

HISTORY

Overall grade boundaries

Standard Level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-10	11-23	24-35	36-48	49-59	60-72	73-100

History of Africa

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-10	11-23	24-35	36-48	49-58	59-71	72-100

History of the Americas

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-10	11-23	24-35	36-48	49-58	59-71	72-100

History of South East Asia and Oceania

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-10	11-23	24-35	36-48	49-58	59-71	72-100

History of Europe

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-10	11-23	24-35	36-48	49-58	59-71	72-100

Internal assessment

Component grade boundaries

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

There is very little that is new to report on internal assessment for the latest session, November 2001. The majority of candidates selected appropriate topics, and submitted research papers on them. The standard achieved varied considerably, partly due to the ability of the candidate, and partly due to time and effort spent on the exercise. As in previous sessions many samples tended to be too narrative and insufficiently analytical. However there, were of course, some excellent analytical pieces of work which investigated worthwhile topics and achieved a high mark.

It is always interesting to compare results over all components at Grade Award, and it is noticeable that the marks for the different components do vary considerably. Very few candidates perform consistently over the four components.

It was pointed out by several examiners that candidates who base their internal assessment on museum visits tend to describe but not to analyse, or even explain the historical benefit obtained from the exercise, which is too often a fact gathering task, based on a guide book produced for the general visitor. Historical visits should illustrate in a personal way, the true meaning and historical value of what has been observed. On the other hand, local history projects do seem to inspire a genuine historical search which inspires the candidate to find out what happened, why it happened and its importance. Most candidates do now base their internal assessment on a question. This does focus the mind, and we are pleased to note that it is more widely adopted; but some of the questions posed need to be more carefully and exactly framed.

Unfortunately there still needs much work to be done to improve the compilation of bibliographies and the entering of reference notes. We are all amazed at the haphazard nature of far too many bibliographies. The works used should be listed in alphabetical order. There were also samples that contained no references. Listing and referencing correctly is a labourious and exacting task, but it is the necessary tool of the historian.

The November session, perhaps because it is so much smaller, produced far fewer samples that exceeded the word limit than in May, but there were a few, most of which had not been penalised by the teacher. If the work is over the limit it must not be given the mark.

Finally there were samples written in a second language where the candidates were obviously struggling. If a candidate would be better writing in Spanish, he or she should be entered in Spanish. This is a history exam, not one designed to help progress in a foreign language.

2002 is the last year for the present IA format, and there were still a few forms filled in using incorrect criteria. It is hoped that all schools are taking steps to familiarise themselves with the new IA in history which comes into operation in 2003. We do think that history candidates profit from being exposed to internal assessment, and we thank teachers for their continued help and commitment to this valuable component.

Paper 1

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-2	3-5	6-7	8-10	11-12	13-15	16-20

General comments

As part of the steps taken to ensure the integrity of the November examination session after packages had been stolen from a DHL van in Peru, a replacement Paper 1 was despatched by bringing forward the paper originally intended for use in November 2002.

The replacement Paper 1, printed on blue paper for security reasons, seemed to work well. It was unfortunate that the cartoon in Section A (Document E) lost clarity when printed on blue paper; the words 'German Gold' were not legible on the bag of the Bolshevik figure, and 'Russia' was barely

visible on the woman's hat. However, these features were explained in a note below the cartoon. As a further precaution, an email was sent to all examiners instructing them not to expect all that was stated in the original markscheme when assessing responses to question 1(b), and also questions 2 and 5(a). The cartoon used in Section C did not suffer a similar loss of clarity. However, an adjustment was made to the markscheme for question 9(a) after studying responses.

With these adjustments, the paper seemed to work well. Comments from teachers and examiners were positive, and the mean mark was slightly higher than that for the previous November session. Approximately 55% of candidates answered the questions on Prescribed Subject 1: The Russian Revolutions and the New Soviet State 1917-1929. The other popular choice was Prescribed Subject 3: The Cold War 1945-1964. There were relatively few answers to Prescribed Subject 2: Origins of the Second World War in Asia 1931-1941, but clear evidence of a similar range in the quality of answers across all three sets of questions.

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

Understandably, candidates had most difficulty with questions assessing higher order skills. Nevertheless, there was evidence of a further fall in the number of answers simply offering a paraphrase of content in response to questions requiring assessment and evaluation, for which teachers and candidates are to be congratulated. Regarding the final question in each section, many candidates continue to have difficulty making effective use of both own knowledge and source material. Synthesis of this kind is a very important skill, and one that has to be taught.

The areas in which candidates appeared well prepared

Most candidates seemed particularly well prepared for answering the second question in each section. Responses generally showed good comprehension of the content of the various documents, and many answers showed sound understanding of similarities and differences of various kinds. There was also evidence of a further improvement in time management. Most candidates write relatively briefly in response to the first question in order to allow themselves sufficient time to write a full response to the final question, which has the highest mark tariff.

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

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

QUESTION 1

Candidates invariably gained a mark for stating that food supply problems caused riots, but more should have added some explanation. Answers to 1(b) generally succeeded in explaining the reference fully, referring to the single protests mentioned in the document (April demonstrations, July days and Kornilov events) and what the "leading section" (e.g. Bolsheviks) believed was needed to achieve their aim of furthering the revolution.

QUESTION 2 *In what ways and to what extent does Document E support Document D?*

Many candidates dealt effectively with "in what ways". However, only good candidates successfully answered "to what extent", explaining that Document E does not hint at other points made in Document D, e.g. weakening the entente and Bolshevik need for peace.

