

HISTORY

Overall grade boundaries

Higher Level Route 2 Europe/Middle East and Americas

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 10	11 - 23	24 - 33	34 - 44	45 - 55	56 - 66	67 - 100

Standard Level Route 2 Europe/Middle East and Americas

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 10	11 - 23	24 - 33	34 - 44	45 - 55	56 - 67	68 - 100

Higher and standard level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 3	4 - 7	8 - 9	10 - 12	13 - 15	16 - 18	19 - 25

The range and suitability of the work submitted

For this session the New Criteria for the Internal Assessment was used. There was not any significant problem with its application. All the schools used it and there were no reports from examiners indicating otherwise. The criteria appear to have been well received as they allowed for more discrimination in the marks; a fact that was welcomed by teachers and examiners. This outcome was expected since the requirements were the same, although the recommendations and criteria were just refined, not changed. There were, however, some issues related to the application of the criteria. Those will be addressed in the discussion for each criterion.

In most cases, the selected topics were appropriate. Most of them were related to topics related to the program and regional options taught at the schools. The schools sent their samples to the examiners within their allocated frame period and the majority of them included the 3CS and 3IA forms. The candidates used the proper subsections. Although, some teachers included relevant and very helpful commentaries in the samples, this was not the norm. It is suggested that comments be included on each candidate's paper to show a rationale for the marks awarded.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A: Plan of Investigation

In this section most candidates did fairly well. However, in some instances the research question was not always clear and there were some difficulties in differentiating between scope and method. The research question must be a clearly defined task which enables the candidate to carry out a rigorous historical investigation leading to an informal judgment. Writing the question format in question format will greatly assist in the historical enquiry. The research question should be included within the body of Section A. No credit can be obtained for a research question which only appears on the cover sheet or title page. The scope of the investigation should identify the aspects, areas or themes that will be explored in the investigation. The provision of a timeframe is always helpful. It is not necessary to state what is not included. Methods should identify the nature of the sources and why they have been selected.

Criterion B: Summary of evidence

Many candidates successfully used factual material for this section, and the material was correctly referenced. On the other hand, it was noticed that despite the new guidelines, candidates were willing to include in this section analysis and interpretations that should have been placed on D. Furthermore, as in previous years references presented problems for some centres. This section must be relevant, well researched and comprehensive. Referencing must conform to a standard acceptable system.

Criterion C: Evaluation of sources

This criterion was mostly satisfactory and continuous improvement in addressing its requirements was noted. Yet, there are some shortcomings here. There is a tendency to interpret value and limitations in terms utility or usefulness and this is not a valid approach when evaluating a source. Moreover, some candidates did not include the complete details of the source being evaluated or included reference to the author or conditions of the source. Complete bibliographical details of the source maybe included as a footnotes or endnotes. The provenance of authors is of great importance. Rudimentary and generalized evaluations are inappropriate.

Criterion D: Analysis

A large number of candidates complied with the new specific requirements to include in this section an analysis of the selected sources in C. But, as in section B, one of the problems with the section was the lack of references. With regard to references, the new criteria specify for Section B: the need for references (differences between 3-4 and 5-6) and in Section D: there is the need for references again (differences between 3-4 and 5-6). Some candidates approached this section by making allusions to B: "as mentioned in B..." and C: "mentioned in C..." but without including the required references. If no references are included only a maximum of 2 marks can be awarded. This section is an analysis of the factual knowledge summarized in B, and no new evidence should be introduced in section D.

Criterion E: Conclusion

No major problems here. But candidates should be reminded that no new information should be included in this section.

Criterion F: Sources and word limit

The application of this criterion presented some problems. According to the new criteria if the word count is not clearly and accurately stated on the title page a maximum of 1 mark should be awarded. Many candidates did not observe this requirement and therefore lost marks here. With regard to “appropriate sources” sources should be relevant and comprehensive.

With regard to this criterion, further instructions have been established. Please take note of this and add it to the Internal Assessment guidelines in History Guide pp: 82-89.

Internal Assessment for 2011 – Criterion F sources and word limit

This criterion requires candidates to include a bibliography or list of sources and all citations, using one standard method; to place all illustrations, documents, or other supporting evidence in an appendix. None of these are included in the word count. The word count must be clearly and accurately stated on the title page and the word limit is 1500–2000 words.

For the May 2011 examinations and onwards, if the word limit is exceeded, the teacher’s assessment must be based on the first 2000 words and no marks should be awarded for criterion F.

Work that contains fewer than 1500 words should not be penalised under criterion F. Work that falls below the word count range of 1500–2000 words is unlikely to meet all the stated requirements for the task and is likely to receive low marks overall.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- Candidates should be reminded the importance of referencing their work, both in section B and section D and including some analysis of the importance of their sources from C in the analysis.
- Help with sourcing information from the internet.
- Candidates should be aware that not all primary sources are so objective and valuable. Also value and limitations should include something more than basic hints about bias and should not just be about the utility to the candidate.
- The importance of writing bibliographies accurately.
- The requirements of section A should be carefully explained so that scope and method are both covered carefully but not at too much length

Higher and standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 2	3 - 5	6 - 8	9 - 11	12 - 14	15 - 17	18 - 25

General comments

The G2 forms sent to IBCA by the schools indicated that the May 2010 Paper One was well received. About 50% of the candidature chose PS1 and the other 50% was equally divided between PS2 and PS3. Of those centres that had responded by the time of Grade Award 96% found the level of difficulty of the paper to be appropriate.

Between 90 and 95% of schools found the syllabus coverage, the clarity of wording and the presentation of the paper to be satisfactory or good.

There were some interesting and, as always, contradictory reactions to the Paper. "Being the first year of this curriculum change, I was nervous about the approach of the topic "Peacekeeping...". However, I was pleased to find that the test was at an appropriate level of difficulty and the sources were well chosen". This was supported by another writer –"Paper 1 included a nice mixture of primary and secondary sources that allowed for a multitude of valid historical interpretations about Abyssinia in the candidate responses". However, some schools thought otherwise—"Of all the paper 1 topics, Abyssinia seems to be the least important. Most of our efforts dealt with the big treaties and organizations such as Kellogg-Briand, Treaty of Versailles, Locarno, etc. This topic was not covered in depth since even in the syllabus it seems like an afterthought". The topic is a clear bullet point in the History Guide and the above comment reinforces the importance of covering all the bullet points in the Prescribed Subject that a school registered for its candidates.

With regard to the second Prescribed Subject again reactions were mixed. "The topic was fine, the sources informational although it would have added more balance if an Arab source was also included". But one centre wrote "The graphic used as source A for the Arab-Israeli Conflict and the associated question was too simple. No real analysis was required in the question".

A valid point was raised for the third Prescribed Subject by several centres "Source E is labelled incorrectly. It says "The statue in the picture above is the Statue of Liberty." This is wrong. The statue in the picture was "the Goddess of Democracy," which was erected in Tiananmen Square during the protests in 1989 (which is what the picture is referring to). This confused at least one of my candidates and I am not sure that Question 1 b should count because of the confusion. If it does count, I think there should be some definite leeway on answers allowed". While the error should not have happened the wording of the markscheme was such that candidates were not penalized for the error. Instructions were sent to all Assistant Examiners to pay particular attention to this point when awarding marks.

There were interesting reactions from the schools about the new format. On the one hand—"I thought the examination was very appropriate for the subject. I also prefer the new format to the previous one, where candidates were given ALL of the topics. I think it was much easier for the candidates to be given the topic they were prepared for, without any distractions".

While other schools differed to agree: "I understand that providing candidates with only one set of documents and set of questions is an environmentally green action, but I preferred the older method where the candidates had three to choose from".

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

There is still a tendency for candidates to describe the content of a source when the question requires them to analyse it and not paraphrase it. The third question on evaluation of sources is also one where candidates do not tend to gain full marks (see guidance below). Some candidates are still not providing sufficient "own knowledge" for the 4th question which does require some significant detail. Own knowledge tends to be rather minimal. Bullet point and "grid" type responses are not going to reach the higher mark ranges as they do not give candidates the chance to link sources.

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

In general, responses showed appropriate knowledge of the prescribed subjects. On the whole, candidates followed the order of questions, and this resulted in a better understanding of the subject. Most candidates were able to manage their time effectively and there were relatively few unfinished or rushed last questions. Candidates were being more succinct on question 1(a) and 1(b) which gave them time to adequately address the other more discursive questions.

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

PS1 Peacemaking, Peacekeeping - International Relations 1918-1936

Question 1

- a) Candidates generally did well on this question although it was surprising how many of them ignored the information that was given in the second paragraph about the military contributions that member nations should make.
- b) Again candidates found it relatively easy to obtain full marks here although there were some odd responses that identified the person as Stalin and who thought that the caption meant the road "to" Rome not "from" Rome.

Question 2

Again candidates found both the comparisons and contrasts easy to identify. There are, however, too many candidates who seem to believe that mentioning one comparison and one contrast will be sufficient to gain maximum marks. Once again end-on responses with no direct linkage between the two sources received little credit. Candidates must be taught to structure their responses along the lines of Source B...., whereas (or similarly) Source D..... This will show the examiners that explicit linkage has been made.

Question 3

In general Source E was handled better than Source D, although there were many candidates who believed that the source had few, if any, limitations as "it reflected the true thoughts of the people of Abyssinia". Source D caused some confusion and candidates made some inaccurate assumptions. "As Packham was in Ghana he knew exactly what was happening in Abyssinia"; "As Packham is British his views mirror those of the British government"; "As Packham fought in the Second World War he must have known what had happened in Abyssinia" etc. Better candidates noted the date of the extract and made valid claims about the source's values and limitations.

Question 4

Hardly surprisingly there were many candidates who were able to use both the sources and their own knowledge to construct a convincing argument focusing on the question. What was surprising however was the lack of detailed knowledge about events such as the Geneva Disarmament Conference, the Four Power Pact, Stresa and the Hoare-Laval Pact and their significance to the topic. Too many candidates made links to Hitler's policies, such as the invasion of the Rhineland and the Austrian Anschluss, and attempted to argue that these were the cause of Mussolini's actions in Abyssinia?

PS2 The Arab Israeli Conflict 1945-1979**Question 1**

- a) Candidates were for the most part able to make inferences/identify material from source A, such as the fact that Jerusalem was under international control. However not so many were able to point out that that the proposed Jewish state was larger. There was much discussion of access to ports and the disparate nature of the Palestinian areas.
- b) Reactions were clearly identified for the most part as unhappiness on both sides - which resulted in civil war.

Question 2

Compare and contrast questions are much more successfully handled as candidates become familiar with the structure of this type of question. There are far fewer instances of candidates describing the content of the sources. However in this paper where the two sources were in marked contrast there was a frequent tendency to be satisfied with identifying broad contrasts. Where there are six marks available the candidates should be focusing on specific detail.

There was more limited success in identifying comparisons - sometimes candidates just have to state the obvious "both sources agreed that civilians were killed".

Question 3

Evaluation sources are increasingly well done. However more use could be made of the attributions of sources by linking where appropriate "origins" and "value" e.g. in the case of source D much more could have been made of Smith's expertise as a value. Source C was relatively straightforward in terms of O.P.V and L although the limitations of this particular source tended to elude candidates.

Question 4

Some answers did not focus sufficiently on "reasons for the flight of Palestinians". A significant number did however and utilized the sources to identify reasons. Own knowledge was less successful, many knew of Plan Dalet and mentioned the influx of Jewish refugees to occupy deserted Palestinian territory (a consequence not a reason). Some candidates referred back to the tensions during the Mandate period and perceived favoritism of the British towards the Jews - in some cases this was successfully linked to the question but in others it became a narrative of events in the 1920's and 1930's.

PS 3 Communism in Crisis 1976-1989**Question 1**

- a) Candidates did not always limit themselves to analysing the source they were meant to explain and included unnecessary background information for which they received no credit. This also wasted a considerable amount of their time.
- b) Most candidates identified the message that the Chinese government had destroyed democracy/freedom. The indication of the use of violence, or the view that the Chinese government had no regrets, was not always identified. Weaker candidates only described the Source.

