

May 2016 subject reports

Global Politics

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-12	13-23	24-37	38-51	52-63	64-76	77-100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-12	13-23	24-35	36-48	49-62	63-74	75-100

Higher level internal assessment– HL Extension

Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-2	3-4	5-8	9-12	13-14	15-16	17-20

General comments

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

The range and suitability of the work submitted was satisfactory. Candidates continue to select interesting case studies covering a wide range of topics.

The overarching question - Does the student present a clear, focused and balanced analysis of the case study, highlighting a global political challenge? - drives our marking using the global impressions marking rubric. As a result, an appropriate number of students earned a mark of excellent (e.g. The student demonstrates an excellent understanding of a political issue raised by the case study, with a clear and focused analysis and an exploration of different perspectives on the issue); conversely, an equally appropriate number of candidates earned a mark of an rudimentary (e.g. The student demonstrates rudimentary knowledge of the case study). Most candidates received marks between basic and very good. The analysis of the case study within the wider context of a global challenge is what typically separates the very good from the excellent, along with an appropriate application of salient theories/theorists. The evaluation of multiple perspectives within a coherent, focused and balance presentation is what separated basic from satisfactory.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

There are still some lingering concerns over ethical considerations as regards candidates reading their presentations -- either directly from paper or, more insidiously, by using some type of teleprompter - although making use of **limited** notes/prompt cards is allowed. Reading extensively from notes will not impress examiners, and presentations may even risk being investigated for possible breaches of academic honesty.

Otherwise, training and support for teachers has absolutely had a positive impact on instruction and the quality of student work.

Internal assessment–engagement activity

Higher and Standard Level Internal Assessment Component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-3	4-5	6-8	9-10	11-13	14-15	16-20

The range and suitability of the work submitted

The internal assessment engagement activity (EA) should be treated as an essential part of course activities, and emphasis should be placed on its importance in concretizing course concepts and analysis. Students who treat the EA as a smaller extended essay, without really exploring the potential of the engagement activity, who don't tie the EA back to course units, and use very limited sources in their work (eg only one interview, often conducted by telephone or e-mail) are unlikely to score highly. Again this session, there were only a few reports that really met the potential of this exercise or established the connection between the exercise and the rest of the course.

It is important to emphasize that the engagement activity has been designed to allow students the opportunity to explore a political issue that is of particular personal interest. There seemed to be some cases where the teacher had assigned the entire class the same IA task, which prevented the students from taking ownership of the task. This compartmentalizes the activity from the units of the course and it was sometimes difficult to understand why the student chose to do the IA that was completed.

An extra note of caution needs to be sounded on the use of simulation activities, in particular, computer simulations. This year there was particular concern about the undue use of computer games, some of which had no educational merit whatsoever, as the sole “engagement activity”. Playing a computer game, even a game of educational merit, and writing about this, should not be allowed to be the sole extent of a candidate’s engagement in a particular issue.

One candidate who based the EA on a computer game that simulated the real-life colonial power struggles in Africa did make a valid analysis and evaluation of this, but nevertheless risked having the IA disqualified because its content was based purely on historical case studies. It must be stressed the global politics is a contemporary course, and all in-depth case studies should be based on events that have happened in the student’s lifetime. Passing reference can be made to historical events, and sometimes it is necessary to reference these as background to a unit (eg the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 in Unit 2), but the main focus of a case study should never be historical, i.e. on events that happened over 18 years before the time in which the course is being taught.

Many of the better reports were based on engagement with political issues affecting everyday lives in the students’ local communities. It is not the intention of the IA that students necessarily engage top political leadership or ruling segments. The focus of the course is on “people, power and politics,” making it possible to include segments of the entire population(s) in the analysis. While it is clearly not possible to do in-depth analyses on all political levels, the focus need not be on powerful individuals or groups. These segments should be mentioned for a comprehensive understanding of the political issue, but it is not necessary to make them the centre of activity. Interaction between and among various stakeholders is a key focus of the course. It is often difficult for a student who is using limited sources (for example a single interview) to include a wider view of the political issue and a variety of points of view. The student should state any bias insofar as he or she is aware of it, including recognition of his or her own bias. Students also frequently used known individuals as their sources, such as parents or relatives, without showing awareness of the potential of this to bias the report and limit the analysis: care should be taken over this aspect.