QUESTION 3 *With reference to their origin and purpose, assess the value and limitations of Documents A and B for historians studying the origins of the two Russian Revolutions.*

Candidates usually examined the origin and value of the documents effectively, but there was insufficient attention to purpose and limitations in some responses. However, good responses, did contain intelligent comment on the possible bias in the Okrana's report, and the limitations of Document B because Lenin was seeking to carry his own views and plans and so could have exaggerated Bolshevik support and the danger of waiting.

QUESTION 4 *Using these documents and your own knowledge explain how the origin of the Bolshevik Revolution differed from the origin of the February/March Revolution.*

Ideally more candidates would have used both own knowledge and evidence extracted from the documents. The maximum is 4 marks if candidates use only source material or own knowledge. However, a pleasing number did produce answers meriting maximum marks.

Prescribed Subject 2: Origins of the Second World War in Asia 1931-1941

QUESTION 5

Most candidates gained credit for suggestions of a conflict or contradiction between a uniformed emperor and a recipient of a peace award, but relatively few substantiated their claim for full marks. Many simply said that Hirohito was pulling a cart; few explained that the scroll represented the Nobel Peace Prize or suggested that the 'cart' might have a military link. Similarly, most candidates grasped that the concerns expressed in Document B related to the secrecy of the military in relation to other aspects of the government of Japan, but only the better answers included some relevant analysis for a second mark.

QUESTION 6 *Compare and contrast the explanations given in Documents A, C and E of Hirohito's influence on making military decisions.*

This question was generally well answered, with candidates readily indicating similarities and differences in the explanations given in the three documents.

QUESTION 7 *With reference to their origin and purpose, assess the value and limitations of Documents C and E for historians investigating the role of Hirohito in Japanese politics.*

Candidates experienced no difficulty in identifying the origins of the two documents. Their respective values – as a private conversation and the source-based work of an historian – were competently handled. Limitations were less readily identified; candidates had difficulty appreciating that Bix, seeking to publicise his book, might be sensationalising his claims.

QUESTION 8 *Using the documents and your own knowledge assess the responsibility of the military, the politicians and the emperor for Japan's decision to attack Pearl Harbor.*

Answers tended to lack knowledge of the emerging expansionism of Japan in the '30s and her worsening relations with the USA; they relied mainly on a trawl of the documents to show the responsibility of the military, politicians and emperor for the decision to attack Pearl Harbor.

Prescribed Subject 3: The Cold War 1945-64

QUESTION 9

In answering 9(a), candidates showed that they appreciated the tenseness in US/Soviet relations at the summit. However, they tended not to add any supporting analysis. For the second mark they could have said that, according to the document, Kennedy was concerned about Khrushchev as an adversary and about the difficult topic of Berlin. Answers to 9(b) tended to offer a literal description of what the cartoon showed, rather than explaining the symbolism of the Wall (representative of repression designed to keep people within rather than to keep others out).

QUESTION 10 *Compare and contrast the views expressed in Documents B and E.*

Answers to this question indicated that candidates appreciated the contrasts, but many did not achieve more than three marks as they made no reference to comparisons. However, strong candidates were able to indicate similarities as well as differences, as shown in the following extract from an answer:

We can state immediately that both sources provide insights into Kennedy's views on the Berlin crisis of 1961, and both do so with extracts from primary sources. Document B is a personal recollection of events by the President himself in the form of a speech to the nation, whilst Document E from the Beschloss book includes an extract of private comments by Kennedy to his aides in 1961. In both there is a clear indication of Kennedy's preoccupation over the conflict with the USSR in Berlin. In Document B he says Khrushchev tries to end the Western "legal rights to be in West Berlin" and their commitment to the people of West Berlin. In Document E, we are told about his concern over the Berlin Wall and why it was constructed. Document B deals with what Kennedy believed after the Vienna Summit in 1961, whilst Document E expresses what Kennedy thought about the Berlin Wall once it was erected in 1961....

QUESTION 11 *With reference to their origin and purpose, assess the value and limitations of Documents D and E, for historians studying the Cold War.*

The origins of these two documents were soundly grasped. Here, in contrast to answers to question 7, it was the potential limitations of the two sources that received most attention. Candidates missed opportunities to comment on their potential value as sources. In Document E Kennedy expresses concerns and views that he could not state in public; in the overheated climate of the time he would have been accused of appeasing Khrushchev. Part of the value of the document is that it exemplifies the difficulties of foreign policy manoeuvres.

QUESTION 12 *Using the documents and your own knowledge, assess the effects of the Berlin Crisis of 1961 on the development of the Cold War.*

There were some excellent answers, but overall this question was rather less satisfactorily answered than the corresponding one in the other sections. Too few candidates ventured beyond the events of 1961. Perhaps they failed to grasp that Khrushchev needed a foreign policy success for a variety of reasons, domestic and international, and the Berlin crisis afforded the possibility of achieving this success. Its failure to do so rendered further confrontation with the US more or less inevitable, leading to the Cuban Crisis. Very perceptive candidates grasped that Kennedy, by showing determination and resolution when faced with Soviet confrontation, determined to a large extent the type of response he would have to demonstrate should another crisis with the USSR emerge. Thus both leaders, through

their respective stances in the Berlin Crisis, contributed significantly to the development of the Cold War.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

These do not change significantly from year to year. Timed practice, using the rubric that candidates will encounter on the exam paper and followed by analysis of their answers, is the best way of preparing candidates for this paper. There is also a definite need for teachers to teach source analysis skills using the rubric that they will encounter in an IB exam. Although there was an overall improvement in the quality of answers to the question on the evaluation of sources, many of the candidates who did pay attention to the wording made only brief or superficial use of their knowledge of origin and purpose when assessing value and limitations.

