



basic education

Department:
Basic Education
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

NATIONAL SENIOR CERTIFICATE

GRADE 12

HISTORY P2

FEBRUARY/MARCH 2018

MARKING GUIDELINES

MARKS: 150

These marking guidelines consist of 25 pages.

1. SOURCE-BASED QUESTIONS

1.1 The following cognitive levels were used to develop source-based questions:

Cognitive Levels	Historical skills	Weighting of questions
LEVEL 1	- Extract evidence from sources - Selection and organisation of relevant information from sources - Define historical concepts/terms	30% (15)
LEVEL 2	- Interpretation of evidence from sources - Explain information gathered from sources - Analyse evidence from sources	40% (20)
LEVEL 3	- Interpret and evaluate evidence from sources - Engage with sources to determine its usefulness, reliability, bias and limitations - Compare and contrast interpretations and perspectives presented in sources and draw independent conclusions	30% (15)

1.2 The information below indicates how source-based questions are assessed:

- In the marking of source-based questions, credit needs to be given to any other valid and relevant viewpoints, arguments, evidence or examples.
- In the allocation of marks, emphasis should be placed on how the requirements of the question have been addressed.
- In the marking guideline, the requirements of the question (skills that need to be addressed) as well as the level of the question are indicated in italics.
- When assessing open-ended source-based questions, learners should be credited for any other relevant answers.
- Learners are expected to take a stance when answering 'to what extent' questions in order for any marks to be awarded.

1.3 Assessment procedures for source-based questions

- Use a tick (✓) for each correct answer.
- Pay attention to the mark scheme e.g. (2 x 2) which translates to two reasons and is given two marks each (✓✓✓✓); (1 x 2) which translates to one reason and is given two marks (✓✓).
- If a question carries 4 marks then indicate by placing 4 ticks (✓✓✓✓).

Paragraph question

Paragraphs are to be assessed globally (holistically). Both the content and structure of the paragraph must be taken into account when awarding a mark. The following steps must be used when assessing a response to a paragraph question:

- Read the paragraph and place a bullet (.) at each point within the text where the candidate has used relevant evidence to address the question.
- Re-read the paragraph to evaluate the extent to which the candidate has been able to use relevant evidence to write a paragraph.

- At the end of the paragraph indicate the ticks (✓) that the candidate has been awarded for the paragraph; as well as the level (1,2, or 3) as indicated in the holistic rubric and a brief comment e.g.

✓✓✓✓✓
 Level 2

Used mostly relevant evidence to write a basic paragraph

- Count all the ticks for the source-based question and then write the mark on the bottom margin to the right, e.g. $\frac{32}{50}$
- Ensure that the total mark is transferred accurately to the front/back cover of the answer script.

2. ESSAY QUESTIONS

2.1 The essay questions require candidates to:

- Be able to structure their argument in a logical and coherent manner. They need to select, organise and connect the relevant information so that they are able to present a reasonable sequence of facts or an effective argument to answer the question posed. It is essential that an essay has an introduction, a coherent and balanced body of evidence and a conclusion.

2.2 Marking of essay questions

- Markers must be aware that the content of the answer will be guided by the textbooks in use at the particular centre.
- Candidates may have any other relevant introduction and/or conclusion than those included in a specific essay marking guideline for a specific essay.
- When assessing open-ended source-based questions, learners should be credited for any other relevant answers.

2.3 Global assessment of the essay

The essay will be assessed holistically (globally). This approach requires the teacher to assess the essay as a whole, rather than assessing the main points of the essay separately. This approach encourages the learner to write an original argument by using relevant evidence to support the line of argument. The learner will **not** be required to simply regurgitate content (facts) in order to achieve a level 7 (high mark). This approach discourages learners from preparing essays and reproducing them without taking the specific requirements of the question into account. Holistic marking of the essay credits learners' opinions that are supported by evidence. Holistic assessment, unlike content-based marking, does not penalise language inadequacies as the emphasis is on the following:

- The learner's interpretation of the question
- The appropriate selection of factual evidence (relevant content selection)
- The construction of argument (planned, structured and has independent line of argument)

2.4 Assessment procedures of the essay

2.4.1 Keep the synopsis in mind when assessing the essay.

2.4.2 During the first reading of the essay ticks need to be awarded for a relevant introduction (which is indicated by a bullet in the marking guideline), the main aspects/body of the essay that sustains/defends the line of argument (which is indicated by bullets in the marking guideline) and a relevant conclusion (which is indicated by a bullet in the marking guideline).
For example in an essay where there are five (5) main points there could be about seven (7) ticks.