It is also important to note that necessary research informs a meaningful engagement, but research alone is **not** an engagement activity. Similarly, engagement activities undertaken **without** supporting research often produce assumptions without justifications. The importance of both the research and experiential elements, and the interaction between the two, should be emphasized from the outset, in initial discussions of this task.

Candidate performance against each criterion

A. Identification of issue and justification

The vast majority of students successfully identified what their engagement activity and political issue were. Too often, however, it was unclear why this issue was chosen, particularly where there was not a clear link to the course units. Stating that the issue is important, or important “for my home country,” is not sufficient justification.

B. Explanation of engagement activity

Explanations of the engagement activities were generally clear although explanations and descriptions of simulation activities and activities such as Model United Nations were often weak. It is important that the student develops his/her own reasoning for engaging in these activities as well as specifically tying them to the rest of the course. It is crucial that it is clear what the student actually did.

A wide variety of engagement activities were seen. Candidates who used **only** simulations, or very limited interviewing (often as few as one or two interviews) had a tendency to miss, or over-simplify, aspects such as the complex negotiations and important variables that take place within and among groups and stakeholders. Simulations, including MUN activities, tend to stress strategy, and the interviewing of one or two individuals may only bring out the management of issues rather than the interaction that takes place among stakeholders and those holding various political beliefs. The most effective engagement activities were those where students interacted with groups of people who may have (messy) differences in their approach to their goals, whether for or against any particular issue. Those using only simulations or very limited interviewing tended to struggle to make connections to the course as a whole, particularly around power, globalization, and how people interact. This point needs to be emphasized, as EAs in 2016 witnessed even more examples of inappropriate simulations that did not directly pertain to the course. For example, one candidate used a random war game to satisfy the engagement requirement, could not adequately justify why he used the simulation, and therefore scored very low marks on the EA. While the use of simulations is not specifically banned in the EA directions, experience has shown that these need to be chosen carefully or else they will be unlikely to provide the kind of information needed to successfully complete an EA.

C. Analysis of issue and D. Synthesis and evaluation

Please see General Comments. These two criteria saw the poorest performance from candidates. Many EAs were overly descriptive in nature. Emphasizing that the analysis should relate back to the units may help with this problem. It is crucial that this activity is seen as an integral part of the course, the “on-the-ground” application of the concepts that are contained in the units rather than a separate and compartmentalized activity that sometimes seems unconnected. Many responses were primarily descriptive or narrative in nature, rather than analytical, and where there was critical analysis this tended not to be well developed. Candidates also seemed to struggle to effectively synthesise the research and experiential aspects within their response.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Some teachers did not follow the EA directions sufficiently carefully, giving credit to students for work that did not fit the task guidance and assessment criteria: teachers need to read the appropriate section of the guide carefully so that they can advise their candidates properly, eg on the suitability of the engagement activities proposed.

As emphasized earlier, the aim should be to integrate engagement activities fully into the mainstream of the course—as the direct application of course learning. Because it takes on a different form than class discussion, it becomes easy to see this exercise as an addendum rather than an essential component. Comments made on the form of the exercise, the sources, and importantly, the emphasis given by the teacher on the importance of the exercise may help students engage with this activity with more energy and commitment, directly applying course learning into the reality of global politics. We have mentioned the problems with simulations and limited interviewing, and believe that this should be emphasized to both students and teachers. While in some places it will remain impossible to directly engage students with local organizations, political groups, etc., it is clear that this approach produces the most valuable form of interactions between students and their research question, and where possible, it should be encouraged.

Further comments

As with last year, despite some excellent work in evidence this year, there are continuing weaknesses in this component. As most of the issues are the same (with perhaps a few requiring some emphasis), last year's comments have been largely repeated here, with some additional comments that reflect this year's experience.

Paper one

Higher and Standard Level component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-3	4-6	7-8	9-12	13-16	17-20	21-25

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

Forming a balance (Q2) or synthesis (Q4) between information from source material and own knowledge can still be a challenge for some candidates. Some candidates found it difficult to provide their own examples when required, such as in Q2 and Q4.

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

On the whole, candidates seemed to have good understanding of the sources, which suggests that they had been well prepared in the unit examined (unit 4 – peace and conflict). Many candidates also had a good deal of background knowledge of concepts and case studies relating to the prescribed content of the unit on which the exam focused (peace and conflict/causes of conflict). Information and facts were extracted very well from the sources by the majority of candidates. Most candidates had a good awareness of the demands of the paper as a whole as well as of individual questions. Candidate time management of all questions on the paper has improved on previous years and this reflects the preparation teachers have invested in candidates. Many candidates were able to reference political theories and approaches effectively to add analysis to their answers.

