



Mark scheme

January 2020

Pearson Edexcel International
Advanced Level in History (WHI02/1D)

Paper 2: Breadth Study with
Source Evaluation

Option 1D: South Africa, 1948–
2014

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 or 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.

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

January 2020

Publication Code: WHI02_1D_2001_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2020

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. –Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- 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.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- 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 1D: 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 impact of sporting boycotts on South Africa.</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">• It indicates that sporting boycotts have changed the attitudes of white South African sportsmen ('white South African sportsmen to rethink ... supporters of racial discrimination')• It provides evidence that the boycotts have been supported by non-white sportsmen in South Africa ('enormously encouraged by the protests and demonstrations')• It claims that the South African Government will allow mixed teams to visit South Africa in the future ('likely to be more flexible in allowing non-white members to be part of overseas teams')• It suggests that equality in sport is unlikely to be achieved under the current political system of white rule ('may not be possible until white domination itself is ended'). <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">• The paper was written by Mary Corrigan, a specialist in history and culture, who, therefore, should be in an excellent position to comment on the impact of sporting boycotts• The purpose of the paper was to inform the United Nations Unit on Apartheid of the role of boycotts in opposing apartheid and therefore it was important to be accurate• As a South African, Corrigan was able to experience, at first-hand, the impact of the sporting boycott in her country. <p>3. Knowledge of the 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">• International boycotts of apartheid sports began in the 1950s and South Africa had already been suspended from FIFA and banned from the Olympics in 1964• The impact of the D'Oliveira affair led not only to the cancellation of the 1970 cricket tour but also to the cancellation of rugby tours• After the cancellation of the 1968–69 cricket tour, the South African cricket authorities announced that future cricket teams would be racially integrated and selected on the grounds of merit. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
1b	<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 living standards of black and white South Africans in the period 1948–78.</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"> • Aubrey Lurie had lived in South Africa as a child and adult and was able to comment on the conditions he observed for both black and white South Africans • Lurie wrote this account in 2015 and was able to reflect on his experiences in South Africa in the light of hindsight • As the son of white immigrants, Lurie was able to comment on living standards in South Africa from the perspective of a non-Afrikaner • Lurie had only a white person’s perspective of the conditions and living standards of black South Africans. <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"> • It provides evidence that living standards for white South Africans were significantly better than those for black South Africans (‘family life was preserved only for white families in white areas, and it was denied to blacks’) • It suggests that differences in employment opportunities determined the conditions of living standards (‘blacks ... unskilled and barred from skilled jobs. Only whites ...employed in skilled labour positions’) • It suggests that living standards for whites were good in all circumstances (‘it was very good — comfortable living with much domestic help...Any white could achieve all heights of ambition and advancement.’). <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 the content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apartheid laws, including the Group Areas Act, restricted where black South Africans could live and treated all blacks in urban areas as visitors whose true residence was in the homelands • White South Africans enjoyed a good standard of living facilitated by well-paid jobs, and state provision of excellent public services, while black employment was restricted and public services were inadequate • The living standards of Afrikaners notably improved after 1948 • Throughout the 1970s, living standards declined for the whole population including whites. By 1978 more people were migrating from South Africa than coming in. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Section B: Indicative content

Option 1D: 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 the extent to which resistance to apartheid became increasingly violent in the years 1960–85. The arguments and evidence that the resistance to apartheid became increasingly violent in the years 1960–85 should be analysed and evaluated. -Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Although the 1960 Sharpeville Protest was non-violent, the police reaction to it encouraged later protests to become more radical. The ANC and PAC both decided to use violent methods after this date• In the 1970s, the Soweto uprising developed into violence as young people burned down schools and thousands joined armed groups to prepare for guerrilla warfare• In the mid-1970s, ANC acts of sabotage of railways, industrial plants and government buildings progressed to assassination of those accused of collaborating with apartheid• The ANC reaction to Botha’s state of emergency, in 1985, was to call for a people’s war. <p>The arguments and evidence that the resistance to apartheid did not become increasingly violent in the years 1960–85 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• From 1963 to the late 1970s, there were no MK attacks in South Africa; violence declined during this period• In 1963, over 2000 supporters of Poqo were arrested. This effectively defeated the organisation and it ceased to play a role in the struggle against apartheid• In the 1970s, Black Consciousness and SASO focused protests on strikes and mass demonstrations against conditions. They did not intend to launch a violent campaign• In the 1980s, the establishment of the UDF and COSATU focused resistance to apartheid on strikes, protests and stayaways. There were mass protests that were non-violent. <p>Other relevant material must be credit</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<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 the role of Nelson Mandela was the most significant factor in the process of dismantling apartheid in the years 1985–94.</p> <p>The arguments and evidence that the role of Nelson Mandela was the most significant factor in the process of dismantling apartheid in the years 1985–94 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Anti-Apartheid Movement increased the international respect and authority of Mandela. After 1982 there was an expectation that Mandela would play a key role in the end of apartheid • Mandela retained respect and authority in the ANC by refusing Botha’s offer of conditional release in 1985. His position in the ANC meant he would lead it in the negotiations to dismantle apartheid • Mandela actively sought negotiations with the government while he was in prison. In 1988–89 he met with four members of the South African Government on 47 occasions • Mandela played a key role in calming the violence after the murder of Chris Hani in 1993, and his preparedness to work with De Klerk allowed the CODESA 2 talks to begin again. <p>The arguments and evidence that there were other, more important factors than the role of Nelson Mandela in the process of dismantling apartheid in the years 1985–94 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The failure of Botha’s Total Strategy was an important factor in demonstrating that the apartheid system could not be maintained • The impact of economic sanctions and international isolation, which included falling investment and low growth rates, placed pressure on the South African Government to bring about a change in the system • FW De Klerk played an important role in dismantling apartheid; he released Mandela, repealed apartheid legislation, unbanned political parties and persuaded his party to support the CODESA decisions • The establishment of CODESA in December 1991 played a key role in preparing the ground for a new constitution and the CODESA 2 negotiations in 1993 paved the way to establishing the interim government. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<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 the extent to which the approach to dealing with the AIDS crisis in South Africa changed in the years 1990–2014.</p> <p>The arguments and evidence that the approach to dealing with the AIDS crisis in South Africa changed in the years 1990–2014 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mandela did very little about AIDS whilst in office. This changed when he left office and he became a campaigner in the fight to combat HIV and AIDS • Before 1995 South African authorities failed to make adequate preparations for the AIDS pandemic. After 2000, the government intervened to encourage production of cheaper drugs to combat HIV • Mbeki’s approach to the AIDS crisis, including withholding ARV drugs from use in government clinics, changed after the TAC sued to overturn the decision and the Constitutional Court ordered that ARV be made available • Zuma’s approach to AIDS was different to that of Mbeki. He acknowledged the importance of ARVs in the treatment of HIV and by 2012 his government ensured that two million people were taking ARVs. <p>The arguments and evidence that the approach to dealing with the AIDS crisis in South Africa did not change in the years 1990–2014 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The seriousness of AIDS was not prioritised by the Presidency for a long period in the 1990s and into the 2000s • There was a continued approach in the 1990s and 2000s in denying ARVs to HIV carriers, based on the belief that the drugs companies were exploiting South Africa to keep it poor by charging high prices for ARVs • The approach to the crisis was characterised by a long running denial of the causes of AIDS. Mbeki and his Health Minister insisted it was caused by poverty and that healthy eating was an effective treatment • As late as 2008, South African scientists continued to promote vitamin supplements as a substitute for ARVs. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>