

TUESDAY MAY 4TH, PAPER 1 AND
PAPER 2

History

Assessment component	Current examination time	Amended examination time
SL Paper 2	1 hr 30 mins	45 mins

Assessment component	Current examination time	Amended examination time
HL Paper 2	1 hr 30 mins	45 mins

Assessment component	Current examination time	Amended examination time
HL Paper 3	2 hrs 30 mins	1 hr 45 mins

History modified marks and weightings					
	Component	Current number of marks	Modified number of marks for M21	Current weighting	Weighting for M21
SL	Paper 1	24	24	30%	30%
	Paper 2	30	15	45%	45%
	IA	25	25	25%	25%
	Total weighting			100%	100%
HL	Paper 1	24	24	20%	20%
	Paper 2	30	15	25%	25%
	Paper 3	45	30	35%	35%
	IA	25	25	20%	20%
	Total weighting			100%	100%

PAPER 1

M18/3/HISTX/BP1/ENG/TZ0/XX/Q



History
Higher level and standard level
Paper 1

Tuesday 8 May 2018 (afternoon)

1 hour

Instructions to candidates

- Do not open this examination paper until instructed to do so.
- The history higher level and standard level paper 1 source booklet is required for this examination paper.
- Answer all questions from one prescribed subject using the relevant sources in the source booklet.
- The maximum mark for this examination paper is **[24 marks]**.

Prescribed subject	Questions
1: Military leaders	1 – 4
2: Conquest and its impact	5 – 8
3: The move to global war	9 – 12
4: Rights and protest	13 – 16
5: Conflict and intervention	17 – 20

Paper 1 – Rubric and Markbands

Duration: 1 hour

Weighting: 20% HL

Paper 1 is a source-based examination paper based on the prescribed subjects. Each prescribed subject consists of two specified case studies, and in each examination session the paper will focus on one of the two case studies specified for each prescribed subject.

The paper will contain four sources for each prescribed subject. Sources will be primary or a mixture of primary and secondary, and may be written, pictorial or diagrammatic. The paper will consist of four questions for each prescribed subject, and students must answer all four questions from their chosen prescribed subject. Some questions will be answered using only evidence from one or more of the sources, as indicated. In other questions students will be asked to use their own knowledge of the prescribed subject as well as evidence contained in the sources.

First question, part A	This question will test understanding of one of the sources.	3 marks
First question, part B	This question will test understanding of one of the sources.	2 marks
Second question	This question will ask students to analyse the value and limitations of one of the sources. In their analysis of value and limitations, students should refer to the origin, purpose and content of the specified source.	4 marks
Third question	This question will ask students to compare and contrast what two of the sources reveal to a historian studying the particular aspect of the prescribed subject.	6 marks
Fourth question	This will be an evaluative question that asks students to draw on both the sources and their own knowledge in their evaluation.	9 marks

The maximum mark for this paper is 24. The paper is marked using a paper-specific markscheme, except for the final question for each prescribed subject, which is marked using the generic markbands that follow, in addition to a paper-specific markscheme.

PAPER 2

M18/3/HISTX/BP2/ENG/TZ1/XX



History
Higher level and standard level
Paper 2

Tuesday 8 May 2018 (afternoon)

1 hour 30 minutes

Instructions to candidates

- Do not open this examination paper until instructed to do so.
- Answer two questions, each chosen from a different topic.
- Each question is worth **[15 marks]**.
- The maximum mark for this examination paper is **[30 marks]**.
- Where the word region is used it refers to the following four regions: Europe, Asia and Oceania, the Americas, and Africa and the Middle East.



This markscheme outlines what members of the paper setting team had in mind when they devised the questions. The points listed in the bullet points indicate possible areas candidates might cover in their answers. They are **not** compulsory points and are **not** necessarily the best possible points. They are only a framework to help examiners in their assessment, and examiners should be responsive to any other valid points or any other valid approaches. Examiners are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the "best fit" to the responses given by candidates and to award credit wherever it is possible to do so.

Marks	Level descriptor
13–15	<p>Responses are clearly focused, showing a high degree of awareness of the demands and implications of the question. Answers are well structured and effectively organized. Knowledge of the world history topic is accurate and relevant. Events are placed in their historical context, and there is a clear understanding of historical concepts.</p> <p>The examples that the student chooses to discuss are appropriate and relevant, and are used effectively to support the analysis/evaluation. The response makes effective links and/or comparisons (as appropriate to the question).</p> <p>The response contains clear and coherent critical analysis. There is evaluation of different perspectives, and this evaluation is integrated effectively into the answer. All, or nearly all, of the main points are substantiated, and the response argues to a consistent conclusion.</p>
10–12	<p>The demands of the question are understood and addressed. Answers are generally well structured and organized, although there is some repetition or lack of clarity in places. Knowledge of the world history topic is mostly accurate and relevant. Events are placed in their historical context, and there is some understanding of historical concepts.</p> <p>The examples that the student chooses to discuss are appropriate and relevant, and are used to support the analysis/evaluation. The response makes effective links and/or comparisons (as appropriate to the question).</p> <p>The response contains critical analysis, which is mainly clear and coherent. There is some awareness and evaluation of different perspectives. Most of the main points are substantiated and the response argues to a consistent conclusion.</p>

