



## Cambridge Pre-U

---

**HISTORY****9769/72**

Paper 5 The Civil Rights Movement in the USA, 1954–1980

**May/June 2022**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 40

---

**Published**

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2022 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

**Generic Marking Principles**

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:**

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:**

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:**

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:**

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:**

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

## Introduction

This assessment is designed to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material.

## Generic guidance on using levels-based mark schemes

Marking of work should be positive, rewarding achievement where possible, but clearly differentiating across the whole range of marks, where appropriate.

The marker should look at the work and then make a judgement about which level statement is the best fit. In practice, work does not always match one level statement precisely so a judgement may need to be made between two or more level statements.

Once a best-fit level statement has been identified, use the following guidance to decide on a specific mark:

If the candidate's work **convincingly** meets the level statement, award the highest mark.

If the candidate's work **adequately** meets the level statement, award the most appropriate mark in the middle of the range.

If the candidate's work **just** meets the level statement, award the lowest mark.

## Assessment Objectives

### AO1

Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately.

### AO2

Showing understanding of appropriate concepts, investigate and respond to historical questions clearly and persuasively using an appropriate coherent structure to reach a substantiated and sustained judgement.

### AO3

Analyse, interpret and evaluate source material and/or interpretations of the historical events studied.

## Levels-based mark schemes

The levels-based mark schemes address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 2 and 3, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content for each question in the mark scheme.

**Levels-based mark scheme for Question 1**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Level description</b>	<b>Mark</b>
<b>3</b>	<p>Analyses both similarities and differences. Compares and contrasts the documents, integrating comments on both documents by content, theme or issue.</p> <p>Makes clear and well-supported comparisons of the content of the documents, and explores their themes and issues.</p> <p>Focuses consistently on the matter under discussion in the question.</p> <p>Analyses the extent to which the documents agree or disagree, and explains why with reference to their provenance.</p> <p>Demonstrates supported critical evaluation of both documents as historical evidence.</p>	8–10
<b>2</b>	<p>Describes the main similarities or the main differences and includes some reference to the alternative viewpoint.</p> <p>There may be some imbalance between comparison and contrast. At the lower end of the level, may treat the documents separately.</p> <p>Makes clear and supported comparisons of content, themes and issues.</p> <p>Deals largely with the matter under discussion, but use of the documents in relation to the question may be uneven.</p> <p>Some analysis of how far the documents agree or disagree. At the higher end of the level, there may be some explanation of why they might agree or differ, though the consideration of provenance will not be well developed.</p> <p>At the higher end of the level, demonstrates some critical evaluation of the documents as historical evidence.</p>	4–7
<b>1</b>	<p>Refers to some differences or similarities. May be uneven, for example, differences may be covered but not similarities or vice versa.</p> <p>Makes some comparison or contrast of content, themes or issues, but may be largely description or paraphrase. Likely to treat the documents separately.</p> <p>Makes reference to the wider topic but with limited focus on the specific matter under discussion in the question.</p> <p>Limited analysis of the extent to which the documents agree or disagree, though this may be implicit or asserted. Limited reference to provenance of the documents.</p> <p>At the lower end of the level, there may be simply description or paraphrase of the documents.</p>	1–3
<b>0</b>	No creditable response	0

