

HISTORY

Overall grade boundaries

Higher Level Route 2 Americas – Peacemaking (Timezone 1)

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 9	10 - 21	22 - 29	30 - 40	41 - 51	52 - 62	63 - 100

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

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 10	11 - 21	22 - 31	32 - 42	43 - 53	54 - 64	65 - 100

Standard Level Route 2 PS 1 Peacemaking (Timezone 1)

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 10	11 - 22	23 - 30	31 - 41	42 - 52	53 - 63	64 - 100

Standard Level Route 2 PS 1 Peacemaking (Timezone 2)

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 10	11 - 21	22 - 31	32 - 42	43 - 53	54 - 64	65 - 100

Standard Level Route 2 PS 2 Arab-Israeli conflict (Timezone 1)

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 10	11 - 22	23 - 30	31 - 41	42 - 54	55 - 65	66 - 100

Standard Level Route 2 PS 2 Arab-Israeli conflict (Timezone 2)

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 10	11 - 21	22 - 31	32 - 42	43 - 55	56 - 67	68 - 100

Standard Level Route 2 PS 3 Communism in crisis (Timezone 1)

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 10	11 - 23	24 - 31	32 - 42	43 - 55	56 - 67	68 - 100

Standard Level Route 2 PS 3 Communism in crisis (Timezone 2)

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 10	11 - 22	23 - 32	33 - 43	44 - 57	58 - 68	69 - 100

NB: The whole of this report should be of interest to centres regardless of what options have been selected. Much of the advice found within separate components is of relevance to all teachers and candidates.

Higher and standard level internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

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

Recommendations for IB procedures, instructions and forms

The majority of centres followed the IB procedures but there are still some centres using the old 3/CS forms. This means the instructor's name is not clearly written or printed on the form. In some cases the reverse side of form 3/CS was not filled in. It is very helpful when instructors write comments, preferably related to the relevant criteria, on the assessments or on a separate sheet; these comments are very helpful in understanding why the marks have been awarded. However, if the comments are written on the assessment they **should be in blue or black ink** or even pencil and **not in red ink** as this colour is used in the moderation process.

The range and suitability of the work submitted

In most of the samples submitted the topics chosen were suitable for the History Internal Assessment and, collectively, they covered a vast range of periods and geographical areas: from early European history to modern US history; topics chosen based on the history of a centre's country (this was especially noticeable in submissions from centres in Latin America). Nevertheless, the majority of topics were focused on twentieth century issues.

As in previous years, although the topics were sound, some research questions could have benefited from being more narrowly focused. If the research question is too broad in nature, scope or time frame the candidates will not be able to address the issues successfully within the 2000 word limit and their work will lack depth. As has been mentioned before, the most successful candidates chose questions that were narrow and focused.

There were some candidates who attempted to evaluate the historical accuracy of films or books and whilst these can lead to very successful assessments, this only tends to be the case on rare occasions. Assessments of this type do not, normally, have analytical depth and can result in narrative or simplistic comparison(s).

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A – Plan of the investigation

Most, but not all, candidates stated their research question in the Plan. However, the scope and method were often only outlined. The method of investigation should

include what types of sources were used and the development should include reasons why they were chosen. It is not enough to state that “primary and secondary sources were used” or to list the sources to be evaluated in Section C. The scope should be more than a reiteration of the research question. The plan should not be a statement of background information nor should it include reasons why the topic was chosen.

Criterion B – Summary of evidence

The evidence should be relevant, well-researched, well-organised and correctly referenced. It should be factual material only and must not contain analysis. It should present all of the evidence that will later be analysed in Section D. Some of the weaker candidates used only a very few sources and more seem to be using sources such as Wikipedia or other online encyclopaedias that may not be academically suitable or cover the History in enough depth. However, some candidates used a variety of sources, including interviews, a wide range of print material and other suitable web sources.

There seems to be a greater use of bullet points in this section. This can be a useful way of presenting information but not if it is just a series of quotations from sources which are not organised or coherent. If there are no references to the sources used, the maximum mark is 2.

Criterion C – Evaluation of sources

Although there seems to be some improvement in this area there are still candidates who appear to choose sources which are not relevant to the research question and then state that the source was limited because it did not give the required information. The value and limitations of a source should not be regarded as to whether or not it is useful, but should be seen with reference to the origin and purpose and its historical reliability.

Criterion D - Analysis

There seems to be a growing tendency for candidates to introduce new material in this section. Indeed some candidates wrote section D with no reference to the material presented in Section B. New material cannot be credited here and some candidates lost valuable marks. Other problematic issues in this section included: candidates who did not focus on their research question; candidates who did not reference their work (and so limited their mark in this section to a maximum of two); and candidates who lacked awareness of the significance of the two sources evaluated in Section C (and who, again, lost marks). Nevertheless, at the upper level of the sample there was some excellent clear critical analysis.

Criterion E - Conclusion

Most candidates managed to write a conclusion that was consistent with the material presented and focused on the research question. However, some introduced new evidence.

Criterion F – Sources and word limit

Fewer candidates appear to have exceeded the word limit, although too many did not include the word count on the title page and so lost marks. Also, too many candidates lost marks because they did not list their bibliographies according to one standard format.

The candidates in the upper mark levels used a wide variety of excellent academic sources in researching their topic, but there are still too many candidates who rely solely on text books, encyclopaedias and other material that is not academically suitable for the demands of the Internal Assessment.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- Make sure the candidates understand what is required and go through the criteria for each section carefully.
- Help the candidates formulate their research question so that it has a precise clear focus with the possibility of incorporating two points of view.
- Advise and direct the candidates in their search for suitable research material.
- Show the candidates how to reference their material correctly.
- Candidates should be made aware of what is required in Section A – the Plan and should be clear about what *method* and *scope* entail.
- Candidates need to know how to distinguish between evidence and analysis.
- Practice evaluating sources for origin, purpose, value and limitations; not just those which will be used in the assessment.
- Help with the choice of sources to be evaluated in Section C. It is important that these can be shown to be significant to the research question in Section D.
- Stress that no new material should be used in Section D
- The conclusion should answer the research question and be based on the material in the assessment.
- Work on the formatting of bibliographies.

Higher and Standard Level Paper One

Prescribed subject 1: Peacemaking, peacekeeping — international relations 1918-1936

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 2	3 - 4	5 - 7	8 - 10	11 - 12	13 - 15	16 - 25

General comments

Written comments from teachers indicated that the May 2014 examination paper was considered to be satisfactory, covered the syllabus well and had an appropriate level of difficulty. It seemed to have worked well with the majority of candidates and most were able to write the exam in the time allocated.

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

Some candidates had difficulty in responding effectively to Question 2. The most frequently seen weakness in responses to this question was where candidates presented extensive descriptions of what the sources said, rather than offering genuine comparative analysis of the views expressed in the sources. In some cases, where comparative analysis was attempted, the candidates' comparison was based upon elements that cannot be compared and contrasted in terms of this question, for example what one source mentions but is not discussed in the other (e.g. Source B mentioning economic issues and Source D not doing so).

Although the quality of answers to question 3 was, on the whole, satisfactory, some candidates limited themselves to paraphrasing the sources or commenting on the content in their attempts to assess value and limitations. Also, many candidates are still claiming that because a source is primary it is intrinsically more reliable than a secondary source, which is clearly not the case.

Many students, when answering the final question, did not use their own knowledge in their answers and this, inevitably, restricted their performance. Furthermore, questions that simply summarize the content of the sources and offer some knowledge, but then fail to focus this material on the set question, will not achieve top marks.

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

On the whole, candidates had good contextual knowledge of the topic and their responses demonstrated comprehension of the content of sources. Candidates answered the questions in the given order and this resulted in a better understanding of the topic. Most candidates were able to manage their time effectively and there were very few unfinished scripts. Candidates were more concise on question 1(a) and 1(b) which gave them time to address the other questions more fully.

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

Question 1

- (a) This question worked very well. Many candidates received between two and three marks by using the source and focusing on what the question specifically asked rather than simply offering background on the Fourteen Points.
- (b) The cartoon was interpreted well in this question. Although a few candidates continued to describe the source rather than focus on its message, most identified at least one message of the cartoon.

Question 2

Weaker candidates tended to approach the question in an end-on fashion (that is to say, they provided a largely narrative and/or descriptive response with some analysis tagged on to the end). Candidates found the contrasts easier to identify than the comparisons. Whereas all the contrasts in the markscheme were seen in the responses, not many candidates identified, for example, that both sources addressed Wilson's hopes for an international organization to solve the disputes. Issues discussed in one source and not mentioned in the other do not make for valid contrasts as they do not reflect the view expressed in the source.

Question 3

In general, Source C (Foerster's book) was better handled than Source A (Prince Max of Baden's letter), as candidates were sidetracked by the content of the latter. Generally, candidates continue to focus on the content of the sources in order to evaluate them and many fail to engage fully with the provenances/attributions. For example, a significant number of candidates did not state the date of the sources and, consequently, lost the opportunity to evaluate how this could contribute to an analysis of their values and limitations. Arguments claiming that a source is limited because it does not discuss a particular issue are not valid evaluations.

Question 4

At the top end responses provided clear lines of argument, used the sources effectively [as opposed to merely referring to them] and included some of the candidates' own knowledge to support their arguments. However, most candidates based their answers on the sources, and without any reference to their own knowledge they limited themselves to a maximum 5 marks. (NB: in these responses, the use of all five sources does not guarantee the maximum award of 5 marks: there has to be an explicit focus on the set question).

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Timed practice tests that present the rubric that candidates will encounter on the exam paper, is the most efficient way of preparing candidates for this paper.

- For Question 3, candidates should refer to the provenance and purpose of the sources and use that information to help them make a detailed, critical assessment of value and limitations.
- For Question 4, answers should be explicitly focused on the set question. Candidates should make use of their own knowledge **and** evidence from the sources in arguments within the framework of an integrated analysis.

Prescribed subject 2: The Arab-Israeli conflict 1945-79

Component grade boundaries

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

General comments

The May 2014 Paper was, according to the majority of the G2 responses received, of an appropriate level though many also argued that the demands of the examination put too many demands on candidates in terms of the time allocated to the paper. Overall, many scripts were disappointingly weak in their interpretation and evaluation of the evidence.

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

It would appear that a number of candidates found the first question a little more difficult than previous cohorts have and this was due to some flawed and/or undeveloped interpretations of the source material. This issue was exacerbated by the amount taken by many candidates to formulate responses to these two questions. Lengthy answers at this early stage will only prevent candidates from maximising their scores later in the paper where more developed, and thus more time-consuming, responses are needed.

With regard to Question 3, there continues to be a reliance on regurgitating the content of the sources rather than providing an analysis of the views expressed in the sources. This misapplication of effort is also evident where a number of candidates did not correctly read and respond to the questions; it is worthwhile reminding candidates to read thoroughly both the sources and the questions before they commence writing.

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

Some students displayed a good grasp of the Prescribed Subject, and a reasonable capability in their source evaluation.

For Question 2 many candidates demonstrated that they had some skill in comparing the two sources and made some interesting points. For Question 4 there are also some positive factors to draw upon. Many candidates demonstrated considerable ability by fully engaging with the set question; some of these built upon this by attempting to reach a balanced and supported judgement of the role of the US.

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

Question 1

- (a) Many answers were weakened by a misunderstanding that one of the obstacles to peacemaking in the Middle East was Sadat's concern about a possible *détente* between the US and the USSR as he feared that he was being squeezed out. In fact, Sadat's fears had the opposite effect: afraid that he would be squeezed out, and possibly lose favour with the US, these events spurred him on to look for ways to build more positive relations with Israel (hence his decision to fly to Jerusalem to seek peace with Israel).
- (b) Interpretations of the cartoon were sometimes flawed; in particular some answers claimed that it showed that Kissinger was engaged on a mere publicity stunt and/or that the cartoon was mocking Kissinger. (One would have hoped that the candidates would carry over from their studies a better understanding of Kissinger's role in the peace process, thus avoiding such misinterpretations).

Question 2

Many answers were more effective in their identification of similarities between Sources C and E, rather than in their inclusion of legitimate contrasts. One could not fully reward answers that included an internal contradiction: on the one hand stating that both Sources recognised the role of the US (which did gain a mark), yet then proceed to claim as a contrast that Source E, unlike Source C, ignores US activity (which could not be rewarded). Also there were a few instances of candidates misreading the question and attempting a comparative analysis of Source C and Source D.

Question 3

Despite the question clearly requesting a focus on the Sources' origin and purpose when assessing their value and limitation, many answers were based partly, or entirely, upon a consideration of the Sources' content. One still encountered evaluations which assumed that primary sources are, *per se*, intrinsically more reliable than secondary sources. Regrettably, as with Question 2, there were a few answers based upon a misreading of the question and this led some students to evaluate the wrong sources.

Question 4

A particularly pleasing feature of the exam was the readiness with which some students applied the material in a manner that focused directly upon the question. Also some answers went further and offered a balanced assessment of the extent and the importance of the US role in the Middle East during the period specified.

Unfortunately, only a minority of candidates included their own knowledge in support of their argument and this precluded them from attaining anything more than 5 marks; no matter how forensic their examination of each of the sources was.

