



Pearson

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2017

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level
In History (WHI02)

Paper 2: Breadth Study with Source Evaluation

Option 1D: South Africa, 1948-2014

Edexcel, BTEC and LCCI qualifications

Edexcel, BTEC and LCCI qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body offering academic and vocational qualifications that are globally recognised and benchmarked. For further information, please visit our qualification websites at www.edexcel.com, www.btec.co.uk or www.lcci.org.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus

About Pearson

Pearson is the world's leading learning company, with 40,000 employees in more than 70 countries working to help people of all ages to make measurable progress in their lives through learning. We put the learner at the centre of everything we do, because wherever learning flourishes, so do people. Find out more about how we can help you and your learners at: www.pearson.com/uk

January 2017

Publication Code WHI02_1D_1701_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

General marking guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the last candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the first.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed-out work should be marked **unless** the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

How to award marks

Finding the right level

The first stage is to decide which level the answer should be placed in. To do this, use a 'best-fit' approach, deciding which level most closely describes the quality of the answer. Answers can display characteristics from more than one level, and where this happens markers must use their professional judgement to decide which level is most appropriate.

Placing a mark within a level

After a level has been decided on, the next stage is to decide on the mark within the level. The instructions below tell you how to reward responses within a level. However, where a level has specific guidance about how to place an answer within a level, always follow that guidance.

Markers should be prepared to use the full range of marks available in a level and not restrict marks to the middle. Markers should start at the middle of the level (or the upper-middle mark if there is an even number of marks) and then move the mark up or down to find the best mark. To do this, they should take into account how far the answer meets the requirements of the level:

- If it meets the requirements *fully*, markers should be prepared to award full marks within the level. The top mark in the level is used for answers that are as good as can realistically be expected within that level
- If it only *barely* meets the requirements of the level, markers should consider awarding marks at the bottom of the level. The bottom mark in the level is used for answers that are the weakest that can be expected within that level
- The middle marks of the level are used for answers that have a *reasonable* match to the descriptor. This might represent a balance between some characteristics of the level that are fully met and others that are only barely met.

Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 2

Section A: Question 1(a)

Target: AO2 (10 marks): Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little substantiation. The concept of value may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	4–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material, but mainly to expand or confirm matters of detail.• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and with some substantiation for assertions of value. The concept of value is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	7–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.• Sufficient knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences, as well as to expand or confirm matters of detail.• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and based on valid criteria although justification is not fully substantiated. Explanation of value takes into account relevant considerations such as the nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author.

Section A: Question 1(b)

Target: A02 (15 marks): Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little supporting evidence. The concept of reliability may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis, by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material but mainly to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. The concept of reliability is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	8–11	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.• Detailed knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of weight takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria, with some justification.
4	12–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion.• Deploys well-selected knowledge of the historical context, but mainly to illuminate or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material. Displays some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may not be fully substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.

Section B

Target: AO1 (25 marks): Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
1	1–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	7–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	13–18	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although some mainly descriptive passages may be included.• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.
4	19–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision.

Section A: indicative content

Option 2: South Africa, 1948-2014

Question	Indicative content
1a	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme.</p> <p>The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are required to analyse the source and consider its value for an enquiry into the living standards of black South Africans in the early 1950s.</p> <p>1. The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Claims that living standards were worsening for black South Africans ('the living conditions of the people, already extremely difficult, are steadily worsening')• Claims that the government was making no effort to improve the living standards of black South Africans ('not a word was said about the poorest and most hard-hit section')• Claims that government policy has caused foreign investors to pull out of South Africa to the detriment of black South Africans' standard of living ('insane policies', 'definitely scared away foreign investment'). <p>2. The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nelson Mandela was a leading member of the ANC, which promoted improved standards of living for black South Africans• Mandela experienced the declining circumstances of black South Africans at first-hand• The speech was designed to reach a wide audience and was clearly important to the ANC as it was read out in Mandela's absence. <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Controls were put in place to ensure that black labour was provided to white businesses but wages were very low leading to poor living standards• The 1950 Group Areas Act imposed controls on the black population, including land ownership and occupations, which had a detrimental impact on their standard of living• Verwoerd rejected the Tomlinson Report that called for massive investment in the Bantustans to develop their economies• Living conditions for black South Africans in the townships were extremely poor. Black South Africans had to rent less than satisfactory housing from local administration boards. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
<p>1b</p>	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme.</p> <p>The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are required to analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into the difficulties facing Helen Suzman in opposing apartheid in the early 1960s.</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helen Suzman was a confirmed opponent of apartheid throughout her political career • Helen Suzman had left the United Party in 1959 to found, with others, the Progressive Party. She would be expected to be critical of its lack of opposition to apartheid • The production of her memoirs after her long career, gave Suzman an opportunity to reflect on her role in opposing apartheid. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests that Suzman was surprised that there was not more opposition ('I had expected the United Party to oppose this Bill'; 'inexplicably ... the United Party would vote for the Bill') • Provides evidence that Helen Suzman was the only person to take a stand in parliament against the Ninety-day Detention Law ('I was the sole voice of opposition'; 'I sat alone') • Suggests that any opponent to apartheid was regarded as a communist ('implied that I was a communist'). <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helen Suzman was the only representative of the Progressive Party in parliament in the years 1961-74 and accepted that she would work within white politics to criticise government policy • The United Party initially opposed the Nationalists' programme of apartheid, but it was not prepared to take any action that might be seen to undermine white minority rule • The advent of the Cold War enabled the supporters of apartheid to denounce any opponent as a communist. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Section B: Indicative content

