

## HISTORY

### Overall grade boundaries

#### Standard Level

|                    |      |       |       |       |       |       |        |
|--------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| <b>Grade:</b>      | 1    | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7      |
| <b>Mark range:</b> | 0-10 | 11-25 | 26-38 | 39-49 | 50-60 | 61-70 | 71-100 |

### History of Africa

#### Higher Level

|                    |      |       |       |       |       |       |        |
|--------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| <b>Grade:</b>      | 1    | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7      |
| <b>Mark range:</b> | 0-11 | 12-25 | 26-38 | 39-49 | 50-60 | 61-70 | 71-100 |

### History of the Americas

#### Higher Level

|                    |      |       |       |       |       |       |        |
|--------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| <b>Grade:</b>      | 1    | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7      |
| <b>Mark range:</b> | 0-11 | 12-24 | 25-37 | 38-49 | 50-59 | 60-70 | 71-100 |

### History of Asia and the Middle East

#### Higher Level

|                    |      |       |       |       |       |       |        |
|--------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| <b>Grade:</b>      | 1    | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7      |
| <b>Mark range:</b> | 0-11 | 12-25 | 26-38 | 39-49 | 50-60 | 61-70 | 71-100 |

### History of East and South East Asia and Oceania

#### Higher Level

|                    |      |       |       |       |       |       |        |
|--------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| <b>Grade:</b>      | 1    | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7      |
| <b>Mark range:</b> | 0-11 | 12-25 | 26-38 | 39-49 | 50-60 | 61-70 | 71-100 |

### History of Europe

#### Higher Level

|                    |      |       |       |       |       |       |        |
|--------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| <b>Grade:</b>      | 1    | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7      |
| <b>Mark range:</b> | 0-11 | 12-25 | 26-38 | 39-49 | 50-60 | 61-70 | 71-100 |

## Internal Assessment

### Component grade boundaries

|                    |     |     |     |       |       |       |       |
|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <b>Grade:</b>      | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     |
| <b>Mark range:</b> | 0-3 | 4-6 | 7-9 | 10-12 | 13-15 | 16-18 | 19-25 |

This is the last year of this history programme, and the last year of the current format for Internal Assessment. As the programme has been running for five years, it was expected that the samples submitted would be similar to previous years, and this was the case. The standard varied from excellent work based on solid research, submitted in a well focused format, to careless, short, untidy essays which appeared to have been written the day before the deadline for submission. To be fair there were very few of these indeed. IB history students take their IA seriously. Most obtain much benefit from conducting individual research and producing it in a form that shows that they have understood and learnt from it.

As in previous years the vast majority of work submitted took the form of a research essay. Titles varied considerably, and most work was submitted under a title, although it has been stressed throughout the programme that it would probably help to focus the essay if a research question was formulated. Teachers are reminded that one of the most helpful ways to assist the candidate is in the choice of a suitable research question. This will, perhaps, be even more important with the new programme. It is probably true to say that the majority of unsuitable topics come from large centres where the staff are hard pressed to supervise and direct all candidates. Of course, there are always students who will persist with an unsuitable choice, no matter how much advice they are given. It is worth recording here that while the majority of the essays on pop music and sport have not scored well, it is possible for students to write on these topics and produce an historical essay provided they do research and focus upon the social and cultural aspects which can be presented as genuine social history.

Most work seen was at least satisfactory and at best excellent. Most also scored more highly than the candidates' external assessment. There were still a few centres which did not score the IA correctly: some of these used the old (now five years old) criteria, and some used the criteria which comes into operation next year. Some of the few centres which did not work with the research essay format did not submit sufficient information. Many centres failed to penalize the candidates who exceeded the word limit. The mark must not be awarded for C when this is the case. Also, two marks were often awarded for D when either the bibliography or the reference notes were incorrectly recorded or inadequate. Throughout the programme this has been a weak point, and teachers are advised to spend more time on this aspect of the new format for IA, which again they are reminded, must be used in the 2003 sessions.

All centres have been sent the new IA guide and teachers who have not seen it are urged to ask their IB coordinator for it. The online curriculum and forum will continue to give advice, and the IB senior history team hope that all teachers and students will find the new IA programme stimulating and challenging.

## Higher and Standard Level Paper 1

### Component grade boundaries

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

## General comments

Candidates chose in more or less equal numbers to answer the questions on prescribed subjects 1 and 3. There were relatively few answers to prescribed subject 2. The current prescribed subjects are being examined for the last time in the 2002 sessions. Looking ahead, it is expected that all three prescribed subjects for examination from May 2003 onwards will attract substantial numbers of candidates. Details of the revised history course, including the new prescribed subjects, are set out in the blue covered guide. (*History*, IBO, February 2001)

In the ‘comments’ section of Form G2 (Teachers’ feedback on the written examinations), many teachers expressed concern that history Papers 1 and 2 had been scheduled on the same day as Language A1. The strength and reasons for this concern have been communicated to those responsible for the scheduling. Teachers’ feedback on Paper 1 itself was as follows.

| Responses to this G2 item. | Exam paper much easier. | A little easier. | Similar Standard. | A little more Difficult. | Much more difficult. |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| 247                        | 0                       | 35               | 181               | 28                       | 3                    |

Paper 1: Comparison with last year’s paper.

Examiners report that the paper worked well, though the final question in Section C was judged to be rather more difficult than the corresponding one in the other sections. Also, the cartoons in Sections B and C were thought to be more difficult than the photograph in A, though candidates generally gained higher marks on the cartoon questions. Overall there was a similar range in the quality of the answers across the three sets of questions.

## Areas of the programme and examination which appeared difficult for the candidates

The main adverse effect on candidates’ performance was insufficient regard for what some of the questions were asking them to do. This was particularly noticeable in answers to the first and last question in each section. Some candidates wrote about the historical situation to which the question referred, rather than shaping the material so as to answer the question directly and effectively. Another tendency was to write too briefly in response to the first question in each section, with candidates underestimating what was required to achieve maximum marks and not taking the time to examine the document thoroughly enough. In answering the third question in each section, candidates were more effective in discussing origin than purpose. Regarding the final question in each section, many candidates continue to have difficulty making effective use of both own knowledge and documentary material. Synthesis of this kind is a very important skill, and one that has to be taught and practised.

## The areas where the candidates seemed well prepared

Candidates frequently displayed good comprehension of the documents (though deficiencies in the planning of answers meant that knowledge and understanding were not always used to best effect.) Most candidates seemed well prepared for answering the second question in each section, though some candidates wasted time explaining the origins and other features of the documents rather than undertaking the comparative analysis required by the question. In answers to the third question in each section, it was encouraging to encounter fewer claims that the primary sources are intrinsically superior to secondary sources. However, when evaluating the value of an historians’ works, there was rarely any evident understanding of the role, aims and techniques of the historian. This is regrettable, not least in the frequent inclusion of an extract from a historical work as one of the documents.

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

### **Prescribed Subject 1: The Russian Revolutions and the New Soviet State 1917-29.**

#### **QUESTION 1(a)** *According to document D why did Nicholas II abdicate?*

Most candidates identified the need to obtain co-operation from the people in order to win the war, but few referred to the wishes of the Duma, the dictates of Nicholas' conscience and the internal problems in Russia. Candidates should not assume that a single assertion is sufficient for maximum marks when a question is worth two or more marks.

#### **QUESTION 1(b)** *What message is portrayed by Document E?*

Most candidates appreciated that the photograph showed hostility to the Russian imperial family; fewer attempted any elaboration or explanation of how the photograph conveyed this.

#### **QUESTION 2** *In what ways do Documents C and E support the views expressed in Document A?*

The best answers offered a perceptive running analysis, fully meriting maximum marks. On the other hand, some candidates' performance was undermined by a determination to provide a detailed description of what the documents said, rather than undertaking the necessary comparative analysis. The latter activity, which is what the question asked the candidates to do, was often left to a concluding paragraph, or – worse – totally omitted.

#### **QUESTION 3** *With reference to their origin and purpose, assess the value and limitations of Documents B and D for historians studying the 1917 February/March Russian Revolution.*

Most candidates were able to assess value in relation to the origin of each document. Considerably fewer successfully discussed purpose and limitations, especially of the Tsar's letter of abdication that was in many ways both an apology and a justification, seeking to put his actions in the best possible light.

#### **QUESTION 4** *Using these documents and your own knowledge, explain why the 1917 February/March Russian Revolution was successful.*

There were some excellent answers which revealed detailed knowledge and understanding of the long term and more immediate reasons for success. On the other hand, some answers showed confusion over the role of Lenin in this revolution, some focused on why there was a revolution rather than why it was successful, and a disappointing number used only documentary material or own knowledge.

