

## HISTORY

### Overall grade boundaries

#### Higher Level Route 2 Americas (Peacemaking) Timezone 1

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 9	10 - 22	23 - 32	33 - 42	43 - 54	55 - 65	66 - 100

#### Higher Level Route 2 Europe/Middle East (Peacemaking) Timezone 2

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 9	10 - 22	23 - 32	33 - 43	44 - 54	55 - 65	66 - 100

#### Standard Level Route 2

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 10	11 - 23	24 - 32	33 - 43	44 - 55	56 - 67	68 - 100

### Higher and standard level internal assessment

#### Component grade boundaries

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

### Recommendations for IB procedures, instructions and forms

This year, as in the past, most schools were prompt in meeting the Internal Assessment deadlines with the appropriate documentation filled out correctly. Each year a number of schools do not send in or fully complete the 3/IA and 3/CS forms. Both of these forms are two-sided and both sides should be completed. **Common areas of neglect are the teacher's name and signature on the back of the 3/IA form and the teacher's signature on the front of the 3/CS form.**

Again this session there seemed to be some confusion over whether teacher annotation on the candidates' papers is appropriate. Teachers are encouraged to place their comments either on the paper itself, or on a separate sheet of paper which is included with the candidates' work. These comments should indicate the rationale used by the teacher for the mark awarded for each criterion. Comments that address specific issues related to the assessment criteria can be most helpful in the moderation process. Schools are advised when making the comments on the candidates' papers not to mark in red or green ink as these are the colours used by moderators.

## The range and suitability of the work submitted

The candidates in this year's cohort clearly understood the general format style for the Internal Assessment investigation. Most candidates correctly divided the work into the six required sections and attempted to address issues in the manner indicated by the assessment criteria. The large majority of candidates wrote on a general topic that was suitable for the Historical Investigation, with many topics aligned with the History Syllabus or based on some aspect of regional history. The topics were most often dealing with issues in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. Moderators did find a number of topics that were centred on issues within the last ten years which is not appropriate for this assessment. Though the topics themselves were appropriate the specific research questions candidates formulated were often too broad to be successfully addressed within the assignment's word limit. In general the application of the criteria was appropriate with some exceptions, which will be dealt with in the discussion of the criterion.

## Candidate performance against each criterion

### **Criterion A: Plan of Investigation**

The candidates achieved some success in this section. The most successful papers clearly stated their research question, while defining the major issues the question investigated and examined the type or nature of the sources and the rationale for their use in the research of the candidate's specific question. Problems for candidates came from not clearly stating their question, not fully developing the issues to be addressed by the question and, in many cases, dealing with method in a very superficial manner. The nature and type of sources is not satisfied by simply stating the two sources that will be evaluated in Section C and should be more developed. It is also not necessary to state here what will not be discussed in the investigation.

### **Criterion B: Summary of evidence**

Most candidates successfully presented relevant evidence with referencing and some type of organization. This section is where the facts of evidence are to be presented yet candidates still blend analysis with their facts and limit the mark awarded. The analysis should be placed in Section D where it is more appropriate and would receive credit for the material. Many investigations were well researched and fit the description required of the upper level mark for this criterion yet a large number of candidates provided only a very limited source list. Referencing style was also a problem for some of the papers as they should reflect one standard style. Again this year some of the candidates submitted work not referenced in this section which limits the section to a maximum of 2 marks.

### **Criterion C: Evaluation of sources**

Candidates continue to improve in their development of this section. Most are now explicitly addressing origin, purpose, value and limitation in their evaluation of the two sources. The specific evaluations are also becoming more appropriate and candidates are using sources that are important to the study. A variety of sources were used including speeches, memoirs, government documents, visuals and secondary accounts. There is still room for improvement in this area. The source choice needs to reflect sources that are significant to the investigation and not simply sources used but with limited worth. It is important that the value and limitation are addressed with regard to the origin and purpose and not simply for their utility to the candidate.

When addressing value and limitation superficial or generic descriptions are not credible and need to be more indicative of the specific source. Stating that an author is biased based on nationality with no linkage to what is displayed in the source is not a successful approach.

#### **Criterion D: Analysis**

This section continues to provide some challenges for the candidates. Most of the investigations attempt some analysis of the evidence in Section B but a number of candidates simply restated Section B with limited comments. When analysis was blended into evidence in Section B candidates would often then introduce new evidence into Section D and comment on that material. Two areas that were particular problems in this section were the lack of awareness of the significance of the sources evaluated in Section C and referencing. If there are no references in this section a maximum of 2 marks can be awarded. Not addressing the sources evaluated in Section C limits the maximum mark that can be awarded to 4. These two issues impacted a significant number of this year's investigations. Candidates are asked in this section to analyze the evidence as it applies to the research question and many candidates actually analyzed the components of the question but did not analyze the full question, which is necessary to successfully reach a conclusion.

#### **Criterion E: Conclusion**

This was a successful section for a large number of candidates. Conclusions that were inconsistent or that introduced new evidence were typically the conclusions that failed to attain full marks.

#### **Criterion F: Sources and word limit**

A few candidates were limited in the marks for this section due to not placing the word count on the title page of the investigation. Source lists still suffered from the problem of not being comprehensive and were also lacking in the use of one standard method of citation style. Often the major problem was the need to alphabetize by the author's last name.

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

- Schools need to work on the development of appropriately focused questions. This is necessary to allow the candidates to create a developed work yet meet the 2000 maximum word limit.
- In explaining the Plan of Investigation a clear explanation of scope and method, showing their meaning and relationship, would help in the development of this section.
- Candidates need to be reminded of the difference between fact and analysis and guided as to where they should be used in the investigation.
- Referencing of the investigations, especially in Sections B and D is clearly necessary to achieve mid to upper level marks. This should be highlighted for the candidates throughout the Internal Assessment process.

## Higher and standard level paper one

### Component grade boundaries

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

### General comments

The G2 forms sent to IBCA by the schools indicated that the May 2011 Paper One received a mixed reception. Again about 50% of the candidature chose PS1 and the other 50% was roughly equally divided between PS2 and PS3. Of those centres that had responded by the time of Grade Award 96% found the level of difficulty, the clarity of wording and the presentation of the paper to be appropriate for PS2 and PS3. There were several comments from schools regarding the lack of choice now available on Paper One and, more alarmingly, the fact that several centres were not aware of this! Other comments related to the separation of questions from the sources to facilitate ease of access for the candidates. On PS2 concern was expressed about the predominantly Western provenance of the sources and their lack of variety. The inconsistency of the amount of identifying background material given in the attributions of the sources on all three Prescribed Subjects was also criticised. Some G2 forms also expressed concerns about the scope of the topic, given that PS3 indicates 1989 as its end date and question 4 asked for an analysis of the contributions of Glasnost and Perestroika to the collapse of the Soviet Union. Although this could be interpreted as an invitation to go up to 1991, the mark scheme included instructions to examiners not to demand knowledge beyond 1989 so that no candidate would be at a disadvantage.

For PS1 96% of schools found the clarity of wording to be either satisfactory or good, and 94% found the presentation of the paper to be either satisfactory or good. 70% of responders found the Topic to be of appropriate difficulty whereas 30% found it too difficult. There were two general criticisms of PS1. Firstly, that the topic of the London Naval Conference was too narrow and secondly, that the wording of Question 4 meant that candidates found it difficult to use their own knowledge. In response to the first comment about narrowness - no candidate should be surprised by any Paper One Topic. They are clearly set out in the syllabus and over the two years of the course teachers should ensure that all students have at least a superficial knowledge of the syllabus content. The title of Prescribed Subject One includes the term "Peacekeeping", a direct reference to disarmament; and Article 8 of the League of Nations' Covenant, identifying one of the main aims of that organisation, expressly states that "The Members of the League recognise that the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations". To that end the 1930 London Naval Conference is an appropriate topic and, interestingly, because of the global nature of the nations present, also responds to the criticism frequently heard that topics on PS1 are too Eurocentric. The question setters have the same information as the teachers and make their selection from the topics listed. However, this does not mean that all bullet points in the History Guide should be taught in depth, as Paper One is a skills paper.

Naturally there are topics which are more popular or are perceived as being more “mainstream” than others but, provided that the students have been taught the skills necessary to handle this paper, the narrowness of the topic should not really be an issue. Those teachers who commented “it was not what I had prepared my students for”, should perhaps rethink the way that they teach the material for Paper One. In fact, it could be argued that narrowly focused topics can be more accessible for students than wide open topics. Think how difficult it would be for a candidate to answer a source based question on “The Paris Peace Settlement” or “Global Disarmament 1918-1936” in the time allowed? Teachers would probably be very pleased with a source paper on the Treaty of Versailles – would they be so content if it were to cover the Treaty of Sèvres-Lausanne? For certain areas of the world it can be argued that the latter Treaty is far more significant than the former. It should also be remembered that the one of the HL regional options is now the History of Europe and the Middle East. The point being made here is that, what may seem an appropriate topic for some centres may not be seen in the same light by others.

The mark scheme, available on the IB website and distributed at workshops, also indicates that out of the maximum 25 marks available on Paper One it is possible for candidates to obtain 22/25 marks merely from using the sources themselves. In May 2010 and May 2011 18/25 marks was the beginning of the Grade 7 boundary, allowing candidates who have the appropriate skills to score very highly without any detailed own knowledge.

To address the second point, about the lack of opportunity for candidates to express their own knowledge on Question 4: The concern here was that the naming of the London Naval Conference was too specific and that a question on Disarmament 1930-1936 would have been more accessible to the candidates. What the question was intending was for the disagreements at London between the various powers, clearly identified in the sources, to be analysed up to 1936. The material needed for this answer should be familiar to all candidates sitting this Prescribed Subject. **In fact many candidates were able to respond appropriately to this question.** Question 4 was seeking indication that, as the 1930 London Naval Conference was unsuccessful in the long-term, so was disarmament. Relevant information included the position of Japan and its resulting turn to militarism, leading to the invasion of Manchuria in 1931; the uncertainty of Britain’s position regarding its navy, leading to the 1935 Anglo-German Naval Treaty; and suspicion and distrust between France and Italy over the Mediterranean and North Africa resulting in the Abyssinian crisis. This report can substantiate that many candidates realised this and included such own knowledge in their answers.

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

There is room for improvement in the treatment of questions 2 and 3. In the case of question 2, candidates are to be reminded that they should make effective links by making specific reference to the material in the sources. Also, the question specifically asks for comparisons and contrasts of the views expressed in two sources. This means that comparisons of the provenance of the sources or their nature as historical documents (e.g. “both are secondary sources”) are not relevant to the question asked. As for the treatment of the third question, it requires that candidates assess the values and limitations of the sources. The conclusion that primary sources are reliable and secondary sources are not is a generalisation of little historical validity and does not offer an effective evaluation of the sources.

Candidates are welcome to reflect on the reliability of the sources when addressing their origins and purpose but such reflection should be explicitly related to how that affects the values and limitations of the sources. Similarly, the evaluation of the sources should integrate origins and purpose on the one hand with the value and limitations of each source on the other. The answers to question 4 did not always develop an argument focused on the specific question but rather offered separate paragraphs which dealt with each of the sources in the paper and which then offered some own knowledge as a separate argument.

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

Candidates generally showed good background knowledge on all three Prescribed Subjects. This enabled them to focus on demonstrating their skills in the treatment of individual questions. As seen in previous years the majority of candidates did not seem to have experienced difficulties in answering the four questions in the time allocated. Answering the questions in the order in which they were presented provided them with an opportunity to gain insight into the sources and to answer question 4 in a more focused manner.

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

### PS1 Peacemaking, Peacekeeping - International Relations 1918-1936

#### Question 1

- a) Most candidates had little difficulty finding two or three of the five possible determinants of significance in the markscheme. Some responses were simply too brief – one sentence or so – to gain high marks
- b) The cartoon worked extremely well and most candidates were able to identify two messages in Source C thus gaining full marks

#### Question 2

A significant number of candidates offered end-on narratives of the sources with no linkage between them. The question explicitly asked for a comparison and contrast “of the views expressed” in the two sources. Responses, which discuss the origins of the sources and the nature of the historical document (primary or secondary; a speech vs. a book etc.) receive no credit. Having said this, there were also many excellent answers that covered both comparisons and contrasts in a running, linked, style of writing.

#### Question 3

Candidates were familiar with the rubric of this question and addressed all elements for both sources; however there were answers which continued to focus on the content of the sources rather than on their evaluation. Also, links between O and P on the one hand and V and L on the other were not explicit in some cases. It is fundamental that candidates are trained to see the relevance of understanding the purpose of a source to judge its value and limitations. The analysis of Source A (statement by Hoover) was often more effective than the evaluation of Source B (a book by Payson O'Brien) which was somewhat surprising as Source B is a type of source that appears regularly on this Paper. Similarly, candidates continued to point out that if a source is secondary it has limited value to a historian and, if it is primary, it has no limitations.

