



# **Examiners' Report**

## **Principal Examiner Feedback**

**June 2017**

**Pearson Edexcel International Advanced  
Level in History (WHI02) Paper 1C**

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

June 2017

Publications Code

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

## **Examiner Report: WHIO2 1C Russia, 1917-91: From Lenin to Yeltsin**

### **Introduction**

It was pleasing to see a range of well-informed and well-written responses from candidates on IAS Paper WHIO2 1C which covers the option Russia, 1917-91: From Lenin to Yeltsin. The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory two-part question for the option studied, each part based on one source. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts - cause, consequence, change/ continuity, similarity/difference and significance.

It is pleasing to note that in Section A some candidates understood what was meant by 'value' and 'weight' in the context of source analysis and evaluation. However, this year there was less evidence of the detailed knowledge base required in this section to be able to add contextual material to support/challenge points derived from the sources. Some candidates are still writing about limitations in question a and this did impact on the length of part b for some candidates.

In Section B, some candidates produced wholly descriptive essays which were devoid of analysis, but more responses were soundly structured. The most common weakness in Section B essays was the lack of a sharp focus on the precise terms of the question and/or the second order concept that was targeted. In some cases candidates struggled to develop sufficient relevant material to address the question and some included material that did not relate to the question.

It remains important to realise that Section A topics are drawn from highlighted topics on the specification whereas Section B questions may be set from any part of any Key Topic, and, as a result, full coverage of the specification is enormously important. There was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer questions from Sections A and B.

The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

### **Question 1a)**

The major issue for candidates addressing this question was that, overall, their knowledge of the Constituent Assembly, and of the circumstances of its dismissal, was often lacking. As a result, many candidates took the source at face value. They did not generally appreciate that Lenin's actions were driven by his determination to hold on to power at any cost and were also unable to add any knowledge of real value to the enquiry. In addition, many comment on the provenance of the source were highly generic, along the lines of 'it's valuable because Lenin was there and so must know the reasons....' Overall, there were many Level 1 and low Level 2 answers. The best responses drew valid inferences that were developed by good contextual knowledge and developed valid comments on the provenance of the source

**DOC ID: 0429001100179** This is a secure level 3 response achieving level 3 in all the bullet points in the mark scheme. It has good contextual knowledge threaded through the response to explain and support inferences. It does make the mistake of looking at limitations and this part of the answer is not rewarded.

In January 1918 Lenin dissolved the Constituent Assembly after only one meeting. The source provided is an extract from the 'Draft Decree on the Dissolution of the Constituent Assembly' written by Lenin himself. As we are looking to assess the value of this source its origin and purpose should not be neglected as well as the message that it tries to pass.

The fact that Lenin ~~himself~~ wrote this Decree raises the value of this source in terms of the reasons that the Bolsheviks gave to the people as to why they dismissed a democratic function of the state. Lenin's Decree thus is the official views that the Bolshevik Party held as to why the Constituent Assembly was dissolved. The purpose of this source is to highlight how the Constituent Assembly was a representation of the 'old world' and ~~how~~ the tried to make the highly exploitative of the system more of dissolving it appear to be at the worker's best interests. In that sense this Decree however valuable, as it represents the official views of the ~~to~~ Bolshevik Party, is more propaganda than ~~to~~ valuable insight to the real reasons behind

Lenin's actions.

# The source itself provides us with well-thought out reasoning for why Lenin claimed he did what he did. The source, -and thus Lenin himself, implies that the 'old bourgeois parliamentary system was absolutely incompatible with the aim of achieving socialism'. This gives evidence of the supposed popular support behind the Revolution and bases its reasoning on the argument that the October Revolution was to the best interest of the 'working and exploited classes' and ~~so~~ that anything that existed before it was a symbol of oppression of said classes. Through this he tried to vilify the Constituent Assembly as being nothing more than an instrument of the bourgeoisie. He further ~~claims~~ indicates that to 'surrender the supreme authority of the Soviets to the Constituent assembly' would be a 'step backwards'. This builds on the previous claim about the evils of the bourgeoisie that are supposedly entrenched in the Assembly itself and thus tries to convince the readers of this source / Decree that the dissolution of the Assembly was a ~~stri~~ sign of strength by the Bolshevik Party, - that they were both capable and willing to hamper any obstacle that got into the way of the Revolution and what it stood for. This is further supported by the fact that he portrays the Right-Socialist-Revolutionaries as something that derailed the country as they refused to recognize the October revolution. He builds this argument on to

fact that a group of the SR's actually joined them as they ~~at~~ were able to recognize the importance of the Revolution ~~and~~ and the 'exile' ~~of the~~ and 'backwardness' of the Assembly. However this group did leave the Bolsheviks after the Brest-Litovsk treaty.