2.4.3 Keep the **PEEL** structure in mind when assessing an essay.

P	Point: The candidate introduces the essay by taking a line of argument/making a major point. Each paragraph should include a point that sustains the major point (line of argument) that was made in the introduction.
E	Explanation: The candidate should explain in more detail what the main point is all about and how it relates to the question posed (line of argument)
E	Example: The candidates should answer the question by selecting content that is relevant to the line of argument. Relevant examples should be given to sustain the line of argument.
L	Link: Candidates should ensure that the line of argument is sustained throughout the essay and is written coherently.

2.4.4 The following additional symbols can also be used:

- Introduction, main aspects and conclusion not properly contextualised

Λ

- Wrong statement

- Irrelevant statement

|
|
|

- Repetition

R

- Analysis

A√

- Interpretation

I√

- Line of argument

LOA ⇕

2.5 The matrix**2.5.1 Use of the matrix in the marking of essays**

In the marking of essays, the criteria as provided in the matrix should be used. When assessing the essay note both the content and presentation. At the point of intersection of the content and presentation based on the seven competency levels, a mark should be awarded.

- (a) The first reading of the essay will be to determine to what extent the main aspects have been covered and to allocate the **content level** (on the matrix).

C	LEVEL 4	

- (b) The second reading of the essay will relate to the level (on the matrix) of **presentation**.

C	LEVEL 4	
P	LEVEL 3	

- (c) Allocate an overall mark with the use of the matrix.

C	LEVEL 4	}26–27
P	LEVEL 3	

GLOBAL ASSESSMENT OF ESSAYS: TOTAL MARKS: 50

	LEVEL 7	LEVEL 6	LEVEL 5	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1
PRESENTATION  CONTENT 	Very well planned and structured essay. Good synthesis of information. Developed an original, well balanced and independent line of argument with the use of evidence, sustained and defended the argument throughout. Independent conclusion is drawn from evidence to support the line of argument.	Very well planned and structured essay. Developed a relevant line of argument. Evidence used to defend the argument. Attempts to draw an independent conclusion from the evidence to support the line of argument.	Well planned and structured essay. Attempts to develop a clear argument. Conclusion drawn from the evidence to support the line of argument.	Planned and constructed an argument. Evidence is used to some extent to support the line of argument. Conclusions reached based on evidence.	Shows some evidence of a planned and constructed argument. Attempts to sustain a line of argument. Conclusions not clearly supported by evidence.	Attempts to structure an answer. Largely descriptive, or some attempt at developing a line of argument. No attempt to draw a conclusion	Little or no attempt to structure the essay.
LEVEL 7 Question has been fully answered. Content selection fully relevant to line of argument.	47–50	43–46					
LEVEL 6 Question has been answered. Content selection relevant to the line of argument.	43–46	40–42	38–39				
LEVEL 5 Question answered to a great extent. Content adequately covered and relevant.	38–39	36–37	34–35	30–33	28–29		
LEVEL 4 Question is recognisable in answer. Some omissions or irrelevant content selection.			30–33	28–29	26–27		
LEVEL 3 Content selection does relate to the question, but does not answer it, or does not always relate to the question. Omissions in coverage.				26–27	24–25	20–23	
LEVEL 2 Question inadequately addressed. Sparse content.					20–23	18–19	14–17
LEVEL 1 Question inadequately addressed or not at all. Inadequate or irrelevant content.						14 –17	0–13

***Guidelines for allocating a mark for Level 1:**

- Question not addressed at all/totally irrelevant content; no attempt to structure the essay = 0
- Content selection includes basic and generally irrelevant information; no attempt to structure the essay = 1 – 6
- Question inadequately addressed and vague; little attempt to structure the essay = 7 – 13

SECTION A: SOURCE-BASED QUESTIONS**QUESTION 1 WHY DID THE APARTHEID REGIME DETAIN BLACK CONSCIOUSNESS LEADER, BANTU STEPHEN BIKO?**