It was particularly galling to encounter answers that had started off in a very promising fashion, but then ended in haste, presumably due to the candidate running out of time.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- There are certain Paper 1 skills that need to be developed and practised in the classroom, in order to help the candidates to come to the exam fully aware of the particular techniques that should be applied to each question.
- Further encouragement of a careful consideration of the precise requirements of each question would be beneficial.
- With reference to the comparative analysis demanded by Question 2, further attention may need to be paid to the practice of this question in advance of the examination as this may well enable candidates to handle this type of question more effectively.
- There is need for some candidates to spend more time developing the techniques of source evaluation so that they can, more effectively, analyse each source and its provenance.
- It would be beneficial to many candidates if there was a greater stress on the need to take care in the timing of answers. In some cases the responses to Questions 1(a) and 1 (b) were simply too long and this may well explain the problem that many candidates had in completing their final answer (although it should be noted that the questions are designed to be answered systematically from Question 1 through to Question 4 in order for candidates to develop the skills and gain the knowledge of the sources that is needed to effectively answer each succeeding question).

Prescribed subject 3: Communism in crisis 1976-89

Component grade boundaries

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

General comments

Overall, candidates demonstrated a general understanding of the topic of the paper and there was a demonstrable improvement in the number of candidates adopting an appropriate approach to each style of question. Nevertheless, there was evidence once again this session that some candidates struggle with the time constraints of the paper. The G2 forms also supported time management as a potential problem – particularly for additional language candidates.

Generally, the paper worked well, the sources were clear and accessible. The topic, ‘the domestic and foreign problems of the Brezhnev era: Afghanistan’ and its related key themes were understood by the majority of candidates and in addition to this, the vast majority of G2 forms agreed that the paper was at the appropriate level (97%). Most G2 responses indicated that the paper was around the same difficulty as last year (70%) with just over 10% thinking it was either a little easier and 10% more difficult.

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

Despite the general understanding of the topic that many candidates demonstrated, responses often lacked development. As was the case in last May’s session, many responses covered only one or two points for questions that offered several marks; perhaps as a consequence of the aforementioned time constraints. Another potential consequence of the restricted time for this paper could be seen in the slight increase in the number of note-form responses (a style of response that should be strongly discouraged). Candidates should be reminded of the importance of effectively planning their time so that they are able to address all of the questions correctly and to the best of their ability.

The note-form responses were mainly seen for Question 2 and, in particular, Question 3. It seems that candidates are increasingly familiar with the mark schemes for this question and are attempting to imitate their style/layout. The mark schemes are written in this way for the ease of examiners and candidates should not replicate this style. Instead they should provide responses that consist of continuous prose and where the four distinct elements (OPVL) are handled in a way that develops an assessment a source’s value and limitations by way of an analysis of its of origin and purpose.

Finally, for Question 4, whilst the majority of candidates attempted this question and most of those were clearly aware of the requirement to explicitly refer to the sources, there were few responses that had detailed own knowledge synthesised to support the argument presented. There was some concern in the G2 forms that the assertion in the question was difficult to challenge with own knowledge; however, there should be sufficient own knowledge to support the idea that the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan was not in their ‘best interests’.

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

Increasing numbers of candidates are adopting an appropriate approach to each style of question and most attempted to find three points for Q1 (a), two points for Q1 (b). In addition to this the majority of candidates had attempted some linkage between the sources for question 2. There continues to be some improvement in the approach of responses to both this question and Q3 and to the latter question responses showed more awareness of the need to focus on the origin and purpose of the sources rather than the content. Additionally, most scripts seemed to reflect a sound basic understanding of the theme and/or topic of the paper, and most candidates attempted to answer all four questions. For Q4, most candidates also attempted to use or refer to the sources in their responses.

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

Question 1

- (a) Many candidates attained full marks for this question. However, there are still a considerable number of responses that offer only one or two points. Some candidates wrote far too much on 'background events' without reference to the content of the source and therefore did not answer the question.
- (b) In general this question worked well. There were several valid points that could have been made to be rewarded two marks – and some candidates gave more than the two required valid points. However, some candidates were too vague in their commentary – and did not link their points to the cartoon. There were a number that misinterpreted the running track of skulls to represent communist repression in the USSR's past.

Some G2 comments were concerned that the term 'Athlete's Foot' was difficult – particularly for additional language students; however this did not seem to prevent candidates from identifying the bandaged foot as a wound and/or impediment to the USSR.

Question 2

The majority of candidates attempted to make some links between the two sources. Most candidates were able to identify two or more comparisons – and these were relatively straightforward. However, candidates did less well in identifying developed contrasts. Many simply stated 'one source mentions... the other does not' as a contrast and, ideally, stronger links than this are desirable when the sources facilitate such a response.

In addition, candidates must be made aware of the need to identify more than one or two points of similarity and difference for this question. There was an increase in the number of 'note-form' or bullet point answers - and students should be made aware that this often prevents them from writing a fully developed running commentary.

Question 3

There was again an increase in students answering this question in note-form (in an imitation of the layout of the mark scheme). This formulaic structure leads to responses that offer four separate statements rather than an integrated and valid analysis of the values and limitations of each source drawn from its origins and purpose. Candidates need to understand that they should attempt more than one comment on the value and limitation of each source – and to be specific in their comments using the information they are given in the provenance. Many candidates continue to make vague statements on the value of each source as 'primary' or 'from the time' without going on to explain why this is a value. This is also the case with limitations where there are vague comments regarding 'bias'. While these evaluation comments might be valid - they should be made as specific to the document they are looking at as possible. There were some good, thorough evaluations and there continues to be some improvement in how students approach Q3.

Question 4

The G2 forms have once again highlighted the potential issues with time for this paper, and whilst the majority of candidates attempted all four questions it was clear that some candidates do not allow sufficient time to properly answer this final, eight-mark, question.

Most responses attempted to use the sources, and most addressed the questions. The key limitation to the majority of responses was the lack of detailed own knowledge.

The better responses attempted to clearly analyse the question but too many merely listed the material in each document – without referring to the specific question – this is not sufficient.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Teach and review all bullet points for the paper and prepare students to use their knowledge of the prescribed subject; many candidates seemed to lack detailed knowledge of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.
- Question 1 (a): Encourage students to find more than two points - this is a three mark question
- Question 1 (b): Students should practice interpreting the message of a variety of sources, be they cartoons, photographs, statistics *etc.* Ensure that students link their comments to the source and make more than one valid point.
- Question 2: Students should practice identifying comparisons and contrasts between two documents. They must know that although there should be balance, and they are expected to identify both comparisons and contrasts, there may not be an equal number *ie* there may be a 3/3, 4/2, 2/4 split between comparisons and contrasts. The question is worth six marks and one comparison and one contrast is insufficient. Nevertheless, students should be reminded to move through the paper; many seem to spend too long on Q2 and this has a negative impact on their performance in Q3 and Q4.

- Also for Q2, candidates should be made aware that the focus is on the content of each source – they are not considering the origin and purpose of the sources for this question. It requires them to consider ‘how’ the sources are similar and different – not ‘why’.
- Question 3: In contrast to Q2, here too many candidates are focusing on the content of the sources. The focus of the question is the origins and purpose of each source and not the content. Students should develop specific evaluation points from the details they are given in the provenance. They need to fully develop their explanations of why a point from the origin or purpose is a value and/or limitation.
- In addition to this, for Q3, some students do not seem to understand how to structure their responses: they should not discuss the sources together, nor should they compare and contrast them.
- Question 4: As timing remains an issue for some candidates, the practice of past papers is important. It may also be useful to offer guidance on the amount of time students should spend on each question to encourage them to move through the paper. The final question requires an analytical and evaluative tone and responses should address the specific question rather than list information from each source.
- Most candidates now explicitly use or refer to the sources, but some do not and they need to be reminded to do so. More emphasis should be made of the need to include detailed own knowledge.

Higher and Standard Level Paper Two - Timezone 1

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 4	5 - 9	10 - 11	12 - 15	16 - 20	21 - 24	25 - 40

General comments

The most popular topics were Topics 1 and 3 and, to a lesser extent, Topic 5. There were very few responses seen to any of the questions in either Topic 2 (with the exception of Questions 7 and 9 where candidates were able to discuss the Weimar Republic) or Topic 4. Question 1 on the use of tactics and strategy in either the First or the Second World War was very popular indeed with most candidates choosing to focus on the Second World War. Most of the six questions on authoritarian/single party leaders were attempted but relatively few from Topic 5, with Question 26 on the role of “containment” being the most popular. Overall, this was a rather narrow selection from a wide-ranging set of exam questions and, as mentioned by many examiners, a tendency to employ knowledge from the regional option studied for Paper 3 that rarely reflected the global approach more appropriate for Paper 2. Unfortunately, although there were some excellent scripts, the overall standard was poor demonstrating a striking lack of detailed knowledge.

A total of 144 G2 forms were received and 88% of the respondents found the paper to be of an “appropriate standard”. When compared to May 2013 65% thought it to be of a “similar standard”, 27% “a little more difficult” and 3% were of the opinion that it was “much more difficult”. Just over 63% of respondents considered the clarity of wording to be very good/excellent with a similar 66% stating that the presentation of the paper was also very good/excellent.

All centres are reminded to encourage teachers to complete and submit the G2 forms as their opinions and comments are an invaluable aid to the Grade Award process where such information is taken into account when setting grade boundaries for the exam session.

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

The overwhelming opinion expressed by examiners for this session was that too many candidates demonstrated insufficient detailed knowledge to be able to answer questions beyond, at best, a satisfactory level of attainment. The level of knowledge was, for the most part, limited and often inaccurate and many examiner reports included comments such as: “a serious lack of detail”; “vague, irrelevant and inaccurate generalisations”; “inadequate knowledge”. Inevitably, limited knowledge made it difficult for many candidates to apply an analytical approach to the questions as arguments were rarely well supported. An emphasis on the importance of wide reading and, as mentioned earlier, an awareness of the global nature of Paper 2, could certainly go some way towards an improvement in the performance of candidates. There was also a tendency to narrate answers rather than to look closely at the command terms of the question and to then identify key words. “To what extent...”, for example, requires a consideration not only of the key factor(s) mentioned in the question, but also of other issues that may have been significant. It is useful practice for candidates to de-construct question on past papers and to break these down so that they are able to determine

the task required of them. This session rather too many candidates seemed to recognise a name or an event and then to write down all they knew rather than using that same knowledge more effectively by directing it towards answering the question.

There were a few instances where candidates did not follow the instructions to choose questions from different topics as well as several instances in Topic 3 of leaders being chosen from the same region when the question asked specifically for different regions. Undoubtedly, exam nerves may be responsible for this error but familiarity with past papers and an expectation of the possibility of a cross-regional requirement may well assist even the most apprehensive candidate.

The areas of the programme and examination for which the candidates appeared to be well prepared.

Overall, most candidates were able to structure an extended response and made some reference, in the introductory paragraph, to the question, although this indication that the question was understood was not always followed up. One examiner noted that the “five paragraph” responses, although useful as a way to train students to structure essays, had appeared rather formulaic and speculated that, in some cases, too much attention had been paid to form rather than content with more attention paid to the structure of a response than answering the question. It was clear that candidates had some knowledge of the more popular topics and had prepared for questions on the two world wars, for example, and on the origins of the Cold War. What did seem to have a negative impact on candidate performance was an apparent expectation that the questions on these “popular” topics would be rather generic and that a knowledge of the causes of the First World War, for example, would be sufficient to answer a question from Topic 1 just as a rote learned list of events from 1945 through 1949 would ensure a high mark on a question from Topic 5. Unfortunately for many candidates, this was not so suggesting that they would have benefitted from more practice with past papers. All candidates should have copies of the relevant sections from the History Guide that outline, in some detail, the curriculum requirements for the Topics in Paper 2. Careful attention to the “Themes” indicates the kind of knowledge they need and that may be examined. Candidates could also be reminded that there will be three non-specific questions but that these may require knowledge of more than one region.

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

Only responses to the most popular questions will be outlined below. Please refer to the mark schemes for further detail regarding indicative or suggested content for individual questions.

Topic 1

Question 1

This was very popular indeed with most candidates writing on the Second World War. Several responses made some reference to both the European and Pacific theatres and mentioned that atomic bombs had been dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. There were references to “island-hopping” as a successful strategy in the Pacific theatre as well as a mention of strategic bombing in Europe, but only rarely were arguments supported by good, detailed evidence. Very few candidates mentioned the

North African or the Italian fronts and although most knew something about D-Day, too many considered this to be the crucial campaign that saved Europe. It seemed that many candidates were not familiar with strategy and tactics, but did what they could. One or two very good answers were able to discuss tactics and strategy in a knowledgeable way and to use supporting evidence to balance their importance against other factors such as the availability of resources; the importance of technological developments and the support of a well-organised and supportive Home Front.

There were fewer responses seen on the First World War and, for the most part, these were written by candidates that had clearly prepared for a question on the causes of the war and determined to use their knowledge, although it was irrelevant. Even so, for candidates who did focus on the question, there were some reasonable references to the Schlieffen Plan and its failure as well as the subsequent war of attrition that was, quite accurately, seen as creating a stalemate that tactics and strategies seemed unable to resolve. Only a few mentioned the importance of the long-term naval blockade of German and Austrian ports, but rather more mentioned the importance of the US intervention in 1917 although it was rather disappointing that so many linked this to the sinking of the Lusitania. Overwhelmingly, candidates ascribed victory in both wars to the US with scant recognition of the efforts of other nations involved. For example, with regard to the Second World War, there were few references to the role of the USSR and the long, tortuous campaign on the Eastern Front. As mentioned in several examiner reports, it did seem that the candidates were using their knowledge of the wars from the material studied for the regional option of Paper 3 rather than looking at these events from the more global perspective appropriate for Paper 2.