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

Question 1

Most candidates did very well and obtained full marks as they followed the demands of the question.

A small minority of candidates attempted to answer from own knowledge and not refer to sources. A significant minority of candidates spent too long on this question, some writing lots of factual information about causes of conflict. This question simply requires the interpretation of data and can be answered in a succinct fashion.

Question 2

As a whole, candidates utilised the information in the source very well.

The question required candidates to provide two examples from their own knowledge. At times, candidates did not add those examples to their response and instead focused solely on the source itself.

Question 3

Answers for Question 3 gained two marks for each valid contrast, so answers needed to reference four separate contrasts to gain the full 8 marks. Again, as noted in previous subject reports, when a question does not require a comparison, one should not be provided. Students should also be encouraged to provide a running commentary of contrast i.e. develop a contrast by referencing one source and then immediately referencing a direct point of contrast in the second source. The best organised responses used key contrasting markers such as "on the other hand", "whilst" or "alternatively"; identified four contrasts, and separated each point with a new paragraph. Full marks are more likely to be accumulated this way.

A small minority of candidates did not contrast the two sources required by the question.

Question 4

Many candidates provided multiple perspectives in response to question 4, which allowed them to access higher markbands.

Better answers provided a balanced response, whereas weaker responses did not acknowledge counter-arguments. Excellent answers were focused on the key issue of the debate and reached a balanced conclusion. The very best answers synthesised the sources and own knowledge to put forward a line of thinking, however many answers did not provide this synthesis.

It was pleasing to see such a variety of valid approaches to answering the question. Diverse examples and case studies were used in answers to this question, which demonstrated a real interest from the candidates in constructing their own learning within the course. Some candidates did not use all the sources, as required by question.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Teachers should stress the importance of reading the question carefully in order to meet its demands. For instance: whether the question requires the use of all the sources; two examples from own knowledge; or a contrast and/or comparison of the sources.

Teachers are advised that candidates should learn about examples and case studies from a variety of world regions.

Teachers are advised to practice the skills required for the paper with candidates, including:

- Further guidance and practice on how candidates could structure Q3.
- Students should be encouraged to provide a running commentary of contrast i.e. to develop a contrast by referencing one source and then immediately referencing the second source.
- For question 4, synthesising of own knowledge and sources provided. The need for a balanced approach to the essay, including consideration of claims and counter-claims in response to a statement could be reinforced.

Higher level paper two

Higher level component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-8	9-17	18-27	28-36	37-44	45-54	55-75

General comments

The Range and Suitability of the work submitted

As with last year, the range of work submitted was varied and covered the full range of accomplishment from very poor to excellent. Many of the comments on the work submitted bear repetition from last year.

Unpacking the concepts that appeared in the questions seem to be the most difficult area that most students faced. Students tended to use the concepts without demonstrating clarity in their understanding of them. This lowered marks for many who otherwise had some good ideas that could have been made clear if the concepts had been used correctly, and worked against the examples that the students provided.

Candidates showed a tendency to drop in names of theories or political approaches with the assumption that the reader knows the theory as well as the connection with the question. They also seemed to have difficulty in managing questions that crossed over two units, and in drawing connections between concepts.

On the whole, candidates structured their answers in appropriate ways, although this still proved problematic. Although some candidates did provide very in-depth examples to support their answers this was not the norm. In many cases examples were stated and explained, sometimes at length, without connecting them to the argument or to the question at hand. Some candidates went to great lengths to explain an example, then stated their argument in just a line and didn't build on it, leaving it to the examiner to draw inferences and connections.

In too many instances, students used incorrect terminology, with some confusing geographic areas and historical events. Some candidates used examples that were unhelpful or even inappropriate, particularly in noting the effects of globalization.

Few candidates used counterarguments in their answers. Some candidates did mention an alternative point of view, but then failed to provide any evidence to support it. As stated last year, this is an area that needs to be emphasized and the reason for providing and examining counterclaims should be explained.

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

Candidates seemed to be well prepared to answer on the core concepts of power, sovereignty, development and globalization. For the most part, the answers were well organized, although again, at times the misuse of concepts confused the progression of their argument.

Most candidates managed their time well, some making outlines before they started their answers. Very few left their papers unfinished.

