

A LEVEL

Examiners' report

HISTORY A

H505

For first teaching in 2015

Y224/01 Summer 2022 series

Contents

Introduction	3
Paper Y224/01 series overview	4
Question 1 (a)	5
Question 1 (b)*	8
Question 2 (a)	11
Question 2 (b)*	11

Introduction

Our examiners' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on candidates' performance in the examinations. They provide useful guidance for future candidates.

The reports will include a general commentary on candidates' performance, identify technical aspects examined in the questions and highlight good performance and where performance could be improved. A selection of candidate answers is also provided. The reports will also explain aspects which caused difficulty and why the difficulties arose, whether through a lack of knowledge, poor examination technique, or any other identifiable and explainable reason.

Where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report.

A full copy of the question paper and the mark scheme can be downloaded from OCR.

Advance Information for Summer 2022 assessments

To support student revision, advance information was published about the focus of exams for Summer 2022 assessments. Advance information was available for most GCSE, AS and A Level subjects, Core Maths, FSMQ, and Cambridge Nationals Information Technologies. You can find more information on our [website](#).

Would you prefer a Word version?

Did you know that you can save this PDF as a Word file using Acrobat Professional?

Simply click on **File > Export to** and select **Microsoft Word**

(If you have opened this PDF in your browser you will need to save it first. Simply right click anywhere on the page and select **Save as . . .** to save the PDF. Then open the PDF in Acrobat Professional.)

If you do not have access to Acrobat Professional there are a number of **free** applications available that will also convert PDF to Word (search for PDF to Word converter).

Paper Y224/01 series overview

Y224 is a non-British period study paper focused on 'Apartheid and Reconciliation: South African Politics, 1948-1999'. Candidates are expected to answer one of two questions. Each question consists of two parts: part (a), in which candidates answer the given question by analysing and evaluating two different factors, and part (b), an essay question.

To achieve marks in the highest level for part (a), candidates need to be able to analyse and evaluate the given factors using detailed knowledge and understanding of the key features of the period. A developed and substantiated judgement, which is focused on the question, is also needed.

To achieve marks in the highest level for part (b), candidates need to provide a response that has a consistent focus on the question throughout, includes a clear and sustained line of reasoning, is based on analysis and evaluation of detailed knowledge and understanding, and which provides a developed judgement that is related to the question.

Many candidates were able to achieve marks in the higher levels for both parts (a) and (b). For (a), knowledge of the careers of Verwoerd and Vorster was good, while for (b), many candidates demonstrated sound understanding of the factors that contributed to unity. Less developed responses for (a) were imbalanced, with some candidates knowing less about South African Church leaders, for example (Question 1). For (b), less successful responses were narrow and therefore less developed, particularly in relation to Question 1.

Candidates who did well on this paper generally did the following:	Candidates who did less well on this paper generally did the following:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrated sound knowledge and understanding of the period • provided an effective comparison of the two factors in (a), leading to a substantiated judgement • showed an ability to analyse knowledge in light of the question in (b) and to evaluate the relative significance of factors in relation to that question • made clear and convincing judgements in responses in both sections, based on sound knowledge and understanding of the period. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • possessed only limited knowledge and understanding of the period • provided less developed knowledge and understanding when answering (a) • treated the factors in (a) unevenly • explained factors in (b) with less detailed knowledge, rather than analysed them in light of the question • provided only limited judgements or broader views on topic areas in their responses relating to both sections - or omitted judgements entirely.

Question 1 (a)

- 1 (a) Which of the following was more effective in the development of opposition to Apartheid in the period from 1978 to 1989?
- (i) International opposition
 - (ii) South African Church leaders

Explain your answer with reference to both (i) and (ii).

[10]

Candidates, in general, demonstrated good knowledge of international opposition (i) with many responses referring to boycotts and legislation against the regime in South Africa, and the measures taken by the UN. Some were able to discuss in detail the financial implications of this opposition, which caused such devastation to the South African economy.

Knowledge of the activities of Church leaders was less developed, with many responses limited only to comments on the work of Desmond Tutu (see Exemplar 1). A few candidates pointed out the vital role played by church leaders in providing continuity in the leadership of opposition with so many prominent activists imprisoned.

Where there was unevenness in the treatment of factors, responses did not move beyond Level 4.

Addressing both factors

To reach the highest level, candidates need to address both factors using detailed knowledge.