Question 2

There were very few answers to this question. With regard to the Indo-Pakistan Wars, knowledge was mostly limited with some mention of Kashmir and links then made to the Hindu-Muslim divide. The East-West Pakistan conflict was not as well known, though some candidates were able to argue that religion was of less importance here and to extend their response to mention the involvement of India.

There were quite a few responses that focused on the Spanish Civil War but these, for the most part, lacked the detailed knowledge necessary to discuss the regional divisions, economic conflicts and political ideologies that, along with religion, played a part in the outbreak of hostilities.

Question 4

This was a very popular question with most candidates choosing the 1920-1930 time period. Better answers defined “collective security” and linked this to the creation of the League of Nations, as well as mentioning some of its weaknesses (most notably, the absence of the US). Not many responses mentioned how the League attempted, with mixed results, to solve conflicts such as the Corfu Crisis; Greek-Bulgarian War; the Aaland Island crisis; the uprising in Vilnius; the resolution of claims over Mosul *etc.* Indeed, knowledge of the League’s activities seemed limited to the Manchurian Crisis (1931) and the invasion of Abyssinia (1935) even though these were outside the timeframe of the question. On the G2 forms, there were several comments suggesting that candidates would have been better able to write about the 1930s, but

post-First World War attempts to achieve collective security were also important and it is expected that candidates would be prepared for such a question.

Question 5

There only a few answers to this question and they were very weak. Most responses demonstrated little knowledge of the political and economic effects of civil wars and lacked the detailed knowledge to support the general assertions that were made.

Question 6

Again, there were only very few responses to this question. Most candidates were able to define what was meant by a guerrilla war but depended on general assertions about the familiarity with terrain *etc* to support rather general arguments. There was little detailed knowledge, even of the Vietnam War, which had probably been widely taught, and so the question was not, for the most part, answered effectively.

Topic 2

Question 7

This was a very popular question with some (general) idea of constitutional weaknesses, but no great understanding of how this affected (or not) the Weimar government. Despite this being a popular topic, candidates demonstrated only limited knowledge and were unable to go beyond making general statements about proportional representation and Article 48 without much supporting evidence or analysis of why (if) these were problematical. Candidates could have argued that proportional representation *per se* is very democratic and works well in many countries and to have queried why, then, did it not work so well in Weimar Germany? For example, it could have been posited that it was “too democratic” and therefore allowed extremist parties to get a foothold. Most of the candidates who attempted this question, hastily dismissed constitutional weaknesses and focused on economic problems, but, again, were unable to explain how these were tackled by the various Weimar coalitions. Candidates could be expected to offer accurate reasons for the 1923 crisis and to demonstrate familiarity with the steps taken to solve it, but currency reform, for example, was rarely mentioned. There were some references to the rise of Hitler during the early 1930s and this was ascribed to economic problems but, again, there was limited knowledge with few responses using evidence such as election statistics, to demonstrate the increased popularity of anti-Weimar and anti-democratic parties.

Question 9

As anticipated, this was another reasonably popular question. Most response used the example of either Weimar Germany or the US. With regards to Germany, as with question 7, there was scant knowledge of the economic problems or attempts to deal with them. Often, there was confusion over the crisis of 1923 and the hyper-inflation that followed with the events of the early 1930s. Again, good, accurate detailed knowledge was rare and too many candidates were hampered by simply not having adequate knowledge to tackle the demands of the question. Few attempted to address “political extremism” that was the other alternative although some did make reference to the rise of both Communism and Nazism but rarely was there sufficient

knowledge of how the Weimar Republic dealt with these issues. Closer reading of the question would, undoubtedly, have helped candidate use what they did know more effectively.

There was an opportunity here for candidates to have drawn upon their knowledge of the policies put into practice in the US to deal with the impact of the Great Depression but, rather disappointingly, responses were narrative rather than analytical although there were some good answers able to distinguish between the policies of Hoover and Roosevelt.

Question 10

There were a few, rather weak, attempts at discussing civil rights in the US, although several candidates failed to identify the US as their chosen example. Mostly, responses were narrative and, although some aspects of the struggle for civil rights were described, there were limited links to the question.

Topic 3

Question 13

This was a very popular question with most candidates choosing to discuss the rise to power of Hitler and Mao as examples of leaders chosen from different regions. Most responses demonstrated some knowledge of the rise of Hitler and were able to link this to the impact of the Great Depression on Germany. There were some good, well supported arguments but, all too often there was insufficient knowledge for a sound analysis. As with Q. 7, candidates may have known about hyperinflation in Germany (rarely accurately) in 1923 and mentioned the Beer hall Putsch but did not then go on to argue that the NSDAP did poorly in 1924 and even worse in the 1928 elections. Similarly, there were too many incorrect references to hyperinflation during the economic crisis of the early 1930s and a blurring of the lines between this and 1923. There was some knowledge of the rise of Mao but few were able to discuss in any detail the economic problems that confronted the GMD and whether or not these had played a significant part in Mao's rise to power. Better answers argued that civil war certainly took its toll on the economy, as did the Japanese occupation, and that of greater importance was the clear victory of the PLA in 1949. Despite the command term having been "to what extent..." there was only limited reference to other factors such as propaganda; the use of force; ideology *etc* that may have been as, if not more, important.

Question 14

This was another very popular question with examples chosen ranging from Stalin to Hitler to Mao and Peron. Unfortunately, candidates who discussed Stalin tended to focus on the opposition he faced during his rise to power, although the question quite specifically mentioned "ruler" and so, for the most part, such material was of only marginal relevance.

Again, this indicates the importance of candidates reading questions carefully and using only material that is relevant rather than simply narrating what they have revised. Even where there was focus on Stalin as ruler, comments were rather general and referred mostly to his purges with scant reference to "nature and extent"

of opposition. Rarely was there a mention of propaganda that could also, quite justifiably, be seen as a method to deal with (or pre-empt) opposition. Hitler's response to opposition was explained a little more accurately but, again, the depth of knowledge was insufficient to support adequate analysis. The same shortcomings applied to responses that chose Mao or Peron. A few candidates did attempt to use opposition from enemy states as evidence citing, for example, the Allied powers of the Second World War being "opposition" to Hitler. This was not relevant as the question stated, quite clearly, opposition to a "ruler" and not opposition to a state.

Question 15

This was quite a popular question but, as mentioned in most examiner reports, responses, for the most part, were limited to descriptions of the Holocaust. Only rarely was there any knowledge demonstrated of Hitler having tried to impose state control over churches *etc* but even so, this was not well explained with too many candidates suggesting the Hitler wanted to be worshipped as a god.

Question 16

Another popular question with candidates attempting a comparative structure for their responses and quite effectively making an effort to compare and to contrast the economic and social policies of Mao and Stalin. Most responses referred to the collectivisation of agriculture and drew both comparisons and contrasts between the methods used by Stalin and by Mao. Similarly with industrial development, candidates were able to discuss the Five Year Plans and to extend this to an account of the Great Leap Forward, with better responses detailing how this was a departure from the Soviet model. Overall, there was less knowledge of social policies with most candidates veering off-course to explain methods used by both leaders to deal with opposition. Rarely were policies on education or the role of women discussed.

Question 17

This was a fairly straightforward question with candidates making some effort to discuss both success and failure. The given choices were Castro and Peron, although few responses demonstrated sufficient detailed knowledge to make well supported arguments. For Castro, most responses were rather vaguely ascribed success to the literacy campaigns and land reform and failure to the consequences for Cuba of the collapse of the USSR. The potential was there for good, solid answers but candidates needed more detail to develop their ideas. Again, familiarity with exemplars of scripts that achieve high marks (available on the OCC) may help future candidates to realise how much detailed knowledge is required. Responses on Peron lacked sufficient detail with most mentioning his marriage to Eva Peron as the key to his success, just as her death led to a decline in his popularity.

Question 18

There were a few attempts at discussing the changing status of women and these mostly contrasted Nazi Germany with the People's Republic of China. For the most part, better knowledge was evident for the role of women under Mao. Possibly, this was because there were specific acts of reform that could be mentioned, although some critical commentary on how effective such policies were in practice would have been helpful.

Topic 5**Question 25**

There were not as many responses to this question as might have been expected this session, perhaps because candidates were uncertain of how much they knew about Yalta and Potsdam. A few candidates demonstrated good knowledge of both conferences and, with specific reference to “high point and breaking point” were able to structure an effective, focused response. More often, however, responses were rather vague and there was limited knowledge of issues discussed at the conferences, although most conveyed an impression of Yalta having been rather more good-natured. More thoughtful answers tackled “to what extent” quite well and suggested that the “breaking point” came later with some quite good discussions of events leading up to the division of Europe and of Germany as more significant. Unfortunately, too many candidates missed the opportunity to challenge the assertion, resorting instead to a description of the 1917 revolution, the civil war, the Nazi-Soviet Pact *etc* perhaps as part of a pre-learned approach to a question on the origins of the Cold War. As this question asked specifically about the end of the wartime alliance, such material was often of marginal relevance and, for the most part, not integrated to support a particular argument.

Question 26

This was a very popular question (perhaps seized upon as the alternative to question 25) with some good responses from candidates who correctly identified containment and discussed the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, Berlin, Korea and Cuba with good understanding and good links that explained the success (or lack thereof) of such efforts to contain the spread of Soviet influence. Quite appropriately and effectively, some responses also mentioned Latin America and the covert efforts used to establish US influence in Guatemala and Nicaragua. Weaker responses failed to take note of the timeframe or of “global spread” and so adopted an overly narrow approach often describing a selection of specific events such as the Berlin Blockade and the Korean War, and thus demonstrating a limited understanding of the demands of the question. Although the US response to the Indo-Chinese War and, indeed, events in Vietnam up to 1962, would have been relevant, several responses went on to discuss the US involvement in the Vietnam War that was outside the timeframe of this question.

Question 27

One of the comments on the G2 form questioned why this question excluded the US and the USSR as examples. This was stipulated because there would have been far too much relevant material for a candidate choosing these two superpowers to discuss in sufficient depth and the risk being that, at best, the question would have been answered only superficially. As it was, attempts to address the impact of the Cold War even on Korea or Cuba, for example, proved rather difficult for the few candidates who chose this question.

Question 28

There were very few responses that discussed the impact of the Congo on the development of the Cold War with one or two that had some knowledge only of the

events of the civil war. More responses chose to discuss the impact of Korea on the development of the Cold War but, again, most did little other than narrate the main stages of the war. It is worth mentioning that both here and for question 26, there was almost no mention of the involvement of the UN in the Korean War with candidates, for the most part, being aware only of the role played by the US.

Question 29

A few responses were seen and candidates who chose this question did attempt to say something about the shift in relations between the US and China from the establishment of the PRC to the thaw of 1972. There was some relevant knowledge of the “loss of China” and the subsequent cooling of relations that was furthered by the Korean War; the Chinese Off-shore Islands Crises (mentioned by a few); the growing tension over Vietnam *etc.* An improvement in relations was attributed to the Sino-Soviet rift; Nixon’s foreign policy and so on. Even weaker answers demonstrated some awareness that relations improved over this time period although some felt compelled to stray into the era of Deng Xiaoping.

Question 30

This was quite a popular question and better responses demonstrated some knowledge of Gorbachev’s reforms and were able to identify and explain, to some extent, the policies of perestroika and glasnost and how the difficulty of putting these into practice led to political reform and subsequent events culminating in the collapse of the USSR by December 1991. Few were able to develop their arguments to include the growth (resurgence?) of nationalism in the Soviet Republics and too many weaker answers thought that the satellite states were also part of the USSR and wrote lengthy accounts of the events of 1989. A few candidates responded by detailing the inherent failings of communism, but without detailed knowledge to demonstrate at least an understanding of what was meant by “internal problems”, such responses did not score well.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- There was evidence of planning in many of the scripts, especially now that candidates have to include such preparatory work in their exam booklet. This was reassuring and, as long as there was sufficient knowledge upon which to base arguments, it clearly benefitted candidates to think through the demands of the question. It is recommended that candidates spend around 5 minutes on this task and it does pay dividends as it can often encourage a re-reading of the question and a stronger focus on the selection of relevant knowledge. Unfortunately, many of the plans were little more than aides-memoire: unorganised jottings of facts and ideas that did not indicate structure or how these facts and ideas would contribute to the argument presented. So, room for improvement here, but, at least, even a list of facts is a step in the right direction.
- Accurate, detailed knowledge is a must for success in this exam and candidates need to be made aware of just how much they need to know about a topic in order to be able to support a strong analysis. It is this detailed knowledge that helps them to understand exactly what the question is asking and to know enough to keep their response relevant and focused. One examiner report suggested that candidates be

encouraged to “zone in” and “zone out” and so develop the ability to discuss a topic in general terms but also to be able to support arguments by “zoning in” to explain in detail how they would support arguments.

- Many examiners suggested that candidates be encouraged to read more widely and to develop their overall understanding of the course through an awareness of what different historians have to say about the topics they study (and why!).

Higher and Standard Level Paper Two - Timezone 2

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 4	5 - 8	9 - 12	13 - 16	17 - 21	22 - 25	26 - 40

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

The vast majority of candidates were able to identify two relevant questions, each from a different topic and then write an essay response to each. By and large, candidates in this session had prepared for topics 1, 3 and 5 although this session a significant number of responses were seen for topic 2, though these were mainly focused on question 7 (on the Weimar Republic). Overall, the most popular responses were from topics 3 and 5.