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

Q1. *Discuss the claim that power in global politics is mostly exercised through the use of force and threats.*

The definitions of power were at times muddled, or not connected to the question in ways that were clear. There was a general overuse of the terms *hard power*, *soft power*, and in some cases, *smart power* (attributed to Hillary Clinton in a speech while she was Secretary of State, and meaning the combination of hard and soft power, or the presentation of threats). While these are examples of kinds of power, they do not by themselves define power in its many and varied forms. Power was thus defined almost solely by the use of military force (hard power) as a variable in global politics or the use of convincing arguments (soft power). Combined with the use of these terms were the uses of *realist* arguments, which claim that those who have force will tend to use it, therefore limiting the range of the discussion; Jack Donnelly was the author most cited by candidates on realism, though the theory has an intellectual history that runs much farther back into history. Students would benefit from a broader exposure to the concept of power and its meanings in various contexts: the overuse of “hard” and “soft” power ignores the wider concept of power as it is presented in the course.

Q2. *Evaluate the claim that state sovereignty creates obstacles for the realization of justice for individuals and communities.*

Students tended to do better in directly answering this question, perhaps because it is well covered in Donnelly. The fact that sovereignty trumps accusations of justice violations and particularly human rights abuses was well covered in a majority of the answers, although the arguments against the claim were less well discussed and at times missing completely. While some candidates were unclear about what sovereignty represents, most used it appropriately. The focus on individuals and communities was perhaps the weakest part of the answers, and justice was often used too broadly to provide a clear analysis or answer to the question.

What is clear is that students who had read material on sovereignty and discussed it in class could use the term to differentiate among sources of responsibility and power. Few discussed humanitarian intervention and how variables and situations can change according to sources of organization (i.e. the Security Council, the United Nations as a whole, and large and influential NGOs).

Q3. “The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) is no longer relevant for dealing with human rights issues in the 21st century.” To what extent do you agree with this claim?

Some students took a broad overview of the question whilst others gave detailed answers that incorporated the main points of the Declaration, and added events, covenants and treaties that have occurred or been ratified since then. Unfortunately, there were a fair number of students who were not familiar with the 1948 Declaration and therefore were not able to discuss the controversies that existed at the time and how they now influence current discussions of human rights. Some were able to discuss subsequent generations of rights and how they fit into the general document, while too many others simply dismissed it as a historical artefact. Few were able to examine the concept of relevance and provide examples, and while some mentioned the controversy regarding East vs West in the development of the document, few discussed the feasibility or not of enforcing the basic tenets of the Declaration. The issue of context—when and where the Declaration came into being, and its usefulness in analysing “governmentality” in its various forms—was noticeably missing in most of the answers, and there were almost no counterclaims examined.

Q4. Examine the effectiveness of non-state actors in advancing the protection of human rights.

Students generally understood the nature of this question but were undecided as to what they considered the correct answer. There was a lot of back and forth, with an underlying tone that States were more powerful than non-state actors and therefore in the end had more power and were more effective. There was also a bit of confusion between IGOs and NGOs, with many considering the United Nations an NGO. Not surprisingly, Amnesty International was the most often mentioned organization for its size and for its influence, with the caveat that it could be overrun by a state if the state desired. There was little on the building of movements by organizations and their participation in them. Candidates focused on the organizations themselves, sometimes giving short examples rather than writing about the purpose of these organizations and the social movements that they were involved in, or how and why they were created.

Q5. *Discuss the view that social factors such as gender relations or migration can both help and hinder development.*

Candidates had a difficult time with this question and it produced the most unorganized and unsure answers of all the questions in Paper Two. Students were unclear what social factors meant, what gender relations represented or what role migration would play in the development of a country. Instead, they depended on their own views of what should happen (i.e. that gender equality is a good thing and should be encouraged) and took from the news stories about migration without analysing what they meant or how they tied into the question itself. Candidates tended to focus on either help or hinder, thus, gender inequality would always help a country's development because it was the right thing to do. Migrants and migrant movements were not adequately dealt with in the majority of the answers (though other social factors could have been chosen), and the literature and examples of "migrants" was not addressed. It was clear that "social factors" needs more focus in class time and its meaning made clearer.

