

4.1 Regional depth: the HL option

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____ **Total: 24 marks**

KEY WORDS historiography • region

Regional depth: the HL option

Objective

Write depth essays with precise regional evidence, deploy named historiographical schools as an analytical tool, and command the four regional menus (Paper 3, HL only).

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

Paper 3 toolkit. Three essays, 150 minutes, Paper 2 markbands with higher expectations. Depth: regional, precise (names, provisions, dates, statistics); two cases per point across a period. Historiography: name the school, state its claim, ask why they disagree (sources? politics? decade?), weigh the evidence – the counter-case professionalised. Regions: Africa/Middle East; the Americas; Asia/Oceania; Europe. Worked example: the Weimar debate – “weak from birth” (structural) versus “golden years” (contingent) with the synthesis weighing structure against agency.

2 Practice

2.1 State what “depth” adds to a Paper 2 answer. [2]

2.2 Name the three moves of historiography as an analytical tool. [3]

2.3 Name the four HL regions. [2]

2.4 Give the classic depth pairing for the Americas region given in the handout. [2]

2.5 How does timing discipline differ between Papers 2 and 3? [2]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 (*Historiography style.*) Outline the classic and revisionist positions on Weimar’s failure, with one piece of named evidence for each, and state the synthesis the handout proposes. [6]

3.2 (*Depth style.*) Using the Americas region, write the opening paragraph (thesis plus evidence plan) for: “The New Deal transformed the American state.” [4]

3.3 (*Region choice style.*) A student’s strongest depth is China 1911–1978. Which region should they choose, and which second topic from that region pairs naturally with it? [3]