- 1.1.1 *[Definition of a historical concept from Source 1A – L1]*
- Accepting oneself as black, to have self-value, self-esteem and self-worth
 - To be proud to be black
 - It is not about the colour of your skin but rather mental emancipation
 - Black South Africans should be proud of themselves and should strive to do things for themselves (self-reliance)
 - Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)
- 1.1.2 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 1A – L1]*
- 'Tertiary institutions'
 - 'Media'
 - 'Schools'
 - 'Community theatres' (any 3 x 1) (3)
- 1.1.3 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 1A – L1]*
- 'He was pushed onto the path of an oncoming train' (1 x 2) (2)
- 1.1.4 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 1A – L1]*
Leaders were:
- 'Expelled'
 - 'Banning'/'banned'
 - 'Prison'
 - 'Killed' (any 3 x 1) (3)
- 1.1.5 *[Interpretation of evidence from Source 1A – L2]*
- The apartheid regime expelled black political activists from universities
 - The apartheid regime cracked down on leaders of BCM
 - Drake Koka, Bokwe Mafuna, Steve Biko and Barney Pityana were banned for their political activities against the apartheid regime
 - Mosibudi Mangena was sentenced to five years in prison because he tried to recruit two policemen to join the armed struggle
 - By killing black consciousness activists such as Tiro
 - Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)
- 1.2.1 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 1B – L1]*
- 'To arrest political activists' (1 x 2) (2)
- 1.2.2 *[Interpretation of evidence from Source 1B – L2]*
- Oosthuizen felt that they were involved in political activity/'terrorists' and were against the apartheid regime
 - Oosthuizen was suspicious of Jones and Biko
 - Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)

- 1.2.3 *[Interpretation of evidence from Source 1B – L2]*
- Steve Biko identified himself to protect his friend Peter Jones
 - Steve Biko knew that his friend Peter Jones would sacrifice his life to protect him from being arrested and interrogated
 - Steve Biko was a selfless leader of good standing/to demonstrate that he was a man of integrity
 - Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)
- 1.2.4 *[Interpretation of evidence from Source 1B – L2]*
- The police hoped that they would turn on each other and give them information they needed about their political activities
 - The police hoped to get evidence from them that could be used to stop the mobilisation and protest action against the government about their planned political activities
 - Used the 'divide and rule' method to get information
 - Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)
- 1.3.1 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 1 C – L1]*
- 'On suspicion of fomenting (inciting) unrest among black South Africans in the Port Elizabeth area'
 - 'Drafting documents urging 'violence and arson' by black South Africans that wanted to overthrow apartheid' (2 x 1) (2)
- 1.3.2 *[Evaluate the usefulness of the evidence in Source 1C – L3]*
The source is USEFUL because:
- It gives the date and reasons why Steve Biko was detained and arrested
 - It indicates where Steve Biko was imprisoned
 - It gives reasons why Steve Biko was transferred to hospital and the conditions under which he was transported
 - It gives details of his alleged hunger strike
 - It informs the reader how many times he was examined by the police doctors
 - It shares the doctors findings that Biko suffered 'no physical problem'
 - Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)
- 1.4.1 *[Interpretation of evidence from Source 1D – L2]*
- Steve Biko was the leader of the Black Consciousness Movement
 - It highlights the doctors findings about Steve Biko
 - The *Rand Daily Mail* wanted to investigate and expose how Steve Biko was murdered
 - Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)
- 1.4.2 *[Interpretation of evidence from Source 1D – L2]*
- The headline confirms that Steve Biko did not die from a hunger strike
 - The headline confirms the suspicions that the apartheid regime was responsible for the murder of Steve Biko
 - Any other relevant response (2 x 2) (4)

1.5. *[Comparison of evidence from Sources 1C and 1D – L3]*

- Source 1C states that Steve Biko consistently refused to eat and drink water that was provided by the police whereas Source 1D indicates that there were no sign of a hunger strike
- In Source 1C states by the seventh day of Biko's hunger strike he appeared to be unwell whereas Source 1D states that the doctors found no evidence of a hunger strike
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

1.6 *[Interpretation, evaluation and synthesis of evidence from relevant sources – L3]*

Candidates could include the following aspects in their response

- Prominent leaders from Black Consciousness (BC) were killed for the role they played in opposing the apartheid regime (Source 1A)
- The apartheid police regarded Steve Biko as a 'terrorist' (Source 1B)
- Steve Biko was arrested when he identified himself (Source 1B)
- The apartheid regime banned BC leaders who got involved in union activities (Source 1B)
- Steve Biko declared he did not fear the police (Source 1B)
- Minister of Justice announced that Biko would be detained indefinitely without trial (Source 1C)
- The apartheid government hoped that Steve Biko's detention would cripple the BC movement (own knowledge)
- Steve Biko was arrested for inciting unrest amongst black South Africans in Port Elizabeth (Source 1C)
- Police documents indicate that Steve Biko tried to overthrow the apartheid government (Source 1C)
- The apartheid government was discredited because of how they murdered Biko (own knowledge)
- Any other relevant response

Use the following rubric to allocate marks:

LEVEL 1	• Uses evidence in an elementary manner e.g. shows no or little understanding of why the apartheid regime detained Black Consciousness leader, Bantu Stephen Biko. • Uses evidence partially or cannot write a paragraph.	MARKS 0–2
LEVEL 2	• Evidence is mostly relevant and relates to a great extent on the topic e.g. shows some understanding of why the apartheid regime detained Black Consciousness leader, Bantu Stephen Biko. • Uses evidence in a very basic manner to write a paragraph.	MARKS 3–5
LEVEL 3	• Uses relevant evidence e.g. demonstrates a thorough understanding of why the apartheid regime detained Black Consciousness leader, Bantu Stephen Biko. • Uses evidence very effectively in an organised paragraph that shows an understanding of the topic.	MARKS 6–8

(8)
[50]

QUESTION 2 WHY WAS THE AMNESTY PROCESS OF THE TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION COMMISSION (TRC) REGARDED AS CONTROVERSIAL?

- 2.1.1 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 2A – L1]*
 • 'To establish as complete a picture as possible about gross human rights violations' (1 x 2) (2)
- 2.1.2 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 2A – L1]*
 • 'Human Rights Violation Committee'
 • 'Amnesty Committee'
 • 'Reparation and Rehabilitation Committee' (3 x 1) (3)
- 2.1.3 *[Definition of a historical concept from Source 2A – L1]*
 • The granting of official pardon for people that committed politically motivated crimes
 • The granting of official pardon to perpetrators who gave full disclosure of the atrocities that were committed for political reasons
 • Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)
- 2.1.4 *[Interpretation of evidence from Source 2A – L2]*
 • Perpetrators were responsible for heinous crimes that were committed against anti-apartheid activists
 • They were against gross human rights abuse that was inflicted on political activists
 • They were against restorative justice and believed in retributive justice
 • Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)
- 2.1.5 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 2A – L1]*
 • 'Full disclosure of all relevant facts'
 • 'For acts associated with a political objective committed in the course of the conflicts of the past' (2 x 1) (2)
- 2.2.1 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 2B – L1]*
 • 'To deal with political crimes that were committed between 1960 and 1994' (1 x 2) (2)
- 2.2.2 *[Interpretation of evidence from Source 2B – L2]*
 Naomi Tutu believed that:
 • It was an easy way out for perpetrators to appear before the TRC and thereby receive amnesty
 • The TRC was not forceful enough because 'it seemed as if we were giving people a present'
 • Many South Africans felt that it was 'a feeling that these people were literally getting away with murder'
 • Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)

2.2.3 *[Interpretation of evidence from Source 2B – L2]*

White South Africans believed that:

- The TRC kept hatred alive in the country
- The TRC was a 'witch-hunt'
- The TRC was lenient on anti-apartheid organisations
- They were blamed for all the political atrocities that were committed during the apartheid rule
- Any other relevant response

(any 2 x 2) (4)

2.2.4 *[Evaluation and synthesis of evidence from Source 2B – L3]*

Candidates could either AGREE or DISAGREE with the statement and support their answer with relevant historical evidence.

AGREE

- The moral truth did not emerge because the perpetrators did not reveal the identity of people who gave the orders to commit political murders
- None of the perpetrators wanted to implicate high ranking officials of the apartheid regime
- There was a degree of patriotism from the perpetrators to protect leaders of the apartheid regime
- Any other relevant response

OR**DISAGREE**

- Some of the perpetrators did reveal who had given them the instruction to kill political activists
- When perpetrators met families of the victims some degree of truth, confession and reconciliation emerged
- The TRC made financial contributions to families that lost their loved ones
- The TRC led to healing among many families who were able to find closure after the whereabouts of their loved ones was established
- Any other relevant response

(any 2 x 2) (4)

2.3.1 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 2C – L1]*

- '37 African National Congress members, including Deputy President Thabo Mbeki'

(1 x 1) (1)

2.3.2 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 2C – L1]*

- 'Decision to grant blanket amnesty'
- 'The ANC applicants... had accepted collective responsibility for actions outlined in the party's submission to the TRC'
- 'Observers have questioned how the ANC members were eligible for amnesty when they had not confessed'

(any 1 x 2) (2)

2.3.3 *[Interpretation of evidence from Source 2C – L2]*

- The TRC did not explain how it had arrived at the granting of blanket amnesty
- There were no confessions from ANC members yet they were granted blanket amnesty
- The Amnesty Committee was not accountable for the granting of blanket amnesty
- Not everyone agreed with this unique model of justice
- Any other relevant response

(any 2 x 2) (4)

2.3.4 *[Evaluate the usefulness of the evidence in Source 2C – L3]***The source is USEFUL because:**