7-9	<p>The response indicates an understanding of the demands of the question, but these demands are only partially addressed. There is an attempt to follow a structured approach. Knowledge of the world history topic is mostly accurate and relevant. Events are generally placed in their historical context.</p> <p>The examples that the student chooses to discuss are appropriate and relevant. The response makes links and/or comparisons (as appropriate to the question).</p> <p>The response moves beyond description to include some analysis or critical commentary, but this is not sustained.</p>
4-6	<p>The response indicates some understanding of the demands of the question. While there may be an attempt to follow a structured approach, the response lacks clarity and coherence. Knowledge of the world history topic is demonstrated, but lacks accuracy and relevance. There is a superficial understanding of historical context.</p> <p>The student identifies specific examples to discuss, but these examples are vague or lack relevance.</p> <p>There is some limited analysis, but the response is primarily narrative/descriptive in nature rather than analytical.</p>
1-3	<p>There is little understanding of the demands of the question. The answer is poorly structured or, where there is a recognizable essay structure, there is minimal focus on the task. Little knowledge of the world history topic is present.</p> <p>The student identifies examples to discuss, but these examples are factually incorrect, irrelevant or vague.</p> <p>The response contains little or no critical analysis. The response may consist mostly of generalizations and poorly substantiated assertions.</p>
0	Answers do not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.

PAPER 2 SKILLS AND TECHNIQUES

OVERVIEW

Nov 2020	To what extent was the arms race the most important reason for the end of the Cold War (1980-1991)?	Examine the economic impact of the Cold War on two countries, each chosen from a different region.
May 2020	Exam Cancelled - COVID!	Exam Cancelled - COVID!
Nov 2019	Evaluate the impact of detente upon US-USSR relations up to the end of 1979.	"Ideology was the most important cause of Cold War crises." Discuss with reference to two Cold War crises, each from a different region.
May 2019	"China's relations with the USSR and the US were largely shaped by increasing mistrust and suspicion." Discuss with reference to the period between 1947 and 1979.	"The actions of individual leaders had a significant impact on the development of the Cold War." Discuss with reference to two leaders, each from a different region.
Nov 2018	"Superpower rivalry in Europe and Asia between 1943 and 1949 led to the breakdown of the grand alliance." To what extent do you agree with this statement?	Discuss the impact of two Cold War crises, each from a different region, on the development of superpower tensions.
May 2018	"Economic problems between 1980 and 1991 were the most significant reason for the end of the Cold War." To what extent do you agree with this statement?	Compare and contrast the impact of two leaders, each from a different region, on the development of the Cold War.
Nov 2017	"Confrontation rather than reconciliation ended the Cold War." Discuss with reference to the period from 1980 to 1991.	Evaluate the impact of two leaders, each from a different region, on the course of the Cold War.
May 2017	To what extent did economic interests rather than ideology lead to the breakdown of the grand alliance between 1943 and 1949?	Evaluate the impact of Cold War tensions on two countries (excluding the USSR and the US).
Spec Paper	Examine the impact of the US policy of containment on superpower relations 1947 - 1964.	Evaluate the impact upon the course of the Cold War of two crises, each chosen from a different region.

- Know certain crisis, wars and policies by heart e.g. first berlin blockade, containment etc.
- You have to know their causes, significance and consequences.
- Paper 2, 3 are all about comparing and contextualizing. Learn the meanings of the different question words such as to what extent, evaluate, discuss... Because they will hint you how you need to argue e.g.
- **To what extent was ideology rather than economics factors the main reason for the breakdown of the Grand Alliance? Lets break it down.**
- To what extent means that you have to look at different perspectives and evaluate them.
- Ideology and economic factors are reasons --> focus in your essay mainly on these factors. "Rather" means that you have to compare the significance and find out which one is more significant.
- Support your arguments with histrionically.
- Reach a definite, clear stated conclusion, dont make a new point. Refer back to your introduction and main arguments.

