Moderator comments

Criterion A: 4 marks

The research question is clearly stated. In the discussion of source one the discussion of origin is connected to value and limitations, although the response is unclear and difficult to follow in places. The connections between limitations and origin are weak, and although there is some discussion of value and limitations related to purpose and content these points are not developed.

Criterion B: 7 marks

This part of this IA moves beyond mere description, but the critical analysis lacks development and clarity. The investigation is under the word limit, and this is reflected in the lack of development of the analysis. There is a limited awareness of different perspectives. As this section progresses it appears to become more of a discussion as to whether Botha or deKlerk was more effective rather than keeping the focus on the question.

Please note: This is an example of an IA where the investigation section is broken down into a series of sub-sections. It is perfectly acceptable for candidates to structure their investigation in this way if they wish to do so. It is not required to provide sub-headings but it can be a useful strategy, particularly for students who might otherwise struggle with how to structure this section of the task. It is also a strategy that some teachers may decide to encourage students to use in the planning stages of their investigation to provide additional support and scaffolding of the task, even if sub-headings are not then used in the final presentation of the investigation.

Criterion C: 2 marks

There is some reflection on the methods used by the historian. The student analyses the problems in assessing bias and value in a variety of sources, albeit simplistically. There is some very basic discussion of the challenges facing historians, although this is very weak and could have been developed far more effectively. The student does make a connection between the reflection and the rest of the investigation in places.

Total: 13 marks