Exemplar 1

1	a	
		<p>The development of ^{opposition to} Apartheid can be put down to many factors, but most notably, International opposition had a greater effect, than, for example, South African Church leaders</p>
		<p>International opposition played the greatest role in the development of opposition to apartheid between 1978-89, as previously colonised & neighbouring African countries started to instigate change, with the Africa for example Mozambique, Swaziland, and Angola all caused threats to the Apartheid system, and without ^{with} their support, for example, MK being able to have bases in Angola, opposition could develop. However, this had limited effectiveness, as these ^{countries} such as Zambia relied on South Africa for part. As well as this, ^{global} Anti-Apartheid Movements in western countries, such as the UK developed opposition very effectively. Thousands of British people demonstrated outside the of South African Embassy, as well as rallies in East London. This put extreme pressure on the government, which led to arms embargo embargo, instigating more opposition to apartheid, as the cause cause became widespread.</p>

	<p>South African Church leaders also played a significant part, although much later than international opposition opposition. Desmond Tutu is an example of this. As he was not arrested in the Treason / Riviera trial, he was able to keep opposition to Apartheid alive, while ANC members were imprisoned. Church leaders educated the black population, making them question Apartheid + white supremacy, leading to more opposition.</p>
	<p>However, it is the evident that international opposition played the greatest ^{role} part in the development of the opposition to Apartheid, as it was at a global, legal state scale, and was reinforced, for example with the UN imposing a mandatory arms embargo. While Church leaders ^{were} were only nation-wide, and therefore lacked the influence that international opposition held. However, Church leaders were still important, as they provided education and a sense of belonging to the Black population, deterring them of crime while fighting for equality.</p>

In Exemplar 1, both factors are analysed but there is unevenness. Church leaders (ii) is less developed than (i) international opposition leading to an imbalance in the response. This was a Level 4 response.

Question 1 (b)*

(b)* How effective was civil disobedience in resisting Apartheid in the period from 1970 to 1976?
[20]

Some candidates found it difficult to address this question effectively. While 'civil disobedience' in the period specified was reasonably well known, for example Steve Biko and Soweto uprising, assessing its effectiveness proved challenging.

Some candidates included knowledge of events from outside the period, such as the Rivonia Trial and the Sharpeville massacre. If used carefully, this knowledge could be made relevant, for example the legacy of the Sharpeville massacre, but when it is simply imparted or explained, with little awareness of the period identified in the question, it was less relevant and focused more on the topic.

Similarly, international opposition was mentioned in some responses as a more effective means of resisting Apartheid. When it was presented as an outcome of civil disobedience, it held greater relevance to the question. However when it was discussed as an alternative factor, it was not always effectively related to the question. Responses therefore tended to be narrow in scope (see Exemplar 2).

To reach the higher levels, candidates need to address a broader range of factors. Factors also need to be evaluated – in this case, the effectiveness of civil disobedience – to address the question properly.

Exemplar 2

1	b)	<p>Civil disobedience in resisting Apartheid was arguably effective between 1970 and 1976 due to the significant impacts of Soweto in 1976. Although a peaceful protest, the violent response of the white government to Soweto significantly led to the increased resistance. The aftermath of Soweto was strikes and boycotts nationwide, with approximately 675 deaths by the end of 1977. This shows civil disobedience to be effective in motivating resistance to Apartheid, especially contributing to significant long-term consequences which would significantly impact South Africa later on. In the years 1970 to 1976, resistance to Apartheid was arguably influenced by the Black Consciousness movement which arguably sparked an increase in youth or student activism, which significantly impacted the effectiveness of the resistance movement. Resistance in this time period was also arguably influenced by the Morogoro Conference of 1969, which established a Revolutionary Programme. Despite being held beyond the borders of South Africa, the ANC's influence over the resistance movement was still strong, and the 1970s arguably marked the beginnings of the resurgence as a more militant movement. This arguably impacted the style of resistance in South Africa, with more militant protests seeming more effective against the Apartheid government.</p> <p>On the other hand, civil disobedience in resisting apartheid was arguably ineffective between 1970 and 1976, which was arguably a low point of</p>
---	----	---