There were very few rubric offences and where they did occur, most were related to students only answering one question because they did not seem prepared to answer two. On a number of occasions it seemed that candidates were unable to stay within the framework of the questions, notably in question 9 (the first half of the 20th Century; question 28, which should have focused on the time period between 1945 and 1961; question 1 on the Central Powers in the First World War (1914–1918) or the Axis Powers in the Second World War (1939–1945).

The most common mistake was to choose a question and drift away from its focus, relying on highly generalised comments and then failing to develop an argument. Nevertheless, stronger responses, and there were many, included a well-structured essay, that explicitly and consistently addressed the needs of the question before arriving at a balanced and supported conclusion.

Finally, candidates presented difficulties in understanding the requirement in the command terms: too many candidates present answers that only describe or narrate events when they should be engaging with the demands of the command term.

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

There is a tendency to “prepare” answers for questions related to the Causes of wars, the rise to power of leaders and the Cold War. Clear culprits were questions 2, 5 and 25 where candidates laid out a whole battery of reasons.

Most candidates worked on a memory exercise that only gave evidence of general learning in the classroom. On the other hand, there were some very skilled answers that showed very high awareness of the demands of the question and substantial amounts of historical information, which was then used effectively to support the main argument.

This year, scripts have been better structured and organized. It is clear that centres have started to put an emphasis on preparing candidates to write an extended response. Many candidates presented an essay plan and this can only help them to clear their minds and organise their thoughts before committing anything final to the script.

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

Only responses to the most popular questions will be outlined below. Please refer to the mark schemes for further detail regarding indicative or suggested content for individual questions.

Topic 1

Question 1

A significant number of candidates attempted this question and there was a good balance between those utilising the First and Second World Wars as the focus for their responses. For the First World War, candidates were clearly prepared to give details regarding the failures of the Schlieffen Plan but nothing more on any of the other war plans. With regards to submarine warfare in the First World War, candidates insist that the sinking of the Lusitania brought the United States into the war immediately, without considering that they did not enter the war until two years later. Stronger answers made links with the Zimmerman telegram and gave clear evidence of the American build-up to war. These were able to demonstrate cause and effect, continuity and change. With reference to the Second World War, the majority of answers focused on Operation Barbarossa as one of the biggest mistakes of the war. Better-prepared candidates, in an effort to fully address the Central Powers/Axis Powers bent, tended to expand their responses with analysis of countries other than Germany when dealing with their elected World War.

Question 2

Candidates did not seem well prepared for a question that focused on economic causes only. The vast majority of the answers seemed to be pre-prepared responses that dealt with the general causes of the Spanish Civil War. More able candidates were able to use historical terminology successfully by making a reference to “Latifundism” but little more than that. The Spanish Civil War was a complex conflict, and a confident understanding of it depends on reasonably detailed knowledge. Instead, many candidates confused Nationalists with Republicans and were unable to distinguish between intervention from the fascist powers and aid for the Nationalists.

Question 3

This year there were strong responses on superior technological development where candidates were able to focus on how technology developed and how it was used to defeat the enemy. However, this question was also tackled by a number of weaker candidates who simply explained technological development vaguely, with generalised examples and little use of appropriate terminology. Rarely, answers focused only on the results of the war without addressing technological developments. Candidates appeared more prepared for answers dealing with the Gulf War rather than the Falklands/Malvinas War.

Question 4

This question presented a number of difficulties to the many candidates who attempted to respond to it. Far too many Presented difficulties in general. A

responded to it; with far too many candidates focusing on dates that were not asked for in the question (*i.e.* responses focused neither on 1920-1930 nor 1945-1955, but on the interim period of 1930-1939 instead). Where the correct dates were used, the majority of answers looked to the first period: many candidates considered the League of Nations and its failures, albeit without providing relevant examples. Others looked to the failure of “important” countries to join the League, which, in their view guaranteed its failure from the outset. With regards to the second period, candidates were apparently ill-prepared to write about the United Nations Organization and its efforts to establish collective security. Instead, answers focused on regional security pacts and the idea of atomic weapons and the fear they generated as a means of preventing war.

Question 5

A fair number of candidates attempted this question, with a specific focus on the Spanish Civil War and the Chinese Civil War. Most candidates were well-prepared to write about external involvement using relevant and accurate historical knowledge. There were very few rubric offences with candidates focusing on two wars each drawn from the same region.

Question 6

Answers to this question were rare. Those who chose to answer this question were ill-prepared to discuss the government’s military strategy and instead, wrote a narrative of the course of the chosen wars and how guerrilla warfare had an effect in the successful rise of the leader. Examples used were Cuba and China with Algeria occurring much less frequently.

Topic 2

Question 7

The focus of this question (as outlined by the topic heading: Democratic States – challenges and responses) was democracy, yet the vast majority of the candidates who attempted this question seized the opportunity to narrate the rise of Hitler. Despite this, there were many candidates who did consider valid obstacles but were then unable to deploy factual knowledge to support their ideas. Instead they tended to use that knowledge to explain how these obstacles paved the way for Hitler’s rise to power.

Question 9

Many candidates focused their responses on the Weimar Republic and, once again, used the opportunity to re-direct the question to the rise of Hitler.

Question 10

Candidates who chose this question produced extremely vague and general answers. Few were able to discuss relevant issues, and instead gave a brief narrative of suffrage rights, education, and employment and family roles. Very few candidates were able to identify specific government policy to address gender issues in specific countries.

Topic 3**Question 13**

A significant number of candidates attempted this question; however responses to it were rarely more than mediocre as the answers betrayed a reluctance to discuss the ideology of the chosen leaders. Instead, there was a focus on other factors that aided the rise to power, although these also earned credit. Stronger responses outlined the ideology of the chosen leaders and analysed how it was deployed to amass support in their rise to power. As it was a “to what extent do you agree...” question, candidates seized the opportunity to focus on what they knew better, which was, other factors. In the future, it is important that candidates understand that “to what extent” requires a balanced and analytical discussion of the named factor in the context of the wider issues; it is not an opportunity to drift from the set question toward a task they may have pre-prepared. The most common chosen leaders were Hitler, Castro and Mao but very few answers had relevant historical knowledge on the specifics of the ideology of those leaders.

Question 14

Candidates were generally well prepared and knowledgeable of the way leaders used force and economic policies to maintain power. Hitler was, by far, the most popular choice in this case, followed by Mao and in third place Castro. Weaknesses were in the level of generalisation in the answers. Only the stronger responses were able to give specific and effective examples of the way in which the leaders used force to maintain power, most of the answers on Hitler, for example, mentioned the Night of the Long Knives and the Night of the Broken Glass, with some variation of the names of the events. However, few were able to make the link between the event and how it enabled Hitler to maintain power; instead examiners were expected to imply these links. Economic policies were on the weaker side of this answer as few candidates were able to give specific examples of policies. For example with Hitler, there was mention of the autobahn, other public work schemes and removal of Jews and women to tackle unemployment, but not more than that. For Mao, there was a tendency to make comparisons with Soviet collectivization and of course, backyard furnaces could not be left out of the picture. For Castro, answers were a lot weaker as candidates were not able to go into any of the specific economic policies and instead focused on the economic embargo, which led to a deteriorating economy. It is recommended that candidates are prepared with some relevant examples of policies that show how the leaders used them to maintain power instead of just solving a problem.

Question 15

Stalin’s domestic policies were well addressed. Candidates were well prepared and demonstrated extensive knowledge of the way the policies were beneficial to the USSR but not to the people as well as how the policies were beneficial to Stalin rather than the people. Students demonstrated depth of knowledge of the transition between the goals of the Five-Year Plans, showing awareness of cause and effect.

Question 16

Few answers on this question showed that candidates are ill-prepared on economic policy. Those who attempted any of the three leaders in question did it in a very general manner, perhaps mentioning an area of the economy that needed work but with little knowledge of key policies put forward by the government.

Question 17

This was by far, one of the most popular questions this session. Several candidates were very well-prepared to answer Mao's successes and failures by specifically referring to economic and social policies as well as political measures. Stronger answers were able to make a clear link with the opposition to those policies and how the leader dealt with this opposition. Weaker answers only described the policies that Mao established with few indications of their success or failure.

Question 18

Those who chose this question, unfortunately, produced weak answers as they narrated or described changes in the status of women that could have been applied to any state at any point in time. The same applied for education. Very few candidates, if any, were able to discuss the implications of the changes in the status of women or the role of education.

Topic 4

Question 19

Pakistan and India were the most common examples, with candidates showing a satisfactory level of knowledge of the reasons for success in achieving independence from colonial rule. Very few answers focused on the African region.

Question 24

Candidates attempting this question largely focused on Ho Chi Minh and were able to identify the reasons why the leader was able to fight colonial control. There were, however, a great majority of candidates who drifted into a general narrative of the Vietnam War.

Topic 5

Question 25

A fair number of candidates attempted this question; however, a few were not able to focus on the time period between the two conferences. Many candidates were well prepared in terms of historical knowledge about the events taking place in Yalta and Potsdam, yet a small number of them were able to make an effective link between the events and the change in East-West relations. Most of the answers were narrative or descriptive where they highlighted what had happened during each conference and how this represented the origins of the Cold War.

Question 26

Candidates who attempted this question were generally focused on the time between 1947 and 1962. There was a balanced distribution of candidates who focused on

Europe and Asia as well as Europe and the Americas, thus giving that international dimension to the answer. Weaker answers focused on one region and one specific event, for example, in Asia, limiting the policy of containment to the Korean War, or in America, where containment was limited to the Cuban Missile Crisis. Stronger answers were able to compare and contrast events between regions and give several specific historical examples of how the US policy of containment proved effective in limiting Soviet expansion.

Question 28

The vast majority, if not all, of the candidates who attempted this question focused on Germany and the events that took place between 1945 and 1961. The main weaknesses were that answers appeared mostly as a description of what happened in Germany during those years, failing to make a link with the significance of those events in the role of relations between East and West during the Cold War.

Question 29

There were but a few answers on this topic, and these showed that candidates were, by and large, prepared to explain the reasons for change in relations between both countries using a narrative and/or descriptive approach. Some candidates were well prepared and had several specific examples for both countries, whereas the rest simply described the development of relations without making a link to the reasons for the change in relations. In this case, giving evidence of knowledge of cause and effect was very limited.

Question 30

The main task for this question was to identify the aims that Gorbachev set for the Soviet Union, rather than the general course of world events during or right before Gorbachev's rule. This is the typical example where students have prepared an answer on the end of the Cold War and come up with answers that show little focus on what the task is really asking for. Few candidates were able to focus on Gorbachev and his policies as many answers just mentioned perestroika or glasnost without going into an explanation of what the policies were and what the impact of the policies was. Determining cause and effect was one of the main weaknesses of this answer.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Structure is extremely important. A well-structured essay will enable the reader to understand the candidate's line of thought. Candidates need to demonstrate the ability to extract the relevant information instead of spending 90 minutes regurgitating anything and everything they can recollect on a topic. An introduction that only re-writes the question does not help candidates to write a focused essay instead they should use the opportunity to directly address the question before going on to give a valid and balanced argument that supports their viewpoint.
- The formatting of responses more generally is an important aspect as strong essays consist of structured paragraphs that separate ideas and develop, with valid factual

support, coherent points that address the set question. This done, the answer should then have a substantiated conclusion that draws together all of the arguments presented and demonstrates why the initial analysis was – in the candidates view – the correct one (and this is why comprehensive planning is so important).

- Candidates should also be reminded that illegible answers do not communicate effectively and, unfortunately, this may undermine their response as examiners have to struggle through their scripts. As such practicing handwritten responses to these questions would be a great benefit to some candidates.
- Finally, no colloquialisms!

Higher Level Paper Three - Africa

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 6	7 - 13	14 - 18	19 - 24	25 - 29	30 - 35	36 - 60

General comments

Generally speaking, “to what extent...” questions were handled well in that they discussed both sides of the argument; however, there was a problem in that many responses were poorly balanced with so much focus on one side that there was very little room for a worthwhile analysis of the second. Further, the compare and contrast questions are still challenging for many of the candidates. As are other questions that require analysis of two factors, for example, causes and results. Again focus was given to causes and there was very little discussion of results. Additionally, critical analysis and, where necessary, references to different approaches also proved to be a challenge for many candidates: some of the essays ended up being narrative accounts, largely because the points made were poorly linked to the demands of the question.

Overall, it is important for in depth knowledge to be deployed by candidates when arguing their case. Candidates should try and address all aspects of a question with supporting evidence.

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

As mentioned above, candidates had particular difficulties with questions that required comparison and contrast. For many their response was an essay of two halves: the first consisting of a discussion of one aspect in its entirety and the second being a discussion of the other aspect. This made it difficult to adequately compare and contrast.

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

There was considerable depth of knowledge in a number of areas. Particularly notable areas of expertise were: Lewanika of Lozi; Shaka and the Mfecane; Kabaka Mwanga and Apolo Kagwa; and Chilembwe's resistance.

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

Only responses to the most popular questions will be outlined below. Please refer to the mark schemes for further detail regarding indicative or suggested content for individual questions.

Question 5

The agreements of the Berlin Conference were a challenge to candidates as they struggled to identify the agreements and just went on to talk about the scramble for Africa in much more general terms.

Question 15

This question, on independent churches, was somewhat challenging to candidates, many of whom did not seem to understand what independent churches were. There was also a failure to link their formation to missionary churches that were themselves linked to colonial rule.

Question 16

Many candidates found it challenging to discuss how colonial rule succeeded in bringing modern and effective education to Africa.

Question 17

The section on Tanganyika was much better handled than the section on Mau Mau resistance was. Factors building to Mau Mau resistance were not handled well by the candidates.