- It highlights the controversial decision to grant blanket amnesty to 37 ANC members
- It reveals the criticism of the South African Press Association to the granting of blanket amnesty
- It questions the decision of how members of the ANC were granted blanket amnesty when they had not confessed to the political crimes that they committed
- It mentions how newspaper editorials have called on committee members to explain how they arrived at the decision to grant blanket amnesty
- It highlights the reason given by the Chairperson, Judge Hassan Mall on why blanket amnesty was granted
- Any other relevant response

(any 2 x 2) (4)

2.4.1 *[Interpretation of evidence from Source 2D – L2]*

(a) National Party

- The NP was against blanket amnesty (wants to use the scissor to cut the cloth labelled blanket amnesty)
- Any other relevant response

(any 1 x 2) (2)

(b) African National Congress

- The ANC wants blanket amnesty (holding on to the cloth labelled blanket amnesty)
- Any other relevant response

(any 1 x 2) (2)

2.4.2 *[Interpretation of evidence from Source 2D – L2]*

- The TRC eventually withdrew blanket amnesty that was initially granted
- The ANC cannot hold onto blanket amnesty for too long
- The TRC cautioned the ANC about holding onto blanket amnesty
- Any other relevant response

(any 2 x 2) (4)

2.5 *[Interpretation, evaluation and synthesis of evidence from relevant sources – L3]*

Candidates could include the following aspects in their response.

- The TRC was established to grant amnesty to those perpetrators who made full disclosure of the political crimes that were committed (Source 2A)
- Those within the anti-apartheid movement were against the granting of amnesty (Source 2A)
- Amnesty was to be granted to applicants who made full disclosure of their political activities that were committed during the course of the conflicts of the past' (Source 2A)
- Naomi Tutu stated she initially was opposed to amnesty as she thought it 'was an easy way out,' and that 'it seemed like we were giving people a present (Source 2B)
- Many Afrikaners felt the hearings were counterproductive, keeping hatred alive in the country rather than moving forward and moving on from the past (Source 2B)
- 72% of white South Africans felt that the TRC made race relations worse (Source 2B)
- Antjie Krog questioned whether the amnesty process did achieve reconciliation (Source 2B)
- The decision to grant blanket amnesty to 37 African National Congress members, including Deputy President Thabo Mbeki was controversial (Source 2C)
- Observers questioned how ANC members were eligible for amnesty when they had not confessed to any offence they had committed (Source 2C)
- Newspaper editorials have called on the committee to explain how they arrived at their decision to grant amnesty to the ANC members (Source 2C)
- The TRC was surrounded by controversy regarding the issue of blanket amnesty (Source 2D)
- Many families did not receive compensation (own knowledge)
- Some white South Africans regarded the TRC as a 'witch hunt' (own knowledge)
- Any other relevant response

Use the following rubric to allocate marks:

LEVEL 1	• Uses evidence in an elementary manner e.g. shows no or little understanding in explaining why the amnesty process of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission was regarded as controversial. • Uses evidence partially or cannot write a paragraph.	MARKS 0–2
LEVEL 2	• Evidence is mostly relevant and relates to a great extent on the topic e.g. shows some understanding in explaining why the amnesty process of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission was regarded as controversial. • Uses evidence in a very basic manner to write a paragraph.	MARKS 3–5
LEVEL 3	• Uses relevant evidence e.g. demonstrates a thorough understanding in explaining why the amnesty process of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission was regarded as controversial. • Uses evidence very effectively in an organised paragraph that shows an understanding of the topic.	MARKS 6–8

(8)
[50]

QUESTION 3: HOW DO MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS SUCH AS McDONALD'S EXPLOIT WORKERS?

- 3.1.1 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 3A – L1]*
- 'Manipulating'
 - 'Exploiting'
 - 'Cutting corners'
- (3 x 1) (3)
- 3.1.2 *[Definition of a historical concept from Source 3A – L1]*
- Multinational corporations refer to companies whose headquarters are in one country, but conduct their businesses in more than one country with the aim of making huge profits
 - Any other relevant response
- (any 1 x 2) (2)
- 3.1.3 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 3A – L1]*
- 'Rapidly globalising market'
 - 'To take advantage of cheap labour'
 - 'To sell their products at a lower market price'
- (any 2 x 1) (2)
- 3.1.4 *[Interpretation of evidence from Source 3A – L2]*
- Economic success was a top priority for western countries
 - Western countries took part in the production process to create markets
 - Western countries took part in the consumption and disposal cycles
 - Any other relevant response
- (any 2 x 2) (4)
- 3.2.1 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 3B – L1]*
- 'Money'
 - 'Making profits'
- (any 1 x 1) (1)
- 3.2.2 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 3B – L1]*
- 'They aim to open more stores across the globe'
 - 'Their continual worldwide expansion means more uniformity, less choice'
 - 'The undermining of local communities'
- (any 1 x 2) (2)
- 3.2.3 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 3B – L1]*
- 'Risk of heart disease, cancer, diabetes and other diseases'
 - 'Cause ill health and hyperactivity in children'
 - 'Food poisoning'
 - 'Serious kidney failure'
- (any 2 x 1) (2)
- 3.2.4 *[Interpretation of evidence from Source 3B – L2]*
- McDonald's paid low wages
 - McDonald's did not pay overtime rates to its workers
 - McDonald's workers worked long hours and were overworked
 - McDonald's outlets were understaffed
 - Any other relevant response
- (any 2 x 2) (4)