Some candidates are still dealing with the sources together e.g. "The origin of Source A... whereas the origin of Source B....". This practice is to be discouraged as it leads to a fragmentation in the response.

#### **Question 4**

Despite the concerns expressed in the G2 forms Question 4 was generally answered well with many candidates including elements of their own knowledge. The most common response suggested that the London Naval Conference of 1930 was a short-term and limited success but a long-term failure, which was suggested by the sources. It must be noted that the inclusion of all the sources in a somewhat mechanical litany does not automatically guarantee five marks for the student unless there is a specific attempt to focus on the question that was set. Some candidates produced excellent, focused, answers which integrated specific elements of the sources with relevant and detailed own knowledge.

### **PS2 The Arab Israeli Conflict 1945-1979**

#### **Question 1**

- a) Many candidates included the reactions of Britain, France and Israel while others also included the reactions of the USA and the USSR.
- b) Most candidates understood the main messages of the cartoon (rivalry and competition for control between the USA and the USSR; Eden left behind) but the depth of analysis varied considerably.

#### **Question 2**

Many candidates still analyse sources separately in an end-on manner with no explicit linkage at all, or with a brief link at the end. Others have a very clear idea of what is required and make clear links between sources. Many candidates included the origin of the source as part of the comparison for which no marks were awarded.

#### **Question 3**

Both sources were very similar in terms of their values and limitations although, as this question does not require any comparison or contrast of the sources, this did not affect the candidates' ability to answer the question. Some candidates have a very clear idea of O, P, V and L while others have learnt certain "recipes" or have a mechanical approach and are not really thinking about the sources. There is still too much description of the content of the sources. Many answers include the words origin, purpose, value and limitation, but then analyse the sources' content.

#### **Question 4**

Many candidates forget to answer the guiding question and merely summarise the information in the sources making no attempt at focusing on the question asked. Stronger answers avoided this temptation and such answers were characterized by a readiness to "shape" the material so as to generate a well-founded assessment of the role of the US in the Suez Crisis. Unfortunately the application of the sources in such good answers was only rarely supplemented by the inclusion of relevant own knowledge.

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

- a) Most candidates had no difficulty in identifying three problems Gorbachev faced as a result of introducing Glasnost and Perestroika such as the weakening of the Communist Party, the tension created between openness and centralised control and the influence of deputies using TV for their own ends. Some did offer unnecessary background information and spent too long on a question worth 3 marks.
- b) The cartoon worked well and most candidates were able to identify two messages in Source E thus gaining full marks. All the messages suggested in the markscheme were identified by candidates in the different responses assessed.

**Question 2**

A significant number of candidates offered end-on narratives of the sources with no explicit linkage between them. Some did not focus on the views expressed and instead compared and contrasted the sources with reference to their origins and the type of historical document they were. Having said this, there were also some very sophisticated answers covering both comparisons and contrasts in the level of detail needed to gain full marks.

**Question 3**

Candidates were familiar with the rubric of this question and addressed all elements for both sources; however there were answers which continued to focus on the content of the sources rather than on their evaluation. Also, links between O and P on the one hand and V and L on the other were not explicit in some cases. It is fundamental that candidates are trained to see the relevance of understanding the purpose of a source to judge its value and limitations. The evaluation of Source C (Gorbachev's memoirs) was often more effective than the evaluation of Source D and the majority of candidates dealt with C very well. In the case of Source D, many candidates did not take the date of the source into consideration and failed to reflect on the implications that the source reflected an ongoing situation in constant change. Also, some candidates jumped to the conclusion that because Source D was a publication by a US academic, it meant that he had not experienced the events first hand and, consequently the source was of limited value to historians. Magstadt's academic expertise was often not identified as a value. Similarly, candidates continued to point out that if a source is secondary it has limited value to a historian and, if it is primary it has no limitations. It is recommended that each source be treated separately.

**Question 4**

This question was a challenge to candidates with difficulties in applying synthesis and who did not treat it as a mini essay. A mechanical approach to the question where each source is quoted separately and some own knowledge is offered - again as a separate paragraph will not score well. Similarly, the use of all sources does not automatically guarantee five marks unless there is a specific attempt to focus on the explicit question. The inclusion of own knowledge was overall rather limited and general. When successfully integrated to the answer, own knowledge was used to either expand on issues identified by the sources (for example, additional information on the economic problems mentioned by Source C) or to help support new arguments (such as the growth of independence movements and their impact on the USSR). Some candidates produced well focused answers which integrated specific elements of the sources with relevant own knowledge.



## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

There are really no 'surprises' on Paper One. All of the content is clearly identified in the Subject Guide. Teachers should give their students copies of the content that is listed and ensure that all students have some basic knowledge of it by the time they sit the examination. There also seems to be the sense that students studying History implicitly know how to evaluate sources. The evidence from Paper One shows **that source evaluation must be taught as part of the course**. The obvious way to do this is to link the content of the Prescribed Subject selected by the school to its Regional Option or Topics covered on Paper Two. When discussing the League of Nations, for example, ensure that students encounter different sources (and types of sources) and are made aware how their origins and purpose affect their values and limitations. Teachers must help students develop the skills necessary to answer the mini essay making reference to both the sources and appropriate outside knowledge. The key to success in the last question is for the answer to respond to the actual question that has been set rather than students attempt to use the sources mechanically without any specific focus.

## Higher and standard level paper two - timezone 1

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 4	5 - 9	10 - 12	13 - 16	17 - 21	22 - 25	26 - 40

### General comments

The number of G2 (Teacher Comments on Examinations) responses received by the time of Grade Award was 326. Examination of these comments revealed that 0.4% of respondents found the paper 'much easier' than that of the previous year, 4.9% found it 'a little easier', 57.4% found it 'of a similar standard', 24% found it 'a little more difficult' and 6.1% found it 'much more difficult'.

With regards to the suitability of the question paper in terms of 'clarity of wording' 10.2% regarded the paper as 'poor', 44.9% as 'satisfactory' and 44.9% as 'good'. The presentation of the paper was judged to be 'poor' by 3.4% of G2 replies, 'satisfactory' by 42% and 'good' by 54.5%.

Topics 1, 3 and 5 remained the favourites for most centres as reflected in candidate responses. It has to be acknowledged that at times questions/tasks were less mainstream than in the past and sometimes the material, though quite clearly noted in the History Guide for specific study, was presented in such a manner as to make the question/task quite challenging (more on this with reference to specific questions below).

Recognition of the fact that the phrasing of a *small minority* of questions may have unsettled or disadvantaged candidates was reflected in the setting of grade boundaries.

As mentioned above, the mainstream topics of 1, 3 and 5 predominated. Of the 30 questions on offer relatively few were attempted by the majority of candidates. As noted in a previous report written in connection with a November examination session, there remains a *'continuing and enduring popularity of topics involving... Hitler, The First World War and the Cold War (in particular anything related to the origins of this latter conflict or its ending)'*. The concentration on these perennial favourites of centres and candidates is perfectly understandable and a study of them is important to the understanding of some of the most momentous historical developments of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. It is necessary, though, to go beyond overview/template treatments of topics, which often lack sufficient focus on the task. This issue will be revisited in the comments on performance in individual questions in the section below.

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

Teachers/Instructors in the G2 forms pointed out areas where they believed candidates had encountered problems due to the nature/phrasing of the questions. 'Odd quotes' as in questions 4 and 15 were commented upon – and one respondent was most aggrieved that the term 'brinkmanship' was used in question 27 about the events in Cuba in 1962. Most candidates avoided questions such as number 4, few seemed to have any problems regarding the phrasing of 15 and it is not unreasonable to expect candidates who have studied the Cold War topic to be aware of the terminology associated with key events - especially when the **term is stated quite clearly** as an area for consideration in the History Guide.

The majority of candidates answered two questions within the time limit and rubric offences (e.g. both questions selected from the same topic area or regional requirements being ignored) were rare. Many responses on the most popular questions were often characterized by prepared/pre-learned responses which were applied without enough attention to the specific task – this was particularly the case in questions relating to the origin of the Great War or the origins and development of the Cold War where candidates produced responses which were overviews of the question of causation but which focused insufficiently on the central theme(s) of the question.

There is still a need for candidates to exhibit a grasp of chronology: in many essays not one date is noted. History is obviously about more than the chronicling of events and listing of dates but an awareness of chronology allows for a sounder grasp of sequence and a basis for comments on cause/effect and continuity/contrast which is often lacking in essays where chronology is simply omitted.

These subject reports constantly mention the need for candidates to be trained in essay writing technique – question analysis/task identification and the subsequent selection and deployment of historical knowledge to address the demands of the question. The provision of a wealth of detail which is applied indiscriminately is not to be encouraged, instead the selection of relevant detail and the structuring of a response (sequentially or thematically) are required. Training in essay technique under timed conditions is to be encouraged, as is the familiarization of candidates with basic historical vocabulary – what is meant for example by 'militarism', 'collective security', 'proportional representation', 'totalitarian', 'peaceful coexistence' and 'brinkmanship' to name some of the terms which appeared in questions this session and appeared to be poorly understood by some candidates.

## The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

The May 2010 Report for Paper 2 (TZ1) made the following comments upon levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated. These points remain generally applicable to responses in essay writing in relation to Paper 2 (TZ1) for the May 2011 session.

*'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.'*

This May 2011 session did witness work which showed evidence that some centres were preparing candidates in effective essay writing by identifying the task at the outset, defining key terms, planning a response and structuring it by theme or in a sequential/end-on treatment fashion depending on the question. Such approaches were often a welcome change from answers which described historiographical views (as opposed to candidates providing their own argumentation based on historical detail), template/learned responses, generalized commentary with a paucity of accurate historical detail.

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

### Topic 1

Of the six questions on offer by far the most popular were questions 2 and 3, mainstream topics for most centres which cover this topic area.

### Question 1

Very few responses indeed were provided for this question. The compare/contrast task was challenging – as G2 comments pointed out. Both wars noted for contrast/comparison are specific/named examples in the History Guide but it would appear that few candidates studied either, far less both of them.

### Question 2

This was the most popular choice in this section. Many candidates addressed the task by providing a two-part essay – the first part being a narrative overview of the causes of the First World War, and the second focusing (again in a narrative overview) on the origins of WWII. The issue or factor of 'militarism' was, for most candidates, synonymous with the naval arms race before 1914 or the Schlieffen Plan and pre-1939 militarism was interpreted as Hitler's foreign policy from 1936 onwards. Better candidates defined militarism not only in terms of actions but pointed out the mood/attitudes/ideals that were associated with, or permeated, the years preceding both conflicts. In such cases the answers were much more convincing.

Too many answers simply dismissed militarism without showing any understanding of what it was and went on to provide the learned responses referred to above. Often these took the form of answers which revolved around the statement that, 'There were four causes of the First World War...' - and similarly with the Second World War. These were essays based on, one suspects, information sheets/class notes which were overviews and in this case insufficiently focused to deal effectively with the demands of the task.

### Question 3

Candidates who chose to tackle this question for the most part dealt with the wars in Indo-China before or after 1954. The task was to analyse the impact on the course and outcome of the war. Many candidates tended to spend the bulk of the essay in describing tactics of the guerillas and the US/ARVIN forces. The impact on the outcome of the war was often ignored or insufficiently dealt with. Claims that guerrilla warfare was the main- indeed the only reason for victory -were not uncommon and revealed a lack of depth of understanding of the factors which produced Vietminh/Vietcong/NVA success.

Some candidates selected China as the example for investigation. Once more although some answers were able to provide details on the course of the war (which tended to be a description of tactics) there needed to be consideration of 'other factors' in relation to analysis of the impact of such warfare upon the outcome of the conflict.

Some good responses were seen which did provide the necessary balance and consideration of a variety of factors relating to 'outcome' but there was often too much description rather than critical commentary in answers.

### Question 4

This was not a popular question. The question itself was challenging since its phrasing was not entirely clear and accessible. In this case candidates sensibly avoided any potential pitfalls by avoiding the task. G2 forms were critical of this question and it must be acknowledged that the task was not clearly enough articulated and accessible for candidates.

### Question 5

This was not a popular question though some answers on the principle of collective security and the achievements of (and barriers to), with regards to the UNO post-1945, were effective.

### Question 6

There were few responses to this question. Some answers, based upon the Spanish Civil War, tended to ignore the thrust of the question and produced pre-learned responses on either the origins, course or general effects of the war (sometimes all three). In this case students had presumably studied Spain's civil war and were determined to write about it despite the fact that the question was quite specific in terms of its focus on 'economic effects'.

