

## PEACE & CONFLICT STUDIES

### Overall grade boundaries

#### Standard level

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 12	13 - 25	26 - 41	42 - 56	57 - 68	69 - 80	81 - 100

### Standard level internal assessment

#### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 16	17 - 23	24 - 28	29 - 34	35 - 40

### Recommendations for IB procedures, instructions and forms

Process is clear and schools deliver correct material on time and with correct paperwork.

### The range and suitability of the work submitted

Excellent level and quality.

### Candidate performance against each criterion

The clarity of expectations for each section of the IA works well as does the "real world" (mock) requirement to write a report and hold a press conference. On a couple of occasions this format was used for the completion of the Extended Essay, which was a mistake and reduced the quality of the EE significantly. Criteria B and Criteria C need clear differentiation.

### Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

Try to get students away from standardised formulaic responses.

## Standard level paper one

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 2	3 - 5	6 - 9	10 - 11	12 - 13	14 - 15	16 - 20

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

Across the schools doing PACS there was increasing evidence that students are being drilled to present prepared answers and seem less able to respond to the specifics of a question, by reading and identifying what a particular question is asking. In simple terms, an instruction "using the sources" requires the sources to be used. Understanding that "Compare and Contrast" requires the student to identify similarities and differences would help many candidates. The content of the subject has been comprehensively grasped but it seems that the learning is more as presented by teachers than researched and learned by students. All candidates from one centre referred to the same theories about the nature of human aggression with very limited broader understanding. This subject should not be delivering drilled knowledge of one or two theories for a particular topic but working on in depth and individualized understanding and the use of a range of relevant theories to enhance understanding.

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

Standard responses to standard questions on human aggression. Less well prepared to explain links between human aggression and warfare. Tended to write about one or the other and not link the two.

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

#### Question 1 (a and b)

Good clear summaries on the whole. Some candidates too brief and did not produce sufficient material for 2 marks.

#### Question 2

Candidates did not see this question as being about "war" but tended to write about aggression and related gender issues.

#### Question 3

Good responses on the whole. Quite a difficult question.

#### Question 4

Prepared essays given here with few top end responses able to effectively use sources to persuasively support their thesis.

## Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Try to allow students to research a range of theories and arrive at their own conclusions rather than present them with taught theories from one social science perspective balanced by another. Almost all responses tended to sit on the fence and not persuasively argue for one perspective. This may be realistic given the intensity of the "nature nurture" debate regarding aggression and war.

### Further comments

The subject is being taught effectively and these suggestions would perhaps enhance the learning experience beyond the basic understanding. Most students would seem capable of this higher level learning, with only a handful who are operating at the Grade 3/4 level and who may need a more tightly presented content.

## Standard level paper two

### Component grade boundaries

<b>Grade:</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Mark range:</b>	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 16	17 - 22	23 - 27	28 - 31	32 - 40

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

PREPARED ANSWERS! Almost all candidates had prepared answers with material available for specific questions (positive) but were unable to shift successfully from their prepared response to meet question demands.

See Specific Questions in this report: Very few candidates tackled question 6 on an International Organization involved in mediating an armed conflict.

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

PREPARED ANSWERS! Almost all candidates had prepared answers with material available for specific questions (positive) but were unable to shift successfully from their prepared response to meet question demands.

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

Overall see above comments. Specific questions:

#### Question 1

Weak understanding of aid and (surprisingly) structural violence. Maybe weaker candidates took this question. Very few candidates raised issue about the definition of aid and whether military aid (arms and weapons or tents and non combatant supplies) count as aid or not.

#### Question 2

Almost no candidates took this question and those who did gave a prepared response about Syria which only gave a limited analysis about the impact on the conflict and conflict symmetry.

#### Question 3

Most candidates chose this question and could understand the debate and articulate it, and did so in a very formulaic style all the same way. A few just ignored any reference to the debate. The weakness of the responses to the question was a lack of clarity or definition of what the "modern nation state" is. Some students hardly

referred to the MNS in their answers and did not discuss what the nature of a threat may mean. A few excellent responses, but few.

#### Question 4

This was a very poorly answered question. Candidates offered reasonable definitions of what terrorism may be defined as but had very poor understanding of the origins of terrorism and saw it only as a tactic employed post 9/11 and since a "war on terror" was declared as a new post Cold War threat. The use of terror in the modern period as a tactic to bring an issue to wider attention, especially as used in the 1970's to raise the Palestinian issue or as a scare tactic in earlier conflicts was not identified. Nor was the idea of the use of terror by states (Dresden, Hiroshima) identified in the discussion about definition.

#### Question 5

This was the most commonly chosen question and yet it was the one which presented the greatest challenge as the Q did not ask about what the candidates had prepared, "conflict resolution" or "conflict transformation", but about "reconstruction". The MS was confusing about this as the MS itself was changed to require discussion of "conflict resolution" even though specific example models of reconstruction were identified, eg Wilsonian model with a focus on markets and democracy or IBL (Institutionalization before Liberalization). These economic and political models did not feature in any candidates responses. Due to the confusion of the Question and the MS and comments by teachers, candidates were allowed to present models of conflict transformation (TRC and Tribunals).

#### Question 6

Very few candidates tackled question 6 on an International Organization involved in mediating an armed conflict.

### Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Great work clearly motivating students but seems a narrow focus and not allowing broad understanding of the subject drawn from students own exploration and discovery, as in IA.