Finally, a reminder that the current prescribed subjects will be examined for the last time in the 2002 exam sessions. Teachers preparing candidates for examination from the May 2003 session onwards will need to be aware of the new prescribed subjects. Details of these and the other requirements of the revised history course are to be found in the new guide, *History* (IBO, February 2001).

Paper 2

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-23	24-28	29-40

This paper was on the whole well received, and the standard appeared to be slightly better than last year. Candidates followed the rubric, and answered two questions, each chosen from a different topic. The majority used their time well, and produced two essays of similar length. Most answers contained an introduction, main body and conclusion. The main demands of most of the questions attempted were understood. This paper showed that most candidates had grasped an outline of some of the main aspects of twentieth century history throughout their studies for this paper. There was as expected a wide variation of marks, no doubt in most, but not all cases there was room for improvement. General areas for improvement will be discussed, then comments will be made on individual questions.

The most obvious area that could have produced a better paper (though not necessarily a higher mark, as marks were not deducted) was for the few candidates who wrote in pencil, to have written in ink.

Every Principal examiner's report and most individual school reports, recommend planning before writing. This plan should be written in the examination booklet, and it indicates a thoughtful approach. However few candidates produce evidence of thoughtful planning. One of the most widespread weaknesses is the tendency for candidates to 'write all they know' without working out how to focus exactly on the question that is set, or how to avoid irrelevant material.

Another common weakness in this paper is the number of too general answers. Candidates have a vague idea of the main areas but fail to produce enough specific evidence to prove their points. Better factual preparation would lead to an improvement here. Closely connected with this is the use of sweeping assertions, that is 'everyone did or said this', 'all historians say...', 'all Germans thought that Hitler...' etc etc. Candidates must not move from the particular to the universal. History rarely supports widespread/universal agreement or behavioural patterns.

If historiography is to be rewarded, it must be used intelligently, and not as a name dropping exercise. It is no use writing that a certain person holds a certain view or opinion, if the historical reasons (factual arguments) for this belief are not explained and evaluated. The candidate must also assess and explain if he or she agrees, in other words if the argument was convincing. An increasing and very annoying trend is for candidates to write 'as Historian XYZ says...' It is sufficient to give the historian's name, not call him 'Historian'. As this is a History examination, one assumes that those cited are historians.

In Topic 1, the first question on the extent to which Germany was responsible for either the First or the Second World War, was the most popular. Perhaps surprisingly the First was better done than the Second. A few candidates did not read the question accurately and answered about both wars. Germany had to be the focus of the answer, even if other countries were also held responsible. This had to be argued within the framework of Germany's responsibility, or lack of it. General causes answers were not the way to score highly. The other popular question was number 3, where candidates were asked to assess the successes and failures of one treaty. Versailles was chosen, and failures far exceeded successes. Candidates should acquire a more balanced view of this treaty.

Once again it was disappointing that there were so few answers to questions in Topic 2. A few attempted question 6, on the reasons for and results of the weakening of colonialism. But these appeared to have been answered from material learnt for a regional paper.

All the questions in Topic 3 were answered by many candidates. They were more successful in assessing 'the conditions of the previous regime', than the support that helped a single-party ruler to power, in question 11. The domestic policies of Peron, and Mussolini were well known and well compared and contrasted by many, in 12. Mao, the choice of others, was also satisfactory. 13 was not quite so successful; candidates were able to describe events that had an impact on world affairs, but analysis was less good. In 14 the appeal of communism or fascism should have been analysed from the point of view of the ruler, rather than the state, a mistake by some.

A few candidates answered questions 16 and 18, in Topic 4, but the results were on the whole not very convincing.

As always, Topic 5 was popular. Candidates discussed the 'blame' that could be attached to USA and USSR in question 21, in a reasonably balanced manner, although the attempts of some to turn it into historiography, was rarely successful. Too many ignored 'onset' and carried on too far. Few good answers were seen for 22 or 23, and 24. China's role was not examined. Question 25 was very popular with many opting for the Cuban Missile Crisis as the main danger of escalation; Berlin, Korea and Vietnam were also chosen. Less description and more analysis would have raised the standard of the responses.

Once again, Topic 6 only produced a handful of disappointing, general short essays.

In spite of the criticisms made, this paper did produce many good or very good scripts, and teachers and candidates are to be applauded for their efforts in understanding a very complex century. The standard of comparative questions has improved considerably over the past few years, as has the ability to fit different events in different parts of the world into a chronological pattern and global framework. The study of IB history does help to foster international understanding.

History of Africa

Higher Level Paper 3

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-6	7-13	14-21	22-28	29-34	25-41	42-60

Introduction

This paper was taken by 40 candidates from three schools. About two thirds of the candidates produced work of a satisfactory standard and 10% work of a very good standard. 90% of the questions answered were chosen from the pre-1900 section of the syllabus. Questions on the 20th century were largely ignored. Ten of the twenty five questions were not answered by a single candidate. The most popular choices were Q.9 (29), Q.8 (19). Qs.3 and 6 (12), and Q.2 (10).

