

OPTION INTERNATIONALE DU BACCALAUREAT

SESSION DE JUIN 2013

SECTION BRITANNIQUE

SUJETS : HISTOIRE-GEOGRAPHIE

FINAL GUIDANCE NOTES FOR MARKING

These notes are for the guidance of examiners only and were developed into the Final version in the light of early script reading and teacher-examiners' comments. Changes are in blue

This document consists of some general marking guidance, the generic marking criteria (new this year) and question-specific notes for Questions 1–3, one per page, for ease of reference.

General marking guidance

1 Assessment criteria

The work of an examiner is to assess each candidate in the three broad areas of knowledge (K), understanding (U) and skills (S). Simply, this means knowledge and understanding of,

- history and geography
- the questions and topics set.

On page 50, the OIB Handbook 2013 lists skills to be developed, including abilities,

- to extract information from a variety of sources
- to interpret, analyse and evaluate material
- to place material in its relevant context
- to develop evidence-based arguments in written and oral form
- to show an awareness of the characteristics of peoples, places and events and the interaction between them
- to use relevant and precise examples and/or case studies to support an answer.

A candidate's performance may also depend on his/her skills in question selection and in time management, between the two questions chosen and in terms of the length of responses provided for the two parts of a question.

2 Positive marking

You are asked to assess candidate's responses positively, rather than negatively, always giving candidates the benefit of the doubt. This is especially true this year, after the late change in the format of the question paper and the reduced choice this offers candidates. Positive marking involves seeking to award credit where it is deserved rather than having a model answer in mind and not penalising work where it is deficient, such as if you find errors. Cambridge does not penalise work you consider to be 'messy', for example with crossings out. It may help to read an answer so as to seek to award marks upwards from 0 to 20, rather than as if to knock marks off downwards from 20 to 0. You should use the full range of marks, if that is appropriate for the work done. Marks that turn out to be unjustifiably "bunched" are problematic and impair comparability between the work of different examiners.

A further aspect of positive marking is that, whilst the selection and application of material is an ability to be assessed, some *transfer of credit* between parts of questions may be admissible.

Note: In Question 3, the document-based question (DBQ), candidates may not derive credit from simply *describing* the documents, as some will do, but only from meeting the question's specific demand(s).

3 Total marks

The total mark you give to an answer should indicate the quality of the answer *as a whole* even though marks will have been given at first to each part of the question (i.e. /8 and /12). You should arrive at this mark using the mark bands in the generic marking criteria for reference. Please note that an answer does not need to meet *all* the criteria of a mark band to be placed within it. Answers which display characteristics of two mark bands should be placed using your judgement to decide which band best sums up its character, e.g. between **Bare pass** and **Satisfactory**.

Lastly and most importantly, the total mark you give to a script should indicate the assessed quality of the script *as a whole* even though this comprises two answers, marked separately, which may be of different qualities and standards. To do this the aggregate mark (out of 40) should be halved and, if not a whole number, always rounded *up*. You should also consider whether it is appropriate to recommend appending an asterisk to a script's final mark (see Handbook, page 58).

4 Paper structure and question structure

Candidates are only required to answer two questions in – a generous – four hours. There should not be a problem with incomplete or unfinished answers or answers in note form, although examiners do see some each year. Blanks in scripts may simply indicate lack of knowledge and understanding, poor question choice, or both. If a candidate does allocate their time poorly it is self-penalising as only the material which is submitted can, of course, be assessed.

Each question is structured in two. Each essay has two elements within it. The document-based question (DBQ) has parts **(a)** and **(b)**. The demands of both types of question and the mark allocation increase between the two. Whilst the subdivision of marks for the question are not printed on the question paper, the anticipated allocation is:

First element of essay and part (a) of DBQ	8 marks
Second element of essay and part (b) of DBQ	12 marks

In the majority of cases, you should mark the different parts of questions out of these totals. In rare cases, depending on the approach taken, it may be appropriate and in a candidate's interest to use an alternative mark allocation, of 6 or 7 marks and 14 or 13 marks, respectively, bearing in mind the above comments on final marks for questions (and the need for a total of 20). If you do this, please annotate the mark sheet accordingly.

For each question some clear marking guidelines are given for the first element to help examiners to treat responses in the same way, i.e. to promote convergence in marking. The second element or part **(b)** is, however, an extended piece of writing or essay involving different skills, such as the presentation of an argument and conclusion, or an assessment, and is much broader in conception and a stimulus for the candidate's own response. This is true for both types of questions; the essays (**Questions 1 and 2**) and the document-based (**Question 3**).

In the second element of the essays candidates are expected to select their own examples or case studies, evidence and material in support of their argument. In part **(b)** in the document-based questions, candidates should develop an answer drawing on the documents to some extent, but also on their own wider knowledge and understanding of the topic. A variety of approaches and responses is expected to this second demand and as such it is difficult to offer specific marking guidelines. Examiners are asked to use their experience of history and/or geography to assess each response using the general guidelines on the next page. You are welcome to refer to me, Anne Davis or David Jackson by e-mail, or by a comment on the mark sheet, any response which you think needs a second opinion (Handbook, page 58).