- 3.3.1 *[Interpretation of evidence from Source 3C – L2]*
- (a)
- The workers seem unhappy with their working conditions therefore they were on strike
 - The workers were striking for higher wages and improved working conditions
 - Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2)
- (b)
- McDonald's food is relatively cheap
 - McDonald's food is easily accessible
 - Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (4)
- 3.4 *[Comparison of evidence from Sources 3B and 3C – L3]*
- Source 3B outlines that workers are paid low wages and Source 3C shows the reaction of workers protesting against low wages (placard – higher wages)
 - Source 3B outlines that the working conditions of workers were poor (understaffing, working harder and faster) and Source 3C shows the unhappiness of workers with their working conditions and therefore went on strike
 - Source 3B outlines that McDonald's is the company that exploits its workers and Source 3C shows that workers are protesting in front of a McDonald's store
 - Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)
- 3.5
- 3.5.1 *[Interpretation of information from Source 3D – L2]*
- They called upon people and organisations for their annual World Day of Action against McDonald's
 - They organised pickets all over the world
 - They organised demonstrations all over the world
 - Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)
- 3.5.2 *[Interpretation of information from Source 3D – L2]*
- McDonald's used advertising to silence world-wide criticism
 - McDonald's threatened legal action against those who spoke out
 - Many anti McDonald's protesters backed down because they did not have financial muscle for sustained legal battles
 - Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)
- 3.5.3 *[Extraction of information from Source 3D – L1]*
- 'Helen Steel'
 - 'Dave Morris' (2 x 1) (2)

3.5.4 *[Ascertaining the usefulness of the evidence in Source 3D – L3]***USEFUL TO A GREATER EXTENT**

- It shows how ordinary people organised themselves to protest and demonstrate against the business practices of McDonalds
- It shows the methods that McDonald's used to silence criticism from ordinary people
- It shows how two ordinary people brought a libel case against McDonald's
- It encourages ordinary people to fight exploitation by multinational companies such as McDonald's
- Any other relevant response

USEFUL TO A LESSER EXTENT

- It only gives you the perspective of Greenpeace
- It is highly critical of McDonald's
- It doesn't offer a response from McDonald's regarding Greenpeace's' point of view
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

3.6 *[Interpretation, evaluation and synthesis of evidence from relevant sources – L3]*

Candidates could include the following aspects in their response.

- McDonald's takes advantage of cheap labour that is available in developing countries (Source 3A)
- McDonald's pays their workers low wages (Source 3B)
- McDonald's are reluctant to pay overtime rates to their workers (Source 3B)
- McDonald's staff have to work harder and faster to keep profits high and the cost of wages low (Source 3B)
- McDonald's workers are not allowed to unionise (Source 3B)
- Worker strikes for higher wages are common at McDonald's (Source 3C)
- Any other relevant response

Use the following rubric to allocate marks:

LEVEL 1	• Uses evidence in an elementary manner e.g. shows no or little understanding of how multinational corporations such as McDonald's exploited workers. • Uses evidence partially or cannot write a paragraph.	MARKS 0–2
LEVEL 2	• Evidence is mostly relevant and relates to a great extent on the topic e.g. shows some understanding of how multinational corporations such as McDonald's exploited workers. • Uses evidence in a very basic manner to write a paragraph.	MARKS 3–5
LEVEL 3	• Uses relevant evidence e.g. demonstrates a thorough understanding of how multinational corporations such as McDonald's exploited workers. • Uses evidence very effectively in an organised paragraph that shows an understanding of the topic.	MARKS 6–8

(8)
[50]

SECTION B: ESSAY QUESTIONS**QUESTION 4 CIVIL RESISTANCE, 1970s TO 1980s: SOUTH AFRICA: THE CRISIS OF APARTHEID IN THE 1980s**

[Plan and construct an original argument based on relevant evidence using analytical and interpretative skills]

SYNOPSIS

Candidates need to explain whether they agree or disagree with the statement. If they agree they must discuss how boycotts, disinvestments and sanctions by the international anti-apartheid movements contributed to the eventual demise of PW Botha's regime in the 1980s. If they disagree with the statement they need to substantiate their line of argument with relevant historical evidence.