## Topic 2

Of the six questions available in this topic area, question 8 on the Weimar Republic received most attention. Question 12 was addressed by some candidates but with very limited success.

**Question 8**

The emphasis in the question was on the Weimar Republic and its progress/problems up until its formal end in 1933. A few candidates tended to treat this as a rise to power of Hitler question rather than an examination of the extent to which such a deterministic statement about democracy in Germany up till 1933 was appropriate/valid.

There were some very sound responses which challenged the 'inevitalist' slant of the quote and pointed out not only the travails but also the achievements of the Republic. Consideration of the circumstances of the foundation of the Republic, the economic and political pressures which it faced (and why) were necessary to support effective answers.

**Question 12**

There were a few answers to this question which revealed that the phrase 'proportional representation' was not understood at all. Responses in these cases revolved around consideration of the US constitution and a confusing account of representation in the House of Representatives and the Senate: - inappropriate treatment and suggesting candidates had no grasp of the system of proportional representation despite it being specifically mentioned in the History Guide.

**Topic 3**

Of the six questions in this topic area question 18 was rare in terms of candidate choice.

**Question 13**

The two right-wing leaders chosen by most who attempted this question were Mussolini and Hitler. The better answers dealt with themes rather than end-on treatments. The question did ask about conditions, not methods; in some cases narratives of the rise of the single-party leader did not always distinguish between the two. A few candidates confused Right and Left and used examples which were invalid.

While some teachers do question the use of Left/Right terminology, the History Guide does specifically note these terms. Whether the classifications are any longer 'meaningful' or not is a matter that can be raised with students by teachers/instructors; however since the terms do appear in the Guide in this topic area, it can be expected that centres and candidates should be made aware of the nature and limitations of the application of such labels – whether in terms of ideological or methodological components.

**Question 14**

This was a popular question choice and candidates covered both Mao and Stalin. Successful responses identified the pressing problems facing each leader at the outset (both for the country and the regime/leader) and went on to present the policies adopted (social, economic, political) in order to address these problems. The most effective answers were able then to make a considered judgment as to the extent of success of such policies (and success for whom exactly).

**Question 15**

Relatively few responses to this question were seen in terms of coverage of Nasser, however Perón proved quite popular. Despite some criticism from teachers on G2 forms that the term 'political policies' was misleading, candidates attempting this question did not appear to have been disadvantaged. Responses usually covered a variety of policy areas in order to explain Perón's maintenance of power.

**Question 16**

The more effective responses defined what the candidate understood by 'totalitarian' at the outset and were then able to examine those areas of control (economic, social, religious, educational, media, political etc.) in relation to the impact they had upon the population of the selected state. Answers were based mostly on coverage of the regimes/states of Stalin, Mao, and Castro. At times some essays tended to be narrative/descriptive pieces of economic planning and in these cases the 'impact', though relevant, was not sufficiently developed in terms of examining the wider 'totalitarian' goals of the regime and the effect upon the 'lives of the citizens'.

**Question 17**

There was significant uptake in relation to this question on propaganda. For the most part the answers were quite well done but one problem noted was that some students ignored the regional requirement. Germany and the USSR belong to the same region.

**Question 18**

There were so few answers seen in relation to this question that it is difficult to make any meaningful comment on candidate performance.

**Topic 4**

There were relatively few answers seen relating to this topic area. Only questions 20 and 21 appeared to attract some attention from a few centres.

**Question 20**

As in the past, essays dealing with the role or contribution of Gandhi to the independence movement (or for that matter almost any question which requires coverage of the rise of 20<sup>th</sup> century Indian nationalism) tend to fall into two main categories. Answers tend to be either hagiographical narratives of the career of Gandhi which tend to ignore other factors which influenced the decline of imperialism in South Asia. Alternately answers are well constructed answers which seek to place Gandhi in a wider context of decolonization in the subcontinent, the political and economic decline of the metropolitan power and the role of other personalities in the independence movement. The former type of responses invariably show little critical awareness of the process of decolonization and the rise of (rival) nationalism(s) in the subcontinent.

**Question 21**

Candidates who had studied for Topic 5 (and possibly Prescribed Subject 3 for Paper One) were no doubt attracted to this question. Poland was by far the most popular choice of the two states on offer. For the most part answers were sound in terms of content and chronology, showing a grasp of the Soviet Union's changing attitude towards the satellite states from 1968, as well as the organization and results of the movements which successfully challenged Soviet control by the late 1980s.

**Topic 5****Question 25**

Questions on the origins of the Cold War are usually popular to answer. Candidates often appeared determined to produce a learned response on the origins of the Cold War regardless of what the specifics of the task were. The context of the Yalta Conference and the issues discussed there were often not well enough understood. It is surprising that so little was known by so many in relation to the Conference.

Indeed a significant proportion of responses decided to either ignore the conference, confuse it with Potsdam, or simply dismiss its importance out of hand. Largely it seemed as though this was because the conference did not fit in with the pre-planned response which usually consisted of a run through of events from 1917 to 1950/53 with scant acknowledgement of the need to provide evidence of the significance of Yalta (or its relative insignificance depending on whatever well supported argument was made).

The 'historiographical' type of response which has often dominated answers to the origins of the Cold War was thankfully less in evidence this session. Describing what 'orthodox', 'revisionist', 'post-revisionist' and 'realpolitiker' views are is not what constitutes an effective answer. The deployment of historical knowledge supplemented by historiography is much more acceptable. Candidates should bear in mind that historiography in the form of regurgitating a series of historians' views without anything else is not a recipe for success.

### **Question 26**

There was often little real understanding by candidates of what exactly 'peaceful coexistence' was. Some confused it with the later period of Détente and wrote accordingly. Relatively few were aware of the origins of the policy as enunciated by Khrushchev and how the policy was received in two countries. There were a few good responses which focused upon the USSR, USA, the PRC and the response of governments and leaders to the practice of peaceful coexistence which was seen by some as a Soviet ruse and by others as a sign of deviationism from the promotion of revolutionary socialism.

### **Question 27**

A very popular question (as questions that mention the events of 1962 in Cuba tend to be). The best responses avoided the narration of background causes dating back to the rise of Castro, the overthrow of Batista etc. and focused upon the issue of brinkmanship as articulated by Dulles. There were some very perceptive responses which examined the actions and attitudes of the statesmen involved in this episode. Some candidates claimed that other episodes could also be seen as examples of brinkmanship (Berlin in 1961 for example) but that these were dwarfed by the Missile Crisis which marked the 'most evident' display of such a policy.

### **Question 28**

This question was on the whole not well done. The mention of Vietnam 1964-1975 launched an avalanche of information about the course of the Vietnam War rather than focusing upon the role of the Vietnam War in the development of the Cold War. In those cases (quite rare) where candidates did focus upon the task there were some very effective answers linking the Détente process with the quagmire faced by Washington in South East Asia.

### **Question 29**

This was a fairly popular question since candidates had often studied 'reasons for the end of the Cold War' or 'reasons for the fall of the Soviet Union' – at times the knowledge base of 'events in Eastern European countries' was not terribly strong. Since this was a 'To what extent...?' question it was necessary, for awards in the higher levels, to deal with the significance/insignificance of these events rather than ignoring or dismissing them because they did not fit in with a pre-planned/learned response on the end of the Cold War.

### Question 30

There were few successful responses to this question. Most candidates who did choose this question wrote about the USA and wrote generally about McCarthyism or how school students were taught to 'duck and cover' in the event of a nuclear attack. Unfortunately the constant references to the building of nuclear shelters and the 'fear that pervaded the American population' during 1953-1964 were inadequately substantiated by reference to sound historical detail. Generalities abounded in the majority of responses to this question. A paucity of historical detail tended to characterize responses to this question.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

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

These recommendations remain as a guide for candidates to successfully address the demands of this particular paper. These suggestions should be shared between teachers of the course and with candidates.

Each year the recommendations concerning guidance for future candidates are remarkable 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 following 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 - 'peaceful coexistence', 'ideology', 'totalitarian', 'collective security', 'brinkmanship' 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.
- 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.

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.

## Higher and standard level paper two - timezone 2

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 4	5 - 9	10 - 12	13 - 16	17 - 21	22 - 25	26 - 40

### General comments

This was the second session of May examinations using the new curriculum and the pleasing performance of the candidates suggests that centres are becoming familiar with the new syllabus content. Topics 1, 3 and 5 continue to be the most popular and, as in previous exams, out of 30 questions on the paper there was a strong focus on a few that were answered by most candidates. On the whole, these were answered quite well, although a more detailed overview will be given in the section that deals with responses to individual questions.

There were over 413 responses from teachers on the level of difficulty and, of these, 76.8% (317) considered the paper to have been of an "appropriate" level of difficulty although 22.8% (94) considered it to have been "too difficult". Similarly, 49.4% (203) of respondents considered the paper to be a similar standard to last year, while 23.4% (96) thought it a little more difficult. Out of 416 who responded to the question on clarity of wording, 76.6% considered it to be "good" or "satisfactory". Although these statistics indicate a general satisfaction with the exam paper, there were a number of concerned teachers, some of whom contributed to threads on the OCC and several of whom made comments on the appropriate section of the G2 form. All of these comments were noted and discussed at some length by the senior examiners who attended the History Grade Award meeting. Indeed, given some of the issues raised by these teachers, there was some apprehension at the prospect of disappointing results for Paper 2, TZ2. This, however, proved not to be the case and indeed, at the top end, candidates performed better than on last year's exam.

On the G2 form, many teachers noted that there were no specific questions on the Spanish Civil War and the Chinese Civil War in Topic 1 this year. Although the new curriculum does take some getting used to, the IB History Guide (p.71) says there will always be 6 questions set on every Topic and, of these, three will use named examples taken from the material for detailed study, two will be open-ended questions that may refer to “different regions” and at least one will address social/economic/gender issues. In all cases, questions will be based upon the “themes” outlined in the Guide. Given its popularity as a chosen topic on previous exam papers, the Spanish civil war appears to be widely taught in centres that register for the Europe/Middle East region, but there is no guarantee that there will be a question on this war (or indeed any specific war) in every exam session. The same applies to the Chinese civil war, although many candidates did use this as an example for Topic 1, Question 3. Similarly, there was some criticism of Question 13 in Topic 3 where candidates were asked to use two right-wing leaders as examples. An open-ended question on Topic 3, however, may ask candidates for a combination of left/right-wing leaders and/or leaders from different regions and, for the most part, candidates who chose Question 13 were able to address the question using two appropriate examples.

Understandably, concern was expressed on the G2 forms about the wording of some of the questions and there was a slight adjustment of the 3–4 grade-boundary, as it was agreed this may have proved challenging for some candidates. Every effort is made to ensure rigorous question setting and editing so that candidates can clearly identify the task and the focus of all the questions. On the positive side, there were many comments that mentioned candidate satisfaction with the paper and this was reflected in the pleasing number of high grades that were awarded.

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

In some cases, candidates chose a little hastily and their knowledge could have been used more effectively to answer a different question. Examiners commented on a lack of depth in some answers and a tendency to stray away from the focus of the question as candidates preferred to remain in the “comfort zone” of a narrative answer. Selecting relevant material is important and, although many candidates demonstrate a good level of this skill, others are inclined to write all they know about a topic. In some specific cases cited by examiners, candidates wrote a narrative of Hitler’s domestic policies in answer to Topic 3, Question 15, for example and did not always write more than one or two lines on economic policies. Similarly, for Topic 5, Question 25, weaker answers fell back on an outline of the origins of the Cold War rather than a focused analysis of the reasons for and the extent of the impact of Potsdam on the development of the Cold War. Familiarity with past papers and practice at answering certain types of questions would help to address these difficulties.

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

The majority of candidates were able to select two questions, to answer each one with some relevant knowledge and to demonstrate their ability to structure an extended response in the required time limit. Increasingly, the majority of candidates focus on the question and attempt some linkage to it as they develop their arguments and better answers included good, accurate knowledge. Some answers were most impressive and demonstrated a high level of appropriate skills and knowledge. In such cases, candidates understood and addressed the demands of a question to a high degree of competency and used historiography judiciously.

It was clear that they had read beyond standard textbooks and were not simply regurgitating memorised responses. An encouraging number of candidates had planned their answers before starting to write, this helped them to remain focused on the task.

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

### Topic 1

#### Question 1

This was not a popular choice of question and, it must be said, a comparing/contrasting of the Falklands/Malvinas War with the Iran-Iraq War was not an easy task. Nevertheless, candidates who chose this question had some relevant knowledge and made some effort to address the causes and the results of both wars.