The areas of the programme which proved difficult for candidates

The weakest answers were those to Qs.3, 10 and Q13. (See notes on these three questions in the section on strengths and weaknesses of candidates in the treatment of individual questions)

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

Lack of accurate, detailed knowledge to support general statements and claims was often a serious weakness. See examples in the notes in the next section. There were very few, if any, cases of candidates failing to understand questions completely. Many candidates, however, failed to meet the requirements of a question fully and effectively. The latter weakness was frequently caused by inadequately developed analytical and explanatory skills.

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

(The following notes are limited to questions answered by at least 3 candidates. The number of candidates answering each question is indicated in brackets.)

QUESTION 2 *'Tewodros II of Ethiopia was a man with a vision.' Why did he fail to turn his vision into reality? (10)*

Answers to this question were mainly satisfactory or good. Most candidates made a clear statement about Tewodros' vision or aims but accounts of his reforms and their impact on his success and popularity were sometimes not full enough. In their conclusions the better candidates pointed out that although Tewodros himself failed to achieve his vision, it lived on to guide the policies of his successors.

QUESTION 3 *Assess the impact of the establishment of the capital of the Omani Sultanate in Zanzibar on the East African mainland and its peoples. (12)*

Answers to this question were much less satisfactory. Few looked beyond the reign of Seyyid Said and many of these had inaccurate ideas about his policies and their impact. They

attributed too much political ambition to Seyyid Said to control the mainland and failed to give sufficient emphasis to his economic aims and their impact which was political and social as well as economic. To gain a good or very good mark answers needed to achieve balance between positive and negative, good and bad, economic, political and social impact. Few answers achieved this balance and coverage.

QUESTION 5 *Compare and contrast the work of Shaka Zulu and Mosheshwe of the Sotho as African state builders. (7)*

The best approach to compare/contrast questions is through a running, point-by-point treatment and this question offered candidates plenty of scope for this, ranging from the broad contrast of Shaka, the aggressive state builder to Mosheshwe's defensive policy, to the two rulers' similar reliance on military skills and strength. The two weak answers depended on two separate, unbalanced, end-on accounts with no more than a token attempt to compare and contrast. There was one outstanding answer showing impressive relevant knowledge and comprehensive analysis of the main features of the two leaders as state builders.

QUESTION 6 *Why was the Berlin West Africa Conference held in 1884-85 and why did its decisions lead to the acceleration of the European partition of Africa? (12)*

To earn a good or very good mark answers here needed to show explanatory and analytical skills; balance between the two parts of the question; accurate knowledge of the chain of events between 1876 and 1884 leading to the convening of the conference; identification of the main decisions taken at the conference and analysis of their impact on the European partition of Africa to the end of the century. Few candidates met these requirements. Two outstanding answers, however, did all this, and also showed awareness of the varied views amongst historians who have contributed to the debate about the causes and the process of the 'scramble for Africa'.

QUESTION 7 *Explain why, and with what results, independent African churches were widely established in Africa before 1914. (6)*

This was another question heavily dependent on the explanatory and analytical skills of the candidates. There were two very weak answers from candidates who showed no specific knowledge of the independent African church movement in any part of Africa and no understanding of the reasons which lay behind its emergence. Other answers were no more than satisfactory. No answers gave adequate and balanced treatment of the two basic reasons for the establishment of these churches; as a protest against the discrimination shown by mission controlled churches against African members, particularly African clergy; and the role played by independent churches in protesting against aspects of colonial rule in general. Finally no answers gave examples of such churches in different parts of the continent. Those that identified individual churches and their activities concentrated almost exclusively on examples from Malawi. The presence in the title of the words '...were widely established in Africa' should have indicated the need for reference to independent churches in different parts of the continent.

QUESTION 8 *Analyse the achievements either of Menelik II, King of Shewa and Emperor of Ethiopia or of Mutesa I, Kabaka of Buganda. (19)*

Most of the answers to this question were on Menelik. Few of them included anything about his achievements as King of Shewa, and most placed too much emphasis on his greatest achievement, the defeat of the Italians at Adowa. Only one answer was comprehensive enough in its analysis of achievements to gain a very good mark. The three answers on

Mutesa I of Buganda were even more limited in their coverage of achievements and, without exception, candidates attempting this question failed to mention these rulers to their predecessors.

QUESTION 9 *Why did Samori Toure succeed in creating the Mandinka Empire but fail to protect it from French conquest? (29)*

Answers to this, the most popular question, varied from three very weak ones to one outstanding and three very good ones. Most were just satisfactory. They contained some explanation" of each part of the two part question but not enough detailed support for sweeping claims about 'an efficient administrative system' and 'a large, efficient army' and 'a flourishing economic position and lucrative trade' in part 1 of the answer; and 'Samori's strategic errors', 'European solidarity' and 'lack of support from other Africans' in part 2. There was some irrelevance in the form of material on the early life of Samori.

QUESTION 10 *'The African response to European expansion varied but the outcome was always European domination.' With reference to the policies of either Lobengula and/or Lewanika, to what extent do you agree with this statement? (4)*

There was one very good answer and 3 weak ones. It seemed that the latter were written by candidates who had not fully understood the question and showed no specific knowledge about the various agreements signed between the two African rulers and the British concession seekers who visited their courts. The very good answer was from a candidate who was aware of the claim that 'Africans who resisted were always losers', whilst 'those who collaborated were gainers.' The candidate was also aware that Lobengula tried very hard to negotiate and collaborate for many years before being forced to resist in an attempt to preserve his sovereignty.