These arguments however representative of Lenin's views and the Bolshevik Party's are not completely indicative of the true reasons as to why the dissolution occurred. The Mensheviks and the SR's after the Revolution tried to make an alliance with the Bolsheviks ~~as~~ as they were left-wing parties. They were met with a firm response by Trotsky: 'You have played out your role. Now go where you belong - the dustbin of history'. The Bolsheviks did not want to ease their hold on power, not even by a little. That is why when the results from the elections came they found themselves weakened: They had won 9 million votes but the SR's with their 21 million votes had secured the majority of the Assembly with 410 seats. The Bolsheviks would not have it. ~~The~~ Lenin dissolved the Constituent Assembly after only one meeting and replaced it ~~by~~ with the All-Russian Congress of the Soviets a party mechanism that he had significant influence over.

The ~~is~~ source can be considered a valuable enquiry into the reasons for Lenin's dissolution of the Constituent Assembly in terms of it being an official document of the Communist Party. However it is largely propaganda and other sources need to be reviewed for the other side of the story: The Bolshevik's <sup>cooperate</sup> hold onto power.

### **Question 1b)**

Whilst there were some well-developed responses to this question with good interrogation of the source to establish its weight, it was clear that many candidates had been coached to assert 'this source has weight' at every opportunity but relatively few really engaged with that concept in any meaningful way. Many candidates knew something of the reforms initiated by Gorbachev but equally, many struggled to make valid inferences from the content of the source and develop them, often caused by not reading the source through properly. As with (a), much of the commentary on provenance was highly generic ('as an American, he will not have experienced this directly...') preventing any real discussion of weight. Again, this approach is not successful and resulted in such candidates remaining in Level 2.

**DOC ID: 0429001100179** This is a secure level 4 response. The response considers both the strengths and limitations of the source. The interrogation of the source is developed using sound contextual knowledge and has a sense of the values of the society from which it originates.

The source provided to us is an extract from an article by a journalist, Michael Parks, published in an American newspaper in 1989. The fact that this source was ~~not~~ printed in the Los Angeles Times ~~both~~ has a double-edged impact on its value. From one viewpoint the 'Los Angeles Times' were a newspaper known for its credibility and objective and thorough reporting, especially back in the 90's. So this raises its value as a source. However, from another standpoint an American newspaper could possibly ~~not~~ represent western attitudes towards Gorbachev's governance. It is clear both from the source and from our own knowledge that the USA were in favour of Gorbachev's reduction of traditional controls as it moved the USSR from a command economy to a more democratic and free-market one, thus, one more similar to that of USA's. This alongside with the fact that this article was published in 1989, before the collapse of the USSR and thus before a proper ~~investigative~~ impact occurred after Gorbachev's reduction of traditional controls lowers the value of the source. However it may not be as biased as it comes from ~~an interview~~ <sup>articles of</sup> ~~with~~ Vladimir Stankov and thus may be representative of Soviet people's opinions. The purpose of this source is probably to project a positive image of Gorbachev's measures to the American public.



The source provides evidence that there are people within the USSR that view the policy of perestroika and its impact on a favourable note ('People want to know what's going on in this country', 'Perestroika has created an insatiable appetite for this'). It is true that with the policies of perestroika and glasnost much of the Soviet population started ~~forming~~<sup>shaping</sup> political views and became increasingly active with political life. Moreover Storkov's articles suggest that ~~the~~ an impact of ~~the~~ the reduction in traditional controls is that now 'concrete facts and materials' are published in contrast to the never-ending propaganda that existed previously. ~~Also, it implies~~ the source implies that an impact of these policies of 'openness' is that now people, such as Vladimir Storkov, can express their views freely. Under Stalin he would have at best been censored at worse shut or deported to the Gulag. However the source also hints that the impact ~~of~~ of Gorbachev's breaking down of traditional controls may not be complete as Storkov ~~was~~ was 'criticised by Gorbachev' and his 'future will be decided formally by the board of the Knowledge Society'. This implies that although some rules and regulations became more lax, criticizing a government newspaper was not yet acceptable. ~~Finally~~ Finally, the source unknowingly gives some insight as to what the future might hold for the USSR with the phrase 'insatiable appetite'. Parks could not have known at the time but indeed, the floodgates had opened and they weren't about to close.