#### Question 2

This was a very popular choice of question that required candidates to address the role of nationalism as a cause of both world wars. To do so within the time limit required a strong focus on relevant analysis and the avoidance of a narrative of the general long- and short-term causes. In general, examiners regretted the rather weak understanding of “nationalism” and the tendency of candidates to skirt around this term rather than attempting to define it clearly before evaluating its contribution to the outbreak of both wars. A disappointing number of candidates were rather unsure of the role of Serbia believing it to have been a part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Better answers, however, were able to link unrest in the Balkans to nationalism and to explain clearly how this was viewed with trepidation in Vienna and Berlin. Attention was also paid to nationalism as both a cause and a result of colonial expansion and militarism. Similarly, better answers linked nationalism to the ideologies of both Hitler and Mussolini and to the militarism of Japan as a cause of the Second World War.

#### Question 3

This was not a particularly popular question, but candidates who did attempt it seemed quite familiar with the concept of guerrilla warfare. The most popular examples included the Vietnam War and the Chinese Civil War. These were quite appropriate and candidates had some knowledge of events, although a disappointingly low number were able to address both “reasons for” and “effectiveness” with good use of supporting evidence. On the whole, examiners concluded that this was not because of weak knowledge of the topic but, rather, a failure to read the question closely and to focus on its demands.

#### Question 4

Possibly, this was the most popular question on the paper with some strong linkage of “collective security” to the League of Nations and its subsequent failure to prevent another war of the magnitude of the First World War. Some candidates did get waylaid by the temptation to narrate the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and so did not manage their time well enough to take their arguments up to the outbreak of war in 1939. In general, many candidates provided a well supported analysis of the weaknesses of the League of Nations; mentioned not only the absence of the USA but outlined why this was a problem; discussed Manchuria and Abyssinia with some authority only to come to an abrupt halt in 1936. Candidates need to read the question very carefully and to make sure they meet its demands fully for a very good/excellent mark.

**Question 5**

A rather difficult question to attempt and it did not prove very popular. There were some interesting responses, however, and on the whole, candidates were able to discuss why peace treaties are not always signed at the end of a war. Popular choices were both World Wars, the Korean War and the Vietnam War.

**Question 6**

Not many responses were seen to this question. Candidates tended to discuss economic problems in general terms rather than using factual evidence to support specific arguments.

**Topic 2: Democratic states – challenges and responses**

Very few answers were seen to questions in this topic with most candidates searching for an opportunity to use their knowledge of the Weimar Republic and so attempting to answer either Question 9 or Question 12.

**Question 9**

Although Weimar would certainly have been an appropriate example to use, candidates who wrote about it tended to ignore the demands of the question. Most used only one example although the question specifically referred to “democratic states” in the plural. Also, too few candidates discussed whether or not economic problems really were the “greatest challenge”, choosing instead to describe the economic problems that plagued Weimar.

**Question 12**

As with Question 9, a few candidates in pursuit of Weimar chose this question and, as one examiner noted, “...appeared to have no knowledge or understanding of the issue of written and unwritten constitutions and therefore gained very poor marks.”

**Topic 3****Question 13**

This was a popular question and, for the most part, handled quite well by candidates using Hitler and Mussolini as examples of right wing leaders. Some also attempted Franco or Perón. There was a clear understanding of the demands of the question and many candidates had good knowledge of the rise to power of both leaders chosen.

**Question 14**

Mao was by far the most popular choice for this question and, although it was feared there might be some confusion among candidates as to whether or not they should discuss events prior to 1949, most understood the demands quite well and discussed problems that Mao faced when he came to power and attempted some discussion of policies such as land reform, the 3 and 5 antis, the Hundred Flowers Campaign and the Great Leap Forward. It was encouraging to see so many answers use terminology from the question and referring to “problems”, “policies” and “success” (or failure) in their response. The best answers demonstrated good knowledge and a strong chronological context.

**Question 15**

This was a very popular question with most candidates discussing Hitler, although a fair number chose Castro. It was very pleasing to see better knowledge demonstrated of Castro's policies with very few candidates ending abruptly after the Cuban Missile Crisis, as had so often been the case in the past. Most candidates were able to discuss his economic policies with some use of supporting evidence and to attempt an evaluation of "to what extent" by referring to propaganda, a cult of personality and terror as other mechanisms for staying in power. Rather surprisingly, candidates who chose to answer on Hitler did not, for the most part, know a great deal about his economic policies. Too often, there were rather vague references to unemployment and rearmament and, only rarely, a good understanding demonstrated of the New Plan and the Four Year Plan and their success/failure.

There were some excellent answers that discussed economic policies with some authority before going on to address other factors but too many answers hastily dismissed economic policies and proceeded to discuss terror and propaganda.

**Question 16**

Hitler was by far the most popular choice of a right wing leader for this question and most candidates did attempt a definition of totalitarianism before discussing the impact it had on the lives of ordinary people. Answers ranged from a discussion of the role of women to the persecution of the German Jews and most candidates demonstrated some understanding of the demands of the question, although weaker answers lost focus and resorted to a description of life in Nazi Germany.

**Questions 17 and 18**

Neither of these questions was answered particularly well with candidates making rather sweeping, mostly unsupported, generalisations. The exceptions were some answers to Question 18, where candidates had good knowledge of the policies of leaders such as Hitler and Mao and how these affected women.

**Topic 4**

Not many answers were seen to this topic with the exception of Question 21 and Question 22.

**Question 21**

There were a few excellent assessments of the role of Ho Chi Minh in the struggle for independence in Vietnam and the best answers demonstrated a very good understanding of the demands of the question.

**Question 22**

Again, where this question was chosen, candidates demonstrated a good knowledge of the countries concerned and wrote well structured comparative responses.

**Topic 5****Question 25**

Not too surprisingly, this was among the most popular questions on the exam paper as candidates who select from this topic are usually well versed in the origins of the Cold War. Rather disappointingly, however, knowledge of the Potsdam Conference was limited and few candidates were confident in their handling of the question.

Many discussed Yalta and Potsdam as if they were one and the same and only a few were able to link later events back to terms agreed to in July 1945. Better answers did refer to the clash of personalities and to Truman's withholding of information about the newly tested 'A' bomb. Some candidates also considered the growing tension over Poland and the Red Army occupation of Central and Eastern Europe. It was a pity that more candidates did not make some reference to the establishment of the Allied Control Council, as this could have been linked very effectively to later quarrels over the administration of both Germany and, more specifically, Berlin. While it was acceptable, and indeed, expected that candidates refer to other factors that led to the development of the Cold War, there had to be some focused discussion of Potsdam for higher mark bands to be reached.

Candidates appear to be prepared for a question on the origins of the Cold War but should, perhaps, be dissuaded from writing a generic answer outlining events from 1917 to 1949 and reciting the three main schools of historiography without explicit linkage to the question being answered.

### **Question 28**

Although not very popular, some responses were seen to this question. For the most part, candidates were inclined to describe the Vietnam War and only a few linked their arguments to the development of the Cold War.

### **Question 29**

This question was quite popular with candidates who wrote mostly about the policies of the USSR under Gorbachev. Some references were made to the Solidarity movement and to the Velvet Revolution, but with only limited analysis.

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

As mentioned earlier, the level of knowledge demonstrated by candidates this May session was, on the whole, quite good. Most attempted to support their arguments with factual knowledge and to include some analysis. Also, most of the essay answers were structured either thematically or chronologically, although in most cases a thematic approach worked best. Where a comparative response was indicated in the question, candidates almost always avoided an end-on approach.

There is room for improvement, however, and undoubtedly, as teachers become more familiar with the demands of the new (now, less new) curriculum, candidates will approach the exam with increased confidence. It was encouraging, this session, to see a few more answers that drew from the less familiar wars or names listed in the material for detailed study, indicating a broadening of the syllabus in many centres. Opportunities to answer questions by using more standard material were still present, however.

Historiography was still used rather indiscriminately. Although it is important that candidates be aware of different interpretations and to have some knowledge of historians working in the field of twentieth century history, this is no substitute for a good, well-argued essay response based upon good knowledge, a sound grasp of what the question requires and accurate chronology. Without these, a recounting of historiography is little more than an exercise in rote learning. Candidates may also be assured that it is not required, in an exam essay, to reference each fact with the name of a historian. Similarly, a few apt quotations used to support arguments can work very well indeed but they are not a pre-requisite of a good essay and candidates should not feel compelled to use all the quotations they have learned.

Candidates need plenty of practice with past papers so that they become familiar with the way questions are presented and with the kind of phrasing that may be used. Even pre-2010 papers may be used as long as the differences are pointed out (such as there now being 5 topics rather than 6). This should enable candidates to approach the exam with confidence and to take their time to find the questions that would suit them best rather than looking for certain wars or leaders and becoming stressed when these may not be specifically named.

Planning is also important and candidates could be encouraged to use their considerable knowledge more effectively but taking a little time to think about what the question is actually asking. This was certainly the case on this exam paper with Topic 5, Question 25, as many candidates could have used their knowledge of the period 1945–49 (or variations on this) to make explicit links to the Potsdam Conference. Instead, rather too many forged ahead recalling, perhaps, a more familiar question and so losing focus on the particular demands of this question.

The command term, “to what extent” is commonly used in this exam paper, but some candidates are inclined to interpret this as an opportunity to discuss areas of the topic that they would have preferred to see mentioned. Candidates should be discouraged from assuming that as long as they briefly mention “economic policies” or “nationalism”, they can then move on to discussing the other factors that they may know more about. Specifically, on this exam paper in Topic 1, Question 2, candidates could not expect a high mark for having briefly mentioned “nationalism” and then discussing other factors. By all means, they could state that nationalism was not important as a contributing factor to the outbreak of the First and Second World War but this argument had to be developed rather than simply dismissed in a sentence or two. For example, candidates could have defined nationalism, analysed how it may have been a contributing factor and only then discussed other factors that may or may not have been more significant.

The Paper 2, TZ2 results for the May 2011 exam session reflect an improvement in candidate performance, as seen in the increased number of very good/excellent scripts.

## Higher level paper three - Africa

### Component grade boundaries

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

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

Answers varied in quality and very few candidates answered questions on the colonial period. Answers to questions on Africa since independence tended to be generalized.

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

Questions on specific countries and rulers e.g. question 1, were better answered than more open ended thematic questions.

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

### Question 1

Questions on Ethiopian history are generally popular and well answered. The answers were generally well focused on reunification and avoided lengthy irrelevant discussion of modernization. There was some relevant discussion of foreign policy. There was general agreement that Yohannes learnt from Tewodros' failure and was more successful because his aims were more limited and realistic and he avoided making enemies. Candidates could have taken a more sympathetic view of Tewodros than they did by pointing out how his vision of a united Ethiopia inspired his successors.

### Question 4

Answers to this question tended to lack depth and detail though many were aware that there was much debate about the causes of the Mfecane. Shaka's role in it has been played down in recent years. He was only one of many great Nguni and Sotho leaders who turned age sets into powerful military forces which were used to conquer neighbouring communities and create larger states. But his wars, actions and the organization of his state did help to make the Mfecane, a period of prolonged warfare and forced migration, more intense.

### Question 5

Questions on the partition of Africa by European powers are always popular and this was no exception. Some good candidates challenged the question and argued that the scramble had already begun. The main emphasis should be on Egypt but this is a 'to what extent' question and requires some consideration of other factors. The argument of Robinson and Gallagher in 'Africa and the Victorians' that the occupation of Egypt by Britain began the scramble is now regarded as an overstatement. But it did lead to further annexation in Africa.

The immediate result was the ratification of the De Brazza Makoko treaty and the establishment of a French colony in the Congo. Disputes over the Congo led to the Berlin West Africa Conference (1884–1885) which gave great impetus to the European annexation of Africa. Some candidates wrote much too briefly about Egypt and wrote very generally about factors contributing to the partition.

### Question 6

This was by far the most popular question but a worrying number of answers did not understand what humanitarian factors might be or defined them incorrectly. Balanced answers were not expected as economic factors were certainly more important. This is a 'to what extent' question and one set of factors alone cannot explain such a complex phenomenon. Different combinations of factors were at work in different parts of Africa including European national rivalry and strategic considerations. There were questionable assertions in the discussion of economic factors. In the short term, for example, the opportunities for marketing industrial goods in Africa were slight. A few candidates mentioned the theory of surplus capital, now discredited. There was insufficient link between, for example, the demand for raw materials or the work of missionary societies and governments feeling the need to have colonies in Africa rather than the previous mostly informal empire.