OIB History-Geography generic marking criteria for the written examination (new in 2013)

Assessing 'what students know, what they understand, and what they can do'.

/8	/12	max /20	Performance descriptors
8	11–12	20	<p>Very good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive, detailed and well-directed knowledge • Very good understanding with a “big picture” approach • High ability to analyse, evaluate and provide evidence-based judgements • Highly skilled interpretation and use of document(s) • Devises and structures response very effectively
6–7	9–10	17	<p>Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good, detailed knowledge, directed effectively • Good level of understanding, developing ideas within firm subject context • Good ability to analyse, evaluate and provide evidence-based judgements • Skilled interpretation and use of document(s) • Devises and structures response well
5	7–8	13	<p>Satisfactory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate knowledge • Sound understanding, with some elements of subject context • Some ability to analyse, evaluate and provide judgements • Clear interpretation and use of document(s) • Devises a simple, clear structure for the response
4	6	10	<p>Bare pass</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic knowledge • Basic understanding and limited awareness of subject context • Analysis, evaluation and use of evidence basic • Basic approach to document(s); limitations in interpretation and/or use • Gives response a basic structure
3	4–5	8	<p>Weak</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic knowledge – restricted in scope, depth or detail • Basic understanding – restricted and/or faulty • Approach largely descriptive or analysis is weak or faulty and evaluation lacks supporting evidence • Weak approach to document(s) interpretation and use • Devises and structures response weakly or offers fragments, notes or an unfinished response
1–2	1–3	5	<p>Very weak</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very little relevant knowledge – a few basic facts • Very restricted understanding • Little or no analysis or evaluation or judgements offered • Very weak approach to document(s) interpretation and use • Devises and structures response very weakly or offers fragments
0	0	0	No response.

The principles of positive marking, benefit of the doubt and ‘best fit’ apply in awarding marks.

Ms Claire J Sladden Cambridge Inspector for History-Geography
+44 (0)1353 662329 cjs25@cantab.net
Draft 07 June / Final 11 June 2013

Question-specific notes

1 Pathways to power – USA

Explain the reasons for the USA reverting to a period of isolationism in the 1920s and 1930s.

Marks of quality in the response may include recognition of main/minor reasons or differing explanations; the use of supportive historical detail; some distinction between the 1920s and the 1930s; or recognition of the interaction of different reasons. Some may 'question the question' in that there were aspects of US policy which were not isolationist.

Key general **reasons**:

- traditional US foreign policy – suspicion of Europe and European entanglements
- US public opinion
- some candidates might refer to economic domination of Latin America, effectively giving informal control / protection of American interests, so permitting isolationism

Reasons for **isolationism** in the **1920s**:

- impact of WWI – losses and costs
- disillusionment over peace settlements (especially Versailles) e.g. mandate system extending imperial powers, League of Nations – might entail unwelcome obligations.
- Wilson's mishandling of the US domestic situation leading to rejection of Versailles treaty
- Republican victory in presidential election – Harding and then Coolidge – view of US role in world primarily economic and not political.

and in the **1930s**:

- economic depression
- rise of the dictators in Europe and Japan
- US public opinion – peace movements (e.g. 'peace strike' 1936, Nye commission report 1934).

Mark holistically, on overall quality of the explanation.

8

Evaluate the factors that led to the USA adopting the role of a global superpower in 1945.

The question progresses in time and opens up characteristically requiring an evidence-based evaluation.

Key **factors** include:

- the US contribution to the Allied victory
- US economic strength and technical superiority
- widespread destruction and bankruptcy in Europe and Asia
- a power vacuum in the world and concerns about the threat posed by communism and Stalin
- changed US public opinion that it was the 'good guy' fighting for freedom and that politicians can be interventionist (view of Roosevelt and then Truman).

Indicators of the quality of the response may include,

- detailed knowledge of the period up to **1945** and of the **global** context
- identification and explanation of a number of **factors** and their relative significance
- some consideration of what **the role of a global superpower** was
- analysis of what **adopting the role** might mean in this context
- evaluative assessment which addresses **factors** explicitly
- an evaluation which demonstrates judgement and admits some diversity of opinions, perspectives, and/or historical interpretations
- structure and organisation of the response
- skills in, and the language of, assessment, providing an evaluative essay rather than a more narrative approach.

12

Total: 20

2 Levels of government : National level : Governing France since 1946

Outline the strengths and weaknesses of the IVth Republic.

Both **strengths and weaknesses** are clearly needed, although balance is not – perception may be of its significant weaknesses. Fully comprehensive answers are not to be expected.