Question 22

This question, on multi-partism, was also not handled well by many of the candidates who attempted it.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Candidates should be made aware of the importance of using specific detailed historical knowledge to support their argument.
-
- The use of critical analysis should be emphasised.
-
- Different approaches should be used and must be critically analysed and evaluated. There should not merely be a summary of various views.
-
- It is important for candidates to substantiate their points and always try to link their points to the questions otherwise their answers will be little more than narrative accounts. There should be – as for all History essay questions – a focus on structure and planning.

Higher Level Paper Three - Americas

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 5	6 - 11	12 - 16	17 - 22	23 - 29	30 - 35	36 - 60

General comments

The M14 exam was the fifth sitting for the 2010 History Syllabus and the exam saw continued growth in the number of candidates. Of the three available components, Peacekeeping and Communism, (combined 76%), remain larger than that of the Arab/Israeli option. However, there is an apparent shift away from the 'Peacemaking' unit toward the 'Communism in Crisis' option. Both of the more popular options are experiencing a slight decline in the total number of schools. While 'Peacemaking' is experiencing a decline in new schools and new candidates, 'Communism' is growing in both categories. Overall predicted grades were little different from past sessions.

G2 comments continue to be relatively few in number and thus represent a percentage of teachers that may not be a statistically relevant sample. It is sincerely hoped that more teachers will take the time to offer suggestions and register complaints in order to secure the depth of both data and insight that will lead to improvement in the quality and accuracy of candidate's testing experience.

For M14, 70% of respondents to the G2s thought the difficulty level to be appropriate, with 31% regarding it as too difficult in terms of both clarity and presentation. Nearly 90% of this session's respondents regarded the exam as either 'good', 'very good' or 'excellent'. In terms of specific comments, there were perceptions that: the exam was too focused on Latin America and Canada; questions were too narrow and specific; the Cold War questions did not allow focus on the US; the Mexican Revolution questions represented only the reconstruction era of the revolution; the Civil War questions represented obscure elements that were neither popular nor necessary elements of the syllabus (though both were acknowledged as being clear bullet points); it was asserted as obligatory that the exam should include a question on US Reconstruction.

For both information and stimulation of discussion, the M14 exam had 8 questions specific to the US; 4 specific to Latin America and 1 specific to Canada. There were: 5 questions allowing either any one country, or any two countries, of the region to be applied; 3 questions on US/Latin American relations; 2 questions with a choice between Canada and Latin America. One question offered a choice between Canada and the US.

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

There did not appear to be any weaknesses that were specific to a geographic, chronological or topical aspect of the curriculum. It did appear that candidates preferred to answer questions on late 19th or 20th century topics, but that may have been specific to the M14 examination.

While not specific to the programme or examination, it is necessary to call attention to the growing problem of candidates who are writing nearly illegible essays. Whilst examiners make every effort to carefully evaluate essays that are quite difficult to read, it is of essential harm to the appraisal of the candidate's knowledge if an examiner's reading is constantly interrupted in an attempt to determine the meaning of the script. This is an issue best addressed by the teacher at an early point in their interaction with the student. Changing from script to printing, skipping lines, etc are some of the solutions possible. Another option is to apply for assessment arrangements so that the candidate may type the essays. In the end, it is the student's responsibility to produce a legible essay and there should be no expectation that examiners will assume an essay demonstrates knowledge if it cannot be clearly read.

There is a tendency for many candidates to write on a predetermined subject, rather than address the question posed. An example from M14 would be question 6 on the extent to which nullification theory and the nullification crisis were causes of the US Civil War. Many candidates ignored nullification or simply dismissed its importance without addressing either the theory or demonstrating knowledge of the crisis. While 'challenging' the importance of nullification as a Civil War cause is definitely a valid approach, candidates must first address the question presented with specific knowledge and analysis. Another example would be question 20 in cases where Cuba was the country of choice. Many candidates wrote on the conflict in foreign policy between the US and the USSR and assumed that it would imply the impact of the Cold War on Cuban foreign policy. While some credit may have been achieved by this implied understanding, such an approach would not have met the demands of the question for specific knowledge of how Cuba altered their foreign policy as a consequence of Cold War events. In overview, these examples illustrate one of the most challenging requirements for students – to understand and directly respond to the specific demands of questions, rather than simply narrate content on the broader aspects of the topic.

With the exception of the US Civil Rights Movement, candidates continue to take very narrative and descriptive approaches to social history questions, generally leading to lower quality responses. This might suggest the need to alter the approach to teaching social history units and the benefit of counselling students in their selection of questions.

Candidates continue to struggle with the ability to properly differentiate between political, economic and social history as illustrated in responses to question 2 where political events were too often the focus though the demand was for social and economic impact.

Candidates continue to apply the names of historians (sometimes even the authors of the most popular survey texts) without identifying the particular or unique analysis that would make the naming of the historian relevant. Application of historiography is quite rare and requires clear identification of conflicting interpretations, either by school of analysis or by specific historian: historians' names should not simply be added for the mere sake of it.

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

There were very few cases of candidates writing on topics from outside the region and there appeared to be fewer instances of candidates writing fewer than three essays.

The quality of essay structure continues to show improvement with candidates providing introductions that address the set question and contain historical context organized either

chronologically or topically, and conclusion paragraphs that summarize both evidence and argument.

In this session, the Mexican Revolution, US expansionism and the Civil Rights Movement were areas of the curriculum represented with especially good depth of knowledge.

Comparison and contrast questions were often well-structured, which has been a weakness in the past. Additionally, more candidates were specific in their treatment of two-part questions, acknowledging both demands and responding with some balance.

There were many responses of good to excellent quality on topics of Canadian history.

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

Question 1

Relatively few candidates chose to address battles or campaigns that were specific to certain independence movements and there were quite a few responses that did not address acceptable examples. Others discussed causes of independence movements or the general reasons for the outcome, rather than focusing on the question posed. The essays of exceptional quality were generally on events of Latin American history.

Question 2

Analysis of the social and economic impact of independence was often quite sound when the candidate did not address the US. There were many sound essays on Latin America, and Haiti was a choice that was of particular note. Those choosing the US often wrote more extensively on causes of the 'revolution', than on impact, or compared the conditions of the Articles of Confederation period to that of the Philadelphia Constitutional era. Candidates often had difficulty distinguishing economic and social impact from political impact and applied largely unsubstantiated generalisations.

Question 3

There were relatively few essays on caudillos and the reason for their rise was addressed more thoroughly than their impact. Depth of knowledge and analysis was generally quite limited.

Question 4

Responses on the causes of the Mexican-American War were generally competent, but seldom exceptional. They often were more narrative than analytical and seldom approached the question from the perspectives of both the US and Mexico. A small percentage of candidates were able to evaluate the actions of both countries but generally with more attention placed on the expansionist ambitions of the Polk administration.

Question 5

The role of foreign powers in the US Civil War was seldom answered with distinction. Many candidates simply denied that there was a role for foreign powers and then discussed war causes or causes for the outcome. Better essays began their assessment with the role of Great Britain in respect to trade with both belligerents, the impact of Antietam and the Emancipation Proclamation, blockade runners, the Trent Affair and then developed other factors regarded as more significant. A few confused the American Revolution and the Civil War in respect to the role of foreign powers.

Question 6

The theory of nullification was generally understood but in very few cases was the nullification crisis addressed or accurately linked to the development of sectionalism, states' rights or the eventual secession of southern states. The typical approach was to briefly mention nullification theory and then discuss general causes of the US Civil War, thus producing essays that failed to directly address the demands of the question.

Question 7

This question saw few respondents but often produced very sound essays, nearly all of which compared and contrasted Booker T Washington to WEB Dubois. The structure of comparison and contrast was often quite good.

Question 8

The role of railroad construction in modernization was not often addressed and seldom led to answers of high quality. The US, Canada and Mexico were the most frequent subjects and the essays typically advanced broad, unsubstantiated generalisations that were more focused on the US.

Question 9

Perhaps the most consistently high-quality responses addressed the reasons for US expansionist foreign policy. There was often an impressive depth and breadth of understanding that encompassed the full demands of the question in terms of ideological, economic, and political motives, along with appropriate examples. Essays of moderate quality were either narrow in their timeframe or limited in discussing the broad base of reasons for expansionism. Some candidates were too focused on listing examples of expansion, rather than assessing 'reasons'. With a limited degree of success, some candidates attempted to apply the First World War as a period when the US expanded its diplomatic role.

Question 10

Canada or Brazil were almost always the choice as to 'reasons and ways' for participation in the First World War and the quality of response was quite high, often with very good detail as to 'ways'. The question was a fairly popular choice.

Question 11

Analysis of the successes and failures of Obregon's rule was answered with a wide range of quality. Weaker responses produced lengthy narratives and lacked specific analysis or examples as to his policies. There was considerable disagreement as to whether success or failure was more pronounced.

Question 12

Comparison and contrast of the political and economic policies of Calles and Cardenas was a fairly popular choice and candidates generally demonstrated good depth of knowledge and appropriate structure in their responses. Treatment as to Cardenas was generally more thorough than for Calles.

Question 13

Reasons for opposition to the New Deal was not chosen with great frequency but did lead to some essays of very good quality. Focus tended to be on the Supreme Court, the Liberty League, Father Coughlin, Robert Townsend and Huey Long. Some candidates did have difficulty distinguishing particular individuals or groups and provided only a general critique of the New Deal based mostly on class divisions. There were also some instances in which candidates simply described either the causes of the Great Depression or the programs of the New Deal.

Question 14

The impact of the Great Depression on women and minorities was one of the most popular questions but, unfortunately, led to many weak responses that provided generalised descriptions lacking specific knowledge. There was often too much focus on the 1920s or the Second World War. The US was almost always the focus. As is too often the tendency, social history questions lead to broad and unsupported generalisations, and these were in plentiful supply in the responses to this question.

Question 15

The diplomatic impact of the Second World War on one country was not often chosen, but was addressed from the perspective of Canada in most cases. There were a few essays exhibiting a quite proficient level of knowledge. However, in many cases, candidates had difficulty in distinguishing between diplomatic, as compared to, economic, social or military factors.

Question 16

The relationship between the Good Neighbour Policy and hemispheric cooperation was not a very popular choice. There was a wide distribution of quality in the responses, including some essays that confused the era and the purpose of the GNP. There were many instances in which the candidates could not define the GNP and discussed issues of hemispheric cooperation in relationship to concerns over communism.

Question 17

The reasons for and results of the Great Society program was a popular choice, but rather surprisingly, was not often addressed with good effect. In many instances, candidates spent considerable attention on President Johnson's Vietnam policies, rather than on domestic programs. While better responses acknowledged the limiting impact of the Vietnam War, they remained clearly focused on Lyndon B Johnson's motives and the impact of the programs. Lesser essays provided a description of the programs with only an implied analysis as to 'reasons and results'.

Question 18

The populist leader most often selected for evaluation as to achieving economic independence was Castro with Peron as a distant second. While there were essays of good quality, most candidates did not attempt to define their choice as a populist leader and provided a narrative of the individual's economic policies with little assessment as to 'economic independence'. Where assessment did take place, the focus was almost entirely on the limitations or failures to achieve economic independence.

Question 19

Kennedy's Alliance for Progress, its 'aims and impact', was a mid-frequency choice and answers were often adequate to good in quality. Many candidates could provide a rather sophisticated critique of the aims and impact, demonstrating a balanced analysis.

Question 20

The impact of the Cold War on a country's foreign policy usually led to a discussion of Cuba, with Canada an occasional choice. Responses on Cuba were quite mixed in quality, but the tendency was to focus on relations between the US and the USSR without developing how events such as the Bay of Pigs or the Cuban Missile Crisis had an impact on **Cuba's** foreign policies.

Question 21

The rise of radical activism in the Civil Rights Movement was the most popular question of the M14 session and, as might be expected, produced an extremely wide range of essays in terms of quality. Most candidates could accurately analyse the difference in objectives and approach between Dr King and radical activists, though some could only generalise as to specific activist leaders. There was often more narrative than specific content linked to the thesis posed. Still, the level of knowledge was quite good overall.

Question 22

The reasons for and impact of youth protests was fairly popular and, surprisingly, was approached more from examples within the Civil Rights Movement and less from the anti-Vietnam War movement. In too many instances only one protest movement was applied. There were quite a few responses in which content from the 1950s was applied or where events were cited that had little relevance to 'youth protests'. A high

proportion of essays described protests and perhaps discussed 'reasons' but failed to analyse the 'impact'. Almost all candidates applied examples from the US.

Question 23

Analyses of Reagan's policies were far too often exclusively focused on either foreign or domestic policy, but not both. Better answers were specific in detail and demonstrated some balance in their assessment, but there were many which took either an entirely positive or negative approach to the analysis and which provided evidence of strong opinions based more on contemporary political views than on historical analysis.

Question 24

The impact of globalization was not frequently selected but did produce some interesting and competent essays, mostly focused on the US. There were quite a few cases in which the candidate could not accurately define or provide examples of globalization and applied elements of military intervention without context to globalization.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- It is essential that programs and teachers give full attention to all of the bullet points within a given topic. This is possible if the curriculum is restricted to the suggested limit of three topics.
- Review of the markband descriptors would be a worthy part of any programme's preparations in that it would help candidates incorporate more of the required elements into their essays.
- Review of past examinations is an essential component in that it helps students develop understanding of the demands that particular command words have in the response to questions. This is best incorporated into daily lesson plans, so that the skill is developed throughout the year, rather than used as strategy over the final few weeks of the course. It also helps to ward against the application of pre-formed essays as a response to popular topics, such as the Mexican Revolution or the US Civil War. Students will benefit from practice of the demands of past questions in respect to: command terms, key words, timeframe and, in relevant instances, case studies.
- Of particular benefit is the use of timed essays within class, as opposed to 'research-based' essays outside of class time. Of equal importance is the feedback that students receive, both through comments on their work and from review of high-quality responses. It is helpful for students to have multiple choices of questions, which allows the teacher to later discuss what questions were most directly connected to the coursework of the program and to consider alternative approaches that would have been possible for each question. Given the many demands on the time of teachers, it is essential to develop strategies for developing essay skills beyond the assignment of timed essays with individual comments as the feedback.