The people did indeed 'want to know what's going on' in this country' Investigations were launched and the ugly truth emerged about many aspects of communism that were ~~kept~~ <sup>kept</sup> hidden by the Government in the fear of uprisings. This appetite was increasing steadily. Starikov's prediction that they 'will undoubtedly ~~sell~~ have a circulation of more than 30m next year' is a clear indicator of that.

Parks wasn't in a position to realise the full blown effect of Gorbachev's policies of perestroika and glasnost and restricted himself to only investigate the impact on the controls of the people and the attitudes of the people. Here the impact could be said to be positive. However in economic or even political terms the impact was quite disastrous. It ~~resulted~~ <sup>produced</sup> in the process of unravelling that eventually ~~caused~~ <sup>brought</sup> about the collapse of the USSR, alongside other factors, that is. However the value of the source can be said to be high as it gives us ~~it~~ insight to the direct impact of Gorbachev's reduction in traditional controls through ~~siting~~ <sup>citing</sup> direct sources from behind the Iron curtain itself.

## Question 2

This was by far the most popular essay question. The best answers were underpinned by a depth of knowledge on a range of relevant factors which were then used to reach a judgement on the significance of the use of terror in Stalin's control of the population. These factors included the purges and show trials, use of the NKVD, economic terror in collectivisation and the five-year plans as well as alternatives such as propaganda and the cult of personality and the education system. The standard of answers was variable. One of the reasons for the lower-achieving was because of the lack of precision in determining the focus of the question, 'control of the population'. Some veered off into consideration of policies and results of industrialisation and collectivisation (both of which were valid when used correctly) while other defined it solely to do with matters concerning Stalin's attainment of the Party leadership. As for 'terror' candidates often knew a sufficient amount but would have benefitted from better organisation of their material. For example, instead of a general narrative taking in the NKVD and its leadership, the show trials and gulags, they may have considered how Stalin's need for control of the party widened out into a general terror and the purposes to which this was all put. They may also have gone beyond the 1930s which most didn't. Lastly, a significant number wrote one-sided responses which didn't go beyond terror at all.

**DOC ID: 0429001100134:** This is a level 4 response. It explores the key issues and is developed with a range of secure knowledge. It is a little weaker in developing the criteria for judgement and the conclusion is not securely developed but overall this merits a mid-level 4 mark.

Plan:

- Intro STALIN (1928-53)

- Para 1 TERROR Felix Dzerzhinsky (All-Union State Party Administration)

- Red army <sup>Purges, Cleansing</sup>
  - The 'Great Terror' of the 30s = <sup>Feroz = Zinoviev</sup> Show trials Propaganda decreased party rivalry
  - Intimidation techniques
  - Did it to secure his own position
- 10% of population killed. Greater than Lenin's 200,000

- Para 2 CONSTITUTION

- Introduced in 1936 \*Theoretically democratic
- \*In practice too much control

- Para 3 NOT MOST SIGNIFICANT FACTOR (system)

- Central system, Gosplan - control of industry & agriculture (collectivization)
- Established by Lenin
- Their will to fight together for communism = evidence was no pay but instead praise. Encouraged by propaganda
- But: destruction of technique & management ~~was~~ feared punishments quality suffered.

- Conclusion

Passport system

\* + Stalin could not physically be able to control USSR - local authorities

Essay:

From 1928, when it became increasingly clear that Stalin was supreme leader of the Soviet Communist Party, till 1953, his death, terror appeared to be used greatly in order to control the population of the Soviet Union (USSR). The government excused it's excessive control by claiming that it was vital for the survival of the Revolution that according to Karl Marx's theories would ~~lead~~ eventually lead the

USSR to Communism. Therefore, it can also be argued that it was the communist ideology, imposed by heavy propaganda, that acted as a force for control of the people - because of their own willingness to co-operate in order to achieve communism.