The **strengths** are likely to be seen as:

- it re-established a strong French Republic (“re-established the one and indivisible Republic with a vengeance” (Gildea)
- a centralised system -- regionalism was discredited by Vichy
- centralisation led to govt. planning for the economy as a whole, social welfare planning, etc.
- greater power given to parliament, therefore the strengthening of democracy
- electoral system (proportional representation) favoured emergence of three large party groups (MRP, Socialists and Communists) in contrast with multiple, small parties of the 3rd Republic
- other

The **weaknesses** may be seen as:

- weak executive government – governments were unstable (26 in 12 years)
- coalition government: governments depended on parliamentary support, which was difficult for any one party to achieve -- short-lived coalitions resulted
- weak presidential powers
- weak powers to upper chamber – Council of the Republic
- cleavages that existed between Left and Right under the 3rd Republic resurfaced under the new constitution of the IVth and were antagonised by the tensions created by the Cold War
- decolonisation led to crises and eventual paralysis of the IVth Republic (Indochina and especially Algeria)
- other.

Students may interpret the question to mean **strengths and weaknesses** in general and so might discuss the French economy (including the *trente glorieuses*), policy towards Europe and integration, the Cold War, postwar reconstruction, etc. Mark this approach on merit.

8

How far do you agree with the view that “again and again Charles de Gaulle was the saviour of France?”

The question opens up to allow candidates to make the best use of the material they have. A number of approaches are possible. Candidates may engage with differing interpretations of de Gaulle and traditional views that de Gaulle saved France three times (from the Nazis in 1945, the attempted putsch in Algiers in 1958, and from the rioting students in 1968). There may be an attempt to discuss ‘Gaullism’ as an ideology / set of ideas but this would need to be linked to the question to be creditable.

Students may interpret this to take an overall view of de Gaulle’s career, e.g. starting with the war years from 1940 leading the Free French and then going on to look at his role in key “crises, e.g. reconstructing France up to the creation of the IV Republic, the creation of a strong presidential regime under the V Republic and his handling of the Algerian crisis up to independence in 1962.

Indicators of quality may include:

- detailed knowledge of the record of de Gaulle
- awareness and analysis of different, and changing, interpretations of history and/or of the approach to history based on a named individual
- understanding of what the term **saviour** may mean in this context
- structure and organisation of the response
- skills in assessment and overall judgment of extent of agreement
- possible suggestion of an alternative or modified **view** from the one given.

12

Total: 20

3 Development issues

(a) **How useful are Documents A and B for understanding contrasting levels of development in Africa? Support your response with evidence from the documents.**

Many candidates will begin by describing what the documents are, what they show and the sources. This should not be credited as the question's demand is **How useful..?**

Document A is likely to be seen as quite useful or some similar comment or judgement. It shows development well, using two measures, but does not help to explain it (for **understanding**).

Possible evidence of what is useful for **understanding contrasting levels** includes:

- HDI and GNP mapped for (almost) every country in Africa
- shading and circle sizes give strong visual impression of contrasts
- Key allows data to be retrieved and HDI has labels e.g. 'low, very low' to suggest contrasts
- other

The ways in which **A** is not useful in **understanding contrasting levels of development** include:

- lack of explanatory content, e.g. economy, political regime, government policy, history, aid, etc.
- any information about development at a scale other than national, e.g. regional, rural/urban
- development in other dimensions, e.g. political or environmental, (HDI is a composite index comprising (after 2010) three measures – life expectancy, education and GNI per capita PPP)
- other, e.g. attitude to FDI, attitude to gender, perception of country by rest of the world, etc.

Document B may be seen as less useful for **understanding contrasting levels of development in Africa** in that it puts Africa in a global context, 'GLOBAL GROWTH,' alongside other regions (evidence likely from paragraphs 2 and 3). It is also more explanatory of its performance as a continent (paragraphs 4, 5 and 7) than *within* Africa (some content in paragraph 6 about South Africa and North Africa). Yet it does mention several factors which could be explored, e.g. structural adjustment, raw materials, debt cancellation, industry and 'undiversified exports'.

Candidates may offer two separate accounts. Some overall view or comparison could be an indicator of quality. For a response which only considers one document, **max. 5.** **8**

(b) **Evaluate strategies of development with the help of Documents A and B.**

The question opens up to allow candidates to use their own material (including, importantly, content from the rest of the world, not just about Africa) and to show knowledge and understanding of **strategies of development**. These strategies may be top-down/bottom-up, sustainable development, country-specific policies, such as a 5-year plan, or broader, such as by involving NGOs or seeking FDI.

Document A is silent about **strategies of development** but gives data about development in Africa. As such, **B** may offer more **help**, e.g. mentioning the IMF, raw materials, debt, industry and exports.

Determine overall quality using the generic criteria and bearing in mind,

- conceptual understanding of **strategies of development**
- some reference to **Documents A and B**
- extent and integration of own knowledge beyond the documents
- the use of detailed examples or case studies from LEDCs, ideally from more than one region of the world
- contemporary, reasonably up-to-date, content and a sense of reality
- dimensionality: a response which is more than just economic
- evaluative discussion of the evidence presented
- structure and organisation of the response
- skills in and the language of evaluation (rather than a narrative approach to development).

For a response without reference to either **Document A** or **Document B** (in name or content), **max. 6.**

12

Total: 20/end