**Question 15**

The answers were all on West Africa. Several went back many centuries before the nineteenth. Valid general points were made but many answers lacked specific knowledge of Samori Toure and of the Jihads of Umar and Dan Fodio. Answers were better on the reasons for than on the extent of the spread of Islam which was often overlooked.

**Question 19**

Most answers had some relevant, if rather basic, knowledge of regional rivalry but few were aware of the process by which the independence of Nigeria was achieved. This is another 'to what extent' question, and it could be argued that regional rivalry did not considerably delay the achievement of independence in Nigeria in 1960, only 3 years after Ghana and earlier than any British colony or protectorate in east, central and southern Africa. It was however very difficult to find a post colonial structure that would satisfy the ambitions of rival politicians in Nigeria. A compromise was eventually reached that gave considerable power to the prime minister of the three regions and limited power to the federal government.

**Question 20**

This is a difficult question but was surprisingly popular. The quality of answers varied considerably. There were some incorrect definitions and inappropriate examples. There were also some suitable examples, especially of the role the French government continued to play in the politics of their former colonies in west and central Africa.

**Question 23**

This quite popular question had some quite good answers. The League was only as strong as the determination of its leading members to stand up to aggression and Abyssinia showed that determination was sadly lacking. Some answers were not well focused and discussed generally some of the League's weaknesses. A strong case could be made that the Abyssinian crisis was indeed a death blow for the League. In contrast to the earlier Manchurian crisis, this was an act of blatant aggression.

It did not take Britain or France by surprise and they could have stopped it with comprehensive sanctions and by closing the Suez Canal to Italian troopships. Instead they chose to appease Mussolini in the vain hope that he would remain their ally against Hitler.

**Question 24**

The quality of the answers largely depended on the countries chosen. Egypt, the Congo and Angola were popular and suitable choices. But some candidates chose other countries where the impact of the Cold War was less obvious. One very damaging aspect of the Cold War, which is often given little attention, was the indifference of Western government to official corruption and human rights abuses in Africa, as long as African governments were on the right side. This was discussed by some candidates in connection with Mobutu's rule over Congo/Zaire.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

It is much better to teach in depth than in breadth. Two questions are set on each of the twelve topics so it would be possible to teach only two topics. Three should be the maximum but it is essential that every sub-section of a topic or bullet point be studied in equal depth. To be sure that candidates have acquired knowledge in depth, they should be given regular factual tests and have regular practice in writing timed essays (50 minutes each) under exam conditions. Candidates should answer question on topics they have been taught. If they answer questions on topics since independence they should have specific relevant knowledge of events in two or three countries.

The most popular topic is still the European annexation of Africa, which is very well covered in such books as Tidy and Leeming, 1840-1914, Vol. 2, but all aspects must be covered.

Candidates must be reminded that quotations do not have to be agreed with and they can score highly if they challenge the assumptions of the quoted statements with well supported arguments.

There are always multiple questions on the paper 3 which ask candidates to focus on more than one factors (for example “to what extent...” or “compare and contrast...” questions). The main focus should be on the key words in the question but there should be enough discussion of other factors to show that complex historical phenomena can rarely be explained by a single causal factor.

Candidates should be shown some model answers so that they are fully aware of the difference between explicitly analytical answers and those that are mostly narrative or descriptive with largely implicit analysis.

Teachers should keep as many past markschemes as possible. Those are not prescriptive but they are quite lengthy and clearly indicate the key areas to focus on.

## Higher level paper three - Americas

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 5	6 - 11	12 - 18	19 - 24	25 - 30	31 - 36	37 - 60

### General comments

This was the second year for implementation of the new History syllabus as stipulated in the History Guide. The G2 responses indicated that 82% regarded the exam as appropriate in difficulty. 17% of the respondents regarded the exam as too difficult, with 24% confirming that it was a little more difficult than the M10 exam. The most commonly cited general complaint was that some questions were too specific or narrow. Questions 1, 3, 21, 22, 23 and 24 were the questions most criticized. Some were regarded as ambiguous, others as too contemporary and still others as lacking a specific time frame. Questions 1, 9, 10, 11, 13, 19, 21 and 24 appeared to be the most popular, but many examiners regarded the spectrum of candidate's choices as wider than in previous years.

A number of G2 responses regarded the exam as lacking sufficient questions on Latin America; nonetheless, 9 questions did allow for a Latin American response. In summation, the vast majority thought the exam to be a fair test of candidate's knowledge, but felt there was potential for improvement through fewer narrowly focused questions, more clearly specified time frames, and wording that did a better job of conveying the question's demands to the candidate.

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

There were few apparent weaknesses as to knowledge within a specific geographic or chronological portion of the History of the Americas. This was reflected by the fact that nearly every question produced a broad spectrum as to the quality of response. The most obvious weaknesses were often seen in how the candidates of particular programs misunderstood the requirements of a question or questions. The tendency to respond with descriptive or narrative accounts, rather than to meet the demands of the question, remains the greatest challenge. Other limitations were reflected by the following approaches: prepared answers to a different question than the one posed; lack of understanding that answers are confined to the Region of the Americas; failure to apply analytical techniques, when required to 'analyse' or 'examine'; failure to address 'to what extent'; confusion as to specified parameters (i.e. foreign/domestic, etc.) and the frequency of unsubstantiated generalizations. The evaluation of the individual questions will provide additional insight into the strengths and weaknesses candidates displayed. The last section of this report will offer suggestions as to how these limitations may be addressed. Also, the syllabus choices of a program, quality of instruction and examination skill level all have tremendous potential to positively influence the candidate's performance.

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

A significant number of examiners reported that candidates demonstrated the capacity to properly structure an essay, including an opening paragraph that provided historical context and demonstrated an understanding of the question. Conclusions which provide synthesis for the arguments in the body of the essay were also widely noted. Awareness of historical processes – cause and effect; comparison and contrast – were also regarded as more prevalent. Historical knowledge of the Mexican Revolution as well as the administrations of Perón, Vargas and Castro was praised. Also, knowledge of the history of the Cold War seems to have expanded appreciably.

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

### Question 1

The question as to foreign aid and independence movements was popular and the majority of candidates chose to apply the assistance of the French to the British North American colonies. The Cuban independence movement and the intervention of the US was also a frequent example. Knowledge of French aid was generally fragmentary. In respect to any of the choices, candidates seldom provided much detail or analysed the 'significance' of foreign aid. There were numerous choices that provided limited potential (due to little foreign assistance), or which were inappropriate for a variety of reasons.

These included, but were not limited to: the Mexican Revolution (not an independence movement), the Southern Confederacy (a civil war and independence not achieved), Vietnam (outside the Region). Some critics thought the question should have provided a time frame, but others liked the breadth of options the question offered.

### **Question 2**

The reasons for and results of the Monroe Doctrine was frequently chosen and yielded fairly strong results. Knowledge of “reasons for” was usually the stronger element. Surprisingly, many candidates jumped from the 1820s to the late 20<sup>th</sup> century for examples of results. Development of the 1880s through to 1920 was not as thorough as might have been appropriate.

### **Question 3**

The question regarding issues that led to changes in the US political system was not frequently chosen. Unfortunately, the question was almost always answered in respect to the shift from the Articles of Confederation to the Federal Constitution. While the issues that led to constitutional change had some relevance to the arguments between Federalists and Jeffersonian Republicans, the potential for reward was quite low. Many thought the wording of the question to be too obscure. Perhaps an insertion of ‘during the Washington administration’ would have been an appropriate clue. In retrospect, the question was not too narrow, but the phrasing was inadequate. Also a problem was that many candidates may have been prepared to compare the two constitutional periods, but were confused as to the exact time frame of the constitutional transition.

### **Question 4**

The significance of the 1837 rebellions in Canada was seldom attempted.

### **Question 5**

Many candidates chose to compare and contrast Lincoln and Davis, but with marginal success. The common approach was to compare/contrast the strengths and weaknesses of the Union and Confederacy. In particular, wartime leadership was not the emphasis. The question provides an excellent example of the tendency to answer a different question to the one posed and thus not meet the demands of the question.

### **Question 6**

One of the most selected questions was that of the Gettysburg ‘turning point’. Many of the stronger candidates challenged the premise, an approach which had excellent potential. However, this approach still required the assessment of the impact of the Gettysburg battle. Weaker essays merely provided a narrative of the Civil War.

### **Question 7**

Few candidates assessed the foreign and domestic policies of Wilfrid Laurier.

### **Question 8**

A significant number of essays were produced on the Harlem Renaissance, but with mediocre results. The ability to describe the era was generally capable. However, examination of the origins or impact was either fragmentary or ignored.

**Question 9**

Explanation as to the reasons for United States' neutrality (1914–17) was a very popular choice and produced a good portion of strong essays. Better candidates often challenged the premise of US neutrality with some success or approached the question with good breadth by examining such matters as Wilson's personal philosophy; US public opinion; ethnic considerations; domestic reform concerns; economic considerations; etc.

**Question 10**

Analysis of the impact of The First World War was most frequently attempted in terms of the impact on the US. Most often, the candidates did not directly or thoroughly address the impact on 'society'. There was a tendency to focus on foreign policy issues relative to the Treaty of Versailles and League of Nations. Quite a few essays described the 1920's social history, but with little attempt to develop a cause-effect relationship to World War One. Additionally, many candidates, without proper evidence, linked the war to the cause of the Great Depression. There were an unusually large number of responses that were outside the Region of the Americas. In retrospect, many candidates needed a more clearly defined understanding as to, 'impact on society', in order to satisfy the demands of the question.

**Question 11**

Comparison and contrast of Madero and Carranza was frequently selected by candidates. Weaker essays provided a narrative of the Mexican Revolution which, at best, implied the aims of the two leaders. However, there were many essays which demonstrated considerable knowledge.

It was clear from this group of essays that many candidates were: 1) prepared to write on the chronology of the revolution, but unprepared to assess aims, and 2) unable to properly structure an essay that calls for comparison and contrast.

**Question 12**

Those who assessed the success or failure of Calles' presidency were generally quite knowledgeable.

**Question 13**

Whether F. Roosevelt's greatest achievement was to make a more financially secure United States was perhaps the most frequently answered question. It posed several problems for candidates. First, was the need to directly address the premise of 'greatest achievement'. Second was the need to define 'financial security'. Third was the demand to assess the 'extent' of success. There was excellent potential to challenge the premise, but this still required assessment of the degree to which financial security was advanced. For instance, to assert that FDR's greatest achievement was in the leadership of the US during the Second World War could not be successful unless the impact of his depression-era policies was also evaluated. Weaker essays simply described various New Deal programs without analyzing the extent to which they contributed to financial security (either in the short-term or long-term). Not surprisingly, some candidates focused much of their attention on current US economic conditions as a means of assessing Roosevelt's degree of success.

**Question 14**

Analysis of the response to the Great Depression in Latin America generally focused on the countries of Argentina, Brazil and Chile. Responses were quite often sound, with considerable detail. Those who chose to focus on Cuba displayed much more limited knowledge.

**Question 15**

Comparison and contrast of the treatment of Japanese-Americans in the US and Canada during the Second World War was infrequently chosen and did not produce many essays that exhibited good depth or which provided appropriately structured comparison and contrast.

**Question 16**

Analysis of the economic effect of the Second World War was almost evenly divided between Canada and several Latin American nations. The depth of knowledge was generally adequate to good. The most common Latin American choices were Argentina and Brazil.

**Question 17**

Examination of the domestic policies of one Canadian or Latin American leader (1945–79) was almost exclusively limited to Castro, Perón and Vargas. Those who examined Castro and Perón produced some essays of very good quality, exhibiting both depth and breadth of content. Essays on Vargas were more problematic, perhaps due to some confusion as to the policies of the two different periods of Vargas' rule.

**Question 18**

The extent of Truman's domestic policy success was chosen with some frequency. There were an unfortunately large number of instances in which candidates evaluated Truman's foreign policy or confused Truman's era that of FDR or Eisenhower. Some candidates were able to effectively incorporate the dominance of Cold War issues into an explanation of Truman's rather limited domestic policy success.

**Question 19**

Evaluation of foreign policy change during Eisenhower's administration was a rather popular question and produced some of the highest quality responses on the exam. In some respects, candidates had difficulty dealing with the broad geographic base of Eisenhower's foreign policy (Latin America, Europe, Middle East, S.E. Asia, etc.). An additional challenge was to provide an adequate context from the Truman era without allowing that content to become a dominant narrative. The requirement to assess 'change' rather than just relate the events of the era was not always achieved.