Question 2

Some candidates did not focus on the views expressed by the sources and, instead, offered comparisons and contrasts related to the nature of the sources. It is important that they are taught the differences between the skills needed to answer Questions 2 and 3. Weaker candidates found it difficult to make running comparisons and contrasts, and limited themselves to paraphrase the content of each source. In some cases, there was a final paragraph in which some comparison and contrast was made more explicit. The answers which scored the highest marks showed high levels of analysis and an ability to identify "categories" that could be compared and contrasted as opposed to a narrative of the content. There were several centres where the candidates had been taught to answer the question using charts. This format is not to be encouraged. Comparisons and contrasts should be explicitly made by the candidates and should focus on specific elements to be compared and contrasted.

Question 3

Most candidates seemed to be able to refer to all elements for both sources, but effective links between the origins and purpose of a source and their value and limitations were not always explicitly made. More attention should be drawn to the fact that the question is phrased as "With reference to their origin and purpose..." in order to avoid separate treatment of the four elements to evaluate.

Source A was better handled than Source D as the treatment of the latter offered speculative elements such as "the author was not present/does not speak Chinese/is British, therefore anti-Chinese". This revealed that candidates were struggling to analyse the Source and had reflected little on its origins and purpose. Many answers insisted that primary sources are valuable per se and did not link the origins of sources to their limitations/values.

For Source A, on the other hand, candidates identified clear values and limitations, such as the fact Deng may not have necessarily been saying everything he thought because the purpose of the speech was to persuade his audience. There were candidates focusing exclusively the reliability of sources as opposed to their value. Unreliable sources may still be of value to a historian.

Question 4

Many candidates lost marks in questions 4 because they did not make use of both the sources and outside knowledge. The latter was, on the whole, limited and general. There was insufficient attention focused on the command term of the questions, leading to little assessment and analysis in many responses which approached the question in a narrative fashion. The use of sources needed to be made more explicitly. "As shown in Source A" may not be necessarily enough and it would be more effective to explain which element in a particular source makes the point.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers should help candidates develop skills to answer the mini essay making reference to both the sources and detailed outside knowledge. At the same time, material discussed in these answers should be structured and geared to respond to the challenges of the specific question. Planning for the second question in the Prescribed Subjects would result in more effective linkage and higher marks.

Source evaluation should be practiced in class with particular emphasis on showing how the origins and purpose affect the value and limitations of sources. Candidates must be taught to understand why bias is not a limitation in itself, in the same way as primary sources are neither reliable nor valuable *per se*. Teachers should share mark schemes with the candidates as this will make much clearer to them what expectations examiners have in the responses to questions.

Higher and standard level paper two - timezone 1

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 4	5 - 9	10 - 13	14 - 17	18 - 21	22 - 25	26 - 40

General comments

This session saw the first examination of the new Paper 2 topics, some of which were significantly different from the previous Paper 2 but most of which should be familiar to teachers of the previous Paper 2 in terms of question types/tasks and command terms. As in the former paper 2, the topic areas, which continued to be most popular in terms of candidate response, were Topics 1, 3 and 5.

The number of G2 responses received by June 11th and the time of the Grade Award in History were 174. These covered both Time Zones for Paper 2 and in terms of syllabus coverage, clarity of wording and presentation of the paper the respondents gave approval ratings (satisfactory and above) of 90.23%, 93.02% and 99.42% respectively.

While it is difficult of course to make a direct comparison with the exam paper of 2009 due to the change of curriculum, teachers did comment (88.4%) that they believed that Paper 2 was appropriate in terms of 'level of difficulty' in comparison with previous Paper 2 demands.

Individual comments on the questions and on the nature of the paper ranged from teachers who were very pleased with the choice of questions on offer to candidates, to those who were disappointed that the questions asked did not 'allow for candidates to show their knowledge'-presumably because they had studied or focused in their courses on material which did not easily lend itself for application to the tasks.

Rubric offences were quite rare this session. Candidates answered in relation to the 20th century and few answered both questions from the same topic area. When consideration of different regions was requested in questions, there was awareness of what constituted such regions. The same could not be said however of chronology. In certain questions in Topic 5 (The Cold War) there was too often no effective grasp of chronology leading to questions being addressed in an irrelevant manner.

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

Candidates did not appear to have trouble in finding what they considered to be appropriate questions but too many responses suffered from a great paucity of sufficient, relevant, accurate historical knowledge. Sweeping generalizations devoid of convincing historical substantiation seemed to characterize too many responses.

It is difficult to believe that candidates have undergone a two year programme of study in IB History at either Higher or Standard level yet still seem unable to plan and effectively support the judgements they make by providing historical evidence (not just general references to historiography where candidates throw around terms like revisionist, intentionalist, structuralist, orthodox etc. without real understanding of the terms and without any real appreciation of the basis of evidence which each of these schools uses in their argumentation)

Understanding the task (question analysis) is essential for success in the examination. Candidates need to be aware of the demands of the command terms and to take note of any dates provided in the question. This is a paper which encourages the application of historical knowledge from more than one region and certainly from more than one country. In some cases the base of what historical information there was, was not only quite weak but also extremely narrow in the sense of dealing with one nation's experience and using that limited knowledge base to generalize on twentieth century history (see comments on individual questions).

As noted last year, candidates really do have to be in possession of a basic historical vocabulary. Failure to understand that for example, Mao was not a right-wing ruler or that Hitler was not a left-wing ruler, can and did have disastrous consequences for candidates. The History Guide states quite clearly that candidates could be required to consider right and left-wing rulers/movements. Candidates should be aware of what these terms mean.

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

The best responses revealed command of chronology, task identification, structure and above all the provision of relevant historical detail. It cannot be emphasized enough that answers must be supported by reference to historical knowledge. This is a History examination and not an invitation to unleash a torrent of generalities which fails to provide a convincing response to the task.

Awareness of historiography was often evident and integrated into the answer in order to supplement the historical detail *rather than as a substitute for it*. Thematic responses and attention to the command terms' invitation to 'evaluate', 'analyse', 'compare and contrast' etc. were evident in these higher award levels. Planning of responses was also evident as focused argument was maintained throughout the essay, with frequent reference to the demands of the question being stated.

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

Topic 1

Question 1

The question required consideration of the part played by two states (excluding Germany) and did emphasise the term 'outbreak'. For many respondents this was seen as an opportunity to write general answers on the origins of the Great War without sufficient focus and detail about the chosen states and the events in 1914 in particular. Excluding Germany led many candidates to choose states which were not always easy to examine (the role of Britain was usually not well understood) or which were largely or totally irrelevant (Italy, USA!).

The better responses tended to be those which concentrated upon the Dual Monarchy, Serbia or Russia. These allowed for a more relevant coverage of 'outbreak' as well as some shorter/longer term coverage to put the 1914 events into perspective.

Question 2

Relatively few candidates chose this question. Spain's Civil war was too often poorly understood in terms of causation and, apart from the fact that the Nationalists won, lacked much in terms of 'results'. Candidates who chose the Chinese Civil War tended to do better in terms of causation/reasons and results. Some argued that the period 1946-49 merely marked the resumption of a conflict which had been evident since 1927.

Question 3

The significance of naval warfare in determining the outcome of one twentieth century war was tackled with reference to either the First World War or the Second World War (usually only in relation to the Pacific) Answers tended to focus heavily upon the USA in both cases-reiterating yet again quite wrongly that it was the sinking of the Lusitania which brought the USA into the war. Better responses did have knowledge of blockades, the use of carriers, submarine warfare, major invasion attempts etc. and were able to also comment on 'other factors' which may have been significant in determining the outcome.

Question 4

Without a clear and comprehensive working definition of the terms 'limited' and 'total war' it is difficult to see how the question can be successfully tackled. Those who had a clear understanding could argue convincingly by referring to the characteristics of such wars and how applicable they were in the selected conflicts. Those who did not have such a definition tended to produce repetitive descriptions of two wars without really addressing the demands of the question. As noted in the comments above, these terms (See History Guide) need to be focused upon in class preparation if Topic 1 is a chosen area of study.

Question 5

There were very few responses seen to this question.

Question 6

This was an extremely popular question indeed and produced an extremely poor performance from the great majority of respondents. Answers lacked detail and consisted of generalized, repetitive, erroneous comments about women (almost always in the USA during the First and Second World wars) and the extent to which their role changed (rather than status). It was quite worrying to see how many candidates used this question as a way to produce responses which were little more than opinionated rants about persecuted minorities (such as women) and how war liberated them. Such questions require specific and relevant detail otherwise they become little more than weak, subjective sweeping essays which do little more than reveal the lack of historical knowledge of the candidate.

Such questions are dangerous indeed for the unwary who seem to believe that somehow their personal views and a bare minimum of facts will earn them success.

Topic 2

Relatively few answers on questions in this section were seen. Question 7 on written and unwritten constitutions were tackled by candidates who had little idea about the former and often on idea about the latter. Specific comment on twentieth century examples was lacking. Question 8 was attempted by a very small minority and there seemed little knowledge about the domestic legislation of Kennedy. Question 11 attracted some candidates but again there was a lack of accurate detail about civil rights, gender issues or political extremism. This was somewhat surprising as it might have been expected that candidates in North America would have welcomed such a question. Question 12 attracted a very few responses.

Topic 3**Question 13 and 14**

Both revealed that the terms left- and right wing were not clearly understood by candidates in some cases. The Guide states quite clearly that these need to be examined and candidates need to be aware of the differences in ideology which allow for such categorization. Where leaders or aspiring leaders do not fall into the categories easily, the opportunity for candidates to discuss this problem of definition was available. Few, if any, took such an opportunity.

Candidates need to read the question carefully: Question 13 focused on rise, Question 14 focused (in part (b) on rule. Too many candidates failed to answer relevantly. Having said that, these questions did provide some very polished responses and accurate historical knowledge but the failure to identify the demands and focus of the question sufficiently led to narratives or responses which were only partially addressing the question.

'Ideology' in Q.14, needed to be defined and the main characteristics identified at the outset. There was more to National Socialism for example than anti-Semitism and the Holocaust.

Question 15

A relatively few responses here- and Stalin and Castro were the examples chosen. Answers tended to consist of end-on/sequential narratives of some aspects of domestic policies with a concluding paragraph which attempted to point out similarities and differences. Thematic, structured answers fared, on the whole, better.

Question 16

Peron was quite effectively done by candidates though once more there was often too much about Eva Peron rather than the policies/methods of Peron himself.

Question 17

While there was a general idea of the role of education in the single-party or authoritarian state, there needed to be much more detail as to the structure of the system in order to effectively answer the question. Indoctrination was an obvious point but the provision of education as a means of fostering the economic growth of the state was overlooked in the examples chosen. (Hitler's Germany, Stalin's USSR and Mao's China were the most popular choices)

Question 18

This question proved quite popular and though detail about propaganda pre-and post rise to power of Hitler was present, the 'to what extent' invitation was not always dealt with. 'Other factors' tended to be conspicuous by their absence.

Topic 4

There were not many answers to questions in this section. A few candidates tackled Q.22 and attempted to analyse the career of Gandhi but often this tended to be a rather confused narrative of his life which failed to adequately deal with his contribution to the nationalist /independence movement in the sub-continent (or his earlier work in South Africa).

Topic 5

This topic area was a popular one with Questions 25, 27, 29 and, surprisingly, 30 being the most attractive to candidates.

Question 25

Evaluation of US policies in the origins of the Cold War (1945-49) produced the usual predictable description of 'historiography' in the guise of descriptions of orthodox, revisionist, and post- revisionist interpretations. While historiography is always a welcome supplement it would appear that too many candidates use it as a replacement for historical detail and knowledge.

The better responses were able to identify key policies and the reasons for them and comment upon the extent to which they were proactive/reactive and the impact they had in these years. Sometimes it appeared as if pre-learned and prepared answers on the origins of the Cold War were simply being regurgitated without the emphasis on 'evaluation'.