### **Prescribed Subject 2: Origins of the Second World War in Asia 1931-41**

#### **QUESTION 5(a)** *According to Document C, what does Jiang Jieshi (Chiang Kai-shek) regard as Japan's aim and what does he believe will prevent it from being fulfilled.*

Most candidates successfully explained that, according to Document C, Jiang Jieshi believed that Japan intended to make China her colony and to make herself mistress of Asia. They were less successful in explaining, in answer to the second part of the question, that he believed this would be prevented because he thought the "world powers" would resist Japan and defeat her.

**QUESTION 5(b)** *What does Document B reveal about the attitude of the West towards Japan at that stage?*

The best answers showed good appreciation of the cartoon's depiction of western feelings towards Japan at the time (apprehension, distaste, even racial contempt) and explained how the cartoon conveyed this message (the Japanese figure is a distorted caricature in military uniform, its large hands clasping the world and its prominent teeth biting down on China).

**QUESTION 6** *How consistent are A, C and D in their view of Japanese intentions in East Asia?*

There were some excellent answers that focused very effectively on how consistent the documents were in their view of Japanese intentions in East Asia. However, most explained Japanese intentions in each document without explicitly addressing "how consistent".

**QUESTION 7** *With reference to their own origin and purpose, assess the value and limitations of A and C for historians studying Sino-Japanese relations in the period 1932-40.*

Answers varied widely in quality here. Too few discussed the purpose of the documents. In some answers there was also limited use of their origin in evaluating utility.

**QUESTION 8** *Using these documents and your own knowledge, assess the role of the western powers, in particular the United States and Great Britain, in the conflict between Japan and China in the period 1932 to 1940.*

Most answers showed awareness that the western powers had an interest in China, usually financial, and were able to state reasons why their role in the Far East was a limited one up until 1940. Very good candidates referred to the worsening situation in Europe or the US isolationist foreign policy as factors that kept the western powers disengaging to some extent despite their anxieties about Japan.

### **Prescribed Subject 3: The Cold War 1954-64**

**QUESTION 9(a)** *What does Document A reveal about the US naval response proposed by Acheson immediately following North Korea's invasion of South Korea?*

Some answers merited full marks; a few scored zero as they ignored the words "naval responses". Many answers missed achieving full marks because they used only the first bullet point, ignoring the second one which stated that the Seventh Fleet should be deployed to prevent attack on Formosa or a Nationalist attack on the mainland.

**QUESTION 9(b)** *What message is portrayed in Document B?*

Most candidates were able to identify the UN and USA rushing to aid South Korea, and to explain the contrast between this action and the earlier inactivity of the League of Nations. A small number totally misunderstood the cartoon, believing that the UN was attacking the League or that the League still existed and was involved with the Korean War.

**QUESTION 10** *Compare and contrast the accounts of the invasion of South Korea given in C and D.*

Many candidates succeeded in articulating a series of differences in the two accounts. They found it more difficult to identify similarities, though a minority successfully did so.

**QUESTION 11** *With reference to their origin and purpose, assess the value and limitations of Documents A and C, for historians studying the outbreak of the Korean War.*

Some candidates did not recognize that Document A was an extract from the memoirs of Acheson, or the relevance of this. As with the equivalent questions on the other prescribed subjects, relatively few answers were secure on the purpose of the document.

**QUESTION 12** *Using these documents and your own knowledge, how far do you agree with the , “The Korean War transformed the Cold War”?*

There were some very good answers with candidates giving a balanced view, backed up by evidence from the documents and extensive knowledge of Cold War developments during this period. On the other hand, many candidates made only limited reference to the documents.

## **Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates**

Timed practice, using the exam paper rubric and followed by analysis of their answers, is an important element in preparing candidates for Paper 1.

Answers on all three sections indicated that many of the candidates could benefit from further practice in planning their answers. Candidates should ensure that, after an initial identification of precisely what the question is asking them to do, they organize and deploy their material so as to address the question in a well focused, explicit manner.

More specifically, when answering questions involving comparison of documents, candidates should seek to identify issues that can be compared and then write a running comparison rather than a separate explanation of the arguments of each document.

For the document evaluation question, candidates should check the provenance of the relevant documents and make thorough use of both that and the purpose of each document when discussing their value and limitations.

For the synthesis question, candidates should ensure that their answer makes use of both own knowledge and evidence from some if not all of the sources, if possible within the framework of an integrated analysis. Arguments should be developed too, as this is the highest tariff question.

Please note that from the 2003 exam session onwards, Paper 1 will be marked out of 25 (5, 6, 6, and 8 marks respectively) and the assessment weighting for SL will be 30%. These changes have been made in order to aid the differentiation at both HL and SL, to increase equity in the marking of the comprehension questions, and to give Paper 1 a higher weighting in the assessment of SL candidates' performance in history. The first question in each section will be worth 5 marks. This change will allow an instruction of “Award 1 mark for each valid assertion” instead of the instruction often used in the past “2 marks for responses indicating 3 valid points; one mark for any two valid points”. For the question involving document comparisons, candidates must offer well argued running contrasts and comparisons for maximum 5 marks now, 6 marks from May 2003 onwards. For the document evaluation question, candidates must refer to origin and purpose, value and limitations for maximum 5 marks now and 6 marks from 2003 onwards. For the maximum 8 marks on the synthesis question, examiners will expect detailed argument synthesizing documentary material and own knowledge. If candidates make use of only source material or own knowledge the maximum that can be obtained will be 5 marks (currently 4 marks). **The changes do not mean the candidates will be expected to write more.**

## Higher and Standard Level Paper 2

### Component grade boundaries

|                    |     |      |       |       |       |       |       |
|--------------------|-----|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <b>Grade:</b>      | 1   | 2    | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     |
| <b>Mark range:</b> | 0-4 | 5-10 | 11-15 | 16-19 | 20-23 | 24-27 | 28-40 |

### General comments

With an ever increasing number of candidates (now 14,000 plus), it becomes more difficult every year to write a report that does justice to all candidates. There are and there will always be a large spectrum ranging from excellent (high grade 7 scripts) to a handful of candidates scoring only one or two marks. Reports from assistant examiners also vary considerably, depending on the centres that they received to mark. Here are some comments from the large number of examiner reports.

‘What was pleasing was the small number of candidates who wrote irrelevant answers. I felt that there were fewer such answers than at any time in the [long] period I have been an International Baccalaureate examiner’.

‘The general level of understanding and knowledge was better than in previous years. Most candidates chose their questions wisely. However too many answers are still too short, at one and a half or two pages’.

‘The most critical weakness that hindered higher scores was the brevity of the answers. While length is certainly no an indicator of quality, it is difficult to produce an adequate essay with fewer than five paragraphs.’

‘Candidates often did not take notice of the precise requirements of the questions.’

‘There were several candidates who appeared to be well prepared and wrote with considerable confidence and competence, but there were rather more who appeared to lack the necessary knowledge and understanding to tackle the paper.’

‘A paper which gave the students the opportunity to excel; in scripts few took this opportunity’.

This report will now repeat what has been said for many years about Paper 2. The most popular topics were 1, 3 and 5. Probably 90% of answers were on these three. It is hoped that the changes to Topic 4 which will be introduced in the new programme starting in May 2003 session will make it more popular. Within the topics, candidates find social, cultural and economic questions difficult, and chronologically the twenties appears to be a difficult decade to understand. (see below for more details).

There were few rubric offences, but in a paper which demands one question from two different topics there should not be any misunderstanding. It is difficult to judge if they were genuine mistakes, or if the candidates hoped that the examiner would not notice. There appeared to be fewer candidates who disobeyed the instruction to select examples from two different regions. This is now a well understood concept in our drive for internationalism in International Baccalaureate history. There are always a few candidates who have learnt practically nothing, but do not want to appear to be in this situation, who spend the time writing a sentence or two on many or even all of the questions, thus wasting their own and the examiner’s time. In spite of remarks to the effect every year that candidates should not write in pencil, a few did so.

As for the performance, very few candidates appear to have planned their answers on paper before beginning to write. We recommend planning every year. One of the main faults with this paper (and the regional papers) is still that too many candidates write all they know about what appears to be the subject of the question, instead of focusing on the set question. Most do write structured essays, but there is still need for better performance in answering this year's question instead of last year's essay. Unfortunately chronology does not seem to be a strong point with many International Baccalaureate candidates. Even when exact dates are not known, the sequence of events should be. An example of this was the confusion of the Berlin blockade and airlift with the Berlin Wall. Even when they were distinguished, candidates seemed to think that they followed each other immediately.

The usual criticism must be highlighted that too many candidates think, or hope that it is sufficient to make, and repeat unsubstantiated generalisations. It is not. Answers without relevant factual evidence to prove assertions made, will not reach a satisfactory grade, and narrative without explicit assessment will not reach a 'good' grade.