QUESTION 13 *Why, and with what results, did Britain change her system of colonial administration in her African colonies between 1890 and 1922?(9)*

This question produced more weak answers than any other. Only three candidates made clear the nature of the change which took place in the last decade of the nineteenth century, particularly in Britain's West African colonies. Only one candidate dealt adequately with the varied reasons that led to change and noted that in West Africa, Britain had practised a form of assimilation before switching to Indirect Rule with mixed results. With one exception candidates based their entire answer on developments in Nigeria, and even there, with concentration on the situation in Northern Nigeria. No attempt was made to explain the situation in Eastern or Central Africa though the title gave no indication that answers were to be based on West Africa alone.

QUESTION 15 *How and why did the two World Wars stimulate the growth of nationalist movements in Africa? (5)*

This was the only twentieth century question to be answered by more than one candidate. It produced one outstandingly good and comprehensive answer, three that were just satisfactory and one very weak one. The outstanding answer was the only one which mentioned the impact on the development of African nationalist movements of the establishment of the League of Nations and its Mandate system and the United Nations and its Trusteeship System.

The type of assistance and guidance the teachers should provide for future candidates

Every year the work from candidates produces some evidence of improvement in performance and some of this improvement may be the result of the implementation by teachers of some of the recommendations in examiners' reports. This year, for example, in this paper there was less irrelevance than usual. However, the overall picture changes little and the same weaknesses recur year after year. The types of assistance recommended, therefore, remain much the same each year. Teachers should urge candidates to:

- Read questions carefully to make sure they know what they are expected to do;
- Identify and note especially the key words like: Analyse ...;Why...?; Explain...; Assess...; Compare and contrast... These are, or should be, words and phrases of 'command' , and should guide a candidate in planning and writing his/her answer. Candidates will certainly not get maximum marks unless they have responded to all such words in the title.
- Avoid making sweeping statements and claims without providing specific support and evidence to substantiate them.
- Avoid including anything which is not required by the key words/phrases. No credit will be given for irrelevant material.

History of the Americas

Higher Level Paper 3

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-6	7-13	14-21	22-28	29-34	35-41	42-60

Introductory comments on the overall performance of the candidates

Compared with previous years, this year Americas paper seemed to provide a difficult challenge to many candidates. Although the difficulty of the paper was similar to previous years, what could be observed was the preference of the candidates in the selection of some particular questions.

Several, although not all, of the questions dealing with Latin America and the United States were selected, not a single question about Canada was answered. There was a wide variation of performances, from very good to very poor (usually according to schools, not to questions) although the general performance was rather unsatisfactory. The most popular questions were: 12, 13, 16, 17, 19 & 20. A few candidates answered 2, 7, 8, 10, 14 & 22. The other questions were not selected.

The areas of the programme which proved difficult for candidates

The candidates showed a tendency to general, unsupported narratives, answering “pre-prepared” answers about the topic and ignoring the issue suggested in the questions. The levels of knowledge in some centres was very low. For example, question 14 about the evolution and impact of nationalism, a favourite question, was answered by almost every candidate, but it elicited some very simplistic answers. The majority of candidates launched into a general narrative of Perón’s regime while ignoring the discussion of nationalism required by the question. Furthermore, the level of generalizations about the topics were regrettable. It elicited answers without the support of any specific facts, just opinions, this was observed particularly in the case of questions 16 and 17. In each case it was evident that many candidates attempting to answer these questions had insufficient knowledge of the topic to enable them (a) to grasp the implications of the questions and (b) to construct a well substantiated answer. It is also rather clear that the use of concrete and specific dates at the end of the questions are not helping the candidates to clarify the topic.

The levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated

As indicated in the previous section, some candidates lacked sufficient knowledge to deal effectively with the questions they chose to answer. However, in some “prepared” topics they showed good knowledge and training. Indeed many of the response to other demanding questions showed well-prepared candidates displaying impressive levels of knowledge, skills and understanding.

All the candidates answered the three required essays, balancing their lengths, thus time was not an issue.

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

Answers were attempted to the following questions:

QUESTION 2 *What influence did ideas from the Enlightenment have on the wars of independence? Support your answer with reference to one country of the region.*

Few attempted this question and the quality of the answers tended to be mediocre.

QUESTION 7 *“Slavery was the most important cause of the civil war in the United States”. To what extent do you agree with this judgement?*

There were a few answers to this question. The general quality was satisfactory. Candidates tended to address the demands of “to what extent” although very few showed sufficient knowledge of the topic to substantiate their argument soundly.

QUESTION 8 *“In the late 19th century Latin American economics grew but did not develop” How far do you agree with this statement? Support your answer with examples from one country of the region.*

Very few candidates selected this question. However, answers were good. There was a clear notion of the differences between “growth” and “development” and the countries selected (Chile and Argentina) provided good examples for the arguments.

QUESTION 10 *In what ways did immigration to the United States in the period 1800 to 1860 differ from the period 1880 to 1924?*

Not a popular question. But the answers were satisfactory. Candidates were able to establish the difference between immigration in the two periods.

QUESTION 11 *Evaluate the changes in the United States policy towards Latin America from 1898 to 1941.*

This question was addressed by many candidates, and the answers varied from satisfactory to excellent. It was obviously a topic that has been studied. The limitations were perceived in candidates failing to follow the dates in the question. Several lost points because they did not discuss the “Good Neighbour” policy. Many answers, however, showed extensive rationale; economic concerns; and the policies of various US presidents. In the majority of answers this knowledge was used to answer the question, not simply to build a descriptive narrative. Cuba and Panama were frequently used as specific examples, and policies such as the ‘Big Stick’ and ‘Dollar Diplomacy’ were used to illustrate the changes, and Mexico as an example of Wilson’s policies.