There was no need to go beyond 1949 but some candidates felt obliged to deal with the Korean War and the Cuban Missile Crisis.

This question did produce some of the best responses in the paper though when candidates did escape the temptation to narrate the origins of the Cold War since 1917 and instead focus principally on the period required.

Question 26

Not a popular choice. Some candidates were very confused chronologically and chose leaders such as Truman and Gorbachev as their leaders to compare and contrast- with less than satisfactory results.

Question 27

Some very sound responses here which kept to the period 1969-79 whilst providing a brief and relevant background to the period. For some candidates this appeared to be an opportunity to dwell on the Cuban Missile Crisis and/or Khrushchev and the Thaw!

Question 28

Very few responses

Question 29

A popular question which was often well answered by candidates who were able to identify the policies of Gorbachev noted in the question and to examine 'other factors' which contributed to the end of the Cold War.

Some candidates tended to write an answer more suited to a different question, i.e: Why did the Soviet Union collapse? It was almost as if a pre-prepared answer was being produced.

The Cold War aspect tended to be ignored in this respect and although some credit could certainly be given, again candidates need to read and answer the question which appears, not the question they wish to answer because they have written a class essay on it or have notes prepared on it.

Question 30

Many of the candidates who chose to answer Question 6, then decided to tackle this question. There was a huge lack of understanding of what 'culture' referred to. Many candidates wrote general narratives about the impact of the Cold war upon Korea, Vietnam, etc and ignored the term 'culture' totally. Instead what followed in many cases was a description of guerrilla warfare in Vietnam, the reasons for the outbreak of war on the Korean peninsula etc. There was no reference to those elements of culture (literature, film, music, art, theatre etc) which the question sought to elicit.

It is noticeable that there were a very large number of candidates choosing this combination of questions (6 and 30) with poor results. It appeared candidates saw these, quite wrongly, as 'soft options' which could be addressed with little depth/detail and with irrelevant information in the case of Q.30.

This goes back to training candidates in examination technique and making clear to them the absolute necessity of reading questions carefully and only tackling them when there is a sound basis of relevant historical knowledge which can be selected and deployed.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Below are recommendations for improving candidate performance made in relation to previous examination sessions. Rather than re-inventing the wheel, these points still stand as a guide for candidates to successfully address the demands of this particular paper.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Higher and standard level paper two - timezone 2

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 4	5 - 9	10 - 13	14 - 17	18 - 21	22 - 25	26 - 40

General comments

This was the first examination session following the introduction of the new curriculum. The number of Topics was reduced from six to five, and there were some changes to the material for detailed study but, all in all, the exam paper followed a familiar format.

The number of G2 forms received from centres taking Route 2, Time zone 2, as of the beginning of the Grade Award for the May session was 174. Of those who submitted G2s, 82 teachers considered the paper to be of a “similar standard” to that of 2009. A total of 24 found it to be “a little more difficult” and 10 “a little easier”. A majority of 153 found the level of difficulty of the paper to be “appropriate” while 18 considered it to be “too difficult”.

The syllabus coverage was considered to be “good” by 85 and “satisfactory” by 72. A similar majority considered the clarity of wording and the presentation of the paper to be “good”.

Comments received from teachers indicated that the exam had a “good range of questions” and was “...appropriate in terms of scope of content and variety of choice”. One comment suggested that candidates had not found the questions to be “terribly challenging” while other comments suggested that the questions in Topic 1, in particular, were rather limited in coverage and too narrow in scope.

It is, perhaps, only to be expected that there needs to be some adjustment to the introduction of new material, such as the Indo-Pakistan Wars and the Algerian War, but there was plenty of scope for candidates with three general questions giving an opportunity for candidates to examples of their own choosing to address the use of air power; the role of women; and the nature of guerrilla warfare. The themes for each of the topics are outlined in the Paper 2 section of the History Guide and as it can be anticipated that the exam questions will be based upon these, candidates should be directed to them when revising.

Several G2 respondents mentioned Questions 13 and 14 in Topic 3 and the use of “left-wing” and “right wing” with regard to leaders of single party or authoritarian states. These terms have been used in previous exam papers, however, and, furthermore, are listed in the syllabus content for Topic 3. As such, it can be assumed that teachers will have familiarised candidates with these terms.

Even though the structure of the paper and the curriculum has changed slightly, past exam papers may still be used to familiarise candidates with the type of questions asked and to encourage them to read questions very carefully before answering.

As in previous examination sessions, the popular topic areas remain Topic 1 on Causes, Practice and Effects of Wars; Topic 3 on Origins and development of authoritarian and single party states; and Topic 5 on the Cold War.

There were very few rubric offences with only a very small number of candidates answering too few questions, or choosing two questions from the same topic. There were a few cases where candidates omitted to write the question number in the margin or, in some cases, wrote the incorrect number (or so it would seem) both in the margin and on the cover sheet. Although examiners will attempt to award marks where possible, candidates need to be reminded to check carefully that they have followed the general exam instructions read out at the beginning and end of each exam.

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

In general, the level of knowledge demonstrated in this year's examination was not as good as in previous years. While many candidates were able to structure a response quite effectively, the content was often of a disappointing standard. In some cases, dates were inaccurate, or omitted altogether, suggesting that candidates had not been encouraged to commit these to memory.

Although it is not necessary to litter an exam answer with dates, it is important that a sense of chronology is demonstrated and some idea of cause and effect illustrated. Similarly, with regard to familiar topics such as the inter-war years in Germany, a good knowledge of the period 1930 -33 is necessary if a candidate is to attempt, as so many did this year, to analyse circumstances linked to the rise of Hitler or the decline of the Weimar Republic. There is no substitute for wide reading, even in this age of the internet, and the best candidates wrote answers that reflected not only in-depth knowledge but also a good understanding of the events they were discussing.

Following a trend that was mentioned in last year's report, there were fewer references to historians this year. Historiography was mostly limited to the origins of the Cold War, although several examiners pointed out that this was mostly a recounting of the "orthodox", "revisionist" and "post-revisionist" interpretations. It is good to know that candidates are aware of these, although it is also unfortunate that so few were able to use this knowledge effectively and to include these terms almost as an afterthought.

As always, abbreviations were used extensively with TOV (Treaty of Versailles) and A-H (Austria- Hungary) being particularly common. Some candidates seemed to think that as long as the abbreviation was pointed out ("...from now on I will use TOV") this would be acceptable. Although marks will not be deducted for abbreviations, examiners cannot always be expected to interpret initials dotted around an exam answer, and candidates need to be aware of this.

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

There were very few excellent scripts this examination session and, indeed, relatively few that were considered to be very good. Candidates who did manage to achieve the highest marks, however, were able to address not only the demands of the question but to demonstrate a sound understanding of the material to be analysed.

These answers showed in-depth knowledge and a sure grasp of what the question was asking, often demonstrating wide reading that went beyond school text books. On the other hand, too many candidates seemed to enter the exam with memorised rote responses to use for any question on the Rise of Hitler or World War One.

It is quite probably that such preparation will produce competent answers and may score in the mid-range mark band but these may also lack the flair and analysis that will get them to the highest mark bands.

Meanwhile, as described by one examiner, "... Many essays were routine, ponderous, meandering and generalised taking a descriptive/narrative approach that was tangential to the demands of the question...knowledge was largely superficial and undeveloped."

On a more positive note, most candidates did refer to the question in their introduction and attempted to mention key words as they moved from one paragraph to the next.

Notably, what was missing this year was good in-depth knowledge.

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

Topic One: Causes, practices and effects of wars

Question 1

Very few candidates chose the Algerian War and most responses focused on the causes of the Spanish Civil War. As expected, this war was quite well known and most answers did focus, quite correctly, on the causes. On the whole, the level of knowledge demonstrated was rather disappointing with most candidates referring only in rather general terms to social and economic causes and very few able to analyse, with some confidence, the events of 1931 – 36. The question asked for an analysis of the "principal causes" rather than the narrative of long and short-term causes that most candidates offered

Question 2

This was quite a popular question with most answers referring to the Second World War, arguing that air power was of importance in the strategy of "blitzkrieg", the Battle of Britain, in supporting Atlantic convoys and in the D-day landings. Several answers also referred to the Pacific

Theatre and the importance of aircraft carriers and, not least, the use of aircraft to carry A-bombs to Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The importance of air power in determining the outcome was often rather implicit, however and narrative took precedence over analysis. The Arab-Israeli War of 1967 was also used as an appropriate example of how air power played a significant role in the outcome although, again, analysis of the outcome was often rather limited.

Question 3

This was a popular question that required a discussion of guerilla warfare in twentieth century wars although, all too often, candidates discussed only one war. The Chinese Civil War was a common choice as well as the Vietnam War although detailed knowledge was rarely demonstrated and analysis was buried in lengthy narratives.

Some candidates chose to argue that guerilla warfare was not important in the Second World War in Europe ignoring the role of partisans or resistance fighters in the Soviet Union, France, and Italy etc.

A question such as this does give candidates broader latitude to survey twentieth century warfare and to demonstrate knowledge of wars they have studied.

It would, for instance, have been quite effective to have argued that guerrilla warfare grew in importance after 1945 in civil wars in Asia, Africa and Latin America. In this way, appropriate analysis could have focused on the changing nature of warfare during the twentieth century.

Question 4

Very few answers were seen to this question.

Question 5

This was a very popular question with equal numbers attempting an analysis of German defeat in the First or the Second World Wars. For the First World War, most candidates began with a description (often overlong) of the Schlieffen Plan and its failure; the failure of Austria-Hungary and Turkey to give Germany significant support (although this was supported, in the main, by only very general statements); and the entry of the USA. Surprisingly, very few candidates discussed the worsening domestic situation in Germany and the anti-war sentiments that had been building since 1917. Candidates who tackled the Second World War mentioned the failure to invade Britain; Germany's failure to prepare adequately for the long-drawn out war against the Soviet Union; and the declaration of war against the USA. There was a tendency to describe rather than to analyse how the errors mentioned were linked to eventual defeat. In rare cases, there was a smattering of historiography.

Question 6

This was not a very popular question and, when attempted, answers were rather general and rather descriptive. Mostly, more than war was mentioned with these usually being the First and Second World War. On the whole, answers were rather weak and, with the rare exception, lacking in detailed knowledge. Candidates would be well advised to steer clear of questions like this unless they know something of relevance. Having said that, candidates from centres where this topic was clearly part of the syllabus, did produce structured, analytical and well supported answers.

Topic 2: Democratic states – challenges and responses

With the exception of Question 10 on Weimar, very few answers were seen to any of the questions in Topic 2.

Question 10

This was a popular question and candidates were able to use their knowledge of the Weimar Republic to quite good effect. Most responses did tend to narrate the successes and failures of Weimar or, indeed, to discuss why it was “unwanted and unloved” suggesting some familiarity with past papers but a significant number made a fair attempt to address both parts.

In general, knowledge of why the Weimar state was set up was rather limited with too many candidates ascribing it to the Treaty of Versailles and neglecting the events of October/November 1918, as well as of the removal of the Constituent Assembly to Weimar in February 1919. All in all, however, there was some quite good discussion of the promise and purpose of the state and of why it failed.

The best answers demonstrated sound understanding of the different challenges from the attempted revolutions of the early 1920s to the impact of the Great Depression. It was a pity, however, that so many candidates quickly dismissed proportional representation as the root of all evil and believed hyperinflation to have dogged the republic throughout its short life.

Topic 3: Origins and development of authoritarian and single-party states**Question 13**

This was a very popular question with the majority of candidates choosing Hitler as their “right wing leader”. While weaker answers did narrate the rise to power of Hitler, with limited focus on “circumstances”, there were some good answers that included a good analysis of the impact on Germany of events such as the Treaty of Versailles; the Ruhr Crisis of 1923; discontent with Weimar; and the Great Depression. The best answers indicated how these affected (or not) the popularity of Hitler and the Nazi Party, drawing out the change in fortune occasioned by the economic and political crises of 1929 -33. Often, there was good detailed knowledge of the political machinations of the Brüning and post-Brüning chancellorships although too many candidates considered President Hindenburg to have been the mover and shaker of German politics at this time. Also, too often, answers went up only to March 1933 and did not continue to the establishment of the single party state in Germany.