- It is crucial for candidates to have a strong chronological awareness of major events, movements, eras, *etc* within their curriculum topics. There were quite a few instances this session of candidates applying knowledge to an inappropriate era of history, such as French assistance to the US during the Civil War rather than the Revolutionary War.
- Weaker responses continue to confuse independence movements with revolutionary wars. This is especially true in respect to Cuba and Mexico. Special emphasis is needed to help them distinguish between these events.
- It is quite understandable that candidates will frequently apply generalisations in the course of their essay writing. It is crucial that throughout their coursework, great emphasis is placed on substantiation of those generalisations through concrete examples. Achievement of this skill would greatly enhance the majority of scripts.

Higher Level Paper Three – Asia and Oceania

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 6	7 - 13	14 - 18	19 - 24	25 - 30	31 - 36	37 - 60

General comments

There were 19 G2 responses and this represents a very small sample of teachers and it would be very helpful if more centres chose to send a response. From the G2 responses received, the majority, 89%, thought that the level of difficulty of the paper was appropriate. While 68% of the respondents felt that the paper was of a similar standard to last year's, a significant number, 21%, thought that it was more difficult and 5% much more difficult. Those who felt that the presentation of the paper was good or better were the majority at 89%, but 11% thought that it was only fair. This session, more respondents were unhappy with the clarity of the wording with 16% indicating that it poor, 21% fair and only 63% thought that it was good or better.

Some of the written comments indicated that the respondents were pleased with the balance of the questions and the coverage of the syllabus, but there were fewer positive comments than in previous sessions. Only a few candidates chose question 2, which was surprising given the usual popularity of questions that enable candidates to discuss the Great Revolt (Indian Mutiny). This may have been due to confusion in the question that was identified by a teacher on the OCC Forum and by others on the G2 form. The use of 'and' instead of 'or' may have led some candidates think that the question was asking about 2 countries. This issue was taken into account in the marking process.

Some G2 respondents thought the phrase 'modernized nation' was too broad in question 8. Others also felt the time frame of 1912-1927 was a little confusing in question 11. A few of the comments in the G2s, however, indicated that some teachers still have not fully come to grips with the format of the examination as it relates to the current syllabus. Only two questions are asked per section so inevitably each year some bullet points in the section will not necessarily have a question. In some sections the scope of each bullet point is quite specific whereas in Sections 11 and 12 they cover a wide scope. The complaints about the narrowness of some questions and the wide time frame of questions 22, 23 and 24 indicate that some teachers do not understand the way questions are set. The latter questions 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. Quite often the candidates who answered them did not really address the question and just presented material about Mao's and/or Deng's China.

The most serious issue for this examination paper was that many candidates did not know the terminology for the centuries or their geography. So a number of candidates needlessly lost marks because they chose to write about the wrong centuries for questions 2 and 3. Most of the candidates who chose question 10 misread the question and wrote about Gandhi instead of a leader from Southeast Asia and therefore received no marks. There were complaints on the OCC and on the G2 form about this question being confusing because the phrase 'between 1919 and the mid-20th century' was considered *'more congruent to South Asia*

example Gandhi', but these dates can equally apply to Ho Chi Minh and Sukarno! Section 5 includes both South and Southeast Asia and question 9 was on already on India. Teachers need to teach all the bullet points in a section and stress that the candidates must read the question carefully. The same bullet points may not be examined every year, and there is no predictable rotation of questions through the bullet points from year to year. This issue of misreading the questions and writing about the wrong geographic area has been raised time and time again in the subject reports.

Not many centres answered questions about Southeast Asia, but there were a few sound responses on Thailand and Singapore. Most centres seemed to concentrate on India and China or China and Japan. The quality of the responses was equally balanced across the countries and also between the nineteenth and twentieth century. There were 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.

It was also pleasing to note that there was much less use of idiosyncratic abbreviations. Hopefully, the comments in previous examiners' reports have alerted teachers to this issue. Only commonly used standard abbreviations such as CCP and GMD (KMT) should be permitted. In a similar vein, 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 candidates should be encouraged to switch to Pinyin.

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

Many 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 8, 11, 12, 14, 19, 20 and 21.

Often candidates tried to impose a rigid political, economic and social analysis when the question did not ask for this. This was particularly evident for questions 12 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 'Taipings' ideology' (4); 'modernized nation' (8); 'nationalism' and 'Communism' (12); 'democratic state' (14); 'socialist state' (19); and 'urbanization' (24) found it difficult to come to terms with these questions and answer them effectively.

Questions 2, 7, 13 and 20 required candidates to cover a great deal of material in order to answer both parts of the question. Most candidates did not deal effectively with the consequences part of these questions.

Many candidates did not have a strong sense of chronology and context.

Many candidates did not seem to understand the distinction between South Asia, and Southeast Asia; consequently these candidates a lost significant number of marks due to this mistake. This applied to question 10.

Some candidates did not seem to understand the names of the centuries, for example late eighteenth to mid nineteenth century means late 1700s to mid 1800s, and consequently these candidates lost a significant number of marks due to this mistake. This applied to questions 2, 3 and 18.

Some candidates ignored the timeframe given in the question and consequently did not score highly. This particularly applied to questions 5, 7, 9, 13, 19 and 20.

Some candidates spent too long on background or biographical information in their responses particularly in questions 3, 4, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 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. Jung Chang was used frequently, but her controversial views were not counterbalanced by references to other historians' views.

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

Many candidates wrote introductions that were clearly focussed on the question. They were able to structure thematic responses and displayed a comprehensive knowledge of a range of topics. Many of them also wrote detailed, relevant and well constructed essays and these were a pleasure to mark.

There were some very good responses to question 22 where the candidates used Singapore or Japan as their case study; however the best responses were on whether Japan became a modernized nation (8); the victory of the CCP (12); the US Occupation of Japan (14) and the reasons for the Korean War (21). They displayed a mastery of historical knowledge, considerable analytical skills and the ability to structure thematic responses.

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

Only responses to the most popular questions will be outlined below. Please refer to the mark schemes for further detail regarding indicative or suggested content for individual questions.

Question 2

This question was chosen by a small number of candidates and it was done very poorly. Most candidates chose India, but they did not all adhere to the timeframe in the question. Many responses were summaries of the reasons for resistance with little mention of consequences.

Question 3

This was a very popular question. Better candidates structured their responses thematically and did a running comparison on a range of aspects. Comparisons yielded more evidence than contrasts. These responses noted the types of government and nexus of power in each country and the way in which that had an impact on how each country was opened for trade. Weaker candidates wrote

descriptive responses that ended with a bolt-on conclusion in an effort to tie-in some relevance to the question. Many candidates knew less about Japan and were stronger on China. Therefore, this indicates that for many candidates Section 1 may not have been studied in full.

Question 4

This was also a very popular question that was generally done well. Most candidates could identify and explain the Taiping ideology and address how it alienated both the Chinese and the Westerners. Better candidates were able to challenge the assumption in the question and also discuss other factors that contributed to the failure of the Taiping Rebellion.

Question 5

There were a reasonable number of responses to this question. Candidates tended to be mainly narrative and/or descriptive. Many ignored the timeframe in the question and wrote about events beyond 1935. Weaker candidates erroneously used this question as an opportunity to write a biographical account of Jinnah.

Question 7

This was a popular choice, but quite a few candidates failed to provide any details of the actual reforms, perhaps because of the way the question was worded. Many candidates included lengthy in-depth background information. Generally, candidates were not clear on the difference between long and short term reasons. Most responses noted the 1911 Double Ten Nationalist Revolution as the ultimate consequence, but only the better candidates were able to link specific details of the late Qing (Ch'ing) reforms to their failure. Many weaker candidates mixed up the reform movements: Self-Strengthening, Hundred Days and Late Qing.

Question 8

This was one of the most popular questions and, overall it was done well. Many candidates responded in a thematic and structured way and identified a combination of areas, albeit not necessarily all, from political, economic, military, social and cultural. Discussion of specific reforms was uneven, but many responses emphasized military successes. Most candidates alluded to or implied the meaning of 'modernized', but some candidates negatively judged Japan against a 20th or 21st century definition. Better candidates were able to identify how modernized Japan became in the context of the features of late 19th century Western nations.

Question 9

There were a reasonable number of responses to this question. Candidates tended to be narrative and/or descriptive and most agreed with the assertion in the question. Only a few candidates demonstrated an in-depth of knowledge about events in the given time frame. Many went beyond it and discussed Partition. Weaker candidates erroneously used this question as an opportunity to write a biographical account of Gandhi.

Question 10

Most candidates who chose this question wrote about Gandhi and, therefore, were awarded zero marks. There were a few relevant ones on Ho Chi Minh or Sukarno.

Question 11

This was a very popular question and there was a wide range of responses from very weak to quite comprehensive. Some candidates got bogged down in lengthy background narrative before addressing the extent to which Yuan Shikai (Yuan Shih-k'ai) was responsible. Candidates who were aware of the timeframe of question and who included an analysis of Yuan's actions in office crafted better responses.

Question 12

This was one of the most popular questions. Weaker candidates did not define the terms and misunderstood what was meant by 'nationalism'. Some had a very narrow definition because they just equated nationalism with the Nationalist Party. Many candidates tended to write set pieces on why the GMD lost and why the CCP won. Responses ran the gamut of very weak to very strong.

Question 13

Quite a number of candidates chose this question and the quality of the responses was mixed. Most candidates were able to identify the Treaty of Versailles, the Washington and London Naval Conferences and the US restricted immigration law as the humiliating policies, but did not discuss the events of the 1930s. Many argued that the consequences were the rise of militarism and Japan's entry into the Second World War. Weaker candidates just used this question to write a set piece on the rise of militarism.

Question 14

This was one of the most popular questions. Some candidates struggled because they did not define the term 'democratic state' clearly and did not provide specific details about the actual reforms. Most candidates included the Reverse Course in their responses and were able to discuss this in context. Answers were mixed about the extent of agreement with the assertion in the question.

Question 17

There were few responses to this question and they were generally narrative and/or descriptive. Candidates largely struggled with this question due to a lack of specific in-depth historical knowledge.

Question 18

Very few candidates answered this question. Most chose India for this answer and discussed Indira Gandhi's rule. Candidates seemed to struggle with responding to this question analytically.

Question 19

This was one of the most popular questions. Many candidates struggled because they did not define what was meant by the term 'socialist state'. Many discussed events after 1961 and lost credit for that. Responses ranged from very weak to comprehensive due to variance in inclusion of in-depth evidence, analytical skills, and awareness of the question. Most candidates discussed economic and political developments, but only the better candidates were able to include social factors such as gender equality, education and welfare.

Question 20

This was a popular question, but the quality of the responses was very uneven. Some candidates spent too long on the reasons and did not discuss consequences. Many wrote very descriptive pieces about the Gang of Four's role in the Cultural Revolution. Others concentrated on the consequences and used this question to write a set piece on Deng Xiaoping's (Teng Hsiao-p'ing's) reforms. Very few really understood in detail the power struggle after Mao's death between the Gang of Four, Hua Guofeng (Hua Kuo-feng) and Deng. They were unable to discuss how Deng emerged as leader despite the fact that this is in the 5th bullet point of Section 10. Hua was not mentioned in a significant number of responses!

Question 21

This question was done by a significant number of candidates, many of whom had very little information on Korea itself. Most concentrated on the beginning of the Cold War and the Truman Doctrine. Most wrote chronological narratives without analysing the evidence they included.

Question 22

This question was occasionally answered. Most candidates chose to write about China. This was problematic because if they only discussed Mao's China they could not score highly. Others used this question to write a set piece on Deng Xiaoping's (Teng Hsiao-p'ing's) reforms. Generally, these responses indicated that the candidates may not have specifically studied Section 11 in the syllabus. Other candidates wrote detailed and relevant responses on Thailand, Japan and Singapore.

Question 23

There were relatively few responses to this question. The answers about China often did not discuss religion directly, but focused more on social issues in general. Many candidates did not recognize that they needed to discuss the changes in the role and influence of religion. All these responses indicated that these candidates may not have specifically studied Section 12 in the syllabus.

Question 24

This question was chosen by a very small number of candidates and it was not done well. The responses contained sweeping generalisations and did not define or understand the term 'urbanization'. Most confused it with industrialisation. All these

responses indicated that these candidates may not have specifically studied Section 12 in the syllabus.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Candidates must know the geography of the region and therefore the difference between South Asia, East Asia, Southeast Asia and Oceania so that candidates do not make the wrong choice of question or include a country outside the region. The following geographic areas must be impressed upon the candidates:

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

East Asia – China, Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong;

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

Oceania – Australia, New Zealand, the Pacific Islands.