QUESTION 12 *“The Mexican constitution of 1917 was the first example of a constitutional document reflecting their own experiences and needs rather than merely copying political ideologies of Europe and the United States”. How justified is this view?*

A popular question and one which was well-answered with most candidates showing sound knowledge and understanding as they explained how the Constitution of 1917 reflected Mexico’s own experiences and needs.

QUESTION 13 *Analyse the causes of the Great Depression (1929) in one country of the region.*

Another popular question. Some candidates showed considerable knowledge in their answers, in particular those who selected the United States as an example.

QUESTION 14 *Assess the evolution of the impact of nationalism in one country of Latin America from the 1930s to the 1960s.*

Many candidates selected this question. There were some excellent answers, some rather mediocre. All the candidates selected Perón's first regime as an example. The best answers discussed both the evolution and the impact of nationalism. Many, however, limited themselves to descriptive renditions of what Perón did but without any reference to nationalism or its evolution and impact. This was a theme that the candidates had been prepared for, but many of them basically ignored the demands of the question and the issue of nationalism.

QUESTION 16 *Evaluate President Truman's decision to drop the atomic bomb on Hiroshima in 1945.*

This was a popular question with mixed results. Many candidates showed a significant lack of knowledge about the topic, and pursued a path of personal, unsubstantiated opinions. Others, however, displayed a great deal of knowledge about the historical controversy surrounding the issue and provided excellent answers.

QUESTION 17 *Why did Cuba become a Marxist-Leninist state closely tied to the Soviet Union by 1961?*

A familiar topic, selected by many with very few good answers. The majority discussed Castro's rise to power within a narrative framework, lacking knowledge and without providing historical evidence to support it.

QUESTION 19 *Why had President Nixon ended American involvement in the Vietnam war by 1973?*

Very few answers and often of disappointing quality. More often than not, candidates seemed unaware of the reasons why Nixon ended the involvement in Vietnam. Some candidates often provided some discussion of the antiwar movement or of political unrest, but without specific references.

QUESTION 20 *Assess the impact of Martin Luther King on the Civil Rights movement.*

Answers to this question varied greatly in quality. The majority selected showed some knowledge about the topic but lacked concrete and specific evidence. The best answers showed preparation and knowledge of the topic.

QUESTION 22 *To what extent has economic failure been characteristic of Latin American military governments between the 1960s and 1980s? Explain your answer using examples of two countries of the region.*

There were few answers to this question. Candidates chose Chile and Argentina. Most answers showed knowledge and were generally well handled.

The type of assistance and guidance the teachers should provide for future candidates

Teachers might make a contribution by becoming familiar with the syllabus and previous IB exams, as well as the type of questions that are asked. Teaching analytical skills, evaluation and assessment will also be of great help to the candidates. Since one of the major problems observed was that the

candidates did not pay a great deal of attention to the dates in the question, it is necessary that teachers practice reading questions carefully with their candidates. As emphasized in previous reports, teachers can help each cohort of candidates by emphasizing to them the importance of identifying the key words and phrases in the question, striving to understand the full requirements of the question, and using their knowledge, skills and understanding to build well-targeted and well-substantiated responses. Candidates who lack adequate knowledge are unlikely to grasp the implications of the questions, and knowledge is also needed to build sound answers.

The recommendations for teachers are:

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

History of East and South East Asia and Oceania

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-6	7-13	14-21	22-28	29-34	35-41	42-60

General comments

The reports from the schools indicated that the teachers considered the November examination to be accessible to most candidates. The general level of performance was of a high standard and there were a number of outstanding scripts. The overall standard of the work submitted in November 2001 was comparable to that of recent years. Although China and Japan were still the main topics chosen there was evidence that this year that candidates selected more widely. In fact, 17 out of the 25 questions on the paper were attempted which, considering the surprisingly small cohort, was pleasing.

The areas of the programme which proved difficult for candidates

The main weakness of candidates taking this examination was indicated in the November 2000 Subject Report. Nothing has changed. Candidates are still unable to focus their knowledge on the question that has been set. This is manifested in two ways. Firstly, candidates were not able to deal with the entire time period that the question demanded or that they only partially answered the question. Secondly, candidates chose questions because they recognized the name or the events, but did not have enough knowledge about the topic to answer them adequately. There was also an inability to develop arguments and have these arguments supported by sound historical material.

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

Six questions were the most popular choices.

QUESTION 1 *“The so-called Opium War (1839 to 1842) was about far more than opium”. How far do you agree with this statement?*

Answers to this question were generally disappointing. Too many candidates focused entirely on the question of opium without taking note of the invitation in the question to disagree with the premise. This meant that many responses did not deal with the underlying background reasons as to why the war broke out but focused entirely on British attitudes towards opium with the corresponding effects they had on China. There were some excellent answers however that realized the implications of the question and analysed relationships between China and Britain during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. These essays then appreciated the fact that, while opium was a contributory factor to the outbreak of the war, there were far deeper, underlying causes.

QUESTION 2 *Analyse the aims and the role of the western clans (Satsuma and Choshu) in bringing about the Meiji Restoration in Japan in 1868.*

This was a popular question and one that, in general, was well answered by candidates. The better answers demonstrated a surprisingly comprehensive knowledge of the clans and were

able to assess and evaluate both their aims and their roles in effecting a change in government in Japan in the middle of the 19th century. Even the weaker candidates were able to construct a convincing descriptive account that indicated a clear understanding of the issues, if not the ability to critically assess them.