The Communist party began its rule instantly by the use of terror, as it seized power through force in the 1917 October Revolution. This makes it logical that Stalin would continue using such tactics in 1928 and onwards in order to maintain power. The establishment of OGPU (All-Union ~~State~~ Party Administration) ~~me, me~~ allowed Stalin a discreet method of ruling out any opposition. At first, through the Nomenklatura system, this was done without much terror as un-loyal members were simply declined ~~pro~~ promotion or were rid from the Party. However, as suspicions, along with Stalin's paranoia, rose so did the use of terror, as the OGPU would exile ~~and~~ ~~or~~, torture, or ~~ex~~ execute members from the government and general public. By 1953 it was estimated that Stalin's government was responsible for over 10 million deaths. Terror was further emphasised by some of its public elements. During the 1930s Stalin used Show Trials in order to not only demonstrate the strict control under the government, but also act as a terrifying warning to those

who were considering of opposing the regime. Radio and Television was used to publicise the trials, and through ~~the~~ hidden (not public) torture, the government was often successful in getting confessions from the accused. This demonstrates how Stalin's government appeared to rely on creating fear ~~in~~ within the government and public in order to avoid any potential opposition.

However, in another view it appeared that ~~the use of~~ terror was used in order to maintain Stalin's position within the government, not in order to maintain general control of the people. Evidence to prove this would be Lenin's much smaller killings\* of only 200,000, (compared to Stalin) despite ~~his power~~ the Party being in a less secure position at the time. This suggests how Stalin's use of terror was simply part of his character, and ~~it~~ just happened to conveniently appear to be used as a political technique of controlling the people.\*

The new Constitution of 1936 may also act as evidence to prove that terror was not the only significant factor in controlling USSR's population. It appeared to be a shift to democracy, stressed by Stalin, as it ~~gave voters~~ for once gave votes

to all members of the population. ~~But~~ When considering this factor it can be implied therefore be implied that it ~~was~~ were the people that were willing to follow the Communist regime, thereby allowing themselves to be controlled as little opposition was shown through votes. However, when looking into the practicality of the constitution this can be explained by the heavy restrictions placed on particular communities and the general vague wording of the constitution - that made it difficult to express ~~and~~ ~~are~~ much views for the public!!

Moreover, the established economic system by the Communist government can also be seen as a significant factor in controlling the population. From 1928 and 1929, under the Gosplan, both industry and agriculture <sup>(through collectivisation)</sup> was placed under direct control from the government. This meant that the centres in Moscow had access to all of the Union's economic operations, ~~as~~. Although this proved to be inefficient for the economy itself, as productivity in agriculture fell and quality in industry suffered, it allowed Stalin to ensure that the government was in control of the main factor that fuelled ~~the~~ ~~what~~ USSR. To add on, since praise and non-financial

incentives were used for the majority in encouraging productivity in the workforce - it suggests that yet again it was the public's willingness to work for communism that led to easy control. However, terror still proved significant here to some extent. In the industry there were great capital punishments for ~~slack~~ individual slackers or a ~~whole~~ industry's united failure in meeting the over-optimistic output targets set by the government. Evidence to support this would be the increase in corruption, falsifying documents of production, and the general fall in quality in a desperate attempt to meet objectives. Example being a tractor industry which had a set target of 500 tractors to be produced in June alone, and in result produced only 8 that worked for less than 3 days. In agriculture terror was evidently also used in the destruction of the Kulak and NEPmen, as the Red Army and 'dekulization squads' were sent in to the agricultural areas to arrest and kill off any opposition. Moreover, the ~~lack~~ lack of mention of the Holodomor that occurred between ~~1931~~ 1932 and 1933, killing about 11 million in regions such as Ukraine, demonstrates how the government simply often simply chose to hide its excessive use of terror - especially when the consequences were so high.



In conclusion, terror was only a factor that contributed to the ability of the government in controlling the population of the Soviet Union between 1928 and 1953. For the majority, control was fuelled by the establishment of a centrally controlled system, and terror was often used only as a means of ensuring supreme control - which even then can still be argued to have still been limited.

