detail especially with regard to the domestic policies of Mubarak.

Question 18

Quite popular and quite well done although there was often limited comment on Nehru's success in establishing democracy in India.

Question 19

Limited number of responses but those were quite knowledgeable and identified a range of factors leading to military dominance in Pakistan post partition.

Question 20

Popular with most answers having both short and long term factors in some detail. On the whole more knowledgeable about the events in 1979.

Question 21

Very much a minority interest but one where there was some very good knowledge of the issues and material.

Question 22

This was quite a popular question however answers tended to describe the events of the conflicts and not really answer why they occurred.

Question 23

Surprisingly few responses to this question. They tended to be rather general and lacking in detail.

Question 24

Responses were reasonable with balanced analysis of domestic and foreign policy issues. Although few managed to consider whether Saddam invaded to shore up his popularity at home.

Question 25

More popular than is usual with this type of question. Importunely there was misunderstanding especially in some centres where candidates discussed Hindu/ Muslim tensions in India which was not the question.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

This course will no longer be offered but aspects will be found in regional options for the new route two. However general guidance is to respond to all aspects of the question set.

Higher level paper three – Asia and Oceania

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 7	8 - 15	16 - 22	23 - 28	29 - 33	34 - 39	40 - 60

General comments

From the G2s received from the schools most centres felt that the level of difficulty of this paper was on a par with that of last year's. Most G2s commented that it was clearly worded and accessible for the candidates.

Many were pleased with the balance of the questions and the coverage of the course. Nevertheless, there was some criticism of the questions set on twentieth century China, because they were seen as too narrow and difficult. Another comment was that there were not enough questions on the countries in South East Asia.

Most centres still seem to concentrate on solely China and Japan in the nineteenth century. In general, the responses on twentieth century Japan were better than those on twentieth century China. Despite a number of questions in recent years about the contributions of both Mao Zedong and other leaders during the period 1949-76 candidates still do not seem to know much about anyone other than Mao.

There were great many responses where the candidates wrote fluently and well, but they did not include enough specific factual evidence to support their analyses. Where this applied to whole schools it seems that the teachers may not be expecting enough precise detail from their candidates.

The areas of the programme and examination that appeared difficult for the candidates

- Some candidates appeared to have prepared answers to set questions and they found it difficult to adapt their material in response to the specific question asked.
- This was particularly evident for questions 1, 3, 8, 9, 12 and 19.
- On the other hand, where candidates did attempt to respond to the actual question many of them did not include enough specific detailed factual information to illustrate and support their comments.
- Many candidates did not have a strong sense of chronology and context.
- Candidates did not seem to understand the distinction between East and S-E Asia and consequently some candidates lost a significant number of marks due to this mistake. This applied to question 14.
- Some candidates did not seem to understand the boundaries of the region and wrote on the USSR, Pakistan and Tibet which are all countries outside the region.
- Some candidates spent too much time on long background information in their responses particularly in questions in 1, 8, 9, 12 and 20.
- Many candidates referred to historians by name but in a forced and unnatural manner. Most of the time the historians' opinions were not integrated within a flowing argument.

The areas of the programme and examination in which candidates appeared well prepared

- Most candidates were able to structure thematic responses.
- Many candidates displayed a comprehensive knowledge of the course.
- Many candidates wrote detailed, relevant and well constructed essays. They were a pleasure to mark.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Comments are only provided on the most popular questions.

Question 1

This was a very popular question. Most candidates agreed with the statement in the question. Some tended to concentrate just on the issue of the trivia of the *kowtow* and the British trade missions, but the majority attempted to address the notion of a culture clash by looking at trade in general and at diplomatic and legal issues. Most candidates needed to include more precise factual detail as evidence to support their analysis.

Question 2

This was another popular question. Many candidates answered this question very well by giving quite a lot of detail about the economic and feudal system changes in Tokugawa Japan. Most candidates mentioned both "Dutch Learning" and "National Learning". Very few discussed the role of the *tozama* clans. Quite a few used a lot of Japanese words without much explanation or analysis. Some candidates who answered this question appeared to be adapting a set piece on the period after Perry's arrival 1853-1868 and did not refer to the period prior to 1853.

Question 3

This was the most popular question on the paper and one which candidates answered very well with clear analysis of the issues. The better candidates challenged the assumption inherent in the question. Most candidates answered it thematically focussing on quality of leadership, strategic blunders, ideology, economic issues, and the alienation of the Western powers and the strength of the Qing armies.