		<p>weakened level of the resistance movement. Resistance between 1970 and 1976 was arguably quite insignificant until Soweto which triggered the resurgence of the anti-apartheid movement. This could be because of the long term consequences of the Granite Response in the 1960s, where a government crackdown on the resistance movement saw the ANC and the PAC – the two major resistance organisations – banned. During the period from 1970 to 1976, the ANC was exiled beyond the borders of South Africa and therefore played a smaller role in directly combating the Apartheid government, only encouraging resistance in South Africa from a distance. The Inkatha remained the only A black South African organisation still legal in the country, however due to simpler ideology and cooperation and negotiations with the government, Inkatha didn't play a significant role in resistance. Arguably this ineffectiveness between of the resistance movement between 1970 and 1976 caused the greater significance of the resurgence of the resistance movement, characterised by the violence of the 1980s and increasing government brutality or repression.</p>
		<p>Ultimately, civil disobedience was largely ineffective in resisting Apartheid in the period from 1970 and 1976. This is because the resistance movement was fairly inactive during this period as a result of the aftermath of the Granite Response with the major resistance organisation of the ANC banned and exiled. The government faced little threat from Inkatha and the Black Consciousness movement, despite being ideologically significant but not playing an important role in the unrest and resistance. Soweto on 14th June 1976 marked the emerging effectiveness of the resistance movement, contributing to the greater significance of the resistance movement in the 1980s that significantly weakened the apartheid government. However, civil disobedience between 1970 and 1976 was therefore ineffective in resisting apartheid.</p>

This Level 3 response is narrow in scope and therefore only partially addresses the question. A view is provided in the conclusion rather than a substantiated judgement.

Question 2 (a)

- 2 (a) Which of the following had the greater impact on the development of Apartheid up to 1978?
- (i) Hendrik Verwoerd
 - (ii) John Vorster

Explain your answer with reference to both (i) and (ii).

[10]

Question 2 was more popular than Question 1. Candidates demonstrated good knowledge of the factors in the question. In some cases, this knowledge was very detailed, particularly in relation to the laws enacted during the premierships of each leader. Candidates who achieved marks in the highest level included very detailed knowledge of each factor.

The discussion in these responses was shaped by a clear perspective on which leader had the greater impact. This perspective was reflected in the final, substantiated judgement, which addressed the question effectively.

Question 2 (b)*

- (b)* 'Sport contributed more to unity in South Africa than any other factor in the period from 1989 to 1999.' How far do you agree? [20]

Candidates demonstrated a good knowledge of the factors that contributed to unity in the country during this period, beginning with sport itself. The 1995 Rugby World Cup featured prominently in many responses, as did Nelson Mandela's decision to wear the team's shirt at the final, complete with the controversial springbok badge. Many candidates recognised the symbolic significance of Mandela's decision. Some commented further by noting that while this image presented a sense of unity on the surface, underneath, the country was still divided.

Most candidates were able to complement discussion of sport with explanation of other factors, such as the activities of the Truth and Reconciliation Committee, the partnership in governance between Mandela and de Klerk, the role of Nelson Mandela himself in fostering unity, and the significance of CODESA 1 and 2. Many candidates had fairly detailed knowledge of these factors and so were able to explain them convincingly.

Responses that moved into the higher levels analysed each factor and evaluated its contribution to unity (see Exemplar 3). In addition, these responses included a substantiated judgement.

Reaching a judgement

To move into the higher levels of the mark scheme, candidates need to include a judgement focused on the key issue in the question.

Exemplar 3

2	b	<p>Sport was indeed one of the most important factors that contributed to unity towards the end of the period, however between 1989 and 1999, it was the work of Mandela and his policies that provided more unity in South Africa.</p> <p>It is This piece will consider the role of sport, Mandela and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), to conclude that it was Mandela's actions that contributed more to unity, not sport, meaning I disagree with the question.</p> <p>Firstly, sport was a significant factor in contributions to unity as it displayed South Africa as a whole to the rest of the world, thus encouraging more friendly international relations and proving to show the South African people that unity was possible. This was evident in the 1994-1995 Rugby World Cup final whereby a mixed-race multi-racial team defeated New Zealand. As this event was broadcast globally, it was clear that sport was able to provide unity and help to unite South Africa. However, it is less important than the role of Mandela as the key aspect to providing unity here was Mandela wearing the Springbok jersey which was a symbol of white supremacy before then. Hence, if it was not for Mandela wearing the jersey at the event, it might not have received as much publicity, and therefore not be as influential in providing unity.</p> <p>Therefore, it is Mandela's role in sport that made it such a successful unifying factor, meaning I disagree with the statement. Similarly, some would argue that it was only under the 1994 government of National Unity that sport was made accessible to everyone, and therefore</p>
---	---	---