There were some instances of candidates choosing a left-wing leader, with no indication given that the question had been read carefully.

Question 14

This question was not very popular with the few answers seen choosing mostly Stalin as the example of a left-wing leader. This was not always an easy choice to handle as explaining his ideology required a careful explanation of Marxism-Leninism and how closely this was or was not followed. In most cases, candidates gave up and gave an account of Stalin’s Five Year Plans and collectivization.

Question 15

Stalin’s Soviet Union and Mao’s China were the most popular choices of single party states for this question. In general, answers were rather limited in scope and resorted to references to propaganda and education. Detailed knowledge of the topic was rarely demonstrated.

Question 16

No answers were seen to this question.

Question 17

It is possible that most candidates who attempted this question would have been better advised to opt for Question 13. Attempts were made to discuss “rhetoric” or, at least, to mention the term but few candidates addressed the demands of the question fully.

There was an even split between candidates who understood this question to ask specifically about Hitler and those who saw it as an opportunity to discuss other dictators. Either approach was acceptable as long as the material included was accurate and relevant.

Question 18

Most candidates chose to discuss the methods used by Castro although few were able to examine his domestic policies to any great effect. In many cases, there was a focus on the rise to power of Castro with only limited attention paid to his economic and social policies after 1959.

There were rather general comments about the use of terror, lengthy speeches and attempts to make Cuba prosper. Background knowledge of the topic was mostly rather limited. A few answers on Nasser were seen but, again, knowledge was limited and focus tended to be on events such as the Suez Crisis and the Six Day War.

Topic 4: Nationalist and independence movements in Africa and Asia and post-1945 Central and Eastern European states

Very few answers were seen to questions in this Topic

Topic 5: The Cold War

Question 25

As might have been expected, this was a very popular question. Most candidates seemed to have been well prepared on the origins of the Cold War and were able to discuss the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan to good effect. Better answers began in 1945 with some discussion of Yalta, Potsdam and the A Bomb and went up to the establishment of NATO and the division of Germany into two independent states. In general, answers did try to address the role of US policy making and how it was interpreted by the USSR although, in quite a few instances, candidates dismissed the responsibility of the US and went on to discuss ideology or fear and mistrust resorting perhaps to rote learned answers to previous exam questions. Historiography was included in most answers and although used sparingly and to good effect in some cases, all too often the three interpretations (orthodox, revisionist and post-revisionist) were described rather than linked to a particular argument. A few candidates spent a great deal of time arguing that the Cold War began in 1917 and, as a result, barely addressed the events of 1945 – 49.

Question 26

There were very few answers to this question.

Question 27

A few candidates answered this question but, for the most part, resorted to narrating the events of the Arab-Israeli conflicts of the period with barely a mention of the Cold War.

Question 28

Disappointingly, many of the candidates who chose this question had only a limited knowledge of détente.

Question 29

One or two very good responses were seen that demonstrated a good, detailed knowledge of the 1980s and the policies of both Reagan and Gorbachev. There was much to discuss and the best answers supported arguments with knowledgeable handling of the summits; the state of the USSR; and a range of factors, both inside and outside of the USSR, that led to the declaration at the Malta Summit that the Cold War was now over. With a few exceptions, most candidates chose to challenge the statement using good, well supported arguments.

Question 30

Only a few answers were seen to this question and were mostly limited to general statements.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

As the first exam session using the new curriculum, the results were generally pleasing. It seemed that candidates had plenty of familiar questions to choose from and most scripts indicated that appropriate material had been learned. The tried and tested topics of Hitler and the Cold War continued to provide a “comfort zone” for candidates and, by far, the most popular questions were Q. 13 in Topic 3 and Q. 25 in Topic 5. It must be noted that answers were, on the whole, less impressive than those of the last May session of 2009. The general standard was competent but not impressive with fewer candidates able to handle material confidently. Many examiners commented on the tendency of whole centres to answer the same two questions using the same arguments and the same structure. To quote one examiner, “I have never marked Paper 2 scripts where the variety of questions answered has been so restricted. This may be a consequence of the schools and samples I saw, but it was certainly unusual”.

While this teaching strategy (as long as the “right” questions turn up) can produce solid mid-range results, it may not always produce impressive answers that will meet the criteria of the “top band”.

Candidates could, perhaps, be encouraged to add flair and individuality to their answers by reading widely and thinking broadly about the “big picture” that is characteristic of Paper 2. Furthermore, as stated in last year’s subject report, “...there is no substitute for sound knowledge, as this is the foundation of all good essays answers”. As mentioned many times in this report, thorough knowledge is the foundation upon which candidates can build by becoming familiar with the type of questions likely to be asked; with the “themes” listed for Paper 2 in the History Guide. Another way in which candidates could be better prepared is to familiarise them with the command terms. In particular, “compare and contrast” questions continue to prove difficult for many candidates who seem uncertain of how to structure a comparative response when required. Lastly, it is by no means necessary to teach all the examples listed in the material for detailed study but at least some should be included in the syllabus in order to give candidates a wider choice of questions.

Higher level paper three - Africa

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 6	7 - 13	14 - 20	21 - 26	27 - 32	33 - 38	39 - 60

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

Questions on 19th century topics continue to be very much more popular and better answered than those on 20th century topics which probably have not been taught. The general standard was quite high though it is clear that not all aspects of Section 3 are taught in equal depth. Otherwise the weaknesses of the candidates were not related to particular areas of the programme.

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

There was a clear range of ability all the way to the highest mark bands. There were many disappointing answers to Questions 5 and 6 on section 3 where there was irrelevance and vague generalization. But most answers were well focused. Many were well structured, looked at others factors in answering 'to what extent' questions and showed the ability to analyse and assess. There were very few unfocused narrative answers. Most candidates sought to address the demands of the question, whose main requirements were well understood. Questions 3 and 7 were exceptionally well answered. Better candidates were ready to challenge the assumptions behind the questions based on quotations and many showed an improved ability to answer 'compare and contrast' questions in a clear and comparative structure.

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

Question 3

The question was well answered and well focused on the quotation, which some were prepared to challenge. Answers showed a commendable knowledge of Mosheshwe's policies as a nation builder and how he managed to preserve the identity of his nation but not its independence, and of Shaka's military tactics and how he turned a small chiefdom into a powerful nation. In assessing Shaka's success, he was sometimes unfairly blamed for the later destruction of his kingdom. Millions of Africans are still proud of their Zulu identity.

Question 4

This was one of the best answered questions. Samori Toure's Mandinka Empire is a popular topic and generally thoroughly studied. Candidates avoided irrelevant discussion of French intervention. Most were familiar with the main political, social and economic features of the empire and their relative importance in causing its rise. These features were generally analysed accurately and in depth.

Question 5

This was the most popular question but one of the least well answered. Few answers mentioned any explorers or mentioned or knew that the main objective of their exploration were the courses of the major rivers. Very few mentioned any traders or trading companies. There were vague generalisations about raw materials and resources. Many answers referred to explorers and traders in one paragraph and devoted the rest of their essays to a general discussion of some other factors contributing to the European partition of Africa. This was a clear example of a sub-section being ignored or not taught and studied in adequate depth.

Question 6

The comments on question 5 largely apply to question 6 as well. This was a very popular question but the knowledge of the activities of King Leopold and De Brazza were generally inadequate. Many references to De Brazza were utterly inaccurate, which suggested that this was another case of a sub-section not being studied at all. There was much lengthy of the Berlin West Africa Conference which could be relevant but most candidates failed to establish a causal link between Leopold, de Brazza and the conference.

Question 7

Questions on Ethiopia are always popular and generally well answered. This was no exception. Candidates had an impressive grasp of the factors that enabled Menelik and the Ethiopians to triumph over the Italians at Adowa. But no candidate was aware that his post-Adowa diplomacy was crucial in securing the recognition by European powers of the sovereignty and independence of Ethiopia.

Question 8

There were some excellent answers to this question and they were generally balanced but several knew more about causes than results and more about Maji Maji than Chilembwe. In particular many were unaware that for Chilembwe the last straw was the recruitment of Africans into the British army during the 1st World War and that the Maji Maji jolted the German governor Rechenberg into reforms including the encouragement of African cash-crop farming.

Question 11

This was fairly well answered by a small number of candidates but not in the same depth as answers to questions 3,4,7 and 8 for example though there was balanced coverage in focused answers of some of the economic and political consequences. Candidates were less familiar with social consequences but these always prove challenging to candidates, in paper 2 even more than in paper 3.

Question 12

This too was fairly well answered by a smaller number of candidates who all had a basic knowledge of De Klerk's contribution to the achievement of majority rule in South Africa but lacked detailed knowledge of CODESA and the negotiations De Klerk took part in from 1991 to 1993.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

As the subject guide indicates, three sections should be selected for in-depth study. It should be noted that two questions can be asked on any of the bullet points within a section. Therefore it is essential that each sub-section is taught in equal depth. It is evident again this year as it has been for many years that some sub-sections are taught in less depth or not at all and candidates fare badly when they attempt to answer questions on them. This was evident in answers to Questions 5 and 6.

Teachers should encourage their candidates to be careful in their choice of questions. They should choose only those about which they have sufficient knowledge to write relevant answers supported by accurate knowledge. If they lack such knowledge to answer a particular question, even if they are familiar with other aspects of the topic, they should choose a question for which they are well prepared. Candidates will improve their overall marks with a wiser choice of questions. It is worth spending more than the five minutes reading time deciding on which three questions to answer. Candidates should have copies of the relevant areas of the syllabus and be confident that they can answer on any of the bullet points within a topic.

They should be assured that there are guaranteed questions on every section and that they will have a choice of questions. They should pay more careful attention to the wording of questions and ensure that they answer all parts of the questions as almost all candidates did in this session and give each part balanced treatment, which may not always mean equal treatment.

Candidates should be given exemplars of answers so that they clearly understand the difference between description, narration and explicit analysis. They should regularly practice all the common types of questions.

'To what extent' questions should be mainly focused on the issue or issues highlighted by the question but must include discussion of other factors. Every paper has 'compare and contrast' questions which will only score high marks if the answers are focused, balanced and in a clear comparative structure. Extensive practice before the exam is essential here. There are also always some questions involving quotations which the candidate is asked to agree or to disagree with. They may wholeheartedly or partially agree or disagree. Candidates should be confident enough, where appropriate, to challenge the assumptions of the quotation and should not think they have to be agreed with.

This year, as for many years, questions on the 19th century were overwhelmingly popular and generally much better answered than the few responses to 20th century ones. But, as was mentioned in the November 2009 subject report, candidates might consider some 20th century topics especially if they use the new OUP IB history course companion, which might encourage teachers to tackle such topics as the Abyssinian crisis (Chapter 1), the Algerian war of independence (Chapter 2), South Africa's transition to one person one vote multi-party democracy (Chapter 5), decolonization and post-independence challenges in Africa, with particular reference to Ghana, Angola and Zimbabwe (Chapter 7), the Congo crisis and the UN (Chapter 9). Such knowledge would have helped answer 6 questions on this year's paper.

Higher level paper three - Americas

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 6	7 - 13	14 - 19	20 - 25	26 - 32	33 - 38	39 - 60

General comments

This session introduced the new History syllabus and assessment approach as stipulated in the History Guide. Neither of them represented a significant variation from the former guide. Within the syllabus some topics were refined with purpose to provide teachers and candidates a more comprehensive view and opportunities to address the theme under discussion.

Given the comments provided by the G2 Forms (98.41%) and the majority of examiners marking during this session it seems that as a whole the Paper proved to be balanced and fair to candidates. The new structure of the Paper did not apparently have negative effects on candidate's performance. There were, however, some teachers which voiced concerns with regard to particular questions. Since this is the first time that the new syllabus is applied several of these issues will be addressed in sections C and D.