MAIN ASPECTS

Candidates should include the following aspects in their response:

- Introduction: Candidates need take a stand and show whether boycotts, disinvestments and sanctions by the international anti-apartheid movements led to the downfall of PW Botha's regime in the 1980s.

ELABORATION

- Formation of the Anti-Apartheid Movement (AAM) in the United Kingdom and its role against PW Botha's regime
- PW Botha's attempts at reforming apartheid by introducing the Tri-Cameral parliamentary system in 1983
- PW Botha's Rubicon Speech of 1985 forced the international community into action which embarked on various forms of boycotts, sanctions and disinvestments against the apartheid regime
- **Sport Boycotts:** The role of the South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee (SANROC). Campaigned against discrimination in sport/against participants of whites only South African teams in international sporting events
- The role of Halt All Racial Tours (HART). It staged protests action against the 'racist' Springbok rugby tour to New Zealand in 1981
- The role of the South African Council on Sport (SACOS). Established political links with the UDF and COSATU. They insisted on sports boycotts. The apartheid regime felt pressure. Slogans 'No normal sport in an abnormal society' were used
- By the late 1980s South Africa was banned from 90% of international sport
- **Cultural Boycotts:** In 1985 US artists protested against apartheid and refused to perform in South Africa and raised money for liberation movements such as the ANC
- In 1986 the Freedom Festival in London was held by British artists against apartheid
- Musicians expressed their solidarity with the freedom loving South Africans

- **Academic Boycotts:** International scholars refused to travel to South Africa/International publishers refused to publish South African manuscripts and grant access to information/International conferences barred South African scholars/Institutions abroad denied South Africa academic access and refused to recognise South African qualifications
- **Consumer Boycotts:** OPEC placed an embargo on oil sales to South Africa. South Africa experienced a recession in 1980s. Irish workers refused to handle fruits from SA. Imports of raw materials from South Africa such as coal, iron and steel were banned
- **Disinvestments:** In 1980s foreign investments dropped by 30%. By 1980 Britain disinvested from Simon's Town naval dockyard; General Motors and Barclays Bank pulled out of SA. The effects of foreign disinvestments had a negative effect on South Africa.
- Between 1985 and 1990 over 200 US companies pulled out of South African, the University of California withdrew its investment of three billion dollars from South Africa
- **Sanctions:** In the 1980s the Sullivan Principle, workers of all USA companies should be treated equally. In 1985 the US Bank – Chase Manhattan Bank cut ties with South Africa; the Johannesburg Stock Exchange (JSE) closed for 4 days. The value of the rand dropped by 35% from 54 to 34 cents to the dollar. In 1986 the US Congress passed a law that banned all new investments and loans to SA. Big corporations such as General Electric, Pepsi Cola, General Motors, Mobil and IBM stopped their investments in South Africa. The USA threatened to stop weapon sales to countries which provided armaments to South Africa. In 1986 Europe and Japan imposed sanctions against South Africa
- In 1982 the UNO condemned apartheid and called for total sanctions against South Africa
- In 1985 the European Economic Community banned all new investments in South Africa
- In 1988 one fifth of British companies withdrew their businesses from South Africa because of pressure from shareholders. Barclays Bank, sold their shares due to pressure from the British public. The South African economy stagnated and produced a growth of only 1,1%
- **Release Mandela Campaign:** Concert held at Wembley Stadium for the release of Mandela; UN Security Council and UN General Assembly called for the release of Nelson Mandela
- **The Role of International Trade Unions:** The AAM in Europe and Australia; Liverpool dockworkers; Finland's Transport Workers Union imposed a ban on trade with South Africa
- This resulted in SA experiencing great economic difficulties and leaders of the apartheid regime were forced to begin negotiations with liberation organisations in South Africa
- Any other relevant information
- Conclusion: Candidates should tie up their argument with a relevant conclusion. [50]

If candidates disagree with the statement they need to support their line of argument with relevant evidence

QUESTION 5 THE COMING OF DEMOCRACY TO SOUTH AFRICA AND COMING TO TERMS WITH THE PAST

[Plan and construct an original argument based on relevant evidence using analytical and interpretative skills]

SYNOPSIS

Candidates need to explain to what extent violence and uncertainty that South Africa experienced during the early 1990s made the road to democracy almost impossible. Candidates must use relevant examples to support their line of argument.