providing unity; as prior to this there were sporting sanctions on South Africa. Hence, it would be wrong to argue that sport was the most contributory factor between 1989 to 1999 as it was only later in the period when sport was made accessible. Indeed, the 'vision for sport' conference in the middle of the period ~~was~~ enabled quotas of 40% of a sports team to be 'black.' However, this did not provide unity as some argued that this was insulting, and therefore divided South African sport. Therefore, sport was not the most important factor in providing unity as it relied heavily ~~of~~ on Mandela's profile, and was only truly influential towards the end of the period, meaning I disagree with the statement.

Secondly, the most important factor in ~~its~~ contributing to unity was the role of Mandela, particularly in his profile and political actions in the period. Indeed, Mandela ensured that the international community continued with sanctions until Apartheid was fully removed, ^{in turn} allowing unity as the people of South Africa could legally be united. This makes Mandela a more important factor as if it was not for his role across the whole period, unity in sport would not have been possible as segregation would have continued. Moreover, Mandela ensured that the 1994 election could go ahead, meaning the new democratic government was representative and required cooperation between all. Indeed, the new

In Exemplar 3, candidate provides detailed coverage of the named factor, 'sport'. There is a clear attempt at addressing the relative importance of the factor through evaluation, culminating in a clear judgement linked to the question. It was marked in Level 6.

Supporting you

Post-results services

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our post-results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#).

Keep up-to-date

We send a weekly roundup to tell you about important updates. You can also sign up for your subject specific updates. If you haven't already, [sign up here](#).

OCR Professional Development

Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear directly from a senior assessor or drop in to a Q&A session. Most of our courses are delivered live via an online platform, so you can attend from any location.

Please find details for all our courses on the relevant subject page on our [website](#) or visit [OCR professional development](#).

Signed up for ExamBuilder?

ExamBuilder is the question builder platform for a range of our GCSE, A Level, Cambridge Nationals and Cambridge Technicals qualifications. [Find out more](#).

ExamBuilder is **free for all OCR centres** with an Interchange account and gives you unlimited users per centre. We need an [Interchange](#) username to validate the identity of your centre's first user account for ExamBuilder.

If you do not have an Interchange account please contact your centre administrator (usually the Exams Officer) to request a username, or nominate an existing Interchange user in your department.

Active Results

Review students' exam performance with our free online results analysis tool. It is available for all GCSEs, AS and A Levels and Cambridge Nationals.

It allows you to:

- review and run analysis reports on exam performance
- analyse results at question and/or topic level
- compare your centre with OCR national averages
- identify trends across the centre
- facilitate effective planning and delivery of courses
- identify areas of the curriculum where students excel or struggle
- help pinpoint strengths and weaknesses of students and teaching departments.

[Find out more](#).

Need to get in touch?

If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our customer support centre.

Call us on
01223 553998

Alternatively, you can email us on
support@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit

 **ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder**

 **ocr.org.uk**

 **/ocrexams**

 **/ocrexams**

 **/company/ocr**

 **/ocrexams**

We really value your feedback

Click to send us an autogenerated email about this resource. Add comments if you want to. Let us know how we can improve this resource or what else you need. Your email address will not be used or shared for any marketing purposes.



I like this



I dislike this

Please note – web links are correct at date of publication but other websites may change over time. If you have any problems with a link you may want to navigate to that organisation's website for a direct search.



OCR is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2022 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA. Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

OCR operates academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers including A Levels, GCSEs, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals.

OCR provides resources to help you deliver our qualifications. These resources do not represent any particular teaching method we expect you to use. We update our resources regularly and aim to make sure content is accurate but please check the OCR website so that you have the most up to date version. OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these resources.

Though we make every effort to check our resources, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, so it is important that you always use information in the latest specification. We indicate any specification changes within the document itself, change the version number and provide a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource, please [contact us](#).

You can copy and distribute this resource freely if you keep the OCR logo and this small print intact and you acknowledge OCR as the originator of the resource.

OCR acknowledges the use of the following content: N/A

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR or are thinking about switching, you can request more information using our [Expression of Interest form](#).

Please [get in touch](#) if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support you in delivering our qualifications.