Nevertheless, two aspects of the program deserve to be mentioned here. First: Canada is an integral and significant part of the region and questions related to the country reflect the international perspective of the IB as much as the United States and Latin America. Therefore questions about Canada, as indicated in the syllabus, are to be expected. Second: teachers are reminded that one of the requirements HL options (History Guide p. 15) is: for route 2, 20th century world history, candidates must select one option from options 2–5. Once an option has been chosen three sections must be selected for in-depth study.

Every bullet point in each of the chosen sections should be covered to ensure sufficient question choice in the examination.

For this session the most popular questions were: 5, 6, 15, 16 and 22. In general candidates selected questions from the popular areas of the US War of Independence and Civil War, the two world wars, FDR and Kennedy, and Civil Rights. Some examiners reported excellent responses about Canadian history and on Question 12, “Analyse the influence of the Mexican Revolution on the arts”.

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

There was not any particular area of the program which proved to be difficult. Almost all questions were answered within a wide range of level of performance. What proved to be difficult for candidates were those questions that refer to a concept or aspect to be developed, (for example “revolution” or “evolution” in Q.1; “wars of independence” in Q. 2; “populism” in Q.18) and the selection of the case when the option is given to the candidate (for example Q.2 and Q.13). What these cases show is that the problem was not the question but the ability of the candidates to choose the proper case to answer the question.

Understanding of the questions did not seem to be an issue for the candidates. Nearly all candidates had a reasonable amount of knowledge of the topics they were addressing, although too often it was not focused enough on the demands of the question. For example, this limitation observed in questions that demanded “to what extent”, such as Q.1, Q.2, Q.5, Q.6, some candidates did not address this indication.

Questions that required comparison or knowledge of more than one country or person also presented difficulties for some candidates, for example Q.7; Q.13; Q.8; and Q. 21

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

There were appropriate level of knowledge, being outstanding in some cases, not only with regards the content required in the question but the writing and organization to develop the argument and communicate it.

However, rather typically, candidates were more comfortable with questions that allow a more narrative approach, but many candidates ignored specific requests for analysis present in the exam questions and proceeded to a descriptive formula.

There appeared to be a greater tendency to apply broad unsubstantiated generalizations without presenting specific factual support. This was particularly true for questions pertaining to social and economic history topic.

Although knowledge was demonstrated in questions that addressed United States history, and to some extent Canada, most examiners remarked the limited knowledge displayed with regard to Latin America.

In this session, more than in previous ones, it was noted that very few candidates displayed awareness of different approaches to, and interpretations of, historical issues and events, even in those questions (Q. 5, 6, 14, 19) which have a rich tradition of historiography.

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

Question 1

This question was frequently answered as a narrative of the American Revolution, with, at best, rather implicit analysis. Candidates were rather evenly split as to their support for evolution or revolution. The range of marks tended to be from the adequate to the very best.

Question 2

Not frequently answered but done quite well in most cases. In general terms, candidates were aware of the Creoles' grievances but less on other reasons for the wars against Spain.

Question 3

Not frequently answered, but in some instances candidates' responses addressed it with reference to the American Revolution of 1776. Very few commendable essays were produced

Question 4

Rather popular question which generally led to answers of substance and some worthy analysis. This was truer for recognizing the impact upon the U. S., sectionalism and the coming of the Civil War, than for treatment of the impact on Mexico or the remainder of Latin America

Question 5

This was also a rather favorite choice and candidates were mostly able to support the thesis adequately. The stronger essays presented either a "dual" thesis or challenged the thesis. Depth and analysis were often quite substantial. The limitations with regard to answers to the question were that some candidates used it as a spring board to discuss the causes of the Civil War. Some answers were not precise enough about the Kansas-Nebraska problem but there were many who considered it with some depth and contextual knowledge.

This assessment and the popularity of the question, contrasted with concerns expressed in some G2 with regard to this question's wording and the usage of the concept "the power of the Southern pro-slavery group".

As mentioned above, many candidates choose this question with excellent results. Answers did not reflect any confusion with regard to the concept "power of the Southern proslavery group" and correctly interpreted it as the political power of the slaveholding class in the South.

Question 6

This was perhaps the most frequently chosen question. However, it was rather surprising the low percentage of candidates who distinguished themselves favorably. Many essays were narrative and repetitive in support of the reasons supported for the North's victory. Better essays developed a few additional factors of strength or weakness, usually in the military or strategic areas. Very few developed aspects of political leadership, foreign policy, etc. Most responses consisted of general agreement with the question.

Given the vast array of resources available for this topic, the poor quality, indeed almost universal absence of specific examples of industrial advances in the Northern economy was striking.

Question 7

There were very few answers but some were well done. Weaker answers used Hoover, FDR, Bennett and King as examples, completely inappropriate.

This question addressed Bullet #5 in Unit 4 which says: Influence of leaders in the transition to the modern era: political and economic aims; assessment of the successes and failures of Theodore Roosevelt, Wilfrid Laurier and a Latin American leader of the candidate's choice.

As mentioned in the opening paragraphs of this report every bullet point in each of the chosen sections should be covered to ensure sufficient question choice in the examination. What it means in this particular case is that the questions could be: open (no names of leaders); could be specific (Roosevelt and/or Laurier); could be a leader of one country (United States, Canada or a Latin American country).

Question 8

This question was chosen infrequently, but almost never answered with particular substance or specific knowledge. Most wrote from the perspective of Canada or the United States.

Question 9

This question produced some rather in-depth and superlative essays.

Question 10

A few good responses knew Moral Diplomacy was Wilson's foreign policy in Latin America, but some generalized about the United States' foreign policy being moral.

Question 11

A very popular question which led to some excellent responses. Unfortunately, weaker candidates wrote a narrative of the Mexican Revolution

Question 12

This question was not answered frequently. However, those who did answer were very knowledgeable. It was evident that some centres had well prepared their candidates for this topic.

Question 13

This question led to quite a number of essays of quality and compared the U.S. to either Argentina or Brazil. Overall, answers to this question focused well on overproduction and buying on credit, but not on other drawbacks.

The question addressed bullet # 1: The Great Depression: political and economic **causes** in the Americas, and as such was understood by the candidates.

However, a number G2 expressed concerns about it mostly centred on the time period which is not incorporated in the title of the unit: The Great Depression and the Americas 1929-39. It also promoted a lively discussion and interesting suggestions among teachers.

As it is clear in bullet #1, by addressing the causes of the Depression it presupposes knowledge **before** the Depression, and this knowledge includes the 1920s. The decision to place it within this unit reflects a thematic approach about the topic. Furthermore, it assumes that when the Depression is taught the causes are also included within the unit.

To place it in other units such as 4 will not be thematically appropriate (development of modern nation), or in unit 5 bullet 6 (impact of WWI) which addresses the effects during or immediately after the war. Furthermore, to remove the causes of the Depression from unit 7, will result in a disservice to the candidates which will be deprived of a very popular topic and a coherent understanding of the Depression, and to teachers which approach the topic in a thematic manner.

Question 14

Answers to Q.14 showed a good knowledge of FDR's policies, but there was considerable variation in understanding the reasons for opposition to them.

Question 15

This question was chosen quite often. It was well understood and answered with depth and analysis, mostly in respect to the U.S. Regarding social effects, most discussed African-Americans, women, Japanese-American, Native-Americans and even, Mexican-Americans. Economics was fairly easy.

Question 16

One of the most popular questions of the paper. It tended to produce some very good depth of response. However, it also led to answers that neglected historical content and engaged in mostly philosophical perspectives.

Question 17

It was, not surprisingly, popular in Canadian schools and usually very well done.

Question 18

It led mostly to comparison and contrast of Peron and Castro, with rather strong results. Unlike other compare and contrast questions this was done very well by many candidates. Weaker answers did not concentrate on the exact wording of the question "rise to power"; tended to choose leaders outside the time frame of the question and did not make reference to populism.

Unit 9 has the following NB: Vargas and Cardenas came to power before 1945 but their rule and influence in their respective states continued after 1945. The question addressed bullet 5 which includes rise to power and therefore disqualified Vargas's and Cardenas's first terms as relevant examples.

Some teachers voiced frustration with this unit questions (Q.17 and 18) on the grounds that Vargas's first term was not an acceptable choice, that there was not a specific question about Castro, that there was a question about Canada and that it was a compare and contrast question. This dissatisfaction is understandable since it reflects a concern about their candidates. However, the issue of the recommendations provided by the History Guide has already been discussed, as has been the comments about Canadian history. Furthermore, and, as mentioned before, most candidates used Castro as an example in their answers. Yet, the compare and contrast approach merits a clarification.

Compare and contrast is a necessary skill for history candidates and it is a fundamental part of the assessment in History (please see External markbands-HL pp 77-81). None of the contents of the units specify the type of questions that will be used.

This should not be expected, nor does the fact that either Specimen papers or previous papers have addressed a particular topic imply that the same questions and the same topics are going to be going to be discussed in the following session.

What should be expected is: that names that are used in the guides will be stated in the question (this does not include “suitable examples could be...”) and that for each paper there are going to be some comparison questions and questions with quotes.

Question 19

This question produced many narratives of the Cuban Missile Crisis and Bay of Pigs invasion ignoring the “Latin American” context of the question. Few candidates focused on policy, but those who did were well rewarded for discussing Flexible Response, Peace Corp initiatives and the Alliance for Progress.

Interesting enough, the Alliance for Progress was seldom mentioned, despite being explicitly stated in the syllabus guide, unlike the Cuban Missile Crisis

Question 20

Rather popular question and done fairly well.

Unit 10, bullet point #6 reads as follows: The Cold War in **either** Canada **or** one Latin American country: reasons for foreign and policies and their implementation.

The wording of this bullet establishes an alternative to use only one country. In some instances questions could be set which the choice is offered.

Question 21

Not a popular choice but done fairly well. Candidates were quite knowledgeable about Native American movements in US and Canada, not so good on to what extent.

Question 22

This was quite a popular question, and often led to excellent results. Candidates were almost always stronger in evidence for the period to 1964 than the late 1960's.

Question 23

Answers to Q.23 mostly agreed with the question with fairly standard knowledge about technology. The fact that this question was broad actually attracted many candidates. It proved to be popular. Although weaker candidates' answers did not have sufficient knowledge to support their assertions, stronger answers used specific themes and examples to support their views.

Some G2 included remarks about the question in terms of its wording and the ability of the candidates to answer it since it did not demand specific countries as examples. Did the wording of the question penalize the candidates? The answer is no. Examiners were prompted to reward well-argued and balanced answers, with relevant in-depth knowledge applied as evidence, and with analysis or critical commentary used to indicate some in-depth understanding.

It was interesting to see that the question attracted many candidates strong and weak. This suggests there is a need for the topics mentioned in Unite 12 to become more mainstream.

Question 24

No answers to this question.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Teachers and candidates should be familiar with the New History syllabus and its modifications. As suggested earlier teachers should choose at least 3 sections of the syllabus and cover it in detail.
- It is strongly recommended that teachers and candidates are acquainted with the new generic markbands described in the new History guide. The new markbands are not a change from the previous ones, but the old ones have been refined and the new ones are more explicit. The purpose of those modifications is to emphasize more effectively some of skills and objectives of the history syllabus.
- Teachers need to provide more experience and training by reviewing past exams and discussing the various types of responses that are appropriate for particular subjects and questions.
- Candidates also need to be reminded of the areas of their particular study that would lead to depth of knowledge and encouraged to look for questions within that category.
- Candidates should be instructed about applying knowledge to the questions set, and not to questions they think should have been set. Prepared answers are a practice that should not be encouraged.
- To achieve adequate to high level of precision, to identify and to maintain the focus and to answer with depth should be the objectives/practices for teachers that want to improve their candidates performance
- Much work remains to be done to persuade candidates that Cuba is not the only country in Latin America. Expanded knowledge about Latin America and Canada would improve the performance of the candidates
- Candidates need to do much more conceptual work, particularly around the notion of causality, especially for the most well-documented and resourced topics on the syllabus
- For section 7 The Great Depression: political and economic causes in the Americas. Please note that this section states clearly the political and economic causes of the Depression. It is therefore advisable to give candidates sufficient background in this area

Higher level paper three – Asia and Oceania

Component grade boundaries

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

General comments

From the G2s received most centres felt that the level of difficulty of this paper was on a par with that of last year's. Many were pleased with the balance of the questions and the coverage of the new syllabus. Most G2s commented that the paper was clearly worded and accessible for the candidates. Nevertheless, there was some criticism of the wording of the quotation in question 19, because it offered three choices for an assessment of Mao and was rather difficult.