A trend which is not to be encouraged is for candidates to write 'as historian Taylor said...' It is sufficient to use the historian's name, if possible with initials or Christian name, as it is assumed that a person quoted in a history answer is a historian, or a well known politician etc. A candidate alluding to what he/she thought Krushchev wrote in his memoirs, wrote 'as Historian Krushchev wrote'. Historiography is a difficult concept, and when used in a form suggestive of name dropping it detracts from rather than enhances an argument. What is required is analytical deduction based on what happened not on what an historian wrote without explaining why he/she wrote it, in other words the evidence.

## **Comments on the questions in each topic**

### **Topic 1**

The most popular question in the topic and probably in the paper was Question 1, which demanded a comparison and contrast of the causes of the two world wars. Few candidates failed to score at least eight marks, but few scored very highly because they narrated the causes of the first then the causes of the second, with generally an attempt to write a final paragraph bringing them together. High marks were obtained by those who produce a careful and analytical comparative structure. Many wrote at too great a length with unnecessary narrative detail. Question 2 also tended to be a narrative descriptive answer of all the candidate knew about changes in warfare, but there were some thoughtful focused answers. Question 3 on civil wars was not well done, and Question 4 attracted those with little knowledge who generalised. Question 5, which offered candidates a clear structure to follow, was probably the most successful question on the paper, because most candidates accepted the structure and wrote focused answers which were also analytical and knowledgeable.

### **Topic 2**

Once again there were few answers to this topic. It was included when the original history programme was introduced to encourage an understanding of new ex-colonial states. Ex-colonial was meant in its original connotation as states that had been granted independence during the twentieth century, mainly in Africa and Asia. During the last two years some candidates have used European 'new' states as examples, even Weimar Germany. All examples were considered seriously and marked accordingly, but from 2003 the words 'excluding Europe' have been added. Latin American states secured their independence from Spain in the nineteenth century, so are not eligible. The USA has even been used, although it has appeared more often in Topic 1, as a civil war. It is necessary for teachers to remind candidates that this is a twentieth century paper.

As for legitimate answers this session, there were a few to Question 8, on Cuba, which on the whole produced political material, rather than social and economic.



### **Topic 3**

It is difficult to assess which question was most popular in this section, as all 5 were answered by many candidates. For Question 11, on conditions that led to single party states candidates used wars, weak governments, economic problems, etc. to account for the rise of totalitarian rulers. Lenin, Hitler, Mussolini Mao and Peron were the most popular choices to illustrate the rulers. In 12, the domestic policies of Hitler and Stalin were reasonably well known. Castro and Mao were popular choices for Question 13, and the USSR were used well for Question 15. More detail and deeper analysis would have improved many answers, but overall, this section worked well.

### **Topic 4**

This topic was disappointing; few candidates selected a question from it, and those that did generally produced rather weak and general answers. The possible exception was Question 19, when inevitably the United Nations was chosen, and a variety of successes and failures suggested, but even here answers were descriptive rather than analytical.

### **Topic 5**

Candidates probably found this topic harder than usual: Question 22 on Germany and Question 24 on Vietnam were straightforward, and quite popular, but the depth of knowledge, or rather the lack of it, made many answers disappointing. Question 21 usually turned into a chronological narrative of Cold War events from 1945 to 1961. Cuba was often chosen to illustrate Question 23 and Question 25 was usually a disaster as candidates addressed political rather than social and cultural differences.

### **Topic 6**

Again this topic was usually the resort of the desperate, with few answers based on case studies or specific knowledge. Question 30 was the most popular and the most successful question attempted with anti-Semitism in Germany and the black civil rights movement used as examples.

## **Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates**

No doubt all students have received this advice from their teachers already, but the following points are always worth repeating: read more widely; think what the question is asking and plan the answer before writing; focus exactly on the set question; make sure sufficient factual material has been learnt to use as evidence to support assertions made; get a good grasp of the chronology of the topic studied; be aware of balance and different interpretation; avoid sweeping generalisations and the use of expressions such as ‘everyone said’, ‘they all did this’, etc. History can rarely be presented in black and white terms, and it is open to a myriad of interpretations. Students must be aware of this and argue their case accordingly. Two students with totally different views can write equally valid answers. It is a clear argument based on logical presentation of evidence that is required for a good International Baccalaureate history essay.

## History of Africa

### Higher Level Paper 3

#### Component grade boundaries

|                    |     |      |       |       |       |       |       |
|--------------------|-----|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <b>Grade:</b>      | 1   | 2    | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     |
| <b>Mark range:</b> | 0-7 | 8-15 | 16-23 | 24-29 | 30-35 | 36-41 | 42-60 |

#### General comments

This paper was taken by sixty one candidates from ten schools. Nine of the schools were international schools in Africa. The tenth school was a public high school in the USA. The largest entry of thirteen candidates came from this last school. Twenty of the twenty five questions on the paper were attempted, but five of them were answered by fewer than five candidates. The six most popular questions – Questions 2, 6, 7, 8, 14 and 16 – accounted for well over three quarters of all the questions answered. The first four of these were on the history of Africa in the nineteenth century. As always in this paper candidates preferred to answer questions on the nineteenth century sections of the syllabus.

#### The areas of the programme which proved difficult for the candidates

The relative neglect by the candidates of the 20<sup>th</sup> century questions does not reflect the greater difficulty of these questions. It is almost certainly the result of the schools preferring to concentrate on the study of the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century history because text books on the earlier periods are still more readily available. Candidates difficulties in answering questions well were reflected in the following common weaknesses:

Failure to respond to all the demands of the question.

Failure to support generalizations with specific evidence.

The inclusion in answers of too much irrelevant information.

All of these weaknesses could have resulted, in part at least, from careless reading of the questions and too little consideration and thought being given to the choice of the three questions being answered.

#### The levels of knowledge, understanding and skills demonstrated

With a few exceptions most candidates would have scored higher marks on the most popular questions had their answers contained more detailed, accurate knowledge to support general claims. (See comments in Section C on answers to Questions 2, 6, 7, 8, 14 and 16). Understanding of the requirements of some of the questions was not always good. For example, several candidates answered Question 2 without considering the claims of all three of the great 19<sup>th</sup> century rulers before reaching their conclusion. Some answers to Question 7 gave little attention to the activities of Leopold II in the Congo and the British occupation of Egypt before considering other events which had contributed to the scramble for Africa. Many answers to Question 16 made no reference to any specific nationalist movements. Few answers to Question 17 made an attempt to evaluate the role of party organization in the achievement of independence in the chosen country. The level of skills demonstrated – e.g. analysis; evaluation; explanation; compare/contrast – varied from the elementary to the well developed.

## **Strengths and weaknesses of candidates in the treatment of individual questions. (Answered by five or more candidates.)**

**QUESTION 1** *Analyze the political organization before colonization of any one African state.*

The best answer was based on the Ndebele state under Mzilikazi. It covered a wide range of relevant aspects of state organization well illustrated by specific knowledge. Another answer based on Egypt under Muhammed Ali and Ismail was too big to handle and superficial in approach. Other answers were written on Lesotho and Asante.

**QUESTION 2** *Which nineteenth century ruler of Ethiopia made the greatest contribution to the unification and modernization of his country? Specific evidence must be given to support your choice.*

This was the most popular question. It was usually answered at the least satisfactorily though a few candidates named their chosen ruler in the opening paragraph and presented no evidence on behalf of the other two great rulers. Two of these chose Tewodros but their supporting evidence was unconvincing and included grossly inaccurate and exaggerated claims. For example: 'All of his policies eventually helped Ethiopia to be equals with the West.' Or 'At one point Tewodros had Ethiopia very modernized and ready to compete with the west.' A few candidates, more realistically chose Menelik, but failed to consider the claims of either Tewodros or Johannis. No answer met the description for a mark in the highest band with required candidates to show an awareness of the limits of modernization. In most answers there were references to the threats to Ethiopia's independence but candidates failed to make this material relevant to the issue of national unity/unification.

**QUESTION 6** *Assess the impact of Shaka on the history of southern Africa.*

Along with Questions 7 and 16 this was the second most popular choice. It was also, overall, the best answered question mainly because it was the one on which candidates showed most accurate and relevant knowledge. The most accurate knowledge was shown on Shaka's military reforms and his skills as an aggressive state builder in the shape of the Zulu Empire. Some candidates did not go beyond these aspects of Shaka's influence, but the best answers analyzed and assessed his role in the wider field of southern Africa including the Mfecane, the Great Trek of the Boers and the migrations of other peoples in the region.

**QUESTION 7** *To what extent did the activities of both Leopold II in the Congo, and the British occupation of Egypt, contribute to the European scramble for Africa?*

Very few candidates gave accurate accounts of Leopold's activities in the Congo or of the circumstances leading to the British occupation of Egypt and of the contributions of these events to the scramble for Africa. This should have been done before candidates moved on to discuss to what extent other factors may have contributed to the scramble. Surprisingly not one of those who attempted the question seemed to be aware of the views of the various historians who have been involved in the historiographical debate about the causes of the scramble. This was a popular question which produced a set of disappointing answers.