**Question 20**

Whether Kennedy's Alliance for Progress was a 'turning point' in US–Latin American relations produced more essays which challenged the construct than those which supported the idea. Weaker responses limited their consideration to Cuban–American relations as the means of evaluating whether there was a 'turning point'. Perhaps this reflected a tendency of some programs and candidates to interpret Latin America only from the perspective of their knowledge of Cuba. Stronger responses defined the Alliance for Progress and assessed the intent as well as the effect throughout the region into the 1970s and beyond.

**Question 21**

The aims and impact of the Black Panthers was chosen with some frequency, but produced few strong essays. Content was often simplistic with generalizations as to the 'violence' of the organization. There were quite a few that attempted to inject Dr. King and Malcolm X into the essay, but with both factual and analytical errors. It was obvious that many candidates were prepared to write on Civil Rights aspects of the 1960s, but possessed only a rudimentary knowledge of the Black Panthers.

**Question 22**

Analysis of the reasons for Native American activism after the 1960s was not chosen frequently, but did produce a significant number of essays in which African American historical examples were substituted for Native Americans.

**Question 23**

The successes and failures of Clinton's presidency was not a common choice, but did produce a wide range of quality in terms of the responses. There was generally good balance as to the examples of success and failure with examples chosen from both foreign and domestic policy aspects. There did not seem to be an abnormal concentration on the scandals of the era. There were some G2 comments indicating the opinion that the question was too contemporary.

**Question 24**

Examination of the positive and negative effects of the internet on society in one country was a quite popular question and one which provoked considerable controversy. There were many criticisms of the question as one which did not require historical knowledge, but which candidates could answer based on popular culture knowledge alone. There were certainly some instances in which weaker candidates, based on their other essays, produced much more detailed and knowledgeable results on this topic. A separate issue was the fact that the question did not state the exclusion of content from the post-2001 period, however this is a clear prohibition of the History syllabus and it was expected that this would be known to candidates. Examiners also expressed considerable frustration in their attempts to apply the marking guidelines to this question.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers need to provide more training for candidates by reviewing past exams and discussing the various types of 'command words and phrases' that are typically applied. This effort could well be incorporated into daily lesson plans in terms of classroom discussion as well as implemented into the tests or evaluation procedures used throughout the year. In particular, skills such as 'comparison and contrast', 'assess the extent', 'analyse the issues', 'how significant', etc. are ones that will be of great benefit. In this regard, it is helpful for students to have timed essay exams within the curriculum, as opposed to research essays, so that the experience of making essay choices and interpreting demands can lead to the development of more test-taking skill and sophistication.

It is essential that teachers and programs place more emphasis upon understanding the new History syllabus and the choice of three sections to cover in detail. In this respect, it is also helpful to review the markband descriptors so that students will be more aware of incorporating the required elements into their essays.

Candidates rarely benefit from practice of questions perceived as commonly set from previous versions of the exam. If this type of preparation is perceived as useful within a program, there should also be appropriate caution as to the danger of not responding to the question posed. As a corollary to this point, candidates should also be reminded of the particular areas of their curriculum where depth has been achieved and which would thus yield the best choices for questions on the exam.

Candidate need to be reminded as to what constitutes the 'Region of the Americas' so that few, if any, candidates apply examples (i.e. nations in Europe, Asia, etc.) that have no potential for relevance. Emphasis should be placed on the exclusion of historical events from the past ten years as lacking relevance to the exam. Additionally, candidates need to be instructed as to the difference between independence movements and civil wars.

## Higher level paper three – Asia and Oceania

### Component grade boundaries

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

### General comments

For this session number of centres that studied this option was 69 and from this group there were 31 G2 responses. The majority, 77%, of those who responded thought that the level of difficulty of the paper was appropriate whilst 23% felt that it was too difficult. Over half the respondents, 55% felt that the paper was of a similar standard to last year's whereas 33% felt that it was more difficult. The majority, 97%, felt that the clarity of the wording was satisfactory or good and 94% felt the presentation was satisfactory or good. Many of the written comments indicated that the respondents were pleased with the balance of the questions and the coverage of the syllabus.

The examination paper is set to comply with the structure of the course which is outlined the (*History Guide (First examinations 2010)*) and therefore the G2 form is not the place for complaints about this structure. Any complaints and suggestions of this nature should be directed to the curriculum review.

Some of the comments in the G2s, however, indicated that a few 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 in the syllabus and there will be two questions per section on the examination. This means that there will only ever be a maximum of four or five 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 the Self-Strengthening Movement in China or Jiang Jieshi's government or the Taisho period in Japan 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. One G2 form complained about the lack of dedicated questions on Japan because the centre had "consistently chosen to teach 100 years of Japanese history".



The 100 year rule is no longer a requirement of the syllabus! 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. There were also a number of complaints about the comparison between China and Japan in question 3, but the thematic nature of section 2 makes a comparison quite within the scope of the syllabus. Similarly, sections 3, 4, 5, 8 and 9 all could have comparison questions set on their content in the future.

Teachers and students need to understand that the pattern of the questions in the examination paper is 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: for example using China in questions 2, 10 and 18, which focussed on Southeast Asia and related to sections 1, 5 and 9 respectively. This could also have helped candidates to resolve any uncertainty with regard to question 3. Question 3 was clearly meant for section 2 and later on question 8 was for section 4. Question 8 was about the Meiji Restoration and therefore question 3 would not cover the same topic. Questions 21, 22, 23 and 24 are not general or generic questions and students should avoid them unless they have studied sections 11 and 12 or developed a particular case study with reference to these sections. Some candidates chose to rehash material that they had used for question 14 in question 22. This was not acceptable because question 22 required a response that went beyond the scope of the immediate post-war period in Japan.

The most serious issue is that many candidates do not know the terminology for the centuries or their geography. So many candidates needlessly lost marks because they wrote about the wrong centuries for question 2. For questions 2, 5, 10 and 18 many candidates did not understand the geographic areas of South or Southeast Asia. The geographic areas must be impressed upon the candidates:

South Asia – India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh;

East Asia – China, Japan, Korea;

Southeast Asia – Burma, Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, the Philippines, Indonesia, East Timor;

Oceania – Australia, New Zealand, the Pacific Islands.

There was a wider spread in the choice of questions answered than in previous sessions. Most centres seemed to concentrate on India and/or China and/or Japan, but it was pleasing to note that there were some sound responses on other countries such as Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Korea, Malaysia and Indonesia. The quality of the responses was equally balanced across the countries and also between the nineteenth and twentieth century. There were a 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 students.

Candidates should avoid using idiosyncratic abbreviations such as SSM (Self-Strengthening Movement); YSK (for Yuan Shikai); SYS (Sun Yatsen); LON (League of Nations); CKS (Chiang Kaishek); EIC (East India Company); CCW (Chinese Civil War); LM (Long March); UL (United League); SEA (Southeast Asia) 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 4, 7, 8, 12, 14, 19 and 20.
- 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 “struggle for independence” (Q5); “revolutionary activities” (Q7); “colonial powers” (Q10); “destiny” (Q12); “authoritarian rule” (Q17); “security and unity” (Q19); “successful economic growth” (Q22); and “education” and “social and economic development” (Q23) 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 Southeast Asia and consequently some candidates a lost significant number of marks due to this mistake. This applied to questions 2, 5, 10 and 18.
- Some candidates did not seem to understand the names of the centuries, for example late eighteenth century means late 1700s and mid nineteenth century means mid 1800s. Consequently some candidates a lost significant number of marks due to this mistake. This applied to questions 1 and 2.
- Some candidates did not understand the difference between colonialism, imperialism and trade concessions.
- Other candidates did not take enough care when reading the questions: some wrote about the First World War instead “the Second World War” in questions 10 and 18. These are costly mistakes.
- Some candidates spent too on long background information in their responses particularly in questions 4, 7, 8, 12, 19 and 20.
- Many candidates referred to historians by name but in a forced and unnatural manner. Some just referred to school textbook authors. Most of the time historians’ opinions were not integrated within a flowing argument or in a discussion of the historiography relating to the topic.
- Many of the candidates who answered question 3 struggled to develop a compare and contrast format.

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

- Many candidates wrote introductions that were clearly focussed on the question.
- 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.

- There were not as many responses that tried to adapt a set piece as in previous years.
- There some very good responses for question 10 where the candidates used Malaysia and Indonesia to illustrate the differences in the impact of Japanese expansion.
- The best responses on the Meiji Restoration (Q8); Yuan Shikai (Q11); the Long March (Q12); the US Occupation of Japan (Q14); Mao's foreign policy (Q19); and Deng Xiaoping's economic developments (Q20) 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 2

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. A small group of candidates used China and thus automatically lost a significant number of marks. China was not appropriate because it is not in Southeast Asia and also because it was not colonised by a European state. It seems that these candidates had not specifically studied section 1 in the syllabus.

### Question 3

This question was chosen by quite a number of candidates, but some struggled with its breadth. Many candidates wrote separate narratives about each country. Others misunderstood the question and ignored the timeframe given and they used it as an opportunity to compare and contrast the Self-Strengthening Movement and the Meiji reforms. It appeared that these candidates may not have specifically studied section 2 in the syllabus. The best responses were from candidates who did address the question in the given timeframe and who developed an analytical compare and contrast framework covering such issues as attitude to foreigners, power of the central government, trade, treaties, Western actions and internal issues.

### Question 4

This was a popular question and one that many candidates answered very well with clear analysis of the reasons why the Qing dynasty succeeded in suppressing the Taiping Rebellion. They looked at both the strengths of the Qing as well as the failures of the Taipings. Weaker candidates tended to spend time discussing the causes and concentrated mainly on the failures of the Taipings and thus appeared to be adapting a set piece.

### Question 5

Only a few candidates answered this question and nearly all misread the timeframe or misunderstood the geographic areas and erroneously used China and Japan. It appeared that these candidates may not have specifically studied section 3 in the syllabus.

**Question 7**

This was a popular question and more candidates displayed greater knowledge about Sun Yixian's activities than in previous years. Weaker candidates, however, did not know much about Sun Yixian beyond his Three Principles of the People ideology. They had very little understanding of the revolutionary movement in China in the period 1902–1911 and the numerous attempts by the Tongmenghui (Revolutionary Alliance League) to overthrow the Qing government. They just discussed the long-term causes of the 1911 Revolution and then mentioned that it started by accident. Responses that did not really integrate Sun Yixian's ideas and activities into this discussion could not score highly.

**Question 8**

This was a very popular question and generally it was done well. Weaker candidates struggled with the concept of "national goal" and did not understand the significance of the 1890 date.

**Question 9**

A small number of candidates chose this question, but it was not done particularly well. Many candidates only knew superficial details about Nehru and concentrated more on Gandhi and therefore did not score highly.

**Question 10**

Generally, the candidates who chose to do this question wrote detailed and analytical responses. To score highly candidates needed to discuss more than one country and there were some very good responses that discussed both Malaysia and Indonesia. Some did not understand the geographic term and used China as an example.

**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 Yuan Shikai and his government. Most responses were descriptive rather than analytical; concentrated on the 'ways'; and did not discuss 'consequences'. The best responses included comprehensive relevant details, addressed the both parts of the question and focussed on the extent to which Yuan Shikai betrayed the Republic.

**Question 12**

This was the most popular question on the paper: some candidates wrote excellent responses because they knew a great many details about the Long March and they were able to analyse these experiences in the context of their far reaching effects on China's future. They were able to discuss events, ideology, Mao's leadership, propaganda and the impact on subsequent experiences of the CCP. Some candidates chose to discuss the other events such as the 1911 Revolution and the May 4<sup>th</sup> Movement (1919) that they considered "changed the destiny of China", but this approach did not work convincingly because unless the Long March was analysed in detail this discussion of other factors was irrelevant.

**Question 13**

A few responses, but they were largely descriptive of events rather than analytical. Many candidates got bogged down in background material about the Meiji military reforms. Very few were able to discuss the impact of the Japanese victories in the Sino-Japanese War (1894–5) and the Russo-Japanese War (1904–5) and the beginning of Japanese expansion. The idea of Japan being a threat to the Western powers was often dismissed and little understanding of the significance of the 1922 date was shown.

**Question 14**

This was quite a popular question and generally it was done well. The better candidates wrote detailed and analytical responses about the US Occupation and they also identified the shift in policies due to the Korean War.

**Question 17**

Only a few responses, but generally candidates wrote relevant responses. Some tended to be narrative and struggled to analyse the reasons why authoritarian rule prevailed.

**Question 18**

Over half the responses to this question used a country not in Southeast Asia such as China, Korea, India or Pakistan. This was a very costly mistake. Most of the candidates who used an appropriate country wrote detailed and analytical essays. There were some fine responses on Malaysia, Vietnam and Indonesia

**Question 19**

This was quite a popular choice: the responses were divided into those who were able to discuss Mao's foreign policy and those who tried to adapt a set piece on Mao's China. The candidates who wrote about foreign policy still found it hard to address the issue of 'security and unity of China'. Most tended to be fairly descriptive of Sino-Soviet and Sino-US relations. Only the better candidates were able to discuss role in the region as a whole. Those candidates who were vague about foreign affairs and tried to turn the question around to discuss domestic issues did not score highly.

