



Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2024

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced
Level in History (WHI02)

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

Summer 2025

Publications Code WHI102_1D_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in summer examination series of the IAS Level Paper WHIO2 1D which covers the option: option South Africa, 1948–2014. 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.

Performance compared favourably to previous series with most coping well with Section A. Candidates demonstrated that they could comprehend, select and summarise from the source material. Most can make relevant comments using the provenance. However, some candidates are still not clear on what is meant by ‘value’ and ‘weight’ in the context of source analysis and evaluation. It is important to note that Question 1a focuses on value and no marks are awarded for examining the shortcomings of the source. Candidates are well advised to avoid wasting time on this. In this series, performance by some candidates in Section A was affected by the absence of the detailed knowledge base required to draw upon contextual material to support/challenge points derived from the sources. In answering Question 1b, some candidates concentrated their use of contextual knowledge on what was missing from the source. This is a legitimate approach where there is reason to judge that there is a deliberate omission or an omission through ignorance, but it is not legitimate where a candidate refers to the omission of events that had not happened at the time of the production of the source. The best responses come from candidates who have concentrated on the focus of the question, for example ‘significance’, ‘reasons’, ‘seriousness’ etc. and draw inferences, explain and support this with contextual knowledge. A significant proportion of candidates evaluate the sources in a vacuum and draw inferences and support with context that is not related to the focus of the enquiry. Sharper focus will help candidates to make the most of their time and produce effective answers. Most candidates did use their time effectively and, although a few responses were quite brief, there was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer questions both sections. The ability range was diverse, but the design of the paper catered for all abilities.

In Section B, in this series, most responses had an analytical focus and there were very few that were wholly descriptive essays which were devoid of analysis and, for the most part, responses were soundly structured. The most common weakness in Section B essays was a lack of knowledge and especially precise knowledge applied to the question. Some candidates did not focus on the dates set in the question. It is important that candidates read the question carefully and note the parameters before planning and writing their answers. This avoids mistakes that undermine performance. It is also important to realise that Section A and 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.

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

Question 1(a)

Most candidates understood the question and were able to comprehend the source and comment on what it revealed about the impact of strikes in South Africa in the 1980s. There were some well-focused responses that drew out inferences about the consequences for the South African economy and the government's control. Many considered the significance of the quick settlement as evidence of the threat posed by strikes.

The best answers developed the inferences with well-selected context to establish their validity. Candidates referred to the increased number of black South Africans joining trades unions in the 1980s and the impact of their strike action on apartheid. Candidates would do well to remember that contextual knowledge does need to be used to explain and develop the inferences drawn from the source and not just to provide free-standing knowledge. In answering this question, too many candidates developed their contextual knowledge about sanctions and boycotts without relating them to the issue of strikes or their impact. These responses struggled accessed level 3 for bullet 2 of the mark scheme. Contextual knowledge used to confirm or expand on the source material can access level 2. It is important that candidates do consider the relevance of the contextual knowledge that they use and target it appropriately. It was disappointing that some candidates had no context to offer at all and this did have a depressing impact on the overall mark awarded.

Most candidates were also able to make good use of the provenance to explain the value of the source, citing the significance an article published in an uncensored British newspaper that was supplied with information by a reporter who was stationed in Johannesburg and could provide the most up to date reaction that was not filtered through another agency. It is important that candidates go beyond the stereotypical claims of a source being 'primary'. These comments do not in themselves provide any explanation of value and do not achieve out of level 1. In addition, those candidates who discussed the limitations could not be rewarded for that part of their answer as it is not the focus of part a) responses.

Question 1 (b)

Most candidates understood the source material and were able to select from it to develop some inferences about the impact of apartheid on living standards in the years 1948-73, including the unequal impact, the role of the Bantustans in reducing the living standards of black South Africans and the deliberate action of the government to limit movement and job opportunities that had a negative impact on the living standards of black South Africans.

There were some effective answers that weighed up the strengths and limitations of the source and used this as a basis to reach a judgement about the weight that should be attached to the source for the enquiry. Although some candidates attached free-standing knowledge to the response, many did use secure knowledge, particularly to challenge the claims in the source and in some cases to carry out a thorough interrogation of the evidence. For example, candidates tested claims about the wealth of white South Africans with reference to car ownership and the number of swimming pools in private homes, as well as considering the poorer white farmers. The establishment of weight is very dependent upon candidates using their contextual knowledge to test the claims in the source. Candidates who only use knowledge to expand on the content of the source remain in level

2 for that bullet point. Some candidates did not use any contextual knowledge in their evaluation or did not focus their on the question and that limited achievement.