\* - Addition to 3 paragraph

Kirov's ~~execution~~ murder, after his public criticism of Stalin in the 'Congress of Victors' and a growing popularity, acts as evidence to prove this. Although it has not been ~~officially~~ ~~officially~~ proven to be done under Stalin's orders, the accused Kamenev and Zinoviev (also Stalin's political opponents) were unlikely. Nevertheless, the death acted as a catalyst for Stalin's ~~the~~ period of 'Great Terror', ~~where~~ where it appeared to escalate to the point where it was done for his own satisfaction, not a means of securing control.

### **Question 3**

This was a more popular question and there were some secure answers that were supported with good knowledge. Some candidates did struggle to develop alternative factors for maintaining apartheid and this made it difficult for them to achieve the higher levels. To access level 4 candidates do need to focus on the second order concept- significance – and develop criteria to make and support judgements. Some candidates tend to lose sight of this and provide a largely descriptive response.

### **Question 4**

The best responses developed a range of factors demonstrating good knowledge of internal and external pressures that led to the collapse of apartheid. These responses also weighed up the relative importance of the different reasons to reach a supported judgement. Some candidates appeared confused by the term 'criteria' in the mark scheme and used this term for the reasons they identified for the collapse of apartheid. This resulted in some rather confused arguments.

**DOC ID: 0429001241278:** This is an excellent response which achieves a high level 4 mark. It develops a range of reasons, supported by secure knowledge. It has a secure judgement considering the importance of the internal and external pressures.

It is argued that International Pressure was responsible for the collapse of Apartheid in the years 1983 - 1994.

I believe that external pressure played large roles ~~was~~ such as the Anti-Apartheid movement and economic sanctions, however factors like Botha's reforms were also significant. In order to assess the significance these factors had on the fall of Apartheid we will see the causes of the pressure it put on the government and how much it ~~was~~ damaged the economy.

Finally, international pressure was mostly responsible for the collapse of Apartheid due to the Anti-Apartheid movement.

The Anti-Apartheid movement started in the UK when Trevor Huddleston and Anthony Keen began to promote disarmament in South Africa following the release of information of Shapelle. However in the 1980s the Anti-Apartheid movement became very widespread due to the Free Nelson Mandela Campaign which carried on through 1983 and onwards. This combined with the main pressure ~~being~~ emerging people not to support South African trade had an impact on the nation as a whole. This is because the damage

to the image of South Africa as a country  
pressured ~~the~~ the Government to make changes.  
This ultimately ~~led~~ led to the softening of  
Apartheid by P.W. Botha in the late 1980s.  
Furthermore, it damaged the economy as the  
fall in demand for South African exports was a  
result of the Anti-Apartheid movement encouraging people to  
not to support trade. However, the Anti-Apartheid  
Movement importantly, the Free Nelson Mandela Campaign  
was key as it would lead to pressure for his  
release and ultimately allow him to run and take  
power in 1994. Against the world, this means the  
idea of damaging the economy as the demand for  
gold and other exports fell in the 1980s and into the  
1990s. It also means the stigma of pressuring the government  
as it made Botha feel the need to release Mandela to  
avoid further condemnation.

Secondly, pressure from the ~~UK and other world~~  
~~economies~~ economic sanctions was key to the  
fall of Apartheid along the lines of South  
Africa in the 1970s and 1980s. The governments of  
the UK and the USA decided to ~~place~~ place  
sanctions on South Africa as a way to condemn them.  
This was made possible as Thatcher's government in the  
UK had led other and thus the government in

The UK no longer supported the idea of continuing trade. The seizure of trade from the UK and US was significant as outside domestic trade and trade within Africa they had nobody to trade with. This put lots of pressure on Botswana as not only did it hurt South Africa's image but would also eventually lead to problems in the economy in the long term. Against or against the economic sanctions from the UK and the US were important as it put pressure on Botswana to avoid future problems and also hurt the economy as they lost a huge trade partner in the UK.

Thirdly, the fall in foreign investment from 1983 to 1994 was another factor supporting the idea international pressure led to the fall in Apartheid.

By the late 1980s and the early 1990s South Africa experienced economic hardship due to the loss in economic support from overseas investors. Firstly because of South Africa's negative reputation people stopped buying goods which led to a fall in price in the 1980s that meant one of South Africa's main industries was damaged. In addition disinvestment pressured the government as in the 1980s 40 American companies pulled out of South Africa and thus ceased trade relations.