**QUESTION 8** *With reference to at least two examples, explain why most African peoples were unsuccessful in their attempts to resist European conquest.*

All candidates mentioned two specific examples of African peoples who resisted European conquest or, in some cases, rebellions by African peoples against Europeans who had already conquered them and established colonial rule. Most candidates, however, chose examples of

peoples about whose unsuccessful attempts to resist they had very little detailed knowledge. Only two candidates commented on the significance of the word 'most' in the title and pointed out that the Ethiopians, more than once, had beaten off attempts at conquest by the Italians. This comment was required before a mark in the top band was awarded.

**QUESTION 10** *To what extent and for what reasons did Samori Toure preserve the independence of his empire up to 1894?*

None of the five candidates reached the level of description which reads: 'for answers which combine an analysis of the factors that enabled him to preserve Mandinka independence with accurate detailed knowledge of the stages by which he lost control of his original Mandinka empire'. All answers lacked an accurate sense of chronology which was essential for a good answer to this question.

**QUESTION 14** *Compare and contrast the British and French systems of administration in their African colonies.*

With only two exceptions the candidates who chose to answer this question made an unwise choice. They did not understand in any kind of detail how either system worked. More than half the candidates did not mention that the French changed their policy from assimilation to association. Most claimed that the British operated systems of both Direct and Indirect Rule but failed to say where or why. The best technique of structuring a 'Compare and contrast' type of question was rarely applied. Most wrote about each system in turn and left the examiner to identify similarities and differences.

**QUESTION 16** *Assess the impact of the Second World War on the growth of nationalism in Africa.*

Most candidates who chose this question were able to make a generalisations about the reasons why the Second World War had an impact on the growth of nationalism in Africa. There were few, however, who were able to show accurate knowledge about any specific nationalist movements which would have gained them a mark in the two top bands.

**QUESTION 17** *Evaluate the role of leadership and party organisation in the achievement of independence in either Kenya or Tanzania.*

Tanzania was the preferred choice of candidates here and answers on Tanzania were better than those on Kenya. Candidates showed more accurate and relevant knowledge about Nyerere's leadership than about Kenyatta's. Only one or two answers contained anything significant on the role of party organisation, though there were more references to TANU than to KANU or KADU, the main parties in Kenya. Many answers, therefore, were unbalanced and incomplete.

**QUESTION 18** *Why did the Gold coast (Ghana) achieve independence before Nigeria?*

All answers identified the basic reasons why Ghana achieved independence before Nigeria: Nkrumah's very able leadership in Ghana; the establishment of a new, mass political party earlier than in Nigeria; and the much more serious ethnic rivalries in Nigeria which hindered progress. However, no candidates gave any specific details of the independence campaigns in the two countries to show and explain the slower progress in Nigeria. In addition Britain's reasons for delaying the granting of independence to Nigeria, as outlined in the mark schemes, were not properly understood.

**QUESTION 20** *For what reasons, and with what consequences, has there been a civil war in any one African country since independence?*

Most of the candidates chose to write about the civil war in Nigeria. There were also single answers on the Sudan and Angola, both very thin in accurate, relevant content and weak in analysis of reasons and consequences. Answers on Nigeria were better on causes than on consequences; but even here no candidate knew enough about the immediate sequence of events which led to the final Biafran attempt to secede and with it, its challenge to the rest of Nigeria.

**QUESTION 22** *“President Nasser made a significant contribution to the development of Egypt.” To what extent do you agree with this ?*

None of the answers to this question were comprehensive in their coverage. Only one did justice, for example, to Nasser’s land reforms and his nationalisation of major industries and financial institutions. Even this answer, however, made no comment on how ‘significant’ the impact of these reforms was for the majority of Egyptians. Another answer was sound in its analysis of the contribution to development resulting from the nationalisation of the Suez canal and the construction of the Aswan Dam. All candidates avoided references to foreign policy which would have been irrelevant here.

### **Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates**

Some suggestions for guidance and advice are implicit in points made in the above sections which identify weaknesses and strengths in the performance of this year’s candidates. There was an improvement this year in that there was a significant fall in the amount of irrelevance. In past years this has often been one of the main problems. One general perennial recommendation needs repeating:

Urge candidates to read each question at least twice before deciding to put it on their short list of possible choices; then to give serious thought to whether they are able to respond effectively to all its requirements before deciding to answer it. The candidate who wrote: ‘I have no idea who Albert Luthuli is’ would not have chosen to answer Question 19 had he acted on the second piece of advice. The candidate who wrote a two page answer on Question 2 before realising that he should have been writing about the nineteenth century rulers of Ethiopia and not about the rulers of Egypt would not have made this mistake and wasted valuable time had he followed the first piece of advice.

Reaching the crucial decision about which three of the twenty five questions on the paper they should answer is one of the major problems facing HL history candidates when taking Paper 3.

## History of the Americas

### Higher Level Paper 3

#### Component grade boundaries

|                    |     |      |       |       |       |       |       |
|--------------------|-----|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <b>Grade:</b>      | 1   | 2    | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     |
| <b>Mark range:</b> | 0-7 | 8-14 | 15-22 | 23-28 | 29-34 | 35-40 | 41-60 |

#### General comments

The general standard of work exhibited a wide range of quality, from candidates who possessed detailed knowledge and demonstrated very good analytical qualities to those who were only able to generalise broadly or who could not grasp the requirements of the question. The Paper 3 options were fair in their range of subject matter, areas within the region and time period. Candidates had every opportunity to display their knowledge of history. The majority of the candidates answered questions that dealt with both the United States and Latin America. Very few responses for Canada were recorded. The most popular questions were Questions 1, 6, 17, 18, 19 and 20. Questions 12, 13, 15, 22 and 23 were also popular.

#### The areas of the programme which proved difficult for candidates

The questions which posed most difficulties for candidates were (a), those, which demanded the applications of concepts such as in Questions 7, 10, 15 and 18 and (b), those, which demanded comparison and contrast such as Questions 6, 12 and 16.

It appears that most candidates have difficulties in understanding and defining historical terms/concepts such as *populism*, *dependency*, *progressive*, *foreign investments* and *political impact*. The difficulties in relating facts to those concepts were a common feature of this session.

Many candidates appear to have faced difficulties when they were called to 'provide specific examples to support...answers,' or when they had to make an evaluation or.

#### The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

The levels of understanding and breadth of knowledge varied although the general tendency was to adopt approaches that were too narrative or descriptive. Few candidates were able to sustain explicit assessments in a relevant and focused manner. Many were too comfortable making assertive and sweeping generalisations without giving specific evidence to support them. For instance, many agreed that the reputations of presidents were destroyed by Watergate and Vietnam but were unable to give detailed evidence in order to support their arguments.

There was, however, a strong indication of organisational skills: clear introductory and concluding statements, theses and / or paragraphs. Knowledge and understanding were evident in some particular topics: US Civil War, Brazilian Slavery and Cuba and Castro.

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

**QUESTION 1** *To what extent did either Britain or France govern their colonies in the Americas for their own economic gain?*

This was one of the most popular questions and nearly all the candidates wrote about Britain's economic gain from the thirteen colonies. These answers were rather limited, producing general comments about mercantilism and the triangular trade. Many used generalisations and sweeping comments to describe Britain's perception of the American colonies. Very few candidates were able to discuss either the terms of the Sugar Act or the purpose of the Stamp Act, and some blamed everything on King George. Since taxes are considered such an important cause of the American Revolution it should be expected that candidates would understand what they were, why they were raised and how effective they were. However, very few candidates were able to address the issues.

**QUESTION 2** *Assess the impact on the social classes, in at least two countries in the Americas, of the Wars of Independence in these countries.*

There were few answers with more than a little knowledge. All considered the United States with either Mexico or Argentina. No real focus was given to 'social classes' in the US; some candidates suggested that Creoles replaced Peninsulares in Latin America, 'so nothing changed'.

**QUESTION 3** *To what extent were the grievances expressed in the Declaration of Independence successfully addressed by the Articles of Confederation?*

Not many candidates selected this question, which required some detailed knowledge. More was known about the Articles of the Confederation than about the grievances as expressed in the Declaration.

**QUESTION 4** *In 1865, a Canadian politician said, "The British North American colonies face a choice between confederation or absorption into the United States". How accurate, in your opinion, was this observation?*

Examiners made very few comments about the answers to this question, and the few that were recorded were very negative in terms of knowledge about the topic.

**QUESTION 5** *Analyse the conditions that produced slave insurrections either in the United States or Brazil. To what extent were these insurrections successful?*

Few, but satisfactory responses to this question. Candidates were stronger on conditions in the US and Brazil but knew very little about insurrections and how successful they were.

**QUESTION 6** *To what extent did economic and social differences cause the United States' Civil War?*

A popular choice and most candidates showed adequate knowledge of economic and social differences. The better answers also discussed the political problems.