MAIN ASPECTS

Candidates should include the following aspects in their essays:

- Introduction: Candidates need to indicate to what extent violence and uncertainty made the road to democracy almost impossible.

ELABORATION

- De Klerk comes to power in 1989 (brief background)
- De Klerk's speech in parliament on 2 February 1990 regarded as a turning point
- Led to the unbanning of political and civic organisations such as the ANC and SACP
- The removal of restrictions on COSATU and AZAPO De Klerk's decision to release Mandela from prison on 11 February 1990 paved the way for negotiations
- Groote Schuur Minute, 2 May 1990 (ANC and NP met: ANC delegation led by Nelson Mandela and the NP delegation led by FW de Klerk)
- Apartheid legislation revoked such as Separate Reservation of Amenities Act
- Pretoria Minute 6 August 1990 (ANC agreed to suspend the armed struggle)
- CODESA 1 (19 political parties excluding AZAPO, CP and PAC - 300 delegates met)
- Violence erupts in various parts of South Africa such as the Rand, Natal and elsewhere (IFP, ANC and Third force violence)
- CODESA 2 (2 May 1992) collapsed. Parties failed to agree on a new constitution-making body and interim government (uncertainty)
- NP wanted minority veto while ANC wanted an interim government for no longer than 18 months and simple majority rule
- Boipatong massacre (17 June 1992) and its consequences (violence and uncertainty)
- Bhisno massacre (7 September 1992) almost derailed the process of negotiations (violence and uncertainty)
- Record of Understanding signed on 26 September 1992 between Roelf Meyer (NP) and Cyril Ramaphosa (ANC)
- Assassination of Chris Hani (10 April 1993) and its impact on South Africa (violence and uncertainty)
- Significance of the Multiparty negotiating Forum for South Africa's future
- Right-wing (AWB) attack on World Trade Centre and its consequences (violence and uncertainty)
- Sunset Clause introduced by Joe Slovo broke the negotiations deadlock

- Heidelberg Tavern massacre – 31 January 1993 (violence and uncertainty)
- St James Massacre in July 1993 – APLA open fire – 11 killed and 58 wounded (violence and uncertainty)
- Interim Constitution in November 1993
- Shell House Massacre in March 1994 – IFP marches to the ANC headquarters – 8 people killed and 250 injured (violence and uncertainty)
- Election date – 27 April 1994 announced
- ANC won elections and Mandela became the first black South African President
- Any other relevant response
- Conclusion: Candidates should tie up their argument with a relevant conclusion.

[50]

QUESTION 6 THE END OF THE COLD WAR AND A NEW WORLD ORDER: THE EVENTS OF 1989

[Plan and construct an original argument based on relevant evidence using analytical and interpretative skills]

SYNOPSIS

Candidates need to critically discuss how the collapse of the Soviet Union served as a turning point for South Africa. They need to show how events in the Soviet Union influenced political transformation that occurred in South Africa after 1989.

MAIN ASPECTS

Candidates should include the following aspects in their response:

- Introduction: Candidates should critically discuss how the collapse of the Soviet Union was a turning point for South Africa. They should support their line of argument with relevant evidence.

ELABORATION

Candidates should include the following points in their answer.

- Gorbachev's policies of Perestroika and Glasnost
- The fall of the Berlin Wall and its impact
- The disintegration of the Soviet Union affected both the ANC and NP
- The collapse of the Soviet Union deprived the ANC of its main source of economic and military support
- Socialism was no more an option for the ANC
- The National Party's claim that it is protecting southern Africa from communism became unrealistic because of Gorbachev's policies
- The National Party could no longer justify that it was a 'bulwark' against the spread of communism in Africa
- The National Party could no longer claim that it was protecting the Cape Sea route against the spread of communism
- Influential National Party members realised that apartheid was not the answer to the needs of white capitalism and therefore opted for negotiations with the ANC in exile
- The Battle of Cuito Caunavale and the fact that the National Party had to negotiate with communists over the independence of Namibia made it easier for them to talk to the ANC
- The security forces and successive states of emergency did not stop revolt in South Africa
- South Africa was slowly edging towards a civil war
- PW Botha (Hawk) suffered a stroke and was succeeded by FW de Klerk (Dove)
- De Klerk started to accept that the struggle against apartheid was not a conspiracy directed from Moscow

- De Klerk initiated talks with the ANC
 - On 2 February 1990 De Klerk unbanned all anti-apartheid organisations
 - This paved the way for negotiations between the National Party and various resistance organisations
 - Any other relevant response
 - Conclusion: Candidates should tie up their argument with a relevant conclusion **[50]**
- TOTAL: 150**