Q6. *Examine the view that successful development cannot be achieved without addressing political inequality.*

Students generally took the position that equality was a good thing, so that political inequality had to be addressed in order to achieve successful development. The biggest problem here, as it was for all the development questions, was the definition of development. There was a great reliance on Rostow as the basis for the definition of development, without noting the problems with this theory or its implementation (Rostow's argument has been shown to be circular, and blames the local citizenry if development does not occur, while praising the theory if development does occur). This theory has been well critiqued and tends to be used nowadays more as a historical example of the justification of hard power). Other models of development such as those suggested in the guide, could be explored more.

Candidates had a hard time coming up with appropriate examples of how inequality sets back development, and the most common examples used was that of women driving – if they could not drive to work, then they could not be useful members of the workforce. They often depended on examples of countries where women were given more rights, thus showing a correlation between development and rights. Few directly answered the question, and few argued against the question itself.

Q7. *Evaluate the success of third party involvement in transforming one intra-state conflict away from violence and towards positive peace.*

Candidates had a difficult time with this question, and many were unable to define "third party involvement" outside of the UN. Answers were generally weak and did not include the kinds of examples that the markscheme notes. The meaning of the concept of "positive peace" was often guessed at, and many answers did not directly address the question. There was also some confusion between intra-state and inter-state, and many of the examples were clearly inter-state conflicts. Humanitarian intervention was often used as the main organizing point, but the idea was often wrongly defined or not defined, causing confusion in the answer to the

question. Some candidates referenced NGOs in their answers, but few provided the analyses that would have made these references appropriate. It is clear that more time needs to be spent on this kind of question in the classroom

Q8. *The use of violence can never be legitimate.* Discuss the validity of this claim, with reference to at least one violent conflict that you have studied.

Candidates gave many and varied answers to this question, although few were tied to theories of conflict and were mostly based on personal opinion. A few did refer to points that are listed in the markscheme, discussing pros and cons, the most common being the “Just War Doctrine.” More took an ethical stance towards violence, and many included both some pros but more often cons. Religious doctrine was often cited, and a few cited moral legitimacy. But most did not have well organized answers, and went between the two with no particular grounded reasoning.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

Although many of the candidates did organize their answers effectively, often spending time in making outlines of their answers before they began, many of the answers were unorganized and many points seemed to be noted down as they occurred to the student, rather than being brought in at appropriate time to support an argument, or to follow an outline plan. Students need to define their terms before they present their arguments, as many answers presumed meanings of concepts rather than discussing their place in the question asked. While it is important to remember that this is not a political theory course, eg requiring the study of prescribed writers, there is an expectation that candidates unpack the concepts in their answers (i.e. what is development?).

With the questions on development, and as was noted in the 2015 subject report, there seems to be an over-reliance on teaching the Rostow model, uncritically: at the least, other contemporary economic and development models should also be examined.

It is important to note that teachers emphasize that personal opinions and bias are not acceptable for question answers. Answers need to be backed up with material from the course, and perhaps examples that were used in class. Too many of the answers substituted personal bias, and often from a western point of view, instead of fully considering the implications of the questions and their possible answers.

Finally, it is important to remember that this is a contemporary course. While some historical examples are acceptable if they add to the contemporary issue under discussion, focusing on historical examples such as the first and second world wars, the Nazis, etc., is not acceptable; at times, this lowered the marks for students who focused outside of the contemporary realm. Students should be reminded that the course is based on issues and problems of the current period, and that they should focus their attention on these.

Standard level paper two

Standard level component grade boundaries

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0-5	6-11	12-17	18-23	24-29	30-35	36-50

General comments

There was a distinct improvement in the general standard of student responses this year. Candidates seemed more comfortable not only with the course content as a whole but also with the types of questions being asked of them. A clear indication of this is that there was rarely a significant variation in quality between the two responses. It was equally evident, however, that a degree of unevenness persists with respect to the different sections of the syllabus, i.e., many more candidates attempted PSIR (Unit 1) questions than did Development and/or Peace and Conflict. Certainly, this may be understandable given the natural sequence of instruction in global politics but it is hoped that in the future a more equal treatment of each unit is apparent.

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

As a whole, there continues to be something of a disconnect between concepts in global politics and real world examples. In many instances, it was evident that candidates were relying on a single example or limited set of examples with which to populate their responses. Sometimes, the same example even appeared across different responses within a single paper, all of which highlights a dearth of originality. More specifically, Peace and Conflict continues to be the area of the programme and examination that poses the most problems for candidates, perhaps because it, along with development, is the most open-ended and contentious of topics. Narrowing matters down even further, very few candidates attempted the question on peace. While the focus of teachers and students on conflict and violence may be understandable given the current state of the world, this was still a depressing realisation but hopefully one that can be rectified in the future.