**QUESTION 7** *Define economic dependency and account for its emergence in, and importance for, one country of Latin America in the late nineteenth century.*

The few who answered this question tended to use Cuba. Unfortunately their answers used Cuba after the revolution or described the Spanish American War.

**QUESTION 8** *Analyse the treatment of the indigenous people of Western Canada between Confederation and the First World War.*

No answers were recorded for this question.

**QUESTION 9** *Compare and contrast the experience of two different groups of immigrants in the United States in the period 1890 to 1914.*

Few, and rather poor answers. Candidates usually offered two end-on accounts based on barely sufficient material.

**QUESTION 10** *Analyse the claims of the Progressives in the United States. To what extent had they achieved their aims by 1920?*

A few candidates took on this question and did reasonably well. The focus was on social and economic issues rather than political.

**QUESTION 11** *How successful was the United States' foreign policy towards Latin America in the first decade of the twentieth century?*

A very popular question and usually handled very well. The stronger candidates analysed the meaning of 'successful' and considered the answers from two points of view.

**QUESTION 12** *To what extent were the aims of Emiliano Zapata and Pancho Villa realised during the Mexican Revolution (1910 to 1940)?*

Another popular question with varying degrees of success. Most had a sound level of knowledge about Zapata, but did not know much about Villa. Some had the tendency to go into a narrative, listing all the presidents and did not take the question beyond the 1920s.

**QUESTION 13** *Assess the impact of the Great Depression on the society of any one country of the region. Provide specific examples to support your answer.*

A popular question that was generally well done. The better answers discussed the long-term impact of the New Deal programme.

**QUESTION 14** *In what ways, and for what reasons, did the relationship between Canada and Britain change between 1900 and 1931?*

Very few answers with very little knowledge of the topic.

**QUESTION 15** *In what ways, and with what results, did either Perón or Vargas pursue populist policies?*

Answers often chose Peron, and generally displayed genuine knowledge of his policies, covered the entire time frame, and provided an assessment of results. Answers which chose Vargas were usually not quite as successful. Nevertheless, those candidates who chose to answer this question usually wrote good essays.



**QUESTION 16** *Compare and contrast the attitudes to, and roles in, the Second World War of Canada and Argentina.*

Very few responses that did not reflect any real knowledge of the topic.

**QUESTION 17** *Why, and with what results did Castro replace Batista as ruler of Cuba?*

This was the question most answered and the one answered in most detail. The reason for Batista's fall seemed the most difficult section for candidates. The results were often handled well with a discussion of both economic and social reforms coupled with a move away from US dependency.

**QUESTION 18** *Compare and contrast the Cold War policies of Truman and Eisenhower.*

Candidates seemed very clear about the basic differences between Truman and Eisenhower's Cold War policies but were often not able to demonstrate those differences through specific examples.

**QUESTION 19** *Analyse the successes and failures of the United States' Civil Rights movement between 1954 and 1964.*

The candidates who chose this question were generally successful, although answers tended to be narrative rather than analytical in structure, which cost the candidates some points.

**QUESTION 20** *"Vietnam and Watergate destroyed the reputations of various United States' Presidents in the 1960s and 1970s. To what extent do you agree with this?"*

This question produced a wide range of responses. Most candidates correctly identified Johnson with the Vietnam War and Nixon with Watergate. However, most of the analysis stopped there. There was some genuine attempt on the part of most candidates to indicate the degree to which their reputations were tarnished but most fell short of in-depth analysis.

**QUESTION 21** *To what extent has either Canada or one Latin American country developed a foreign policy independent of the United States since 1945?*

A number of candidates seized the opportunity to re-use material on Castro's foreign policy already considered in Question 17. However, this was usually narrated with little focus on the necessary assessment and no consideration was given to the period from 1945 to 1959. Cuba was the only country selected by candidates.

**QUESTION 22** *Account for the emergence of the "women's liberation" movement of the 1960s. How successful has it been in addressing its original concerns? Provide specific examples from one or more countries in the Americas to support your answer.*

There were very few answers to this question with little evidence of knowledge about the topic.

**QUESTION 23** *Analyse the reasons for the United States' intervention in Guatemala in 1954.*

A rather popular question with some good results. Stronger answers discussed the Eisenhower administration views' during the time period and provided adequate support and analysis.

**QUESTION 24** *“President Reagan’s policies brought great benefits to the United States in the period 1981 to 1990”. How far do you agree with this?*

Responses were both affirmative and negative, with genuine attempts at analysing costs and benefits.

**QUESTION 25** *Why was the Organization of American States (OAS) founded and how successful has it been in achieving its aims?*

Very few answers, none of which revealed much knowledge of the OAS.

## **Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates**

As in previous years, teachers might make a contribution by covering topics in greater depth and demanding better analytical skills. Since one of the major problems observed was that the candidates did not pay a great deal of attention to the dates in the question, it is necessary that teachers practice with their candidates carefully reading the International Baccalaureate questions. Less emphasis on syllabus coverage and more on depth, detail, understanding and developing analytical skills would be beneficial in these instances.

One way in which this can be done is by providing samples of former International Baccalaureate papers. As emphasised in previous reports, teachers can help each cohort of candidates by emphasising to them the importance of reading questions carefully, identifying the key words and phrases in the question, striving to understand the full requirements of the question and using their knowledge, skills and understanding to build well-targeted and well-substantiated responses. Candidates who lack adequate knowledge are unlikely to grasp the implications of the questions, and knowledge is also needed to build sound answers.

Candidates should choose questions on topics that they have studied, not simply ones that seem interesting. When choosing questions candidates should also examine the key words, consider what the question is asking, and then decide whether they know enough to answer it effectively. Candidates should strive to provide well-supported answers to the question asked and avoid use of sweeping generalisations and ‘pre-prepared’ answers. Practice on past questions should be part of every candidate’s preparation for the final exams.

# History of South Asia and the Middle East (including North Africa)

## Higher Level Paper 3

### Component grade boundaries

|                    |     |      |       |       |       |       |       |
|--------------------|-----|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <b>Grade:</b>      | 1   | 2    | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     |
| <b>Mark range:</b> | 0-7 | 8-15 | 16-23 | 24-29 | 30-35 | 36-41 | 42-60 |

### General comments

There were a limited number of candidates whose choice of question tended to reflect the geographical position of the centres. This was not always the case and indicates that centres are teaching national history but also contextualising work both regionally and internationally.

Of the scripts, there seemed to be no difficulty in meeting the requirements of the allotted time. Indeed, some candidates appeared to have remarkable stamina, producing three essays running to seven or eight pages in two and a half hours. Candidates on the whole had a reasonable knowledge of the material, although at times answers tended to be rather thematic in approach and were not sufficiently well illustrated to sustain points made. Exemplars can be found in detailed notes on questions. It was pleasing to see a much closer focus on the questions set, rather than responses to key dates/events/names that reiterate factual knowledge.

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

As always with this paper, many questions were not attempted. Those answered this year were: 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14 (very popular), 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 25 (significant number).

**QUESTION 2** *“It was far more than a mutiny yet much less than a first war of independence.” To what extent do you agree with this, with reference to the events in India in 1857?*

Most candidates were willing to address the premise in the question. A pleasing proportion were able to identify both underlying and short-term causes for the events of 1857. Many knew the events reasonably well and used their knowledge to consider the issues of both ‘mutiny’ and ‘war of independence’. Others failed to explore the scale/aims of events in any detail when considering whether they could be described as a war.

**QUESTION 3** *How far were the achievements of Muhammad Ali Pasha affected by the interests of the great powers?*

A limited number of responses. Muhammed Ali’s career was generally well known, and his aims were identified and assessed. The difficulty lay in identifying and synthesising into an answer the ‘interests’ of the Great Powers and their impact on his career.

**QUESTION 4** *Evaluate the success of the Tanzimat reforms in modernizing and strengthening the Ottoman Empire.*

The reforms were known in detail and some effective comments were made on the ‘modernising’ effect. Comments on the actual successes tended to be limited, although most could assess the damaging economic impact associated with the reforms.

**QUESTION 7** *Analyse the factors which led to the emergence of the Indian Nationalist movement between 1858 and 1914.*

A very popular question but one where themes tended to predominate. Themes such as the frustration of an educated middle class, brief references to economic exploitation, impact of 1857, with little factual evidence; often the founding of the INC was not mentioned. This was not universal and there were some excellent answers which achieved a very good balance of both analysis and detailed material. Where questions cover a long time frame, candidates should consider how much they really know.

**QUESTION 9** *Assess the strength and weaknesses of the Qajar dynasty in the years 1850-1906.*

A relatively small number of responses, but there was focused assessment of the ‘real strength’ of the Qajar dynasty linked to socio/religious, economic and foreign intervention problems.