- Candidates must know the correct names for the centuries so that they do not write about the wrong timeframe.
- It should stress be stressed to candidates how important a proper reading of the question is – it will alleviate many costly mistakes.
- Candidates should ensure that they know the sections of the syllabus they have studied and therefore the corresponding question numbers in the examination.
- Better candidates should be encouraged to include quite a lot of precise evidence in their responses. Helping candidates to learn this level of detail can be done by getting them to: create their own timelines rather than just photocopy one from a text book; construct charts that identify all events/factors including compare and contrast; draw detailed concept maps. Research tasks as part of their coursework will also help candidates gain in-depth knowledge.
- Similarly, the better candidates should be encouraged to show evidence of wide reading and an understanding of historiography, particularly with regard to the Taiping Rebellion; the Meiji reforms in Japan; the struggle between the GMD and the CCP in the 1930s and 1940s; the US Occupation of Japan; and the struggle for power after Mao's death. Evidence of wide reading can be obtained by encouraging candidates to use a range of academic history books and by using relevant articles from magazines such as *History Today*, *History Review* and *Twentieth Century History Review*.
- It appears that the word historiography is not clearly understood by too many candidates. Name dropping and referring to school text book authors does not constitute a discussion of historiography. Furthermore, the analysis of different interpretations is not a substitute for evidence; instead it should complement the factual details.

- It is essential that candidates respond to the set question and not a question of their own devising. As such they should avoid learning 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 fit the needs of the set question and thus tend to include irrelevant material.
- Clear essay writing guidelines should be taught. These should include a focused introduction that directly responds to the requirements of the set question, proper paragraphing and a coherent conclusion that draws together the key arguments made and justifies the opening statement. 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 are rather cumbersome and lead to lengthy introductions. 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. Similarly, long repetitive conclusions ought to be avoided too.
- Some candidates tend to overwrite and include far too much irrelevant narrative or descriptive material. Where this applies to whole schools it seems that the 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 use the key words of the question such as 'opened up for trade'; 'ideology'; 'reasons'; 'results'; 'consequences'; 'compare'; 'contrast'; 'modernized nation'; 'disunity'; 'nationalism'; 'communism'; 'humiliated'; 'democratic state'; 'vision'; 'socialist state'; throughout the response as part of the analysis and also in the conclusion.
- Candidates should be trained in answering questions that have two parts such as *Examine the causes, and consequences, of ...; Compare and contrast...; etc* and should be familiar with the mark bands as outlined in the subject guide.
- Practise timed essays in class and ensure that each response is clearly planned. Five or so minutes writing a plan 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, but also to draw a line through this plan to indicate it is not part of the final essay answer.

Higher Level Paper Three – Europe and Middle East

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 6	7 - 12	13 - 19	20 - 25	26 - 31	32 - 37	38 - 60

General comments

The vast majority of responses indicate a broad general knowledge of the section of the program that candidates had studied and overall there was no indication that candidates found the paper difficult.

However whilst there were some really excellent responses that showed both in-depth (*ie* detailed) knowledge and some sophisticated analysis in relation to the question these were in the minority.

The most popular questions were 9, 10, 15, and 16, with some of the earlier questions such as 3, 4, 11, 18 and 20 also eliciting a significant number of responses.

Candidates attempt at times to refer to different interpretations but this often only means that they "name drop" historians without any real understanding of the particular historian's viewpoint.

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

For many candidates it seems that they struggle to provide sufficient specific detailed evidence to support their arguments; however because of the lack of detailed knowledge and understanding, analysis tended to be undeveloped and arguments tended to be unsupported. Often answers show real understanding but are undermined by a lack of support.

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

In terms of the more popular areas of the course, notably the history of Germany and Russia, the 'big picture' was generally well known; however, as mentioned above more detailed knowledge is necessary to substantiate that broader understanding.

In terms of exam organisation, it is pleasing to note that candidates are continuing to manage their time effectively as there were fewer unfinished responses.

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

Only responses to the most popular questions will be outlined below. Please refer to the mark schemes for further detail regarding indicative or suggested content for individual questions.

Question 1

Some very good answers were seen but the vast majority turned this question into a cause of the revolution essay.

Question 2

Not a popular choice with answers that varied in quality. Some focused on the rise of Napoleon with little reference to the weakness of the Directory. However where the candidates had good detailed knowledge they were able to weigh up a range of factors and reach conclusions as to which was the most significant.

Question 3

Stronger candidates answered this question without difficulty and covered the whole period with focus on the increasing power of Piedmont. However, many knew - and wrote - about the process of Italian unification and showed reasonable knowledge, especially after 1848, but with insufficient focus on the question.

Question 4

Many answers failed to focus on “continuity and change” with some interpreting it as change from pre-1871 to post-1871. Some wrote about foreign policy despite the questions demand for a discussion of domestic policy. Nevertheless, there were some knowledgeable answers that made good links to Bismarck’s aim of strengthening the new empire under Prussian dominance.

Question 6

There were some knowledgeable and thoughtful answers on reform within the Turkish Empire and these considered both reasons for reform and the impact of those reforms.

Question 8

There were very few answers to this question, but where they did appear they tended to include a good knowledge of Gladstone and his policies.

Question 9

This was extremely popular and most answers had clear knowledge of Alexander’s reforms. Weaker responses tended to be very uncritical of the reforms accepting that they were entirely successful. Better, more critical, responses clearly identified the aims and then were able to make informed analytical comment as to how far these aims were met.

Question 10

A very popular question, although a few candidates mixed up the revolutions. Still, the vast majority of these were candidates were able to consider both long and short term causes of the revolution and incorporated some interesting and valid material. This was mainly focused on the problems caused by the war, notably those that

exacerbated the underlying weakness of the Tsarist state and in turn led to discontent and revolution.

Question 11

There were some very good responses that identified the objectives of German foreign policy and made sound analytical points on the impact of German actions. However many candidates seemed confused by the focus of the question; some responses treated it as a causes of the First World War question whilst others focused heavily on German expansionism with too many references to the desire for Lebensraum.

Question 12

Again some very mixed responses as some candidates clearly had no idea that the “home front” was a reference to the civilian population. Instead these candidates elected to compose responses that were entirely or largely focused on the military fronts. Better responses showed good knowledge of both the German and British home fronts and were able to make pertinent comments on the contribution made to the “outcome” of the war.

Question 13

There were quite a few answers to this question and some candidates showed a good understanding of the background to the peace settlements. Their responses linked the detail of the various treaties to wartime diplomatic activity and to the desire of Britain and France in particular to retain their influence in the region. Pleasingly only a few answers resorted to descriptions of problems in the Palestine mandate alone.

Question 14

Answers to this question showed a generally sound knowledge of events in Saudi Arabia and the various factors that led to Ibn Saud gaining power and keeping power.

Question 15

This was a very popular question although it was attempted with varying degrees of success. Most candidates were able to link Hitler’s policies with the problems of Germany prior to Hitler gaining power. However there was, at times, very limited knowledge in evidence with a great deal too much emphasis on rearmament as a solution to unemployment. Knowledge of Hjalmar Schacht and the New Plan *etc* was in disappointingly low supply.

Nevertheless, some good points were made about the success of foreign policy in removing the constraints of Versailles and more able candidates successfully pointed out that Lebensraum and war were not necessarily what the Germans wanted. At this level there was also comment on the provision of political stability and strong leadership.

As far as other aspects of domestic policy were concerned there was some micro-examination of the role of women, education and of anti-Semitic policies with statements that the Jews obviously did not get what they wanted.

Very few answers referred to the limited opposition to the Hitler state and the levels of collusion from the bulk of the population, thus accepting, uncritically, that the Gestapo prevented opposition.

Question 16

A very popular question with the vast majority of answers writing about Germany which was perfectly acceptable as the question was left open. Unfortunately however there was limited understanding of the depression period with a considerable number of answers suggesting that the Great Depression lasted from 1918 until 1939. Other areas of factual knowledge also proved to be erroneous: there was NO hyperinflation in Germany in the early 1930s. For the most part candidates were content to assert that unemployment rose and Hitler therefore gained support and power and turned Germany into a one-party state. A minority of candidates were able to discuss, quite knowledgeably, the impact of the Depression on Weimar democracy; how the depression polarised politics and how the various Chancellors were increasingly reliant on the use of non-democratic methods of government that would go on to pave the way for Hitler to gain power.

Question 17

There were some extremely good answers for this question. They examined – with some detail - the internal impact of the war on the Soviet Union, referencing the economy, casualty rates, and leadership *etc.* Some candidates were, however, tempted to discuss the ways in which the Soviet Union emerged as a superpower. This was fine so long as they did not move far beyond the end date of 1945.

Question 18

Better candidates considered the whole range of Khrushchev's foreign policy and not just the Cuban Missile Crisis. They were able to link their knowledge to what they understood to be Khrushchev's aims and how far these aims were achieved.

Question 19

Variable answers to this question some chose to write about how Franco came to power rather than his period in power therefore knowledge was largely irrelevant. Better responses knew quite a lot about Franco's regime, his use of oppression, the support of the Church, outside support *etc* and linked this knowledge to the notions of "consolidation" and the maintenance of power quite effectively.

Question 20

Responses varied greatly with a large number accepting the statement uncritically. Most had some knowledge of the events of the post-Second World War period and wanted to write a 'causes of the Cold War' answer. Nevertheless others were able to examine the situation with a more analytical approach and considered several other possible reasons underpinning the formation of NATO. However, some thought that NATO and the United Nations were interchangeable and there were several responses in which candidates had written descriptions of events up to and including the formation of the Warsaw Pact. These were not relevant responses.

Question 21

For this question there were not huge numbers of responses but many of those that did emerge showed a good knowledge of Nasser's policies within Egypt and demonstrated reasonable commentaries as to the extent to which these policies led to change in Egypt.

Question 22

Many answers to this disregarded the dates in the set question and wrote rather broad answers that identified the underlying causes of the Arab-Israeli conflict and specified those that made negotiation difficult. There was limited knowledge of the various attempts at peacemaking.

Question 23

Many answers were vague and showed limited knowledge of the arts in their chosen exemplar. They frequently failed to cover a 50 year period by examining the arts in a more confined historical period - Nazi Germany for example. Some examiners reported some very good answers that showed detailed knowledge of developments in such diverse examples as the United Kingdom or Czechoslovakia.

Question 24

Generally, this question elicited weak answers with generalised assertions that failed to cover 50 years and instead focused on, for example, Stalin's Russia. A handful of candidates wrote about Mao's China; however these could not be credited in an examination on the history of Europe and the Middle East.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Candidates should be taught to identify the key words in questions that give them the correct focus. They should then (as has been mentioned elsewhere in this report as well as in previous reports) use these key words to formulate a plan that clearly addresses the set question.
- Arguments should be supported with relevant, specific, detailed knowledge of the period relating to the question. This will greatly strengthen their analysis.
- Candidates at this level should be able to be more critical of the events in question.

HISTORY ROUTE 1

Overall grade boundaries

Higher Level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 10	11 - 22	23 - 32	33 - 42	43 - 53	54 - 64	65 - 100

Standard Level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 10	11 - 22	23 - 31	32 - 42	43 - 54	55 - 65	66 - 100

Higher and Standard Level Paper One

Component grade boundaries

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

General comments

Section B responses (Kingdom of Sicily) reflected much better performance than Section A responses (Rise of Islam). Although there was an obvious improvement in source based exam skills (Section A) when compared with previous examination sessions, still, some candidates often lacked the basic skills to respond to paper 1 questions, (compare and contrast) and (source-evaluation).

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

Weak performance, particularly in this year's Section A could be due to the nature of this year's Section A topic (relations between Muslims and the Christians of Ethiopia). It was a little more obscure than the one used for Section B. The sources related to a relatively isolated topic and the questions set proved to be more challenging to candidates than might have been anticipated. Question 4 (Section A) about reasons and results did not generate responses that were as thoughtful and analytical in nature as may have been hoped due to the event's marginal status in terms of the wider history of the period.

Although the event is indeed part of the career of the Prophet Mohammad, candidates would have struggled to explore long term consequences or ramifications of its occurrence (when compared to other similar occurrences such as the migration to Medina or the relations with the Jews of Medina, for example).

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

Despite weaknesses in the content of some responses, it has been noted that an earnest attempt to apply the different skills was made by many candidates. These skills, by and large demonstrated an improvement on those deployed in previous years and there was a more clearly discernible format in the answers.

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) The majority of candidates easily identified at least two key points in (Section A), and reasons in (Section B) with many achieving the 3 marks.
- (b) (Section A) Most candidates were able to identify “use of diplomacy” and “consideration of areas outside Arabia” to spread Islam as messages conveyed by Source E.
(Section B) Regardless of the document’s religious functions, rarely were there responses that interpreted the Harley Psalter as a way to impose Christianity on other faiths of the Kingdom. Most responses did, however, understand and interpret the document as reflecting the tolerance, acceptance and diversity of the kingdom. Furthermore, the majority of responses interpreted the importance of Latin being at the centre of the Psalter.

Question 2

Most candidates were able to generate at least the minimum number of similarities and differences with a clear format. Nevertheless, some points were brief and did not utilise material to support the points being made.

Question 3

Some responses failed to evaluate sources in relation to their origin and purpose, instead, responses tended to be based on the source content.

Many candidates were confused with regards to Section A, (Source D); some responses provided the origin and the purpose as a book by Ibn Ishaq while in fact it is an extract of a speech by Jafar ibn Abi Talib reported in the book of Ibn Ishaq. The fact that the speech was reported in a book that is considered one of the earliest sources for the early Islamic period and is by a notable and early Islamic historian (and was thus a value) ought to have been commented on. But, candidates should have also referred to the speech itself, its purpose, value and limitations.