Many of the comments in the G2s, however, indicated that teachers have not fully come to grips with the format of the examination as it relates to the new syllabus. For each regional option there are now 12 sections and there will be two questions per section on the examination. This means that there will only ever be a maximum of three or four questions on Southeast Asia. Similarly, the criticisms about the limited number of questions on the nineteenth century indicate that teachers are still using the old course. There will only ever be five or six questions on the nineteenth century. The complaints about the lack of questions on Vietnam and Deng show that teachers do not understand that only two questions are asked per section so inevitably each year some topics in the section will not necessarily have a question. The comments querying the inclusion of question 15 indicate that section 8 has not been understood.

The syllabus recommends that three sections are covered completely. This should give candidates at least six questions from which to choose. If just a selection from a range of sections is studied it is conceivable that the candidates could end up with a very limited choice or at worst no questions at all that they could answer in the examination. Teachers and candidates need to understand the pattern of the questions in the examination paper based on the sections in the syllabus. If candidates know which questions to look for it should help them to avoid making the costly mistake of writing about the wrong time period, region or person. Questions 21, 22, 23 and 24 are not general or generic questions and candidates should avoid them unless they have studied sections 11 and 12.

Having made these observations it must be acknowledged that unfortunately there was a mistake on this particular examination paper in that question 10 did not match the content of section 10. Many G2s comments noted this.

With the inclusion of India in the regional option there was a wider spread in the choice of questions answered. Most centres seemed to concentrate on India and /or China and/or Japan. The quality of the responses was equally balanced across the countries and also between the nineteenth and twentieth century. There were great many answers where the candidates wrote fluently and well, but they did not include enough specific factual evidence to support their analyses. Where this applied to whole schools it seems that the teachers may not be expecting enough precise detail from their candidates.

Candidates should avoid using idiosyncratic abbreviations such as YSK (for Yuan Shikai); SYS (Sun Yatsen); LON (League of Nations); CKS (Chiang Kaishek); EIC (East India Company); CCW (Chinese Civil War); FYP (Five Year Plan); SEM (Socialist Education Movement) and RTCs (Round Table Conferences) etc! Only commonly used standard abbreviations such as CCP and GMD (KMT) should be permitted.

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

- Some candidates appeared to have prepared answers to set questions and they found it difficult to adapt their material in response to the specific question asked.
- This was particularly evident for questions 3, 11, 12, 13 and 19.
- On the other hand, where candidates did attempt to respond to the actual question many of them did not include enough specific detailed factual information to illustrate and support their comments.
- Candidates who did not clearly define in the introduction what was meant by the terms “militarism and nationalism” (13); “monster” and “visionary” (19) “globalization” (22) and “urbanization” (24) struggled to come to grips with those questions.
- Many candidates did not have a strong sense of chronology and context.
- Candidates did not seem to understand the distinction between South Asia, East Asia and S-E Asia and consequently some candidates a lost significant number of marks due to this mistake. This applied to question 1.
- Some candidates did not seem to understand the names of the centuries, for example late eighteenth century means late 1700s, and consequently some candidates a lost significant number of marks due to this mistake. This applied to questions 1, 2 and 3.
- Some candidates spent too on long background information in their responses particularly in questions 9, 12, 13 and 14.
- Many candidates referred to historians by name but in a forced and unnatural manner. Most of the time the historians’ opinions were not integrated within a flowing argument or in a discussion of the historiography relating to the topic.

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

- Many candidates were able to structure thematic responses.
- Many candidates displayed a comprehensive knowledge of the course.
- Many candidates wrote detailed, relevant and well constructed essays. They were a pleasure to mark.
- The best responses on Jiang Jieshi, Mao and Indira Gandhi showed considerable analytical skills.

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

Comments are only provided on the most popular questions

Question 1

This question was not chosen by many candidates, but often those who did choose it used China as one of the examples and thus automatically lost a significant number of marks. China was not an appropriate example because it is not in Southeast Asia and also because it was not colonised by a European state. Other candidates misunderstood the timeframe given. It seems that all these candidates had not specifically studied Section 1 in the syllabus.

Question 2

This was quite a popular question and most candidates chose India, but at least half of them wrote about the wrong timeframe and discussed British rule in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries! This was obviously disastrous for them because very few marks could be awarded.

Many of these candidates came from centres where their peers wrote about the correct timeframe so they had most probably studied material from Section 1. Candidates need to know the terminology for the centuries and also understand the pattern of the questions in the examination based on the sections of the syllabus.

Question 3

This was a popular question and one that many candidates answered very well with clear analysis of both the causes and the consequences of the Taiping Rebellion. Weaker candidates tended to spend more time discussing the causes and it appeared as though they were adapting a set piece. The better candidates were able to identify both long term and short term causes and also immediate and far reaching consequences.

Question 4

Many candidates answered this question very well by giving quite a lot of detail about the economic and feudal system changes in Tokugawa Japan. Many candidates mentioned both "Dutch Learning" and "National Learning". Some also discussed the role of the tozama clans. Other candidates who answered this question appeared to be adapting a set piece on the period after Perry's arrival 1853-1868 and did not refer to the period prior to 1853. These responses ignored the timeframe given in the question and therefore were awarded fewer marks.

Question 5

This question was chosen by quite a few candidates. While there were some strong responses, the majority were very superficial and did not really address both parts of the question. Little specific detail was known about the Muslim situation in late-nineteenth century India and the partition of Bengal in 1905. Jinnah was erroneously given credit for the creation of the League. Candidates tended to write more about the consequences, but even then there were many inaccuracies and the responses tended to jump to the 1940s rather than discuss the immediate consequences.

Question 7

This question was chosen by only a few candidates. Generally, it was not done particularly well. Candidates tended to use it as a vehicle to discuss the modernisation of Japanese industry and the military. Others just discussed the Sino-Japanese War and the Russo-Japanese War. Very few really drew the links between these events and analysed the internal pressures and the strategic needs of Japan that gave rise to the annexation.

Question 8

This was a very popular question, but overall it was not done particularly well. Only a few candidates wrote comprehensive and detailed running analyses which both compared and contrasted. Most only contrasted. Others seemed to know more about Japan than China. Many candidates were quite dismissive of China's achievements. Some candidates were quite confused about the Self-Strengthening Movement and the 100 Days Reform Movement in China. They thought they were the one and the same. The latter is actually out of the timeframe for the question.

Question 9

A few candidates chose this question. Most were able to discuss Jinnah's role in the 1940s quite well. His earlier activities were not fully known although some candidates erroneously credited Jinnah with the founding of the All India Muslim League in 1906.

Question 10

Generally, the candidates who chose to do this question on Korea wrote detailed and analytical responses. For those who chose China the question was more problematic as 1910 is a year of no particular significance in the relationship. Most candidates wrote about the 21 Demands in 1915; the Japanese territorial gains from the Treaty of Versailles; the 1931 Mukden Incident and the creation of Manchuko. What was surprising, however, was that there was very little knowledge and understanding shown about the 2nd Sino-Japanese War (1937-1945) and the Japanese occupation during this period.

Question 11

This was one of the most popular questions on the paper, but it was also one of the most poorly done. Very few candidates displayed detailed knowledge about the May 4th Movement. All the candidates from one particular centre seemed to confuse the May 4th demonstrations with 10 October 1911! While most candidates were able to identify the reasons for the demonstrations many were not able to put it into the context of the New Culture Movement nor were they able to discuss the main ideas associated with it. Most candidates just discussed the demonstrations and then without linking information or analysis launched in to the formation of the CCP, the reorganisation of the GMD, the subsequent rivalry and the eventual CCP victory in 1949.

Question 12

This was a very popular choice. Some candidates answered the question thematically and really addressed the issue of the problems facing Jiang's government. The best responses examined Jiang's successes and failures. Weaker candidates did not know anything about the problems confronting Jiang beyond Japan and the CCP. Too many candidates used this question, like the previous one, to write a set piece about the conflict between the GMD and the CCP.

Question 13

Although this question was quite popular many of the candidates found it difficult because it required them to define and address both nationalism and militarism. Only a few were able to successfully analyse them in the context of “Western influence and modernisation”. Many were fairly narrative in their approach and a number got bogged down in background material well before the given timeframe. The best answers challenged the assumption inherent in the question and also examined the internal factors.

Question 14

The responses to this question were uneven. The better candidates looked at both internal and external factors that led to the breakdown of relations between Japan and the USA whilst the weaker candidates tended to be more narrative in their approach and just concentrated on external issues. Most candidates addressed the given timeframe well.

Question 17

Only a few responses and some did not write on the nominated states!

Question 18

There were quite a number of responses, but like question 2 many candidates misread the question. They wrote about Mahatma Gandhi and not Indira Gandhi and no marks could be awarded. Those who wrote about the correct person generally had a good command of the events and issues confronting her and made some astute comments about her style of governments. Bhutto was only chosen by a few.

Question 19

This was the most popular question on the paper. Many candidates wrote detailed and interesting chronological accounts of the policies and events in Mao's China. There were also some very good thematic responses.

The main issue with this question was that most candidates did not fully address the question and assess whether Mao was “an absolute monster or a great visionary – or both” and come to a conclusion about Mao. Many candidates wrote about Mao's successes and failures and their assessment of Mao in the light of the question was implicit or only a token acknowledgement in the conclusion by using the words from the quotation. The weaker candidates did not have much sense of chronology.

Question 20

This question done well by the few candidates who chose it and most argued that China's relations with the Soviet Union were always fraught.

Question 21

Only done by a few candidates, but generally the answers were relevant and comprehensive

Question 22

There were a number of responses to this question, but many candidates appeared to have chosen it as a last resort because it was done very poorly. Most responses contained sweeping generalisations. Candidates failed to define the term “globalisation”. Most who answered this question used it as a way of writing a set piece on China under Deng Xiaoping.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Teachers should make sure that their candidates know the geography of the region and therefore the difference between South Asia, East Asia and Southeast Asia so that candidates do not make the wrong choice of question or include a country outside the region.
- Teacher should make sure that their candidates know the correct names for the centuries so that candidates do not write about the wrong timeframe.
- Teachers should stress the importance of reading the question properly and thus avoid costly mistakes.
- Teachers could encourage their better candidates to include quite a lot of precise evidence in their responses. Helping candidates to learn this level of detail can be done by getting candidates to create their own timelines rather than just photocopy one from a text book; to construct charts that identify all events/factors including compare and contrast; to draw detailed concept maps. Setting research tasks as part of the coursework also helps candidates to gain in-depth knowledge.
- Similarly, the better candidates should also be encouraged to show evidence of wide reading and an understanding of historiography, particularly with regard to Tokugawa Japan and Perry's arrival; the Meiji period and the Self-Strengthening Movement; and to Mao's China.
- Evidence of wide reading can be obtained by encouraging candidates to use a range of history books like Hsu, Spence, Gray, and Fairbank for China; Beasley, Reichschauer and Lehmann for Japan; and by using relevant articles from magazines such as *History Today*, *History Review* and *Twentieth Century History Review*.
- Teachers and candidates should be wary of misunderstanding what is meant by historiography. Name dropping and referring to school text book authors does not constitute a discussion of historiography. Also, the analysis of different interpretations is not a substitute for evidence, but it should complement the factual details.
- Teachers should avoid preparing candidates with set pieces on a particular topic using exactly the same examples and information. Candidates who have this type of prepared answer struggle to adapt the material to the actual question asked in the examination.
- Teachers should stress that the candidates must respond to the actual question asked. Many candidates did not do this and included irrelevant material which was often out of the timeframe given. Candidates need to be taught to define the terms given in the question in the introduction. Also candidates should also use the key words of the question such as "visionary"; "monster"; "militarism"; "nationalism" throughout the response and as part of the analysis.
- Teachers could use model answers and exemplar scripts to help candidates improve their essay writing. They need to encourage quality writing and could refer to good practice in, for example, *The Concord Review*

- Candidates should be trained in answering questions that have two parts such as *Compare and contrast the...; Analyse the causes and the consequences of...?; For what reasons, and with what consequences...?; For what reasons, and with what results...?; Evaluate...militarism and nationalism?; etc.*
- Teachers should make sure that their candidates do many practice timed essays in 50 minutes which is the time candidates should allow for each question in the examination.
- Candidates from some schools wrote introductions that were far too long and which included too much detailed information. Some teachers appear to expect their candidates to write “In this essay I will examine.....” or “This essay will....”. These techniques were rather cumbersome and it meant that the introductions tended to be very long. Candidates later repeated this information in the body of the essay which meant that the essays were very repetitive. This often led to time management problems for the candidates.
- Proper paragraphing is essential in a good history essay.
- Candidates should also avoid long repetitive conclusions.