**QUESTION 10** *“The consequences of the First World War for the region were of much greater significance than the scale of the fighting there indicated.” To what extent do you agree with this ?*

On the whole this question was tackled well, with no one being drawn into accounts of the actual military conflict. Most candidates were able to identify short term consequences as well as the longer term instabilities as a result of war-time priorities (confused diplomacy etc).

**QUESTION 11** *Why did the Ottoman Empire collapse in the years after the First World War?*

There was a tendency here to produce fairly generalised answers which relied heavily on accounts of Ottoman weakness, the phrase ‘sick man of Europe’ was overused. Whilst this may have formed part of the picture, the question pointed firmly to ‘the years after the First World War’. On the whole, it was not a question that was done well.

**QUESTION 13** *Account for Britain’s decision to withdraw from the Palestine Mandate by 1947.*

Reasonably popular, the sequence of events was well-known, tensions were identified. The contradictory nature of British policy was emphasised. The pre-war period was much more fully addressed than the period 45-48 and very little effective comment was made with regard to Britain’s strength in the post-war period.

**QUESTION 14** *“British imperial policy of divide and rule made the partition of India inevitable.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?*

Most candidates were able and willing to consider a range of factors which led to partition in 1947. Perhaps there was a little too much emphasis on Jinnah’s personal impact at times. However, the majority of answers were both objective and able to prioritise.

**QUESTION 15** *Why was Israel able to survive the hostility of her neighbours up to 1973?*

This was relatively popular and, again, candidates were knowledgeable enough to argue a range of factors. Only a few were limited to a minimal number of factors such as US support/Arab disunity, although obviously these are important.

**QUESTION 16** *Analyse the political developments in either Libya or Egypt from the Second World War up to 1990.*

The great weakness here was tendency to narrate foreign affairs rather than to examine closely political developments **inside** the chosen country – not in all cases but in a number.

**QUESTION 17** *To what extent had independent India resolved her social and economic problems by 1984.*

A limited number of responses to this question. Candidates would have helped themselves if they had identified social and economic problems. Answers tended to be narrations of political/social/economic policies of Nehru and Indira Gandhi. There was very little comment on ‘To what extent’.

**QUESTION 18** *“Conflicts between India and Pakistan since 1948 were a consequence of border disputes.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?*

This was quite well done, with candidates identifying border issues and especially Kashmir as a major cause of conflict. However, they were also astute enough to see other factors as contributing to the build up of tension, including Cold War factors, arms race etc.

**QUESTION 20** *“The presence of the Palestinian refugees was a major factor in causing civil war in Lebanon in 1975.” How far do you agree with this statement?*

One of the more popular questions with serious consideration being given to the statement. Candidates had, for the most part, a thorough understanding of Confessional tensions in Lebanon/weaknesses in the Lebanese state etc. They could synthesise these tensions with the added dimension of Palestinian refugees and reach a .

**QUESTION 22** *How successful were the superpowers in obtaining allies in the region during the Cold War?*

Answers to this question either from an Asian or Middle Eastern perspective were quite well done. Most avoided stereotypical answers and were able to demonstrate the fluidity of Superpower ‘alliances’/spheres of influence in the area under discussion.

**QUESTION 25** *Examine the role and status of women in any one country in the region since 1950.*

A small number of responses, which tended to generalise and identify improved status with little real evidence. More able candidates were able to show that improved status was reliant not only government policy but also class, occupation, urban or rural life etc.

## **Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates**

Encouraging candidates to move away from rote learning of a sequence of events is to be applauded to some extent. The encouragement to identify key issues and themes is beneficial and allows the candidates to develop their analysis. However, it is a fine balance and they must be reminded of the need to sustain their analysis.

## History of East and Southeast Asia and Oceania

### Higher Level Paper 3

#### Component grade boundaries

|                    |     |      |       |       |       |       |       |
|--------------------|-----|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <b>Grade:</b>      | 1   | 2    | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     |
| <b>Mark range:</b> | 0-7 | 8-15 | 16-23 | 24-29 | 30-35 | 36-41 | 42-60 |

#### General comments

Within the narrow range of topics selected, there is evidence of much solid teaching. Most centres had candidates who wrote well and revealed adequate knowledge, even if it was not always relevant. But there were too many occasions when candidates misunderstood the requirements. There are also too many candidates who write answers which are relatively short, general and simplistic and who lack detailed knowledge, analysis and historiographical awareness. There was also evidence that, by focusing on the histories of China and / or Japan, candidates were generally ill-prepared to respond to questions which did not conform to what appears to be a stereotyped presentation of the material.

#### The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

Many candidates possessed adequate knowledge but lacked the skill and understanding to use that knowledge in a relevant way. In all centres there were candidates who failed to recognise what was required and produced weak, irrelevant and inconsistent answers. In the weaker centres a lack of both analytical skills and of broader reading was evident. There were candidates who produced very good to excellent answers to individual questions but only a handful did so for all three questions attempted.

There appears to be a lack of both depth and breadth in the way the course is studied, thus restricting analysis of the particular and awareness of the general. In some cases candidates were unable to depart from what was a prepared and learnt way of addressing a topic. In other cases there was ignorance of certain facets of a topic or of the incident or period which was the focus of discussion.

From some centres there was the tendency to quote the opinions of different writers on issues, but without supporting historical evidence. Nevertheless, there were many very commendable answers to questions designed to reveal knowledge, understanding and analytical skills. Moreover, there was not that almost complete lack of knowledge, understanding and skill which characterised too many papers a few years ago.

Some centres are encouraging their candidates to attribute arguments by writing 'Historian Lowe'. The use of the last name is sufficient but candidates should be more aware of who is an historian and who is a writer of school textbooks. Some centres encouraged their candidates to write headings or use bullet points in their essays. This is a practice which should be discontinued.

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

**QUESTION 1** *To what extent were China's domestic problems in the reign of the Jiaqing (Chia-ch'ing) emperor (1796-1820) evidence of Qing's (Ch'ing) decline?*

Attempted by very few candidates who wrote general descriptive answers about the causes of the Opium War and who had little idea of the earlier period of Chinese history.

**QUESTION 2** *"By 1850 the Tokugawa Shogunate was facing collapse." To what extent do you agree?*

Many candidates treated this as a question on the fall of the Tokugawa, with excessive emphasis on the period after 1850. There were also some good answers which analysed the position in 1850 before commenting on the crisis produced by Perry's arrival. Too few answers focused on the actual working of the question ignoring the notion of 'collapse' and its causes.

**QUESTION 3** *In what ways, and to what extent, did the treaties signed between China and the western powers between 1842 and 1860 restrict China's sovereignty?*

Weaker candidates wrote general essays about the Opium War, some listing the terms of treaties.

**QUESTION 4** *To what extent was the Taiping Rebellion (1850-1864) in China a consequence of peasant discontent?*

It was pleasing to note that most candidates who answered the question did not attempt to give an account of the rebellion itself, but there were few well-balanced answers. A number of candidates wrote of peasant discontent in general. Many candidates showed little awareness of the various disaffected groups who joined the rebellion, affected by the economic dislocations brought about by the Opium War and the treaties, or recognised the role of the triads, disbanded militias and others.

Only a very few perceptive candidates successfully analysed Hung's role as a catalyst and leader, though weaker candidates sometimes wrote at length about his failures, visions and beliefs without reference to peasant discontent.

**QUESTION 9** *"China's Self-Strengthening Movement (1860-1894) is often regarded as a failure." To what extent do you agree with this assessment?*

A few very good to excellent answers but overall the essays were a little disappointing. Too many candidates wrote very general and vague essays without reference to actual reforms or the leading figures involved. Some paid no attention to the time span and a few candidates brought in the 100 Days Reform of 1898. This was a question in which it should have been possible to acquire a reasonable mark by exhibiting knowledge of the main facts and including some general analysis.

**QUESTION 13** *"An inspiration figure." How far does this phrase define the role of Sun Yatsen (Sun Yat-sen) as 'founder' of the Chinese Republic between 1895 and 1925?*

There were very few satisfactory answers. Most candidates wrote very little about Sun's activities up to 1912 or attempted to analyse his Three People's Principles and other political ideas. There was almost no mention of his activities in the period 1912 to 1925. This is rather surprisingly an area in which candidates' knowledge seems to be very weak.

**QUESTION 14** *Analyze the reasons for the rise and changing nature of militarism in Japan between 1925 and 1936.*

There were some excellent and very good answers, which covered both parts of the question and included the whole chronology. Weaker candidates wrote general accounts of Japanese militarism with little reference to events within Japan and the changing nature of militarism over the period.

**QUESTION 16** *“The significance of the Long March (1934-5) in the history of modern China has been greatly exaggerated.” To what extent do you agree with this assessment?*

Except for a very few good to excellent answers, the response was disappointing, with a large proportion of poor answers. The better candidates supported their assessment of the significance of the Long March with accurate reference to events, personalities and consequences and were also aware of both its real significance and of its propaganda role. The weaker candidates wrote general accounts of the Long March, some failing to notice even the more obvious items of significance; others uncritically accepting the most exaggerated claims, without reference to evidence to support their assertions.