Question 4

Only a few responses to this question, but they were quite detailed and done well.

Question 8

Only a few responses to this question and they were generally rather superficial. Most candidates did not really display much knowledge about the topic and used it to write a set piece about the Self-Strengthening Movement.

Question 9

Quite a popular choice, but many candidates seemed to be adapting a set piece on either economic developments in Meiji Japan or one on the extent to which the reforms in Meiji Japan transformed society. Other candidates equated modernisation with the growth of industry or military reform. Very few addressed issues raised in the question: why Japan chose to modernise and why it was possible to do so in such a short period of time.

Question 10

This question was chosen by many candidates and generally it was done well. Most discussed both the Sino-Japanese War and the Russo-Japanese War and analysed Japan's emergence as a powerful military presence in relation to China, Korea and Russia, as well as the other Western powers with vested interests in the region.

Question 12

This was a popular question, but one which was done very poorly overall. Very few candidates really knew much about Sun Yatsen beyond his Three Principles of the People ideology. There was very little understanding of the revolutionary movement in China in the period 1902-1911 and the numerous attempts by the Tongmenghui (Revolutionary Alliance) to overthrow the Qing government. Many candidates agreed with the question, mentioned Sun Yatsen briefly and then just discussed the long-term causes of the 1911 Revolution.

These responses did not really integrate Sun Yatsen's ideas and activities into this discussion or even analyse why he was initially made President in 1912. Very few candidates mentioned the period 1912-25. Nevertheless, there were a few excellent responses that fully analysed the significant influence of his ideas both before and after his death and also the way in which life and ideas were used for propaganda purposes by both the GMD and CCP. The phrase "*modern China*" proved to be a confusing one for some candidates who chose to discuss Mao or Deng as more important in the creation of modern China. This approach was not successful unless a detailed analysis of Sun was also included.

Question 14

A few responses, but most misread the question and wrote about countries not in South East Asia or even in the region, like Tibet and Pakistan!

Question 15

Only a few responses to this question, but they were quite detailed and done well.

Question 16

This question was a very popular choice. Some candidates wrote excellent responses because they knew a great detail about the First United Front. Many candidates confused the First and Second United Fronts and wrote about fighting the Japanese and the leadership of both Jiang Jieshi and Mao Zedong. Other candidates did not seem to know much about the First United front but answered the question in very general terms about the contrasting ideologies of the GMD and the CCP.

Question 18

This was a popular question and it was done well by most candidates. They addressed both the international and domestic factors clearly and included much relevant detail.

Question 19

A popular question, but most candidates wrote about Mao's contribution with only superficial references to other leaders. Many candidates wrote detailed chronological accounts of the

policies and events in Mao's China. However, the main issue was that most candidates did not fully address the question and assess Mao Zedong's contribution in relation to the contributions of other CCP leaders. Some candidates misinterpreted the question and compared Mao with leaders such as Jiang Jieshi or Deng Xiaoping who were out of the timeframe.

Question 20

There were a few responses that were largely descriptive and which focussed on the economic power of Japan in the 1960s rather than analysing the contribution of the post-war allied occupation. Other responses challenged the assumption in the question and claimed that the roots of Japan's recovery came from the Meiji period. These answers were not really successful unless there was also a balanced analysis of the post-war period.

Question 23

There were quite a few responses to this question, but many candidates appeared to have chosen it as a last resort because it was done very poorly. Most responses contained sweeping generalisations. Many candidates erroneously equated technological developments with just armaments and military advances. Some used this question as a vehicle to discuss the Vietnam War. Others chose the USSR which is not even included in the region!

Question 25

There were a few responses to this question and those who chose Japan, Korea or China as case studies did quite well. Others chose the USSR which is not even included in the region!

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Teachers should make sure that their candidates know the geography of the region and therefore the difference between East Asia and South East Asia so that candidates do not make the wrong choice of question or include a country outside the region.
- Teachers should stress the importance of reading the question properly and thus avoid costly mistakes.
- Teachers could encourage their better candidates to include quite a lot of precise evidence in their responses. This can be done by setting research tasks as part of the coursework.
- Similarly, the better candidates should also be encouraged to show evidence of wide reading and an understanding of historiography, particularly with regard to Tokugawa Japan and Perry's arrival; and to Mao's China.