Further comments

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

Higher level paper three – Europe

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 6	7 - 13	14 - 20	21 - 26	27 - 32	33 - 38	39 - 60

General comments

Candidates have proved to possess an adequate knowledge of the questions attempted but have still difficulties in selecting and using the knowledge relevantly and effectively. Candidates' attention should be drawn to the fact that quality essays use events and facts effectively to support statements and arguments related to the question. Although the use of historiography is slowly becoming more of a supporting tool than the simple dropping of names, there are still some centres in which candidates need to be trained to use historiography relevantly.

Areas of the programme in which candidates appear to be well prepared

Time did not seem to be a major issue this session as most candidates managed to finish their three essays. Knowledge on the selected questions was appropriate. A narrower scope of questions was attempted in comparison to previous years with 12 and 16 being by far the most popular choices. In the 20th century sections of the paper. In the earlier questions 4, 9 10 and 11 were the most popular. Both 19th and 20th century questions were attempted.

The scripts assessed showed that schools chose to focus either on European OR Middle East History rather than attempt to integrate the study of both regions. This is valid under the new curriculum.

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

Showed difficulties in responding to questions covering the full chronology demanded (11, 16, 22 for example) or in addressing two part questions with adequate material for both parts (4,16, 18, 20 for example).

Candidates still find it difficult not to turn the questions into those they would have liked to be asked. Question 9 was often answered as an analysis of the successes and failures of Alexander II's reforms rather than identifying how they might strengthen the autocracy. Question 12 was frequently turned into a "rise of Hitler" answer Q 16 was often answered as if the question posed had been one on the successes and failures of the League of Nations.

Candidates should be trained to avoid narrative answers which do not focus clearly on the command terms of the question. Q. 3 was often answered with little to no attention to "political factors" but rather candidates provided a narrative of the Italian unification. Similarly Q 4 was often a narrative of the German wars of Unification there was little reference to the fact that Bismarck was able to use Prussia's economic strength as a basis for a strong foreign policy, although answers have shown that knowledge of Austria Hungary has improved.

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

Question 1

The best candidates focused on the "how far" command term and provided an analysis of the causes of the French Revolution. On the other hand, there were answers which revealed candidates should have a more detailed knowledge of the chronology of events in the French Revolution as they often included events post 1789.

Question 2

A significant number of candidates focused on Napoleon's foreign policy and, consequently, wrote less relevantly. Knowledge of his home policies was not very solid. There was limited reference in answers to the issue of the "rights of man"

Question 3

“Political factors” was often an overlooked term. Weaker answers responded with narratives on Cavour; some included Garibaldi but did not focus on issues such as nationalism (Mazzini) and liberalism effectively.

Question 4

Although knowledge of Austria Hungary is improving, questions on the unification still tempt too many candidates to offer narratives of Bismarck’s wars which would only partially address the question. Some answers did have a real understanding of Austria’s decline but many were satisfied with a brief mention of Austria’s exclusion from the Zollverein.

Question 5

Few attempted this question. Knowledge was limited and revolved around the Crimean War and little else.

Question 6 and 7

None

Question 8

Some answers tended to focus only on defeat in the Franco-Prussian war ,others were more knowledgeable on other aspects of Napoleon III’s foreign policy but surprisingly few were able to note that on the whole he was popular everywhere (plebiscite) except for Paris where events moved swiftly in 1870 after defeat at Sedan.

Question 9

A popular choice. Again, the “how far” was overlooked and many answers offered a narrative Alexander’s reforms. There was also a significant number of candidates who focused on the effects of reforms and argued on how successful Alexander had been. It should be noted that this question focuses on motives.

Question 10

A popular question. Some candidates still struggle to offer a comparative structure and only get to effective comparisons and contrasts in the conclusion. Having said this, this question was also answered by some in a highly effective and knowledgeable way.

Question 11

Candidates were quite knowledgeable on Bismarck’s aims and policies post 1870 but less secure on Wilhelm II and tended to rely on mention of Weltpolitik with little until we got to the “blank cheque” Continuity and change were not really addressed by very many.

Question 12

99% of answers focused on the Treaty of Versailles. Some offered Locarno as an example although this was not a relevant choice.

In relation to those using relevant treaties, knowledge was sound, but there was limited specific assessment of failures and, particularly, successes. Narratives on Versailles causing the rise of Hitler or the outbreak of World War II were, unfortunately, also fairly common.

Question 13

Few answers. Most focused more on the problems brought upon by the Palestine mandate after 1947 than on the question as set. Very few identified importance in an international context. Material from Paper 1 was used by many candidates who were clearly struggling with their choice of question.

Question 14

Very few which was surprising as Atatürk is such a significant figure in the Middle East. Answers proved to be knowledgeable and focused.

Question 15

A popular choice. Answers shared the problems mentioned above in relation to comparative structure. Hitler is better known than Mussolini, for whom samples were very general. The comparative social and family policies were well known.

Question 16

The “to what extent” command term was overlooked as candidates focused largely on events such as Abyssinia (Paper 1 being quoted too often!) and Manchuria with limited attention to the period 1919-1929. Some candidates offered a definition of “collective security” and relevant material outside the League of Nations but they were certainly a minority. However there were also a pleasing number who did discuss the impact of the Depression and Appeasement.

Question 17

Limited knowledge on Stalin’s last years. Candidates either turned this into a question on the 1920s and 30s or one on origins of the Cold War.

Question 18

Most candidates knew little about Khrushchev’s rise but handled the second part of the question more effectively although even here there was a tendency to drift into Cold war issues. Where post war USSR had been taught there were some very good answers on the years 53-55.

Question 19

Few attempts based on limited knowledge.

Question 20

The question was difficult for candidate as it covered a very wide period of time. In the attempt to answer the two parts of the question and, at the same time, cover the entire chronology demanded, the answers became narrative and lacked depth.

Question 21

A few answers with some reasonable knowledge but very little focus on compare and contrast. They were rather narrative

Question 22

Again, as in 20, a wide period of time which led to narrative answers with little depth or, alternatively, a focus on a limited period of time.

Question 23

Few answers. Choices were Russia under Stalin (not 50 years) or general responses on the pros and cons of the industrial revolution which named a country but offered little specific evidence drawn from it.

Question 24

Few answers, mostly based on generalisations but one or two where there was obviously case study work completed and which were therefore supported with reasonable detail.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Candidates should be taught to answer the specific question asked rather than use prepared answers which will not score high. They should be taught to understand the difference between narrative /descriptive essays and those which use historical knowledge effectively as evidence to support their arguments. Candidates' attention should be advised to take some time to read the question and focus their attention on the command terms which indicate the structure and focus the answer should have. Also, the definition of terms should be included in responses where necessary (Q16).

Some class exercises on unpicking questions or getting them to write their own questions and identifying what they want in the answers is often helpful here.

HISTORY ROUTE 1

Overall grade boundaries

Higher Level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 11	12 - 23	24 - 34	35 - 45	46 - 55	56 - 66	67 - 100

Standard Level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 10	11 - 22	23 - 33	34 - 44	45 - 55	56 - 67	68 - 100

Higher and standard level paper one

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 2	3 - 5	6 - 8	9 - 11	12 - 14	15 - 17	18 - 25

General Comments

Most candidates from the Middle East answered the set of questions on Prescribed Subject 1: The Origins and Rise of Islam c500-661 while most candidates from Europe and the USA answered the set of questions on Prescribed Subject 2: The Kingdom of Sicily 1130-1302. This was the first examination using these particular prescribed subjects as part of the revised history course.

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

The third question in Prescribed subject 1 proved difficult for many candidates. A majority demonstrated little understanding of the “the value and limitations of Source C and D.” This indicated limited ability to assess the documents for their value and limitations. A minority demonstrated effective understanding of the value and limitations, however they were unable to adequately discuss the second requirement of the question relative to “origin and purpose”. In these instances, candidates tended to examine origin more effectively than purpose. In addition, they tended to focus on either value or limitations; relatively few evaluated both in detail.

In order to achieve high marks, candidates need to address all parts of the question effectively, the “value and limitations” and the “origin and purpose”. The final question in both Prescribed Subject 1 and 2 requires the skill of evaluating and synthesizing evidence from both historical sources and background knowledge. Not all candidates were able to construct an answer that demonstrated effective and detailed use of both documentary material and their own knowledge. Yet, a considerable number of candidates achieved the maximum 5 marks available for using documentary material.

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

Many answers in both Prescribed Subjects were structured and precise. While most candidates demonstrated good skill managing their time during the one hour available to them to answer the four document-based questions, a few were unable to finish the test in the allotted time.

These candidates did not organize their time and as a result were unable to demonstrate their knowledge effectively. Moreover, most candidates achieved high marks against the first question in both prescribed subjects reflecting good comprehension of the content of the documents. Although some candidates presented a paraphrasing of the documents for question 2, there were some answers that demonstrated an ability to maintain a detailed running comparison/contrast.

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

Prescribed Subject 1: The Origins and Rise of Islam c500-661

Question 1

- a) Most candidates scored maximum marks against question 1 (a), which facilitated a satisfactory overall achievement. Most answers included Uthman’s acquisitiveness and business acumen expanded when he became Caliph, the luxury of his house in Medina and his further enrichment through real estate acquisition, the impressive amount of his personal wealth, his enrichment at the expense of the Muslim treasury, his illegal actions in giving his friends access to the treasury and his corrupting and bribing of the companions to justify his actions.
- b) Part b of the question proved more difficult for many candidates, but most of them identified the fact that Caliph Uthman issued a standard version of the Quran and ordered the destruction of all others.

Question 2

There were a variety of good answers. This was particularly positive since candidates usually focus more on differences than similarities. Here, candidates recognized that both sources acknowledged that Uthman adopted policies that were different from Umar’s policies and that both sources recognized that he favored members of his family and clan giving them lucrative positions. Also, most candidates recognized that both sources referred to the centralizing policies of Uthman and his promulgation of a standard version of the Quran.

Obvious contrasts were also recognized by most candidates, yet only the best candidates were able to identify less observable contrasts such as Source B is more critical of Uthman's predecessor than Source A and Source B suggests that Umar, as much as Uthman, was the reason for the financial problems and discontent.

Question 3

There was a clear indication in some scripts of the lack of understanding of terms of the question, origin, purpose, value and limitations.

Question 4

Many answers relied heavily on extracting relevant information from the documents to answer the question. A major weakness was not integrating document information with their own knowledge. Another weakness was the candidates' inability to argue against the traditional view of Uthman. In order to achieve full marks, candidates are expected to argue and to use both source material and their own knowledge as well as references to the sources used.