**QUESTION 17** *What aims and policies lay behind the Japanese concept of the Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere and to what extent was Japan able to achieve them in the years 1941 to 1945?*

Weaker candidates were attracted to the question, but failed to define the concept or to discuss it within the time-frame 1941-45. Many wrote a general account of Japan’s expansion and defeat, failing to recognise that Japan still occupied large areas of East and Southeast Asia until then.

Too many candidates referred to the policies and actions of the two sides without making it clear whether these referred to the period of the Japanese War or to the Civil War. Some points could apply to both, but other anecdotes many candidates mentioned were peculiar or more applicable to the war against Japan. In too many cases the weaknesses of the Nationalists and the strengths of the Communists were so generalised as to have little meaning and examples were not drawn from the Civil War period itself. Answers were general and simplistic with little reference to actual events. Only a handful of candidates attempted to analyse the events of the war period in order to identify the actual reasons why the Nationalists lost and the Communists won.

**QUESTION 20** *To what extent do you agree that the Cultural Revolution was a “struggle for control over the future of the Chinese Revolution”?*

This was the second most popular question on the paper. There were several very good answers and most candidates saw the point of the question. However, answers generally were simplistic, general and lacking in historical knowledge. In other cases, candidates often recognised that Mao’s position had been weakened by the GLF, but lacked sufficient knowledge to support an adequate analysis. Many weak candidates merely described the excesses of the period in general terms. The large majority did not recognise that Mao himself was not necessarily in full control of events and that other players had their own agendas. Some candidates wrote only about the GLF.



**QUESTION 21** *Analyze Japan's economic growth in the 1960s.*

A disappointing set of responses. There were a few good answers, but the large majority were very general and simplistic. Many essays failed to recognise that external factors had to be discussed and their importance assessed. A number of candidates attributed the economic 'miracle' only to American aid, expertise and policies during the Occupation and took the topic no further. Others wrote very generally about the Japanese work ethic and desire for education. A number of these wrote in the present tense and provided no reference points to the 1960s.

### **Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates**

Teachers should encourage candidates to read questions carefully and to think about what is required before beginning an answer. Teachers should also encourage candidates to make use of dictionaries and glossaries of political, economic and historical terms. Many textbooks have glossaries and teachers should also compile their own to suit their needs.

Analysis, comparison and assessment are possible only when candidates have sufficient exposure to a range of materials and are involved in reading, viewing, listening to, discussing and writing about themes and problems from different points of view. The best candidates showed this. However, this defeats the object when candidates merely quote or paraphrase the views of other writers without themselves making a and reaching a conclusion based on historical knowledge. There is still too much 'name dropping' on this paper.

Teachers can assist by providing access to resources, posing questions and problems, and providing time for discussion and candidate presentations. The most basic requirement, however, is the acquisition of a body of sound historical knowledge. Too many candidates lack sufficient relevant knowledge to support an answer at this level.

## History of Europe

### Higher Level Paper 3

#### Component grade boundaries

|                    |     |      |       |       |       |       |       |
|--------------------|-----|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <b>Grade:</b>      | 1   | 2    | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     |
| <b>Mark range:</b> | 0-7 | 8-15 | 16-23 | 24-29 | 30-35 | 36-41 | 42-60 |

#### General comments

The G2 Reports from the schools and the individual examiner reports indicated that the May 2002 Paper was considered to be generally satisfactory and accessible to most candidates. There were very few negative comments from the centres and it was evident that both the individual questions and the manner in which they were phrased allowed candidates to demonstrate their historical knowledge. There is always a centre whose 'pet' topic did not appear on the exam paper, but this is the case every year and indicates that a wider breadth of subject matter needs to be taught.

Examiners reported that every question on the paper had been attempted by some candidate. It was evident that, once again, candidates feel most comfortable with questions that are political in nature. Questions on social or economic history were less well answered. There were very few weak scripts and the general level of performance of the candidates was of a good calibre. Some of the work that was submitted was truly excellent, indicating that there is some very sound history teaching taking place in certain centres. The overall standard of the candidates' work in May 2002 was higher than in previous years.

#### The levels of knowledge, understanding and skills demonstrated

Once again, there was a wide range of skills demonstrated, with some high quality answers. The correlation was obvious between candidates in some centres receiving a greater depth of teaching, the necessary preparation in skills, and the grades which were awarded to these candidates. For the most part, knowledge was certainly adequate, with the major weakness probably being in the application of skills relevant to the questions posed. Interpreting the needs of the question and breaking them down into component parts in order to address it, is a skill that some candidates lack.

The greatest difficulty still seems to be the selection and use of *relevant* knowledge. While candidates wrote fewer descriptive essays this year, there was still a tendency for candidates to write everything they knew about a topic rather than directing their knowledge towards answering the question that was actually set. The construction of arguments also needs to include more critical . Candidates frequently quote names rather than developing their own line of argument. There was a clear correlation between the inclusion of valid arguments linked to appropriately selected material and the superior grades which these essays were awarded. The structure and organisation of essays was carried out quite effectively by nearly all candidates this year although some candidates still need to be reminded of the need for structured paragraphs, introductions and conclusions within their essays.

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

**QUESTION 1** *To what extent were both poverty and prosperity causes of the 1789 French Revolution?*

The Third Estate was too often treated monolithically: only the most capable candidates considered the bourgeoisie when answering the question; instead, most focused on the peasantry and on taxation. Few candidates made the leap of linking the economic prosperity of the bourgeoisie with their increasing desire for political representation. Some looked at the question differently – and acceptably – and considered the gap between impoverished landowners and the wealthy nobility. Some also considered the poverty of the monarchy (due to foreign wars and decadent lifestyles) as a cause of the French revolution. There were some strong essays, but they were rare.

**QUESTION 2** *Why did Napoleon Bonaparte (Napoleon I) become ruler of France and what were the results of his period in power?*

In general, most candidates gave accurate accounts of how Napoleon I became ruler of France, but were weaker on the results of his regime in France and Europe. The answers were a mixed bag; some candidates wrote wonderful essays which showed sophisticated understanding of Napoleon's rise and rule; others simply provided a biography.

**QUESTION 3** *Evaluate the successes and failures of the Congress of Vienna (1814-1815) in the period that followed, until 1850.*

Candidates tended to list the aims and terms of the settlements, especially the territorial components, rather than answer the question that was set. The subsequent Congresses were only discussed by the most capable candidates, and very few answers took the question all the way up to 1850. On the positive side, the candidates who answered this question tended to write sound essays and knew of the historical debates that rage over this topic.

**QUESTION 4** *Why, and to what extent, had Prussia replaced Austria as the leading power in the German Confederation by 1862?*

Despite the date in the question, some weaker candidates wrote mostly on post-1862 events, looking at Bismarck's policies, rather than those what preceded Bismarck. However, there were many strong responses that looked at how the Congress of Vienna set the stage for Prussia's development; the Zollverein's development and significance; and Austria's weaknesses. Although candidates were, as usual, much stronger on Prussia than Austria, there were quite a few balanced essays which reflected upon Austria's domination of the Confederation and the Humiliation of Olmütz. Better candidates noted that it was not clear at all that Prussia replaced Austria by 1862, and that it was only the 7 Weeks' War in 1866 that made this evident.

**QUESTION 5** *'A popular patriot.' How far do you agree with this of Garibaldi's contribution to Italian unification?*

Most candidate knew of Garibaldi's military victories in 1860-61, but little else. Several candidates went through Cavour and Mazzini before reaching Garibaldi. There was scanty knowledge shown of Garibaldi's participation in Latin America, or even the Roman Republic of 1849. The term 'patriot' was seldom defined or discussed.

**QUESTION 6** *Compare and contrast the foreign and imperial policies (excluding Ireland) of Disraeli and Gladstone from 1868 to 1886.*

This was the least popular question on the paper which was only answered by a handful of candidates. Most of these described the policies rather than comparing and contrasting them.

**QUESTION 7** *Assess the aims and achievements of Bismarck's foreign and domestic policies between 1871 and 1890.*

Weaker candidates spent most of their essays writing on the wars of unification and ignored the dates in the question. Those who went beyond unification and into the time period specified had sound knowledge of foreign affairs, but little information on Bismarck's domestic policies. Candidates knew that the Kulturkampf existed, but really didn't know what it was; very few of the candidates looked at conservative, Prussian opposition to the Kulturkampf. Even the strongest essays here were unbalanced, but were rewarded for their clear knowledge of Bismarck's agenda and manipulation of European relations 1871-90.