Option 2. South Africa, 1948-2014

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether resistance to apartheid became increasingly effective in the years 1976-89.</p> <p>The arguments and evidence that resistance to apartheid did become increasingly effective in the years 1976-89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Soweto uprising in 1976, in which the authorities killed 138 children in the first days of the protest, attracted global attention and encouraged students to adopt the use of violence in their struggle against apartheid• The United Democratic Front formed in 1983 and embarked on a programme of boycotts. It provided an effective umbrella organisation for many strands of opposition with different methods of resistance• In October 1984 the ANC in exile called for tactics to make the country ungovernable. The actions taken led to Botha's declaration of a state of emergency in June 1985• Botha's decision to embark on programme of reform from 1985 was in part in response to escalating violence; his offer to release Mandela that year was a clear response to the insurrection• Strikes orchestrated by COSATU in 1988-9 impacted on white-owned South African businesses, and the MDM's Defiance Campaign in 1989, which targeted segregated facilities, kept up the pressure on the government. <p>The arguments and evidence that resistance to apartheid did not become increasingly effective in the years 1976-89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The government was able to contain resistance using increasingly oppressive measures, e.g. including the imprisonment of student leaders of the Soweto uprising on Robben Island, and the murder of Steve Biko• The size of the police force was increased and over 25,000 were detained between 1986 and 1987 partially stifling opposition• The rising in the Johannesburg township of Alexandra resulted in the arrest and trial of all the key leaders and the township was placed in the hands of white bureaucrats• The government's use of former ANC guerrillas, captured in Namibia, to infiltrate the township movements reduced the effectiveness of the ANC. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

3

Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.

Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether the healthcare for non-whites was different to that for white South Africans during the era of apartheid.

The arguments and evidence that the healthcare for non-whites was different from that for white South Africans during the era of apartheid should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- Whites and non-whites were treated in separate facilities in the urban areas and private healthcare schemes were restricted to whites. In the homelands, each Bantustan had its own underfunded health service
- Health services in the Bantustans were focused on the hospital sector and primary level services were under-developed compared to services for white South Africans. The Bantustans relied on missionary-run hospitals until the 1970s
- Healthcare for whites focused on curative medicine using high technology techniques (including the first heart transplant) whilst for non-whites the focus was on low technology preventative medicine
- Poor health provision for non-whites was reflected in high infant mortality rates and short life expectancy compared to the white population. Mortality rates for black and Coloured children were 13 times higher than for white children
- The principal diseases for black South Africans during apartheid were Third World diseases such as TB. AIDS was spreading rapidly in the black South African population by the end of apartheid but was low in the white and Coloured populations.

The arguments and evidence that the healthcare for non-whites was not different from that for white South Africans during the era of apartheid should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The Department of National Health and Development was responsible for the health policy of both white and non-white South Africans suggesting similar treatment of the races
- There was an increase in spending on health for all races from the 1970s
- In 1990, urban hospitals were opened to all races
- Poorer white South Africans could not access the private health system in which two out of three doctors worked and they therefore relied on state provision as the most non-whites did.

Other relevant material must be credited.

4

Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.

Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the extent to which South Africa's relationship with Britain worsened in the 1960s and 1970s.

The arguments and evidence that South Africa's relationship with Britain worsened in the 1960s and 1970s should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- Macmillan queried South Africa's policies on his 1960 tour. His implied criticism of apartheid confirmed for Verwoerd that South Africa needed to go it alone. In May 1961, South Africa became a republic
- South Africa left the Commonwealth in 1961 after the British and Australian negotiators refused to accept South Africa's stance on apartheid
- The Anti-apartheid movement was established in London in 1960 and became the global focus for opposition to South Africa. Its boycott movement was supported by British newspapers including the *Guardian* and *Observer*
- Vorster refused to allow the England cricket tour in 1968 because of the inclusion of D'Oliveira in the team. The South African rugby tour of Britain was disrupted by mass demonstrations and the 1970 cricket tour cancelled
- By the end of the 1970s, the USA had replaced Britain as South Africa's most important trading partner.

The arguments and evidence that South Africa's relationship with Britain did not worsen in the 1960s and 1970s should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- One of the aims of Macmillan's 1960 tour in Africa was to persuade African countries, including South Africa, to reject communism. Britain wanted to retain good relations with South Africa for this reason
- There was massive investment in South Africa in the 1960s. In 1978 Britain was responsible for 40 per cent of all its foreign investment
- Britain maintained diplomatic ties with South Africa in the 1960s in spite of pressure from the United Nations and the Anti-apartheid Movement
- In 1972 Edward Heath withdrew from the UN arms embargo. During the 1970s, British Conservatives developed 'constructive engagement' and argued that economic growth would lead to the demise of apartheid.

Other relevant material must be credited.