QUESTION 5 *Explain why the self-strengthening movement in China between 1861 and 1894 failed to achieve the success of the reforms in Japan between 1868 and 1894.*

This was a difficult question in that it required candidates to compare and contrast China and Japan in the latter half of the 19th century. There were some absolutely superb essays on this question in which candidates demonstrated not only an extremely comprehensive knowledge of the two countries but also the ability to critically compare and evaluate the progress of China and Japan during this time period. Unfortunately there were also some candidates who only chose China or Japan, which made it impossible for them to gain high marks as the comparative aspect of the question was ignored.

QUESTION 9 *In what ways did the Boxer Rebellion of 1899 illustrate the weakness of the Qing (Ch'ing) regime in China?*

This was quite a popular choice for candidates but frequently they were unable to put the Boxer Rebellion in a wider context and explain why it could be said that the combination of factors in the latter half of the 19th century in China were manifested in the outbreak of the Rebellion. Answers became focused on the events of the Rebellion itself and were not able to show why it illustrated the weakness of the Qing dynasty. A somewhat disappointing set of essays.

QUESTION 12 *“Why did the Communists and Guomindang (Kuomintang) in China create a United Front in 1924, and why had it collapsed by 1928?”*

This was the most popular 20th-century question on the exam paper. As is to be expected it also attracted a variety of responses. The better candidates were able to link causes and effects behind the creation of a United Front and explain clearly the reasons why it collapsed by 1928. Weaker responses could identify the events that occurred between 1924 and 1928, but were then unable to link the one to the other creating an explanation as to why the United Front collapsed. This question proved to be a good discriminator among the candidates.

QUESTION 17 *There has been a tendency to attribute all of China's achievements and problems between 1949 and 1976 to Mao Zedong (Mao Tse-tung)? How far does this do justice to other leading figures in China's government over those years?*

It goes without saying that in an examination paper set on East Asia a question on Mao will always be popular. The focus of this particular question that asked candidates to examine the roles of other prominent Communist politicians proved to be challenging. Candidates had obviously expected a question on Mao and knew a considerable amount about both him and his policies, but they were unable to make any clear assessment of the roles of other leading governmental members. This meant that answers to this particular question were weak. In fact it was one of the questions in which the candidates overall received the lowest marks. Candidates cannot simply argue that the quotation is nonsense and that Mao was in fact of the single most important person in China between 1949 and 1976 unless this can be supported with adequate evidence. Unfortunately candidates who took this approach were unable to provide any supporting material and therefore scored towards the bottom of the mark band.

QUESTION 22 *Why, and with what consequences, were the Four Modernizations adopted in China after the death of Mao Zedong (Mao Tse-tung)?*

It was with some surprise that examiners reported that no candidates chose this question.

The type of assistance and guidance which teachers should provide for future candidates

During the November 2001 Grade Award in Cardiff it became apparent that many of the weaknesses which are demonstrated in the 314 (East Asia) Paper are the same as those exhibited in the 315 (Europe) Paper. The recommendations below are therefore identical to those made for the European Option. Candidates need to be taught how to develop an argument using historical information rather than merely listing events/facts and assuming that these have therefore an implied relevance. There are very few cases where candidates have actually thought through their own arguments. There is still too much citing of material from general textbooks and candidates are assuming that what is written is definitive or 'good' history. In summary teachers should:

- Use of a variety of historical sources, not just a textbook.
- Encourage the better candidates to take risks and stretch themselves in their analyses.
- Teach the key phrases such as 'analyse', 'to what extent', 'assess', 'account for' etc. Give candidates practice in deciphering questions.
- Concentrate on higher thinking skills in class discussion and short paragraph writing.
- Help candidates acquire an accurate and substantial body of knowledge, especially of the popular topics.
- Practice pacing answers. A 2 1/2 hour, 3 question paper needs a few minutes to prepare each question, some proofreading time and 40 minutes of fairly swift, copious, close writing.

History of Europe

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-6	7-13	14-21	22-28	29-34	35-41	42-60

General comments

The G2 Reports from the schools and the individual examiner reports indicated that the November 2001 paper was considered to be fair. Some schools complained about the lack of a question on Stalin but, in general, there were very few negative comments and it was evident that the majority of the questions allowed candidates to demonstrate their historical knowledge. There were very few weak scripts and the general level of performance of the candidates was of a sound standard. Some of the work that was submitted was truly outstanding, indicating that there is some excellent history teaching taking place in some schools.

The areas of the programme which proved difficult for candidates

The greatest difficulty seemed to be the selection and use of *relevant* knowledge. While candidates wrote fewer descriptive essays this year, there was still a tendency for candidates to write everything they knew about a topic rather than directing their knowledge towards answering the question that was actually set. The construction of arguments needs to include more critical judgment. There was less evidence of ‘name-dropping’ but candidates frequently quote names rather than developing their own line of argument. There is a tendency in some parts of the world to refer to people writing on Historical Topics as ‘Historian Smith argued...’. The simple use of the last name is preferable.

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

Ten questions were the most popular choices.

QUESTION 2 *To what extent were Napoleon’s domestic policies based on the principles of the French Revolution?*

There were some excellent answers here that made a clear link between the French Revolution and Napoleon’s domestic policies. The weaker answers simply listed Napoleon’s policies and made no distinction between those that were domestic, and those that were foreign. In fact some candidates simply answered as if the question required only knowledge of foreign policies.