**Question 20**

This was a very popular question. Many candidates wrote well structured responses which discussed the economic developments during Deng's rule and were able to evaluate the degrees of success of Deng's policies. Weaker candidates tended to be descriptive about only a few aspects of Deng's economic reforms or they went beyond the economic to discuss the issues concerning the democracy movement. Some candidates appeared to be adapting a set piece which compared and contrasted the policies of Mao and Deng and therefore included material that was irrelevant to this question.

**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.

Some candidates ignored the wording in the questions and discussed China. Most discussed Japan and the US Occupation whilst a few did South Korea until the 1960s. This indicates that these candidates may not have specifically studied section 11 in the syllabus, but were just using material from other sections. The question required a reasonable coverage of a long time span. Some candidates just rehashed material they had used in question 14.

### Question 23

Candidates failed to define the terms in the question and were too superficial. Most who answered this question used it as a way of writing a set piece on Mao Zedong's domestic policies. The question required a reasonable coverage of the fifty year time span indicated.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Teachers should make sure that their students 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.
- Teachers should make sure that their students 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 should encourage their better students to include quite a lot of precise evidence in their responses. Helping candidates to learn this level of detail can be done by getting students 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 Internal Investigation also helps students to gain in-depth knowledge.
- Similarly, the better students should also be encouraged to show evidence of wide reading and an understanding of historiography, particularly with regard to Sun Yixian; the Meiji Restoration; the Long March; the Vietnam War, and Mao's China.
- Evidence of wide reading can be obtained by encouraging students 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 students 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.

- Clear essay writing guidelines should be taught.
- Candidates from some schools wrote introductions that were far too long and which included too much detailed information. Some teachers appear to expect their students to write “In this essay I will examine....” or “This essay will....”. These techniques were rather too 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.
- Nevertheless, candidates should be taught to clearly and succinctly define the key terms, indicate the organisation of the paragraphs and state the argument in the introduction. One way of helping students to remember is to use the four Cs: context, clarification, controversies and contention.
- Proper paragraphing is essential in a good history essay.
- Candidates should also avoid long repetitive conclusions.
- Some candidates tended to over-write and included far too much irrelevant narrative or descriptive material. Where this applied to whole schools it seems that teachers may be accepting this style because they equate it with detail. Candidates should be encouraged to write comprehensive, well structured, thematic essays. They should try to include several points/facts/pieces of evidence in one sentence rather than take several sentences to explain one.
- Also, candidates should also use the key words of the question such as “revolutionary activities”, “national goal”, “dominated”, “destiny”, “authoritarian rule”, “security and unity”, “economic developments” throughout the response and as part of the analysis.
- Teachers could use model answers and exemplar scripts to help students 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 familiar with the meanings of command terms listed on page 90 of the subject guide.
- Candidates should be trained in answering questions that have two parts such as Compare and contrast...; Analyse the nature and extent of...?; In what ways, and with what reasons...?; For what reasons, and with what results...?; In what ways, and with what consequences...?; Analyze causes and consequences...; Identify and explain...; Evaluate ...changes in.....to social and economic development...etc
- Teachers should make sure that their students do many practice timed essays in 50 minutes which is the time students should allow for each question in the examination.
- Teachers should also make sure that students are familiar with the markbands shown in the subject guide on pages 77–81.

### 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

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 5	6 - 11	12 - 19	20 - 25	26 - 30	31 - 36	37 - 60

### General comments

There were some comments on the G2s which indicated that teachers felt the paper was more difficult than last year because of the wording of some questions, specifically questions 10 and to a lesser extent 12. These issues were addressed in both the markscheme issued to examiners and in setting the Grade boundaries for this year's session.

Some G2s also questioned the absence of certain topics such as Alexander II. The guide is very clear that for each of the sections of the History program studied there will be two questions set. Thus when studying section 5 the period of study runs from 1853-1924 and candidates should be prepared for questions on any of the bullet points in the guide. Candidates should not expect to always find questions on their "favourite" topic.

Some examiners commented on the rather mechanistic use of Historiography by candidates which often amounts to name-dropping without any real development of the ideas of historians who are mentioned.

When considering the paper as whole examiners were impressed with the depth of knowledge of candidates in some areas of the paper, specifically the early questions which dealt with France and Prussia and the Unification of both Germany and Italy where there were answers which showed both in-depth knowledge, good analysis and focus on the question. This was also true of answers responding to questions on the Middle East.

However for more popular topics such as Hitler's domestic policies and Stalin's foreign policy there was often limited specific detail and little analysis related to the question set. Teachers should reinforce the need for detailed accurate, relevant knowledge to support answers.

Very few scripts were found where candidates were unable to answer 3 questions which indicates that they had no problems with time and examiners were often impressed with the stamina of candidates who were able to write 3 extensive answers in the allocated time.

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

- The vast majority of candidates have a clear essay structure with focus on the questions
- Many candidates displayed an impressive and detailed knowledge of the course
- At the higher levels there were well argued, well structured challenges to the questions set.



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

- Question 10 – some candidates did not understand that the phrase “provisional government” meant that the focus was on 1917 and tried to write answers that went back to Alexander II or 1905 revolutions.
- Question 12 – the impact of the First World War was often interpreted as the immediate post-war period and some credit was given for this. However many candidates either turned it into an answer on Versailles or the rise of Hitler because this is what they had prepared for.
- As a general comment candidates need training in identifying the focus of the questions and synthesizing factual material and analysis. Too many are still writing narrative answers with fairly superficial knowledge.
- Some candidates had a limited knowledge of chronology

## Levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

Levels of knowledge were variable; some candidates had a broad knowledge of key events but lacked the more specific detail which would enable them to develop their analysis. Where candidates had more detailed knowledge their answers had developed critical analysis.

Comparative questions were generally completed effectively with even the less knowledgeable candidates adhering to the structure.

Where there was evidence of planning it was brief and focused, this helped the candidates write well-focused and structured answers.

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

### Question 1

Most candidates who answered this had reasonable knowledge of the causes of the French revolution but very few focused on the period after 1789 or the increasing violence.

### Question 2

Some confusion as to which Napoleon (the mark scheme took account of this) there was perhaps too much emphasis on the Russian campaign and not enough on other factors such as the Peninsular War, resistance in Prussia or the strains of prolonged war at home.

For answers on Napoleon III there was some detail on foreign policy, some on Mexico but unsurprisingly little focus on the question.

### Question 3

Most answers to this question were well done and included comparisons between Prussia and Austria, Austrian weaknesses were well illustrated. Weaker candidates insisted on answering on Bismarck and unification which is exactly what the date of 1862 was designed to prevent.

**Question 4**

A popular question, which was on the whole done with clear comparisons and some contrasts. There was also evidence of good balance and quite detailed knowledge. Some got distracted by historical debate on the aims of both Bismarck and Cavour with superficial knowledge.

**Question 5 – 8**

These were not attempted by many candidates. Question 7 was attempted by very few and those who did were not clear on the rapidly moving events of 1848–1852.

**Question 9**

A reasonably popular question and where the candidates were well prepared they produced some very good answers evaluating Stolypin's aims and how successful they were. Weaker candidates drifted into comparative answers with Alexander II and III or focused on the events of 1905 with minimal reference to Stolypin's policies. The question referred to 1905 but should have been 1906.

**Question 10**

This question caused most anxiety with teachers and clearly some candidates did not find the wording accessible (see general points) However it was a very popular question and the vast majority of the answers concentrated on both the weakness of the Provisional Government and the strength of the Bolsheviks; using detailed knowledge and developed analysis to answer the question effectively. Those that went back to 1905 clearly did not understand what the phrase Provisional Government meant and got confused with the Dumas.

**Question 11**

There were some good answers to this question and most were reasonably balanced in their treatment of both Bismarck and Wilhelm II's foreign policy, keeping the word "impact" in focus throughout. Pleasingly many avoided turning the answers into causes of the First World War essay although again there were some who answered the question they wanted to find.

**Question 12**

Popular with mixed responses, there were some exceptionally high quality answers on the impact on domestic affairs in Britain and some on social, economic and political conditions in Germany. Unfortunately the majority turned their answers either into an essay on Versailles or the rise of Hitler. Those answers which linked Versailles to internal difficulties in Germany in the immediate post war period received credit, rise of Hitler answers did not.

**Question 13**

One of the Middle East questions where well-prepared students were able to do reasonably well although few ventured away from Palestine to issues in the other mandates.

**Question 14**

A limited number of responses that were fairly well answered although knowledge was rather limited in detail at times with many not seeing that external willingness to accept his rule helped Ibn Saud to remain in power.

**Question 15**

Germany was the favourite exemplar with a large number of answers, but the majority of these seemed unclear as to chronology confusing the hyperinflation of 1923 with the recession of 1929-1932. There was some understanding of the problems caused by unemployment, contributing to the rise of the Nazis. The majority of candidates asserted firmly that Hitler gained more support without substantiating their statements, which is easily done with reference the huge increase in the number of Nazi deputies in the Reichstag. Nor was there much consideration of the difficulties faced by Weimar governments because of the polarization of politics and the class based nature of German political parties plus the overuse of article 48. For such a popular area where material could be used in paper 2 responses the level of detailed knowledge was disappointing. There were some excellent exceptions to this comment.

**Question 16**

This was exceptionally popular. Candidates did have a broad knowledge of a range of Hitler's policies albeit limited in detail at times. The better answers used their knowledge to evaluate "success" linked to aims but the majority either wrote descriptive answers or addressed success in a limited way.

**Question 17**

A not well answered question. Very few candidates had any in depth knowledge of Stalin's Foreign Policy, focusing on the Nazi-Soviet pact and little else. Some were aware of the diplomacy in the 1930's and Stalin's search for collective security and only a very few were aware of events in the Far East.

**Question 18**

Reasonably popular choice, the causes of Gorbachev's choice of policies were reasonably well known. Consequences tended to focus on their impact on satellite states and there was clearly confusion between the Eastern Bloc and the Soviet Union. Little was known about the economic impact of these policies and their destabilising effect internally.

**Question 19**

Not many responses and quite a few focused solely on the period 1945-1949 with references made to Marshall Aid. However there were some well-written answers which moved from Marshall Aid to closer integration in the 1950s and also linked the Cold War relationships to the Federal Republic's economic recovery and growth.

**Question 21**

Quite a few answers seen with a good knowledge base and an attempt to focus on the issue of how important each factor was in causing conflict.

**Question 22**

This was popular with good attempts to compare and contrast the chosen conflicts on the whole. Weaker candidates tended to narrate events rather than look at causes, consequences were undeveloped by these candidates.

**Questions 23 and 24**

There were few responses to questions 23 and 24 and where there were answers they tended to be vague generalisations. One answer focused on Facebook which is a post-2000 answer.

Answers on the welfare state tended to be better with reasonable knowledge of post war Britain, for example. If schools focus on this section they should ensure that the candidates have in depth knowledge up to 2000

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

- Ensure that candidates are prepared for all the bullets in the sections of the guide that the teaching programme is based on
- Remind them that they need detailed evidence to support their analysis
- Identify key focus words in the questions – practice with previous questions
- Take notice of dates and keep answers within the time frame. Limit background context and focus on the time period in question.

## HISTORY ROUTE 1

### Overall grade boundaries

#### Higher Level

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 9	10 - 21	22 - 32	33 - 43	44 - 53	54 - 64	65 - 100

#### Standard Level

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 10	11 - 22	23 - 32	33 - 43	44 - 54	55 - 65	66 - 100

### Higher and standard level paper one

#### Component grade boundaries

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

### General Comments

There were almost an equal number of responses to, PS 1 – The Origins and Rise of Islam c500-661, and PS 2 – The Kingdom of Sicily 1130-1302. The current prescribed subjects are being examined for the second time since the revised history course. In general, performance was better than last year and it seems that some of last year's recommendations were taken into consideration.

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

Question 3 in Prescribed Subject 1 and 2 proved difficult for some candidates who lacked a real understanding of source evaluation. Although most responses directly referred to origin, purpose, value and limitations, many candidates failed to evaluate sources properly. Instead candidates tended to paraphrase the sources especially when assessing the value of the source. In addition, in the case of question 4 which requires the candidate to use the source material and own knowledge, many candidates did not utilize source material effectively or did not directly refer to the sources. Also, some candidates failed to relate the source material to the question.