- Evidence of wide reading can be obtained by encouraging candidates to use a range of history books like Hsu, Spence, Gray, and Fairbank for China; Beasley, Reichschauer and Lehmann for Japan; and by using relevant articles from magazines such as *History Today*, *History Review* and *Twentieth Century History Review*.
- Teachers and candidates should be wary of misunderstanding what is meant by historiography. Name dropping and referring to school text book authors does not constitute a discussion of historiography. Also, the analysis of different interpretations is not a substitute for evidence, but it should complement the factual details.
- Teachers should avoid preparing candidates with set pieces on a particular topic using exactly the same examples and information. Candidates who have this type of prepared answer struggle to adapt the material to the actual question asked in the examination.
- Teachers should stress that the candidates must respond to the actual question asked. Many candidates did not do this and included irrelevant material which was often out of the timeframe given. Discussing the role of an alternative person or the significance of another series of events does not really address the issue unless the main subject of the question is analysed in detail initially.
- Candidates should be trained in answering questions that have two parts such as *How successful was...and why was it discontinued...?; Assess the reasons for and the consequences of...; Compare and contrast the relative successes and failures...; Compare and contrast the aims and policies of...; Compare and contrast the causes of...and the reasons for their failure....*
- Teachers should make sure that their candidates do many practice timed essays in 50 minutes which is the time candidates should allow for each question in the examination.
- Candidates from some schools wrote introductions that were far too long and which included too much detailed information. Some teachers appear to expect their candidates to write “In this essay I will examine.....” or “This essay will.....”.

These techniques were rather cumbersome and it meant that the introductions tended to be very long. Candidates later repeated this information in the body of the essay which meant that the essays were very repetitive. This often led to time management problems for the candidates.

- Proper paragraphing is essential in a good history essay.
- Candidates should also avoid long repetitive conclusions.

Further comments

Consistency in the spelling of the Chinese words is needed. Some candidates used a mixture of Pinyin and Wade-Giles. A candidate should only use one system. Given that the IB uses Pinyin with Wade-Giles in brackets teachers should be encouraged to switch to Pinyin.

Higher level paper three - Europe

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 7	8 - 15	16 - 22	23 - 28	29 - 33	34 - 39	40 - 60

General comments

This is the last year for the present History programme. Numbers have continued to rise, and Paper 3 Europe had a bigger percentage rise than last year, although it is still way behind the Americas Regional paper. It is hoped that it will retain its popularity when it is merged with the Middle East section of the present Asia and the Middle East, regional paper. There were no real problems with this paper, and most candidates and teachers welcomed it.

The areas of the programme and examination that appeared difficult for the candidates

This was not thought to be a difficult paper, but one or two questions were harder than the candidates thought they were. Question 21 was not as well answered as it should have been because candidates did not approach it from a European angle. Many ignored Europe, except for the USSR, completely, and looked on the Cold War as a conflict between the USA and the USSR, as is frequently the case in Paper 2 Section 5. In question 13, the reference to 1914 was often ignored. On the whole answers to nineteenth century questions were more detailed, specific and focused than those based on the twentieth century. This may be that candidates use their Paper 2 material and approach, rather than obtaining the depth that is required for a higher level option.

Although most candidates do appear to be aware of the main demands of the questions they have chosen, many do find it difficult to focus exactly on the set question. As one team leader wrote:

“Many candidates present their knowledge in the way they have been taught, e.g. causes of the First World War, successes and failures of Alexander II, and they cannot tailor their knowledge to a different interpretation/question.”

A temptation that too many cannot resist, is to write all they know that is remotely connected to the person, event, etc., named in the question. Also some candidates, and they do not all appear to be second language candidates, cannot distinguish between domestic, foreign, social and economic policies. Social and economic issues remain a difficult area. They are often disregarded, and the candidate writes about political aspects. Questions 9, 10, and 25, were neither well done nor popular. However question 15, was better answered than social and economic questions in previous years, with most candidate selecting Germany, 1919-1939.

Chronology is either difficult or neglected. Insufficient dates were included. Dates are not perhaps as emphasised as they used to be, but an understanding of the time frame and sequence of events is vital for a clear understanding of many topics. Also attention must be paid to specific time periods when specified in the question. A narrative or descriptive approach was adopted in many answers, when a thematic approach would have improved the answer. Analysis is usually better in thematic answers.

Finally a key problem in weaker candidates' scripts is the tendency to exaggerate with sweeping generalisations using 'everybody' or 'all'.