In the most effective answers, candidates were able to use the provenance of the source in conjunction with the content of the source to develop criteria to judge the weight of the source as test this with claims in the source. A minority of candidates made some questionable assumptions about the source and presented them in a very stereotypical way, e.g., source is reliable because it was written at the time etc. Many candidates made good use of the origin of the source and argued that as the leader the ANC and giving evidence in a trial, Mandela was in an excellent position to comment on living standards that he had personally experienced, observed and had campaigned it improve. Some were able to challenge the views by pointing to certain improvements in the time period after Mandela's testimony. This was used effectively to consider what weight could be ascribed to the source. In level 4, bullet point 3 requires candidates to use criteria that are 'justified and applied' to evaluate the source. Where candidates identify objective or subjective views in the source, it is important that they refer to them specifically in their answer to support their evaluation.

Question 2

This was the most popular essay question. Performance was rather variable. There were some well-focused responses that considered changes in the nature of government, including the impact of the National Party victory in 1948 and its imposition of apartheid legislation, the shift to a republic and withdrawal from the Commonwealth, the removal of voting rights from the Coloured population and the growth and then banning of opposition parties, and then in counteracted these changes with continuities in National Party rule and the continuation of a racist structure of government that originated prior to 1948 from before. However, many candidates simply took the opportunity to describe the apartheid system and government atrocities, often extending well beyond the date range set in the question. These responses struggle to achieve beyond level 3.

The best answers were able to establish criteria for assessing both change and continuity and used good knowledge effectively to support their response. However, where knowledge was limited and imprecise, candidates struggled to establish criteria and reach judgements.

Question 3

This question produced some very well focused and supported responses. Most candidates were able to address the question of the whether the impact of South Africa's involvement in Angola was the most significant external pressure facing the National Party in the years 1961-94. Most candidates were able to draw on a good range of precise knowledge and some very fine answers were written with many candidates achieving level 4 for well-focused responses that established valid criteria and argued their case effectively.

Candidates considered the threat of a Marxist government in Angola, the training of ANC activists in Angola, the withdrawal of support from the USA after the Cold War ended, and contrasted it with the threat from economic sanctions, sporting and cultural boycotts, the influence of the Anti-Apartheid Movement and impact of the oil crisis. In some responses,

knowledge of involvement on Angola was limited and candidates relied on alternative factors. This made it difficult to develop valid criteria for judgements. Candidates should be reminded that they need to study and revise all of the content in the specification to ensure they can maximise their achievement.

Question 4

This essay question had the smallest number of responses. Most responses achieved in levels 3 and 4 and demonstrated knowledge of both the threat of Eugene Terreblanche and the AWB and the threat of Julius Malema. Candidates considered Terreblanche's bombing campaigns and role in ensuring that Bophuthatswana did not participate in the 1994 elections. They countered his threat by referring to his imprisonment that left the AWB leaderless and ineffective for several years during the period and his assassination that ended the threat. In considering which was most significant, candidates examined Malema's influence in the youth wing of the ANC, the way in which he threatened the ANC's reputation by supporting violence, his establishment of the EEF after his suspension from the ANC and the EEF's calls to expropriate land and nationalise mines without compensation. Candidates were able to use this knowledge to help develop criteria for judgement. In a few cases, candidates introduced a third threat – the DA – and considered its significance. This undermined answers as the question targeted only two opponents to the new regime.

Paper Summary

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

Section A

Value of Source Question (1(a))

- Candidates must be more prepared to make valid inferences rather than to paraphrase the source
- Focus inferences, contextual support and explanations on the focus of the enquiry
- Be prepared to back up inferences by adding additional contextual knowledge from beyond the source
- Move beyond stereotypical approaches to the nature/purpose and authorship of the source e.g. look at the specific stance and/or purpose of the writer
- Avoid writing about the limitations of the source when assessing its value to the enquiry.

Weight of Source Question (1(b))

- Candidates should be prepared to assess the weight of the source for an enquiry by being aware that the author is writing for a specific audience. Be aware of the values and concerns of that audience.
- In assessing weight, it is perfectly permissible to use contextual knowledge to support/challenge statements and claims made in the source

- Consider omissions from the source material only where it is apparent that there is a deliberate decision to exclude something, or the ignorance of the author has led to omission
- Try to distinguish between fact and opinion by using your contextual knowledge of the period
- In coming to a judgement about the nature/purpose of the source, take account of the weight you may be able to give to the author's evidence in the light of his or her stance and/or purpose.

Section B: Essay questions

- Candidates must revise thoroughly and ensure that they have good knowledge to draw upon in addressing the essay question. Candidates must provide more factual details in support of their arguments. Weaker responses lacked depth and sometimes range
- Take a few minutes to plan your answer before you begin to write your response
- Pick out three or four key themes and then provide an analysis of (for e.g.) the target significance mentioned in the question, setting its importance against other themes rather than providing a description of each
- Pay more careful attention to key phrases in the question when analysing and use them throughout the essay to prevent deviation from the central issues and concepts
- It is a good idea to address the factor in the question where given. This makes it easier to consider relative significance
- Try to explore links between issues to make the structure flow more logically and the arguments more integrated.