This contributed to the fall of Apartheid as it meant the government was forced to loosen up control of Apartheid or face economic hardship. Again the union it was significant as it pressed the government by damaging their main industry. It also hurt the economy by decreasing investment as 40 US companies left South Africa between 1983 and 1994.

On the contrary, Pressure from Trade Union Activity was significant in the ~~breakdown~~ collapse of Apartheid. In the 1980s Trade Union groups including miners had formed into the Congress of South African Trade Unions or COSATU. This increase in trade union activity was important in opposing Apartheid as 160 strikes were called out and the main organisation had over 500,000 members from 600 mines and factories.

The trade union activity in the 1980s and the 1990s was key as it pressed the government to address workers needs thus weakening Apartheid rule and it also ~~the~~ impaired domestic economy. However, Trade Union Activity was limited in its role in ending Apartheid as although it challenged the Apartheid system and the government it was more concerned with

Home wages. When using the criteria we can conclude that it was somewhat damaging to the economy but was not necessarily paving for the end of Apartheid.

In addition, the reforms of P. W. Botha ~~in 1985~~ were key in the downfall of Apartheid.

In the late 1980s, Botha began negotiations which would potentially lead to the fall of Apartheid.

Botha's Total Strategy ~~is~~ included upgrading homelands with increased funding as well as the creation of a Tri-Cameral parliament which would give Blacks and Coloreds more representation. This

contributed to the fall of Apartheid as it ~~was~~ went against the very foundations the ideology was built on. However, while Botha's Reforms and

Total Strategy which was the idea of softening Apartheid to ~~increase~~ <sup>increase</sup> support and ~~lower~~ lower opposition were damaging to Apartheid it is hard to

agree that they led to the overall downfall as it does not meet the criteria. This is because it ultimately retained power in the short term and did not impair economy. In contrast, it should

be noted that ~~the~~ the idea would eventually lead to negotiations and the fall of Apartheid in

1994, and that most of the reforms came from pressure internationally as Botha was somewhat forced to make a change.

Lastly, the actual general election in 1994 was the trigger for the fall of Apartheid. In 1994 under F.W. De Klerk the ANC was allowed to run for office under recently released Nelson Mandela in the 1994 election. These elections would result in an almost guaranteed win as the majority of South Africa was black and supported the ANC. This was significant as the error would ~~ultimately~~ ~~end~~ ultimately end the 46 year Apartheid rule as the National Party was replaced by the ANC. The actual election did not necessarily force our Apartheid rather it marked the end of it. When analysing against the criteria the ~~effect~~ 1994 election does not damage the economy but does put enough pressure on the National Party to take over. However, it must be understood that although it did not meet the full criteria it was still extremely significant as a trigger point for the fall of Apartheid.

In conclusion, I believe that International Pressure was the main reason for the fall of Apartheid as it met the criteria of damaging the economy and forcing the government in all three instances.



Furthermore, some of the domestic pressure such as Botswana's ~~domestic~~ ~~issues~~ ~~them~~ were ultimately a product of international pressure. However, the actual trigger point was the negotiation and the call for the ANC to enter the 1994 election. ~~That~~ Overall, ~~the~~ international pressure was the ~~main~~ reason for the collapse of Apartheid from 1983 - 1994 to a ~~greater~~ greater extent.

Based on the performance of this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

#### Section A

- Make sure you are aware of the topics highlighted for the source question and have prepared for them
- A careful reading of the sources is needed so that the issues raised are clearly identified
- You must ensure that you draw out inferences, but these should always be directly linked to the source and not driven by contextual knowledge
- You should consider the nature, origin and purpose of the source
- Do not merely restate what the provenance says – think about how it can be used to address the question. In a, this requires a consideration of how it adds value and in b, this requires considering value and limitations
- Contextual knowledge should be used to support the answer, not to drive it, and should be made relevant to the enquiry
- Question 1a does not require a consideration of the limitations of sources
- It is unlikely that weight can be assessed by listing all the things that a source does not deal with.

#### Section B

- Spending a few minutes planning helps to ensure the second order concept is correctly identified
- Candidates must provide more precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses lacked depth and sometimes range

- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Essay questions are set over a period of at least ten years; candidates need to address the whole time period set in the question
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues in order to make the structure of the response flow more logically and to enable the integration of analysis.