Question 4

Prescribed subject (section A)

A minority of candidates were able to address question 4 fully by utilizing source content and their own knowledge. For Section A, this was not only due to the, perhaps complex, nature of the historical topic itself, but also due to the failure of the candidates to link the question with the sources. . In the teaching of both sections it is important that candidates are trained to extract relevant (*ie question-based*) material from the sources rather than paraphrasing the whole source; the idea is to use only relevant source material – as well as some own knowledge - to answer a particular question.

Some responses included historiography and candidates should be cautious of providing material such as this: it is often out of place and frequently misleading.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- A sufficient amount of time should be devoted to the practice of these papers to enable candidates to familiarize the techniques and skills associated with this paper.
- Given the tight timeframe of this exam, candidates should be well-practiced in how to utilize that time most effectively.
- When tackling question 2, which requires candidates to compare and contrast, candidates should fully explore the sources; they should identify points and then write a running comparison with (brief, supportive) quotes drawn from the sources.
- When practicing source evaluation (question 3), candidates should be aware of those two vital words - origin and purpose. Too many are still content to focus their efforts on an analysis of the content of the source.
- In addressing question 4 candidates should write a response that answers the question rather than paraphrasing each source. In addition, responses should include candidates' own knowledge and develop an argument in relation to the question.

Higher and Standard Level Paper Two

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 4	5 - 8	9 - 11	12 - 15	16 - 20	21 - 24	25 - 40

General comments

The level of historical knowledge demonstrated by candidates showed a considerable variation: a number of candidates displayed a strong mastery of the subject matter; others showed much more limited knowledge or were not able to discern what knowledge was relevant to the questions being asked.

There has been an improvement in essay writing and more candidates are attempting to produce better-structured responses. This is shown in improved results for a number of centres. There is still a very wide range of achievement but the trend is a positive one. One could expect that if these developments are encouraged then there will be a notable improvement in overall results.

The vast majority of responses were from Topics 1 and 3. Relatively few questions were attempted in the other sections.

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, detailed knowledge of the topics they have studied but others show a lack of both breadth and depth in historical knowledge.

Too frequently it was clear that candidates had not read the questions carefully. This meant that they did not identify the command terms and the key words that specified the focus and nature of the response required. This failure leads to irrelevant and unfocused responses; in turn, these lead to poor results.

Some candidates try to utilise pre-prepared responses to the questions. This comes from memorization of certain material or responses that are then reproduced without reference to the specific demands of the question. This will not yield good results.

A significant number of candidates continue to produce narrative accounts that do not display the necessary analytical skills required for an effective response. This is a major obstacle to the achievement of better results.

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

As mentioned above, there are candidates who have excellent knowledge. It is hoped that their work could be used to model the correct approach to candidates who, perhaps, need more direction.

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

Only responses to the most popular questions will be outlined below. Please refer to the mark schemes for further detail regarding indicative or suggested content for individual questions.

Topic 1

Question 1

This was a very popular question. Candidates were asked to determine the extent that a ruler's power depended on his military power. The choices in the question were William I and Frederick I. The majority of candidates elected William I and most made a good effort of recognizing the various non-military methods that were important in maintaining and or extending his power.

However, some candidates spent too long on descriptions of Hastings and this limited the time that they had to examine other factors. Overall many good answers were seen although some candidates did not recognize the importance of the Church and the overhaul of the feudal system by William as well as his efforts to maintain many Anglo-Saxon laws and practices.

Very few candidates elected to discuss Frederick I.

Question 4

This question asked candidates to evaluate the success of Harun al-Rashid in maintaining political authority. There were some good answers but too many produced a simple narrative of his career as a ruler without a focus on the issue of political authority. There was a lack of detailed, well-structured essays in the responses to this question.

Topic 2

Question 7

There were a number of responses to this question on women in medieval society. Of these, there were many good answers showing knowledge of the great variety of roles played by women (as well as their significance). There was a tendency not to respond very effectively to the issue of women being overlooked and this was necessary to ensure a very high result in this question.

Topic 3

Question 13

This was a popular question dealing with the role of religion as a cause of medieval wars. The best responses established a clear thesis and a strong essay structure supported by relevant examples. Strong responses showed a breadth of knowledge of a number of wars and their causes and were able to explain effectively the extent to which any of them might be considered religious. Good knowledge and sound essay structure were paramount to an effective response.

Question 15

There were many responses to this question and they invariably showed a considerable range of knowledge and organizational skill. Many candidates were able to discuss reasons other than military tactics for the success of the First Crusade., but the best responses had cogent knowledge of military tactics as well as the material necessary for a full analysis of the various other causes. Overall, these responses had a mastery of detail and depth of knowledge on these points that set them apart. The weaker answers were not able to produce this range and many omitted such things as the Byzantine contributions.

Question 18

The question called for a discussion of the extent to which the causes of the first *fitna* were religious in nature. The weaker responses were rather narrative and were largely an account of the events leading up to the *fitna* (as well as the events involved; battles *etc*). The battles were not the focus of the question but rather the causes.

The best responses adopted a sound essay structure with a clear thesis and points for discussion. These focused on the various causes of the *fitna* and included tribal, financial *and* personal issues. Clear, detailed knowledge was used to support the points that were directed towards the demands of the question.

Topic 5**Question 26**

This question was in two parts and asked for an examination of both the causes and the consequences of the conflict between Thomas Becket and Henry II. The best responses dealt with both parts of the question and had a well-structured presentation and effective content. Weaker responses, on the other hand, failed to deal with consequences or produced a simple narrative without analysis of the events during the period of conflict.

This was a case where candidates were either not prepared for the question or were not willing to follow the directions.

Question 28

This question dealt with reasons for anti-Semitism in Europe and asked candidates to assess the degree to which religion was responsible. There were some excellent responses showing good analytical qualities and detailed knowledge. The best responses were able to strike an effective balance between religious and non-religious causes and present effective arguments in a clear essay format.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Candidates should be taught how to read questions effectively. They should be aware of all the regularly used command terms which specify the nature of the task, eg *evaluate, compare and contrast*. They should also know how to approach a question

that asks “to what extent”. They should understand the terms that focus the response to a specific area; words such as *cause and effect*, *reasons for success and failure*, *rise to power*, *impact or significance*. Candidates who do not read and understand questions effectively will not be able to produce sound responses.

- Candidates should be reminded that they are to pay close attention to dates when they appear in questions. They specify the timeframe that the response is required to address.
- Candidates should be aware that questions that ask for causes *and* results for example, are two-part questions and both parts must be addressed in the response. The two parts need not always be equal in length but both parts must be addressed if a good result is to be obtained.
- Many candidates need more practice in writing well-structured responses that display the appropriate critical thinking and analytical skills. They should practice these regularly and should be actively discouraged from writing narrative responses or simple collections of historical information. These are often of limited relevance to the question asked and will not be rewarded in examinations. Similarly candidates who produce stock, memorized responses to certain sections of the syllabus in the hope that they will fit the question should not be rewarded. Candidates should use knowledge and ideas relevant to the question asked and not hope to succeed by producing a response from the general topic area.
- Many candidates need to expand the breadth and depth of their historical knowledge. The best candidates display not only extensive historical knowledge but the ability to employ it effectively. Limited knowledge will not produce strong results and may make it difficult for the candidate to answer many questions.
- Candidates should keep lists of historical terms and their meanings throughout the course. This will expand knowledge, provide an effective review tool and improve their ability to understand questions and respond effectively.

Higher Level Paper Three

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 6	7 - 13	14 - 19	20 - 25	26 - 30	31 - 36	37 - 60

General comments

The G2 forms indicated general satisfaction with the paper in terms of level of difficulty and syllabus coverage.

The paper was gauged to be of the same level of difficulty as the previous year. There were signs of improvement overall in the results and this was very pleasing to see.

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

There are still too many candidates writing broad narrative responses that do not demonstrate the required analytical and critical thinking skills. There were also a number of examples where the candidates had not understood the meaning or focus of the question and this caused them to write misdirected responses. All candidates would benefit from taking a few moments before they start writing to consider the meaning of the question and preparing an outline of the key themes or ideas to be analysed in their responses.

In addition, many candidates need to improve their mastery of the historical content in the parts of the syllabus that they have studied. They should have a stronger grasp of chronology, key historical terms and concepts and the contributions of important individuals.

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

There were a number of very strong papers showing excellent achievement both in knowledge and analytical skills. It is hoped that schools will work to produce more papers of this calibre.

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

Only responses to the most popular questions will be outlined below. Please refer to the mark schemes for further detail regarding indicative or suggested content for individual questions.

Question 1

There were some good responses that focussed on the impact of the founding of one of the orders. These responses limited themselves to the issue of impact and did not wander into descriptions of the founding of the orders. The strong responses showed

a well-structured range of factors that had an impact and were well-supported by content.

Weaker candidates tended to recount the story of the founding of the orders without sufficient attention to analysing the impact on the Church. In weaker responses, what discussion of impact that was found tended to be quite limited and lacked adequate detail. Some of these weaker responses may have been a result of ignoring or mistaking the demands of the question.

Question 2

There were a number of responses to this question. The best responses took notice of the fact that there were two parts to the question and dealt with both causes and results. Many candidates are well-versed in the causes of the Investiture Crisis and so tended to focus their response on those without adequate recognition of what was demanded. These responses scored lower marks as they did not have adequate balance, structure and content.

Question 3

This was a popular question but often not well done. Many responses were simple narratives about the career of al-Mu'izz or al-Mustansir without any analytical structure. Many responses focused only on the story of the conquest of Egypt and the establishment of Cairo thus omitting an enormous amount of material. In addition the lack of analytical structure was often a weakness.

Question 5

This was a very popular question for which there were many excellent responses. These often displayed considerable analytical skills and mastery of content. What separated the best responses from the mediocre ones was range and depth of knowledge with respect to Henry I and Louis VI; in particular their relationships with the Church, towns and different social classes. These were key points amongst a number of others that distinguished the best responses.

Question 6

This was another popular question. Responses were often quite sound and some were outstanding. Candidates had to notice the two-part nature of the question and weaker responses tended to focus more on causes than results. Most responses showed good essay structure and what distinguished the best answers was depth of knowledge and a balance between causes and results.

Question 7

There were many sound responses and the best answers were effective, well-focused, well-structured ones that reflected breadth and depth of knowledge.

Better answers included the role of the Byzantines, changing papal focus, the expense of crusades, increased Muslim resistance as well as increased disunity amongst Crusaders and noted that the victory in the First crusade was perhaps, an anomaly which could not be sustained. The diversion of Crusading resources into

Spain and the East was crucial for good responses as well as the lack of direction and motivation as shown by the Fourth crusade.

Question 16

This question asked for an assessment of the difficulties faced by either Frederick I or Frederick II and the overwhelming number of response dealt with Frederick I.

There were many good responses showing analytical skill and knowledge. The best responses were able to demonstrate depth of knowledge and an understanding of difficult problems such as his relationship with the papacy and the problems caused by his own character and obsession with Italy. The analysis of the differences between Italy and Germany was an additional, effective argument that was seen in the stronger responses.

Question 17

This question asked for an analysis of the consequences of the environmental and demographic collapse of the 14th century. These collapses were caused by the climatic shift and resulting famine of the early 14th century as well as the impact of the Black Death. Many responses ignored one or the other of the disasters while others engaged in simple descriptions of the events. Some attempted a general assessment of consequences but these often lacked relevant content and were very general in nature.

The best responses focused clearly on a range of consequences and supported them effectively. Breadth and depth of knowledge as well as a narrow focus on consequences as demanded by the question was crucial.

Question 22

This question asked for an assessment of the importance of the Italian city states during the Renaissance, and there were a number of superb answers that demonstrated a broad range of topics relevant to the question. These were presented effectively and supported by excellent content. These were examples of the type of response that one hopes to see.

Question 24

The better answers to this question were able to show that this event did not have a great impact on many parts of the movement as they had begun before 1453 and involved countries like Spain, Portugal and England, which had their own well developed motives. In addition some of the mythology about the impact of Constantinople was addressed and showed that trade did not cease after 1453.

Candidates were able to show effectively that the event had minimal impact. Some candidates did explain the psychological shock that encouraged the Christian nations to increase their power and territory and this could be an effective argument in favour.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- The most crucial point is giving candidates instruction in, and opportunities to practise, the reading of questions. They should learn to examine terms, names and instructions carefully to ensure that they understand the specific demands of the question both in terms of focus and structure. Candidates should be able to recognize and understand command terms such as *to what extent*, *evaluate* and *compare and contrast* as well as key words that give direction to the task such as *impact* or *causes and results*. These skills are of critical importance.
- Candidates should be very familiar with key historical terms, names of individuals or organizations as well as related terminology. These terms are crucial to the production of a strong response. Candidates should be encouraged to make lists of these terms and review their meaning as they progress through the course. These collections of terms will be invaluable study aids and will improve the candidates' confidence and ability to write effective responses.
- Candidates must be encouraged at all times to write analytical essays that display critical thinking skills and the ability to use content effectively to support their arguments. Candidates must be discouraged from writing rambling, general narratives that demonstrate little in the way of analytical or critical thinking skills.
- It is crucial that teachers cover all the bullet points in those sections of the syllabus that they have chosen to teach. Questions may be asked on any one of the areas discussed in the bullet points.
- Some candidates try to fit a prepared or memorized response to the examination question even though it does not correspond well to the demands of the question. This will produce a poor result. Candidates should learn how to use their knowledge to answer the specific demands of the questions rather than trying to write down a lot of material in the hope that some of it will be relevant.