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

Some answers in particular in Prescribed Subject 2 were structured and focused. In addition, most candidates achieved high marks in question 1 (a) and commonly demonstrated good comprehension of the sources. As opposed to last year, most candidates adapted to the one hour duration of the exam and a small minority failed to complete the task in the allotted time.

## 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 or mid range marks against question 1 (a), which facilitated a satisfactory overall achievement. Most candidates listed the motives of the apostasy as in the source however few copied directly from the source without using their own language and quoting from the source. In addition, candidates should be aware that in order to achieve a maximum mark, all valid points should be mentioned.
- b) Many candidates appreciated that Abu Bakr's speech conveyed humility and justice by quoting the relevant sentences in the speech. A minority referred to the traditional concept of shura reflected in the speech.

#### Question 2

Answers which achieved maximum marks offered an observant running analysis. However, some candidates merely provided a detailed description of the content of each source thus achieving lower marks. In addition, candidates should be made aware that there should be a balance between the similarities and the differences offered.

#### Question 3

Some responses reflected an obvious lack of understanding of the terms value and limitations. Many candidates when discussing the value and limitations of the sources tend to paraphrase the content of each source rather than assessing value in relation to the origin of each source, for example, what the source is, who wrote it and when.

#### Question 4

There were few excellent answers which utilized source material and used own knowledge to analyse the statement of the question. However, many candidates achieved a maximum five marks for utilizing source material only. Very few responses included own knowledge and argument.

**Prescribed Subject 2: The Kingdom of Sicily 1130–1302****Question 1**

- a) Most candidates successfully explained the reasons why the Hohenstaufen family lost control of the Kingdom of Sicily including the fact that Manfred was illegitimate and the fact that the papacy was totally opposed to the Hohenstaufen continuing to rule Sicily and thus formed an agreement with Charles of Anjou who defeated Manfred at the battle of Benevento.
- b) Most candidates achieved high marks by offering valid interpretations such as identifying the death of Frederick II in 1250 and his male heirs. Most responses also mentioned the illegitimacy of Manfred along with the fact that Manfred and Conrad died violently in 1266 and 1268 respectively.

**Question 2**

Many candidates effectively offered a detailed running comparison/contrast. However, a few candidates found it difficult to spot differences.

**Question 3**

There were some excellent answers that referred to both origin and purpose and value and limitations.

**Question 4**

There were some answers that 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 and thus achieved maximum marks.

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

- In general, teachers should emphasize practicing techniques and stimulate students' skills of source-based exams.
- In order to prepare candidates appropriately for paper 1, teachers should make sure that practice in class is timed, exam rubrics are used and candidates' answers are examined and analyzed.
- In question 3, which involves the comparison of sources, candidates should be instructed to identify points that can be compared and then write a running comparison rather than addressing each source separately.
- With regard to source evaluation questions, teachers should explain to students that the content of the sources is not the focus of the source evaluation questions 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.
- In question 4, candidates should make sure that their response is geared towards answering the question. In addition, they should ensure that their answer utilizes relevant source material and uses own knowledge.

Given the fact that this question has the highest mark allocation, answers to this question should include a developed argument in relation to the question.

## Higher and standard level paper two

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 4	5 - 8	9 - 12	13 - 16	17 - 20	21 - 24	25 - 40

### General comments

There was an increased number of candidates for this paper, nearly 300 in total. The G2 forms submitted showed general satisfaction with the paper as to difficulty and syllabus coverage. Some notes were made about questions 15 and 18 as proving challenging to candidates.

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 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 less understanding of how to construct an effective historical essay. It should be noted that there were signs of improvement from a number of centres in this area and it is hoped that this trend will continue.

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

There continues to be a considerable difference in the level of historical knowledge possessed by candidates. Some have excellent knowledge and command of the material they have studied while others seem to lack both breadth and depth. This lack of knowledge proved to be a serious impediment to the success of some candidates.

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, and challenges. As a result, many unfocused 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 student to organize their thoughts, keeps their writing focused 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 1**

This was a popular question and a number of strong results were produced. Some candidates chose to focus on one ruler and this was allowed, others chose to examine examples from 2 or 3 rulers. Excellent results were produced from both approaches. The discussion of a single ruler required a strong analytical framework which demonstrated understanding of a range of methods and detailed relevant knowledge in support. Those who produced strong responses based on 2 or 3 rulers, created a strong analytical framework showing understanding of the range of methods used by rulers to establish and consolidate power and then illustrated these points with detailed, relevant material from the rulers they had chosen.

Weaker responses lacked good structure and detailed information. Some candidates produced a collection of short accounts of the rule of 3-4 individuals in an essentially narrative format which failed to respond to the question.

#### **Question 2**

This was a popular question and many candidates demonstrated a strong knowledge of the rule of Henry II. The best answers commented effectively on the “to what extent” requirement of the question and produced effective well-balanced responses.

Some candidates restricted themselves to an analysis of his administrative skills and achievements without commenting effectively on the military aspect.

In almost all cases, candidates demonstrated at least a good knowledge of his achievements.

### **Question 3**

This was done by quite a number of candidates and the responses were generally of a good to excellent standard. The major weakness was paying inadequate attention to the requirement to comment on the results of Louis VI's efforts to increase his power. Some candidates wrote overly narrative accounts and did not identify the key points in the introduction and then develop them through the essay. Knowledge was on the whole good although weaker essays did not produce an adequate range of methods by which power was increased and failed to comment effectively on results.

### **Question 4**

This question was not always well done as candidates often produced narrative accounts of the Fatimid rise instead of creating well-structured essays. Candidates also tended to ignore the word Tunisia in the question and allowed their response to go beyond this into the Fatimid campaigns in Egypt. While some improvements in knowledge were demonstrated, analytical structure was often lacking which lowered the value of the responses.

### **Question 5**

This question was attempted by a significant number of candidates with varying degrees of success. A number of candidates produced better responses demonstrating knowledge of a range of methods used by Abd al-Malik. Weaker candidates continued to produce narrative accounts of his rule without providing the appropriate analytical structure. Some candidates who did attempt analytical responses produced too few points and the entire response was a detailed description of one or two methods such as currency reform. In all cases the second part of the question on the results of his methods was not given adequate attention. Responses were unbalanced on the methods side of the question.

### **Topic 2**

There were very few responses in this topic area. The most common response was question 8. 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 14**

This question was not undertaken by a great number of candidates but the responses demonstrate some of the problems with responses. The question asked for types of war. Many candidates limited their response to the discussion of a single type such as religious (Crusades) and failed to grasp the breadth of response that was required. The various types and causes of wars outlined in the syllabus should have formed the basis for the response to this question.

**Question 15**

This question proved challenging for many candidates as they resorted to narrative accounts of the military accomplishments of the chosen rulers. They did not focus on an analysis of what would be considered success in the broader sense but limited their comments to battle results. Some candidates noted that certain rulers were not successful militarily but used other skills to achieve their military goals e.g. diplomacy or negotiation. Knowing when to fight and when not to fight might be considered an important skill for a military leader.

**Question 16**

This was a very popular topic. The greatest problem in responses was a tendency to narrate the events of the wars, battles, etc, and not remain focused on the causes. This produced weak results as candidates wasted considerable effort on material that was not relevant to the question. Most candidates had some awareness of causes of the fitna but they produced only a limited number of points and did not understand the need to address the “to what extent” requirement of the question. Understanding what is meant by political as opposed to religious or other causes was a challenge for some candidates.

**Question 18**

This was a popular question although results were quite varied and not generally strong. Candidates tended to limit their responses to the career of one individual usually Mohamed as the basis for their response. This was too narrow a focus as the question expected a discussion of the methods employed over a longer period of time during the expansion of Islam throughout North Africa, the Middle East and beyond. Candidates did not seem to appreciate the demands of the “to what extent” command and limited themselves to one side of the argument and did not produce a well-balanced analysis. Lack of knowledge of events and reasons for the expansion of Islam was a significant problem for some candidates.

**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 understand that questions with two parts such as cause and effect require a response to both parts. The length of responses does not have to be equal, but there must be reasonable attention paid to both elements. If this is not done, results will be lower.

- Candidates should practice 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 practiced 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 also 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

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 5	6 - 11	12 - 19	20 - 25	26 - 30	31 - 36	37 - 60

### General comments

This paper had a larger number of candidates this year, 199 in total.

The number of G2 forms received was small but there was general satisfaction with the level of difficulty and syllabus coverage.

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”.

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.

There was some improvement in the standard of responses as candidates showed improvement in their ability to produce effective analytical essays

The majority of responses were found to be from a very limited number of questions. A number of questions on the paper were not attempted

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 4

There were a number of good essays on this question which showed clear focus and a comprehensive range of reasons for the Fatimid collapse. Weaker candidates produced fewer reasons or tended to write a narrative account of the later years of the Empire without creating a strong analytical format. Lack of knowledge was also a barrier to achievement for some candidates.

### Question 5

This was a very popular question which produced a number of exceptional responses. Many candidates were able to construct good analytical formats and support them with relevant content. The best answers were able to demonstrate and analyse a broad range of methods by which William I was able to establish his authority. Weaker answers tended to rely on a narrower range often limited to military force, Domesday Book, and the replacement of Saxon leaders with Normans.

### Question 6

This was a very popular question which produced some strong responses. A number of candidates however failed to give adequate attention to the results part of the question or limited themselves to the acquisition of Angevin lands by Phillip II. More attention should have been given to the wider results about the position of France in medieval Europe and Phillip's ability to increase the power of the Capetian dynasty in France. The reasons for the struggle were often limited by a desire for Phillip to acquire more land or reduce the influence of the Angevin in France. Wider reasons such as personal enmity and the process begun by his father and grandfather were not noted. Weaker candidates tended to narrate the story of the struggles between Phillip and various Angevin kings without organizing the information into a proper analytical format

### Question 7

This was a popular question. The strongest responses provided a range of reasons over the course of the Crusading period to 1291. Many candidates limited themselves to the period ending with the battle of Hattin in 1187 and thus failed to provide a comprehensive response beyond this point. Weaker responses focused on the period leading up to Hattin and failed to consider broader European factors, economic and social problems in Outremer, lack of population and a decline in the Crusading spirit or its deflection to other areas such as Spain.

### Question 8

This was a popular question with good responses in some cases. Weaker candidates tended to spend time on the motives for the Crusades or on a narrative of the events of the First Crusade. Strong responses focused on a range of reasons including the role of the Byzantine Empire in providing assistance as well as details of the weakness in the Islamic world as well as assistance from the Italian cities.

**Question 13**

This question was attempted by a number of candidates with some success. This is a broad question and requires coverage from Magna Carta to the reign of Edward I. Candidates had some trouble organizing the material and creating a well-focused response which incorporated the key elements. Some responses ended with the Provisions of Oxford and failed to consider the resulting civil war and the later acceptance of Parliament for financial reasons by Edward I. Understanding the forces which caused monarchs to have to accept the existence of parliament and some limits on their power was crucial to the question as well as knowledge of important events such as the Provisions of Oxford and the role of key individuals.

**Question 14**

This was done by a fair number of candidates, with some success in a number of cases. Strong responses were able to identify Frederick's aims when he ascended the throne and then produce an analysis of how successful he was in the chosen areas. Understanding of his strengths and weaknesses in the different areas was crucial to a strong response. In addition knowledge of the key individuals and events relating to Frederick's efforts was crucial in Italy and Germany.

**Question 18**

This question produced a number of interesting responses. Candidates were asked to assess the significance for the mediaeval church of the Black Death. This would mean that they would have to be aware of and explain both positive and negative impacts. The best responses were able to demonstrate understanding of both aspects and provide clear explanations and evidence to support these points. Weaker candidates tended to focus on either positive or negative impacts alone with limited evidence or depth of explanation.

**Question 21**

This was not attempted by a great number of candidates, but of those who did a number produced excellent responses. This is an excellent question to demonstrate mastery of both knowledge and analytical structure. There is a good range of points from which to choose and candidates should seek to cover a number of different aspects in their responses.

In addition links can be made to knowledge gained from a number of different topics such as the 12th century renaissance, impact of increased trade, the Crusades, contact with Islam and the revival of classical ideas. In addition the geography of Italy and its wealth and cosmopolitan nature could be examined.

## 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 each term, reference and instruction carefully 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 and 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 focused 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.
- In addition, where a question asks for causes and results or reasons and results as in Question 6, candidates must be aware of the need to address both parts of the question. An exact balance between the two is not essential but both must be addressed in a meaningful way.
- 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.
- Trying to fit a prepared response to an examination question is a cause for poor results. Candidates may have prepared a response with respect to a particular individual or event and then produce that response on the examination even though it does not correspond well to the demands of the question.