OVERVIEW

- 45 minutes to formulate 1 essays

PLANNING AN ESSAY

PLANNING AN ESSAY

- Spend 5 minutes listing factors relevant to the question
 - List of notes to refer to if you get stuck
 - Cross off items from the list
- Make sure you understand the question
 - Breakdown the question
- Create a list of events (factual information)
 - [ib study center](#)
- What will you focus on? What idea/concept will you focus your essay around? – Thesis

PLANNING AN ESSAY - EXAMPLE

Question:

Discuss the impact of one country in either Europe or Asia on the emergence of superpower rivalry between 1943 and 1949

Breakdown the question:

- Discuss
 - Look at a range of arguments relevant to the rest of the question
- One country in either Europe or Asia
 - Only one country
- Emergence of superpower rivalry
 - Origins of conflict between USA and USSR
- 1943 and 1949
 - Time frame includes: opening a second front, conferences (Yalta and Potsdam), berlin airlift, NATO, victory of communists in Asia, division of Germany, dropping of the atom bomb, truman doctrine, marshall plan, coup in Czechoslovakia

PLANNING AN ESSAY - EXAMPLE... CONTINUED

Let's choose Germany!

Create a list of events

- Yalta and Potsdam
- Division of Germany as an occupied country
- Long Telegram
- Currency crisis
- Marshall plan
- NATO
- Berlin Blockade
- Berlin Airlift
- Division of Germany into two political units

Ask yourself: What will you focus on? What idea/concept will you focus your essay around?

- Conflict over Germany was a decisive factor in the emergence of superpower rivalry

PLANNING YOUR ESSAY - YOUR TURN

- **Examine the impact of the US Containment policy on the superpower relations from 1947-1968**
- Identify the different components of the essay and write down, in your own words, what you think the question is asking you to do.
- List the event that will help you answer the question.
- Come up with a response to the question. (don't write the entire essay, just come up with a list of events)
- Finally, what idea/concept will you focus your essay on?

WRITING AN INTRODUCTION

WRITING AND INTRODUCTION

- How will you answer the question?
- Succinct introductory paragraph
- **BOLT**
 - **B** - Background information that places the question in its historical context
 - **O** - Opposing view (s) revisionist vs. orthodox
 - **L** - List of evidence; a reasonable amount (time)
 - **T** - Thesis - how will you answer the questions
- Write in your central idea/concept

WRITING AND INTRODUCTION - EXAMPLE

B - Background information and identification of the example	
O - Opposing view	
L - List of evidence	
T - Thesis is presented	

WRITING THE BODY OF THE ESSAY

WRITING THE BODY OF THE ESSAY

Question:

Discuss the impact of one country in either Europe or Asia on the emergence of superpower rivalry between 1943 and 1949.

Avoid:

1. Describing situations
2. Telling stories

BODY PARAGRAPHS

Think of them as mini-essays that should have an introduction, a body and conclusion

Always advance argument

PEEL

P	Point - your topic sentence where you present the argument for this paragraph
E	Evidence - the facts you use to support the argument
E	Explanation - the analysis of the evidence you present
L	Link - where you relate this argument to the larger question

PRACTICE 1 - BODY PARAGRAPH

At Yalta the Big 3 decided they needed to make decisions about Germany as it was definitely going to fall soon. At first they decided to divide Germany into three parts - one each for the UK, USSR and US - but later the UK wanted France to get a share but the Soviets did not want to give up their portion, so Stalin told FDR and Churchill that France could have a part, but it had to come out of the US and UK spheres so the Soviets took one third of Germany and the other two-thirds were divided between France, the UK and the USA. The four were supposed to have joint command of Germany but soon after the German surrender it was obvious that the western parts did not have the same goals as the USSR.

PRACTICE 1 - QUESTIONS

Answer these questions with the previous slide's paragraph:

1. Is there useful information in this paragraph? If so, what is it?
2. How could the information be more useful? What would you add?
3. Is there an argument here?
4. Is there any analytical content?
5. How does it relate to the question?

PRACTICE 1 - ANSWERS

This body paragraph is descriptive, with little analytical content and some relation to the question.

It is useful, but doesn't help to advance an argument because of it lacks structure

PRACTICE 2 - BODY PARAGRAPH

The UK, USSR and USA worked together towards the defeat of Nazi Germany but as the postwar era began their fundamental differences surfaced with the division of Germany between 1945 and 1948. As decided upon in the postwar agreements they divided Germany into sectors, each to be managed by one of the Allied powers. This was meant to be temporary and in 1947 the western sectors (under US, UK and France) expressed their intentions to begin to merge towards unification. Stalin objected and grew frustrated as the other three continued with their plans to combine their powers. The US and UK first combined their sectors into bizonia and later France joined and it became trizonia. This angered Stalin who withdrew from the Allied Control Council. This series of actions showed very clearly how Germany impacted the development of a rivalry between the US and USSR.