Levels of knowledge, understanding and skills demonstrated

This varied considerably, but statistics show that a majority of candidates obtained at least a level 5, with very few in the two lowest grades. As noted above, most had a general understanding and knowledge of the material they had been taught. Some revealed the skill of selection, focus and in- depth analysis, while others at least managed some assessment or analytical comments. Cause and effects/results were well understood.

Time management was also good; few candidates ran out of time and most wrote three consistent answers. Skills that could be developed further revolve around interpreting key command words accurately, obeying the dates in the question, and structuring the answer more carefully. Planning is still a problem; some candidates do write plans, but are not allowed to submit them, and others write plans that are more detailed than the actual answer. All answers should be planned, preferably on an answer sheet, and it should be short and concise. Some comments by team leader were, "Some candidates produced well-informed answers but not very focused ones" (especially questions 13 and 14), but, "the best candidates developed their own arguments in response to the question." A few candidates substituted historians' views for specific evidence. Few candidates are capable of using historiography well, and it is not necessary for top marks.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual questions

Questions not discussed below were those with no or very few answers seen.

Question 1

Most candidates found it difficult to identify how developments in the French Revolution helped the rise of Napoleon.

Question 3

The few candidates who attempted this question were able to identify political and economic causes for their two chosen 1848 revolutions.

Question 5

Good answers which addressed both negative and positive contributions of the aspects were seen in this popular and on the whole well known and understood topic. Separatism appeared to be difficult for some, and weaker candidates, as usual, recounted what they knew about Italian unification.

Question 6

Both the strengths of Prussia and the weakness of Prussia were known and analysed by most candidates. Few narrated Bismarck's wars, thus the marks obtained were usually 14+.

Question 7

This question about Bismarck and Germany post 1871 was not so popular, but quite well done, using domestic and foreign policies.

Question 8

This question on Alexander II was very popular, and most candidates were very knowledgeable about his reforms. The treatment of the quotation and revolutionary was the difference between satisfactory and good answers.

Question 13

Perhaps the most popular question on the paper; its standard varied in relation to those who wrote their learnt causes and those who analysed the causes and reached a considered verdict on why the war broke out in 1914.

Question 14

Many previous Paper 3 Europe reports have expressed disappointment with the lack of detailed accurate knowledge about the two 1917 Russian Revolutions. This report is sadly the same. Some candidates did produce detailed accurate specific causes, others made confused references to the 1905 'revolution', the tsar and the war, Rasputin, and above all Lenin, who they thought 'won' the Revolution.

Question 15

Germany and Russia /USSR were the two chosen countries, and some specific economic problems were known.

Question 16

Questions on the domestic policies of Hitler or Stalin usually largely consist of terror, but this session where it forms the focus of the question, very little appeared to be known about their use of terror, and often it was ignored and other policies were compared and contrasted.

Question 17

The question on Mussolini's domestic and foreign policies was quite popular, but few candidates had detailed knowledge of either, and 'impact' was generally ignored.

Question 20

Candidates generally understood — at last — the meaning of total war, but few wrote a fully comprehensive answer, and many referred to evidence outside Europe, including 'Rosie the Riveter'.

Question 21

This was another question that confused some candidates by its appearance on a Europe regional paper. Better candidates did refer all the time to 'the western allies', but weaker ones turned it into a USA versus USSR and did not score well.

Question 24

This was the only question that was answered by many candidates in the last section of the paper. Candidates had a reasonable knowledge of the nature and results of Gorbachev's policies and gave judgement on their responsibility for the breakup of the USSR, but more depth and detail would have led to higher marks.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Most candidates had clearly been well taught, and approached the examination with the will to do their best. The syllabus had been covered appropriately, with the attention of giving the candidates an historical perspective and interest in the subject. It is hoped that the changes in the History programme will not diminish this. Wide reading is always to be encouraged, as well as encouraging candidates to delve more deeply into areas that interest them so that they can use this knowledge to answer questions in greater depth and in a more analytical way. The skills of focus, structure, selection and analysis always need to be emphasised, and much discussion of questions, preparing outlines etc. will help, all candidates, but especially the less able ones. Weaker candidates should be helped to avoid generalised unsupported assertions, and instructed not to use exaggerated general language such as 'everybody did this' or 'all the people followed, or held this view'. Two words that seem to dominate the writing of weaker candidates, and should be avoided by them and able candidates are 'dramatic' and 'created'; neither are suitable in history essays. It is hoped that problems are not being encountered in following the new History programme. If they are, seek advice. It is also hoped that some of you will be tackling Route 1 which should provide a new interest and perspective for your candidates.