QUESTION 3 *How far did the Congress System succeed in achieving the aims of its members between 1815 and 1822?*

Only the very best candidates possessed the depth and breadth of knowledge to answer this question well. Too many answers were simply a catalogue of the terms of the Congress of Vienna with little or no assessment of whether or not these were a success or a failure. Another difficulty with this question was that many candidates did not include the entire chronology between 1815 and 1822. They either started far too late in 1818 or stopped in 1815. A major weakness was the failure of candidates to recognise that the aims of its

members might have changed between the inception of the Congress System and its demise in 1822.

QUESTION 5 *Assess the relative importance of the roles played by Mazzini and Cavour in the unification of Italy.*

This was an extremely popular question. Mazzini is rarely well known despite the regularity with which he appears in exam papers. This was the major weakness of candidates who chose this question. Cavour was covered in a sound manner, but Mazzini was dealt with in a very superficial way. The greatest weakness of candidates who chose this question was of the inability to assess the relative importance of the two men. This involves the judgment of in which way either man was more important than the other. This was usually left to the end of the essay in a very brief conclusion which attempted to then say - 'Mazzini was more important than Cavour' or vice versa, although this assertion was not supported.

QUESTION 7 *How successful was Bismarck as Chancellor in his foreign policies between 1862 and 1890?*

This was another extremely popular question. The major difficulty here was the dates, which ran from 1862 to 1890. Too few candidates stopped in 1871 and a very small minority started their essay in 1871. There was a surprising lack of knowledge about the Triple Alliance, affairs in the Balkans, and the Berlin Conference of 1885. There were a handful of excellent answers, which covered the entire chronology and made appropriate critical judgments about Bismarck's success or failure

QUESTION 12 *How far did the achievements of Alexander II, between 1855 and 1881, justify his claim to be the "Tsar Liberator"?*

Although this was a popular question, and one that has appeared in a similar form in previous exam papers, too many candidates simply listed the reforms of Alexander but made no connection between these reforms and the quotation in the question. In general the answers here were disappointing.

QUESTION 14 *Why did World War I start in 1914 and not earlier?*

This was another popular question and most candidates attempt questions on the First World War. What made this question more difficult was the inclusion of the date 1914 with the intention that candidates should identify the immediate causes of the war and argue that events in 1914 made the war almost inevitable. Too often answers were simply a litany of events from 1879 to 1914 with no clear focus on the date that appeared in the question. A handful of candidates focused correctly on the events of June and July 1914 and then related these back to some of the longer-term causes of the conflicts. Answers such as these were highly rewarded.

QUESTION 15 *Why did the Reds win the Russian Civil War (1918 to 1921)?*

Somewhat surprisingly, but perhaps due to the fact that the Russian Revolution is a prescribed subject, this was the most popular question answered in November 2001. There were some superb answers here that showed a variety of explanations as to why the Reds were victorious, and these were supported with appropriate critical commentary. Even the weakest candidates were able to construct a satisfactory explanation as to why the Reds won.

QUESTION 16 *Why did the League of Nations fail to achieve its aim of disarmament between 1920 and 1939?*

This was without doubt the most disappointing question on the exam paper. Very few candidates took note of the term disarmament and instead wrote general essays about the failures of the League of Nations. Almost no one realised that one of the fundamental aims of the League, as stated in the Covenant, was disarmament and that this lack of understanding ensured that most answers were unfocused and almost irrelevant.

QUESTION 17 *“The key factor was their control of the media.” How far does this statement explain the success of Mussolini and Hitler in retaining power in Italy and Germany respectively?*

Questions on Mussolini and Hitler are always popular but the focus of this question on the media caused problems for many candidates. They were unable to define the term “media” and instead wrote rather general essays on the social and cultural policies of Mussolini and Hitler. Some candidates wrote only on Mussolini, and some only on Hitler. Better candidates were able to understand that the quotation could be challenged and these answers showed that, while the media was to an extent important, there were other factors that made the retention of power by Mussolini and Hitler possible.

QUESTION 23 *To what extent do you agree with the view that “terrorism is a justifiable weapon in the arsenal of European politics if it is the only means through which success may be achieved”?*

Following the events of September the 11th it would have been assumed that candidates would have a good understanding of what the term “terrorism” involved. Unfortunately this was not the case and far too many candidates focused on the notion of State Terror, using as examples Hitler and Stalin, rather than on the more general term terrorism. There were many examples of terrorism, which could have been used to either support or refute the question, but it became obvious that candidates had little knowledge or understanding of this subject.

The type of assistance and guidance which teachers should provide for future candidates

- Candidates need to be taught how to develop an argument using historical information rather than merely listing events/facts and assuming that these have therefore an implied relevance. There are very few cases where candidates have actually thought through their own arguments. There is still too much citing of material from general textbooks and candidates are assuming that what is written is definitive or ‘good’ history. In summary teachers should:
- Use of a variety of historical sources, not just a textbook.
- Encourage the better candidates to take risks and stretch themselves in their analyses.
- Teach the key phrases such as 'analyse', 'to what extent', 'assess', 'account for' etc. Give candidates practice in deciphering questions.
- Concentrate on higher thinking skills in class discussion and short paragraph writing.
- Have candidates acquire an accurate and substantial body of knowledge, especially of the popular topics.
- Practice pacing answers. A 2 1/2 hour, 3 question paper needs a few minutes to prepare each question, some proofreading time and 40 minutes of fairly swift, copious, close writing.