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

Candidates demonstrated a sound grasp of the key concepts of power and sovereignty and in many instances were able to consider both in a nuanced fashion, which points to an increasing level of sophistication in both instruction and student understanding. In addition, human rights was also an area of strength for many candidates and they appeared well-versed in many of the major debates surrounding the effectiveness of human rights and the actors involved.

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

Before considering the questions individually a general comment needs to be made about the need for candidates to read each question carefully. Quite often, it was clear that a candidate had not fully understood the question asked and, as a result, failed to address the key demands of the question.

Question 1: For the most part, candidates performed admirably on this question, displaying a sound understanding of the different dimensions of power and of how each operated either independently from, or in concert with, one another. The point of distinction between the higher and lower levels of the markband lay in the degree to which candidates were able to address and unpack the 'mostly exercised' claim.

Question 2: Another strong showing with most candidates demonstrating a firm understanding of the key concepts of sovereignty and justice. While most candidates were able to counterpose state sovereignty and justice and provide numerous real world examples of when the former posed a real challenge to the realisation of the latter, the strongest responses sought to illuminate how sovereignty is, in fact, underpinned by a robust commitment to justice. The issue for many of the weaker responses was that only one side of the argument was entertained, i.e. that state sovereignty creates obstacles in the realization of justice, without recognising that they also needed to consider alternative perspectives.

Question 3: Perhaps unsurprisingly candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the Declaration of Human Rights, recognising the historical context of its genesis. Stronger candidates were then able to explore how the world has changed (or not) since 1948 in order to arrive at a reasoned conclusion as to the documents continuing relevance or irrelevance. Weaker candidates neglected to explore the concept of relevance and instead focused more on the provisions of the document itself.

Question 4: Stronger responses considered the panoply of non-state actors in global politics who are active in the protection (or violation) of human rights, while also seeking to provide some kind of metric for, or conceptualisation of, 'effectiveness'. Weaker responses focused primarily on international non-governmental organisations and what they can and cannot do in terms of the protection of human rights.

Question 5: The best responses here managed to identify and consider a range of social factors, often integrating these as part of a holistic analysis of development. Weaker responses often focused on a single social factor, typically migration, but neglected to link it meaningfully to the concept of development. Frequently, a clear or accurate understanding / definition of what is meant by 'development' was notable by its absence.

Question 6: Not many candidates attempted this question, perhaps due to some confusion over the term 'political inequality'. Stronger responses to this question presented a more contextual conceptualisation of development and considered examples where the role of political (in)equality varied depending on the situation at hand. Weaker responses showed candidates struggling with how best to conceptualise 'successful development' as well as the

more fundamental issue of what political (in)equality entails and how this might help/hinder the processes surrounding development.

Question 7: This was another question that was roundly avoided by the vast majority of candidates, most likely due to confusion over the term 'intra-state'. Those candidates who did attempt this question generally struggled to define a 'positive peace' and also had difficulty in accurately identifying a real world example of a third-party involvement. With all of this in mind, it is unsurprising then that such responses generally fell short in actually meeting the evaluative demands of the question.

Question 8: This was a relatively popular question and one, which for the most part, was ably answered. Stronger responses provided not only clear and precise definitions for violence and legitimacy but also considered how legitimacy might be a fluid concept inasmuch as what is legitimate (including the use or avoidance of violence) depends very much on the audience to which or on behalf of which such claims are made. Weaker responses tended to focus solely on how violence could never be considered legitimate.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- At the risk of sounding repetitive, students need to have greater opportunities to identify real world examples of their own. Rather than whole groups relying on the same one or two examples that were clearly presented in class, students need original, self-researched examples with which to illustrate their comprehension of the concepts covered in class. Not only would this allow for greater variety in responses but it would also provide candidates with a deeper and richer understanding of global politics.
- Key terms and concepts need to be clearly defined, particularly the terms included in the course guide.
- Students need to have a much clearer idea of what each IB command term requires of them.
- Following on from this, students must have a better understanding of and practice with counterclaims. All too frequently, responses were unable to earn higher marks simply because the candidate had not entertained or assessed alternative perspectives and/or understandings.
- Practice, practice, practice. As the bank of exam questions grows, there are increased opportunities for students to practise with actual IB questions. The value of doing so cannot be underestimated.