**QUESTION 8** *To what extent did Alexander II succeed in reforming Russian life and institutions?*

This was a very popular question and was generally well answered, with some solid assessment against 'life' and 'institutions.' However, knowledge of the reforms lacked precision in most answers and there were many bland descriptive surveys of Alexander's rule. While increasing opposition to Alexander was well handled, many candidates took this as the focus of the question and became sidetracked.

**QUESTION 9** *'Success abroad and failure at home.' To what extent do you agree with this of the policies of Napoleon III?*

This question gave candidates an excellent opportunity to challenge the question and many candidates did so effectively. Candidates who answered this question seemed to be very knowledgeable on Napoleon III's rule and this was generally complemented by interesting critical analysis. Few takers, but those who did rose to the occasion. Most candidates were weaker on domestic policies.

**QUESTION 10** *Analyze the social and political effects of the developments during the nineteenth century in one or more European countries, of two of the following: agriculture, social legislation, transport.*

This was an unpopular question which was generally taken by weaker candidates. Few of these could write anything meaningful about two countries. Transport was the most popular choice.

**QUESTION 11** *Assess the political and economic development of one Scandinavian country in the nineteenth century.*

This question was attempted by several candidates who had obviously studied their own country's history. The majority of responses were far stronger on 'political' than 'economic' development.

**QUESTION 12** *Evaluate the importance of Austria-Hungary on European developments between 1867 and 1918.*

Candidates successfully tackled the nationality issue and most looked at how Austria-Hungary contributed to the outbreak of the First World War. However, little else was covered in the responses and the dates were largely ignored. The effect of Austria-Hungary's participation in the First World War was frequently omitted.

**QUESTION 13** *In what ways, and for what reasons, had the quality of education improved and the number of people educated increase, in one European country by 1900?*

This question was poorly answered in the vast majority of cases. It appeared that candidates attempted to write an essay based on a general survey course or on their general knowledge. The depth of factual analysis was shallow, and analysis was rare.

**QUESTION 14** *Analyze the causes and results until the end of 1917, of the first 1917 revolution in Russia.*

This was the most popular question on the paper and, not surprisingly, produced a wide range of answers. There were some good, analytical answers, showing a sound level of knowledge. Many responses, however, were unbalanced, focusing mainly on the causes, and there was very little about the post-February period. Some answers focused very much on the early twentieth century background, and relatively little on the First World War period. There was some confusion and gaps in knowledge. For example, candidates confused Witte and Stolypin. Some of the analysis of weaker candidates was simplistic: some believed that Lenin immediately carried all before him on his return to Russia, some paint a picture of Nicholas II as the devil incarnate. Some are confused about which parties were in the Provisional Government. However, there were some detailed responses. One person wrote about Lennon (sic.)

**QUESTION 15** *How did the treaties which followed the First World War affect Europe up to 1929?*

This question was also very popular. There were several solid answers, but very few good ones, principally because they were unbalanced. The majority of candidates concentrated on Versailles and ignored or skated over the other treaties. They were knowledgeable about the terms of Versailles, but in considering their impact, tended to focus on reparations and exaggerated the impact of these. The impact of the treaties on Europe was often not dealt with effectively. Some candidates ignored the date and wrote about the rise of Hitler and the outbreak of the Second World War.

**QUESTION 16** *'Lenin succeeded in convincing the Russian people that the path to happiness lay through lawlessness, arbitrary rule and violence.' To what extent does Lenin's position in, and rule of, the USSR between 1918 and his death in 1924 support this statement?*

This was another popular question, perhaps because of the link to Paper 1. There were several knowledgeable answers which were reasonable wide-ranging, although also some weaker answers which showed insecure knowledge of features such as War Communism and NEP. In many cases, candidates ignored the question and wrote descriptive answers on Lenin. One candidate wrote that s/he has not idea what 'arbitrary' meant, but was going to answer the question anyway.

**QUESTION 17** *To what extent is it true to say that the League of Nations failed (a) because of its idealistic origins, and (b) in spite of its idealistic origins?*

This was not as popular as might have been thought. There were a substantial number of knowledgeable answers which focused on the weak points of the League as a peacekeeping organization. Disappointingly, very few answers referred to the other aspects of the League's work. Weaker answers were rather generalized and did not give much attention to the League's activities either in the 1920s or the 1930s, or sometimes got confused about the details of major crises such as Manchuria and Abyssinia. Many candidates ignored the two parts of the question and wrote general answers on the League.

**QUESTION 18** *Assess the success and failures of Mussolini's domestic policies.*

This produced variable responses. Most candidates were able to analyze some aspects of Mussolini's domestic policies, but many were limited in scope, and contained dubious analysis, e.g. regarding the supposed success of economic policies. Several candidates misunderstood the nature of the corporate state and Mussolini's relations with the Church. Better candidates made some attempt at assessment, but far too many candidates wrote descriptive outlines of Mussolini's policies with no attempt at evaluation.

**QUESTION 19** *Analyze the causes and results of either the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939), or the Portuguese Revolution of 1974.*

Spain was, not surprisingly, much more popular than Portugal. The results were almost completely ignored other than a passing reference to the Second World War. It is evident that most candidates know the Spanish Civil War, but little else.

**QUESTION 20** *For what reasons could it be argued that the Second World War in Europe was 'total war?'*

This question was very popular, but was answered very poorly by almost all candidates. Most responses did not understand the concept of Total War beyond conceiving it as a war fought by a lot of nations over a large area, and/or involving a lot of weapons. There was no mature analysis of the mobilizing of war economies or the extent to which civilians were involved other than as the target for bombing. Many candidates also insisted on writing about the war outside Europe. This question was a disaster for many candidates and teachers should steer their candidates away from this question unless it has been specifically taught in school.

**QUESTION 21** *Evaluate the impact of Stalin's policies between 1941 and 1953 on the USSR and on Europe.*

There were very few effective answers to this question. Several candidates wrote reasonable accounts of Stalin's involvement in Europe after the Second World War, but very few wrote about his impact within Russia, or else wrote about the 1930s. Therefore, even the better answers were unbalanced. In many cases, this became a 'Cold War' question which was unfocused and simplistic.

**QUESTION 22** *'In spite of the ravages of the Second World War and the anxiety of the Cold War, the period 1945 to 1990 was one of reconstruction and development in Western Europe.' To what extent do you agree with this statement?*

This was another disastrous question for many of those who attempted it. Most candidates simply did not know enough about events in Western Europe and wrote effectively only about the immediate post-war period and Marshall Aid. There was no acknowledgement of key developments, such as the European Union. Several candidates were unsure about what

constituted Western Europe. Others treated this as a question about the Superpowers and their relations, with only marginal relevance to the question. Few responses went past 1955.

**QUESTION 23** *Compare and contrast the career and importance of two of the following: Adenauer; De Gaulle; Khrushchev.*

The vast majority of responses were written as two separate biographies without any attempt at comparison/contrast. Adenauer and Khrushchev were the most popular choices. Some candidates only chose one statesman.

**QUESTION 24** *How and why were conditions and patterns of work affected and changed by gender issues during the twentieth century?*

This was attempted by a few candidates, and ineffectively. Answers tended to be far too generalized and repetitive or focused upon one particular factor, such as the impact of one of the world wars on women's patterns of work. There were no wide ranging answers. This question seemed to be a desperation choice by weaker candidates who had little content in their essay, but plenty of opinions.

**QUESTION 25** *Analyze economic and political developments in one Eastern European country, excluding the USSR, in the second half of the twentieth century.*

This was attempted by few candidates, who had specialized knowledge of their own country. As a result, they were able to produce reasonable responses, although their knowledge of economic events was weaker than their knowledge of political matters.

## **Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates**

Some centres are obviously teaching their candidates to write essays with reasonable introductions and conclusions and candidates generally have a sound grasp of the historical content of the subject matter. However, even the better centres need to help their candidates to direct their answers to the questions and link their knowledge to what the question is actually asking. Candidates need to be taught how to develop an argument using historical information rather than merely listing events/facts and assuming that these have therefore an implied relevance. There are very few cases where candidates have actually thought through their own arguments. Names are still too frequently cited – 'Historian Bullock argues'; 'Historian Morris has said' without any real understanding of the arguments which these writers are using. The usage of the term 'Historian' is clumsy and should be discontinued. The key terms of a question are frequently ignored and teachers need to help their candidates to identify these and use them as the basis for an essay. There is still too much citing of material from general textbooks and candidates are assuming that what is written there is definitive or 'sound' history. It is evident that many centres have reduced the chronological time period which they are studying which has enabled candidates to have more depth of knowledge on particular subjects, and this is to be encouraged. But it also seems clear that teachers need to give very clear advice to candidates on choosing the 'right' questions. Candidates going for the more general questions tended to perform much more poorly than those going for a particular country. Teachers also need to ensure that candidates read the questions carefully and avoid writing unbalanced answers to what are sometimes effectively two-part questions. It is also clear that many candidates rely on one or two textbooks which provide insufficient depth for some of these questions. Wider reading should also be encouraged.