PRACTICE 2 - QUESTIONS

1. Find all the parts of PEEL (with previous slide's paragraph) - (see next slide for answers)

PRACTICE 2 - BODY PARAGRAPH

P

E
E
L

The UK, USSR and USA worked together towards the defeat of Nazi Germany but as the postwar era began their fundamental differences surfaced with the division of Germany between 1945 and 1948. As decided upon in the postwar agreements they divided Germany into sectors, each to be managed by one of the Allied powers. This was meant to be temporary and in 1947 the western sectors (under US, UK and France) expressed their intentions to begin to merge towards unification. Stalin objected and grew frustrated as the other three continued with their plans to combine their powers. The US and UK first combined their sectors into bizonia and later France joined and it became trizonia. This angered Stalin who withdrew from the Allied Control Council. This series of actions showed very clearly how Germany impacted the development of a rivalry between the US and USSR.

PRACTICE 2 - ANSWERS

1. Good structure - have body paragraphs in chronological order (sequencing)
2. Alternative perspective - should be considered before you reach your conclusion - you can present this as one for your body paragraphs (see next slide)

PRACTICE 2 - ALTERNATIVE PERSPECTIVE

One the other hand, Germany also represented a last attempt for the superpowers to work together, in the new form of the Nuremberg Trials. Beginning in November 1945, the Allied powers collaborated in the war crimes tribunals. Through their cooperation, many of the surviving leaders were convicted of crimes against humanity, often resulting in executions. This demonstrated that Germany wasn't always a source of tension between the superpowers and, indeed, was at times a place of agreement between the USSR and USA.

WRITING THE CONCLUSION

WRITING THE CONCLUSION

Question:

Discuss the impact of one country in either Europe or Asia on the emergence of superpower rivalry between 1943 and 1949.

What to do?

- 1. Summarize your points and reach a holistic conclusion.**
- 2. Restate thesis (if you had one)**
- 3. Explain how you proved your thesis**
- 4. Could also raise other issues to provide another line of inquiry for future exploration**

CONCLUSION 1 - EXAMPLE

Germany clearly had a significant impact on the emergence of Soviet-American rivalry. By 1949 each country had its sphere of influence in a politically divided Germany and both superpowers were determined that they would not lose the next power struggle. Berlin continued to be a source of tension, as the US had an enclave in the middle of the Soviet sector, and would continue to be a source of tension through the early 1960s, but for a long time being Germany was reflective of the East-West rivalry that dominated the globe.

CONCLUSION 1 - THOUGHTS

1. 1st sentence is a clear restatement of the conclusion
2. 2nd sentence addresses the points in a broad, collective manner
3. final sentence takes the essay out to its broadened implications

CONCLUSION 2 - EXAMPLE

Ironically, the two nations had formed an alliance due to Germany during WWII to defeat Germany, but that divided the two most sharply. Decisions about postwar Germany contributed to the breakdown of East-West relations between 1943 and 1949 to an extremely large extent. The relation between the USSR and US for the rest of the Cold War era was defined through these events in Germany. Because they could not agree on an action plan, the wartime relationship began to break down. The course that this rivalry would take was muddled when the USSR dominated an atom bomb in August 1949 and the PRC claimed victory in the Chinese Civil War in OCT 1949. The Berlin Blockade showed the unwillingness of the superpowers to engage one another directly, so the result was a series of proxy wars that lasted until the 1980s.

CONCLUSION 2 - QUESTIONS

Identify each of the following components of Conclusion 2

1. Answer or restatement of thesis
2. Main points
3. Bigger picture
4. Is there anything you would add or delete to the conclusion

CONCLUSION 3 - EXAMPLE

In reality, Germany was not as important to the development of superpower rivalries as has been presented so far. Instead, the main issue between the two countries was atomic superiority of the US that was negated in Aug 1949 when the Soviets levelled the playing field by detonating their own bomb. It was this parity that caused the superpower rivalry to emerge.

CONCLUSION 3 - QUESTIONS

What is the problem with Conclusion 3?

TOP TIPS TO BE SUCCESSFUL

1. Take time to unpack the question
2. Answer the question you were asked
3. Make a plan
4. Know your material
5. Asking a history teacher if you need to know names and dates is like asking a math teacher if you need to know numbers
6. Keep your essay focused by referring back to the question
7. Make the ending relevant: this isn't a mystery novel - no surprise endings :)

TOP TIPS TO BE SUCCESSFUL (...CONTINUED)

8. There is no right answer and there is nothing wrong with taking the middle ground
9. As long as you support your argument with relevant factual details, it is a valid argument
10. An essay should be as long as it takes for you to answer the questions; some of the best essays are short, but loaded with concise explanations and good use of historical data
11. Practice leads to improvement