Prescribed Subject 2: The Kingdom of Sicily 1130-1302

Question 1

- a) Most candidates demonstrated excellent comprehension of Source B and provided valid points to explain why Roger II became king of Italy. Maximum marks were achieved.
- b) Most candidates showed some understanding of the message conveyed about Roger II in Source E explaining that Roger led a luxurious life and that he was a tolerant King towards Muslims which was reflected in the use of Arabic on the cloak. Candidates with comprehensive answers were able to interpret the image of lions attacking camels as to mean the triumph of Christianity over Islam.

Question 2

All responses earned credit for indicating some similarities and differences. Some responses demonstrated excellent linkage between Source C and D. Also there were some thorough and well focused running comparisons and contrasts which achieved maximum marks.

Question 3

In general most candidates adequately met the demands of the question and demonstrated good awareness of source evaluation. However, only the best candidates addressed all parts of the question in detail. In addition, evaluation of document B was generally more effective than that of A. All in all, most answers reflected very good paper 1 preparation and practice by candidates.

Question 4

As with question 4 in prescribed subject 1, some answers demonstrated more use of material from the documents than own knowledge. However, there were answers that included argument, synthesis of source material and own knowledge, as well as, references to the sources used.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Teachers are encouraged to emphasize the practicing techniques of source-based exams in their classes. Also, it would be beneficial if source-based exam practices were timed so that candidates adapt to the one hour available for them to complete paper 1.
- In compare and contrast questions, particular attention should be paid to writing a running comparison rather than separate explanations of each source.
- In source evaluation questions, teachers should explain to candidates that the content of the sources is not main answer to source evaluation as much as considering the origin and purpose of the sources and their significance for assessing the value and limitations. Candidates are encouraged to emphasize the purpose and the potential value of the historian's methods and explanations.

Higher and standard level paper two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 4	5 - 8	9 - 13	14 - 17	18 - 21	22 - 25	26 - 40

General comments

There were a small number of candidates for this paper: 199 in total. The number of centres submitting G2 forms is therefore, limited.

A total of 6 G2 forms were received. All agreed that the level of difficulty of the paper was appropriate and all agreed that the syllabus coverage was either satisfactory or good.

The most popular topics were numbers 1 and 3 with very few responses from other topics.

All candidates followed the rubric correctly, there were no examples of any candidate doing two questions from the same topic.

The level of historical knowledge possessed by candidates showed a wide variation-a number of candidates displayed considerable mastery of the subject matter while others showed limited knowledge or were not able to discern what knowledge was relevant to the questions asked.

There was also a wide variety in the analytical skills the ability to form and develop clear thematic essays and the critical thinking skills displayed by candidates. Some were exceptionally strong while others showed very little in terms of the above mentioned skills.

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

The level of historical knowledge in a significant number of cases lacked both breadth and depth. There was evidence that, in a number of cases, candidates did not really comprehend the various aspects of the material studied.

Too many candidates produced narrative responses and not the analytical essays that were required by the questions

Candidates did not read the question carefully in order to identify not only the command terms but also key words that focus the task such as impact, effect, challenges. As a result, many unfocussed and irrelevant responses were produced as candidates did not identify the task.

Candidates produced responses that they had learned and which they tried to fit to the question rather than responding to the actual demands of the question.

In some cases candidates produced near identical answers-the result, probably, of rote memorization of responses relating to certain syllabus points. Candidates were not reading questions and using their knowledge to respond to the specific demands of the question.

The above problems led to candidates enjoying very limited success as a result of these problems.

Producing better responses

There are several strategies that would help in producing better responses.

A careful reading of the question in order to understand the exact nature of the task required is essential. A word by word analysis of the question would be an excellent approach. Candidates must be aware not only of command terms but also terms, dates, and concepts which are designed to specify and focus the response.

Candidates should take time to identify and consider the major themes or ideas that they are going to employ in their responses. This may involve creating an outline or plan before beginning the essay. This helps the candidate to organize their thoughts, keeps their writing focussed and will be noted by the examiner. In any event a better response which will score higher will likely be produced.

Candidates must focus on producing organized, structured analytical essays and avoiding broad general narratives of limited application or relevance to the question.

The best responses demonstrated excellent essay structure which included introductory paragraphs which established the thesis and outlined the themes which would be used to develop the response. These themes should focus on the specific demands of the question and be supported by accurate, relevant historical information.

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

Topic 1

Question 4

This was a popular question and a number of strong results were produced. Some candidates did not pay close attention to both of the tasks: consolidate and expand authority. Some did not seem to comprehend that this was not a rise to power question.

A number of weak responses were encountered which merely recounted the career of the chosen ruler in a broad narrative fashion.

Question 5

This was a popular question particularly with respect to Henry II. Strong knowledge of his accomplishments was displayed by the majority of candidates. Stronger response provided comment on the effectiveness of his rule and provide comments on where he had been more or less successful.

Question 6

This was also a popular question with strong responses which addressed both parts of the question in a strong analytical format. Weak response either failed to address both parts of the question or did so in a broad narrative style with little critical analysis.

Too often weaker responses did not demonstrate sufficient breadth when identifying the types of challenges faced by the chosen ruler. Lack of historical knowledge was also a factor. In some cases, set piece rote answers were provided which addressed the life of the chosen ruler but did not address the question effectively.

Topic 2

There were very few responses in this topic area. The most common response was question 10. Responses to this question tended to be broad descriptions of the roles played by women without a strong analytical structure relevant to the demands of the question.

Topic 3

Question 13

This was a very popular question but often badly done. The answers lacked both good organization and sufficient breadth of knowledge.

Many responses did not extend beyond narrative accounts of the struggles immediately after the death of the Prophet. They did not seek to analyse reasons for the conquest of large areas outside Arabia.

The responses therefore did not score well as they lacked both structure and sufficient depth and breadth of knowledge.

Question 14

This was also a popular question, too often handled in a narrative style. There was a tendency to describe the actions of Nur al-Din rather than to provide an analytical explanation of the reasons for his success. Knowledge was often lacking in both breadth and depth which led to weaker results

Question 15

A very popular question. The best responses displayed excellent knowledge in both breadth and depth as well as a strong /analytical, thematic structure.

Many candidates tended to focus on the Crusades for their entire response. Better answers showed a broader knowledge of the reasons for warfare supported by good historical knowledge.

Topic 4 and Topic 5

Very few questions were answered in these two topics.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Candidates should be taught how to read questions accurately. They should not only be aware of the command terms which describe the nature of the task e.g. analyse, compare and contrast but also the words which focus the response to a specific area such as effect, consolidation, reasons for success or failure. Only when candidates are able to read and understand the question will they be able to produce effective responses.
- Candidates should also pay attention to dates when they appear in questions as well as references to specific historical periods or events.
- Candidates should practise writing analytical responses which are properly structured and supported. They should be actively discouraged from producing rambling narratives, or responses which merely put down a collection of historical information of limited relevance to the question.
- Well structured, analytical, thematic responses should be practised and rewarded when mastered
- The memorization and uncritical repetition of historical material in an attempt to respond to a question must be avoided if candidates hope to be successful and improve their skill level.
- Candidates need to expand their historical knowledge. in both breadth and depth. The best candidates display not only extensive knowledge but the ability to employ it effectively. Limited knowledge will not produce strong results and makes it impossible for the candidate to answer different types of questions.

Higher level Paper three

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 7	8 - 14	15 - 21	22 - 27	28 - 32	33 - 38	39 - 60

General comments

This paper had a small number of candidates only 79 in total.

The number of G2 forms received totalled 4 and these were all positive with respect to level of difficulty and syllabus coverage in the paper.

This was not seen as a difficult paper although some candidates did not perform as well as they might have. One examiner noted that "candidates did not focus on the precise wording of the question and instead wrote generally about the topic".

Some candidates have a tendency to attempt to make the question fit their knowledge rather than carrying out the task required. This produces poor quality responses.

There was a tendency from weaker candidates to produce broad, general narrative responses which did not address the question clearly or demonstrate any of the required analytical or critical thinking skills.

All candidates can benefit from taking a few minutes to consider the meaning of the question and determining how they will approach it. Creating a plan or outline of the key points or themes to be analysed will produce stronger results.

A number of candidates had trouble with the meaning of the term insurrection and therefore did poorly on Question 17- some thought that the Black Death was an insurrection. The concept of a succession crisis in question 15 was also not well understood by some.

In addition candidates had a tendency to overlook key words in questions. This occurred in question 14 where the word impact is quite crucial but some failed to recognize this and produced a narrative account of his reign.

Similarly in Question 13 candidates went beyond the question in discussing Frederick II –they were supposed to limit the response to Italy and Sicily but included Germany to a large degree.

In general, candidates need to focus on mastering the historical content, developing a stronger grasp of key terms, chronology and the significance of critical events and the contributions of important individuals.

There were a number of very strong papers which showed excellent knowledge and analytical skill. These are to be applauded and it is hoped that schools can work to producing more papers of this calibre through a strong emphasis on both skills and knowledge

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

The most commonly answered questions will be discussed below:

Question 2

Some candidates had trouble distinguishing between temporal and spiritual matters. Responses tended to narrative descriptions of the career of Innocent III rather than an effective analysis of the quotation.

Question 3

Responses here tended to be very weak and consisted of narrative accounts of event during the period of the rise of the Fatimids. There was a lack of well structured analytical responses. Historical knowledge was often not sufficient for a solid response

Question 4

Candidates had trouble focussing on the demands of the question and went beyond the requirements of economic and commercial influence into political and religious matters. In addition they were not able to confine themselves to the geographical area of the question.

Question 5

There were some very good responses to this question showing strong analysis and command of historical material.

Weaker candidates tended to spend too much time on Henry's rise to power rather than his development of administration.

Question 6

This was a popular question which produced a number of strong results. There was tendency to focus on his military accomplishments in evicting the Angevins rather than some of the other methods by which he established French power. Better candidates noted that he built on the foundations laid by his predecessors.

Question 7

This was a popular question which produced widely varied results. The best responses examined the entire period of the Crusades and analysed a wide range of motives beyond the purely religious. Weaker candidates tended to focus on a narrow time frame or on a single cause such as religion their responses were more descriptive than analytical.

Question 8

A very popular question. Saladin was the most popular choice. Better answers analysed and evaluated his role in the Crusades noting his strengths and weaknesses. Weaker answers merely recounted the events of his career and did not produce critical comment.

Question 13

This was attempted by a large number of candidates with varying degrees of success. Most addressed both parts of the question fairly effectively. Problems occurred because candidates did not limit their responses to Italy and Sicily as required. Their knowledge of some of his Italian campaigns seemed a bit thin in a number of cases.

Question 14

One of the most popular questions, there were a number of excellent response. However a significant number of candidates did not do well because they failed to address the key word in the question which was the impact of John's reign.

They produced a catalogue of his policies failures etc-often military without any real analysis of how they impacted on England.

Question 17

This was badly done by a number of candidates who did not understand the word 'insurrection' this led to responses which were completely irrelevant. Candidates who focussed on the demands of the question and had adequate historical knowledge were able to produce solid answers.

Question 23

Many candidates had a reasonable grasp of the reasons for exploration although they tended to produce these rather than focus more clearly on the to what extent aspect of the question. More substantial knowledge would have been helpful to a number of candidates as would a wider range of reasons.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- The most crucial area is giving candidates instruction in the careful reading of the questions. They must examine every word and ensure that they understand the demands of the question. The command words such as analyse and compare and contrast must be clearly understood. In addition the key words that focus the task such as impact, effects, causes must be seen and understood to be of critical importance.
- Key historical terms, names of individuals or institutions and dates that appear in questions must be identified and recognized as important to the production of a properly focussed and precise response.
- Candidates must have further practice in constructing well-organized and structured analytical essays these should have an introduction which puts forward the thesis and makes note of the key these or concepts that will be employed in the response.
- Candidates must be discouraged from producing rambling, general narratives which demonstrate little or no analytical or critical thinking skills.
- Candidates should be encouraged to deepen and broaden their historical knowledge of the sections of the syllabus that they have chosen to study. Better command of the historical material will allow them to respond more effectively to a range of questions rather than trying to make the questions fit their limited knowledge often with poor results.