**Levels-based mark scheme for Question 2**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Analyse and interpret (AO3) 10 marks</b>	<b>Critically evaluate (AO3) and judgement in response to the question (AO2) 20 marks</b>
<b>5</b>	9–10 marks Full analysis of all the documents as a set, interpreting them in relation to the question.	17–20 marks Well-sustained critical evaluation of evidence from the documents. Critical evaluation is well explained and supported throughout. Has a precise focus on the question. Coherent and developed judgement on the interpretation in the question, based on clear and persuasive evidence from the documents in their historical context.
<b>4</b>	7–8 marks Analyses all the documents, interpreting them in relation to the question, but some unevenness in depth or coverage of the documents.	13–16 marks Generally sustains a critical evaluation of evidence from the documents. Critical evaluation is mostly well explained and supported throughout. Has a broad focus on the question. Coherent judgement on the interpretation in the question, based on evidence from the documents in their historical context which is mostly clear and persuasive, but unevenly developed.
<b>3</b>	5–6 marks Some analysis of all the documents, with some interpretation of them in relation to the question. Uneven in depth of coverage of the documents with some omissions, description or irrelevance.	9–12 marks Some critical evaluation of evidence from the documents, but unevenly supported and explained. Generally coherent and contains some argument applicable to the question. Undeveloped judgement based predominantly on evidence from the documents which is occasionally clear and persuasive.
<b>2</b>	3–4 marks Limited analysis of the documents, with little interpretation of them in relation to the question. The depth of coverage of the documents will be very uneven, with significant omissions or evidence of misinterpretation of some documents, and with much description or irrelevance.	5–8 marks Limited critical evaluation of the evidence from the documents. Generalised critical comments with limited support and uneven explanations. Generally coherent and introduces argument which is mostly relevant to the topic. Attempts a judgement but offers limited supporting evidence from the documents.
<b>1</b>	1–2 marks Describes or paraphrases the documents. Little or no analysis and there may be major omissions of documents and very limited reference to the question. Answers reveal serious misinterpretation of the documents.	1–4 marks Little critical evaluation of evidence from the documents. Has some coherence. Few parts of the response are relevant. It responds to some of the issues raised by the topic. No judgement beyond simple and unsupported assertions or relies on description of the documents.

<b>Level</b>	<b>Analyse and interpret (AO3) 10 marks</b>	<b>Critically evaluate (AO3) and judgement in response to the question (AO2) 20 marks</b>
<b>0</b>	0 marks No creditable response	0 marks No creditable response

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p><b>Compare and contrast the evidence in Documents A and B about the appeal of Malcolm X. You should analyse both the content and provenance of both documents.</b></p> <p>Similarities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both Documents A and B agree that Malcolm X was an inspiration. Document A states he was ‘a hero’ and the author of Document B admits that, as a youth, Malcolm X ‘appealed to me’.</li> <li>• Both Documents A and B confirm that Malcolm X put the poor as his priority. In Document A, he is said to have spent much of his time in ‘the poverty-ridden’ streets of Harlem and in Document B it is claimed ‘Malcolm spoke with uncompromising passion about the poor’.</li> <li>• Both Documents A and B agree that Malcolm X’s leadership was more authentic than others in the Civil Rights Movement. The implication of the phrase ‘so-called black leaders’, in Document A, is that those who were prominent in the Civil Rights Movement were not worthy of respect, and their tendency to speak of ‘black masses statistics’ showed they were remote from those they led. In Document B, Malcolm X is considered to be more in tune with ‘African American culture than many other civil rights leaders’.</li> </ul> <p>Differences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document A emphasises Malcolm X’s friendliness [meeting all with a ‘boyish grin’, ‘conversation’ and being ‘quiet and pleasant’]. In contrast, Document B stresses ‘his considerable skills’, especially his ‘passionate oratory’.</li> <li>• In Document A, the picture is of Malcolm X as a local figure. He was ‘most at ease among members of our own race’ doing ‘what he called ‘my daily rounds’, and ‘avoided the arterial 125th Street in Harlem’ and, instead, ‘he plied the side streets’. Document B presents him as a national figure representing African American culture and calling out ‘racism when and where he found it’.</li> <li>• Document B regards Malcolm X as a prophet who foresaw the riots of 1967 which were in line with his ‘warnings about the desperate state of urban America’. Document A, however, shows Malcolm X as immersed in the immediate problems of those on the street, especially those ‘in the gutter’.</li> </ul> <p>Provenance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neither Document A nor Document B offers any criticism of Malcolm X. The authors of Documents A and B are both sympathetic to him. Haley helped him write his autobiography and, from the text, it is clear he spent time with him in Harlem and came to admire him. Dyson admits to sharing Malcolm X’s aim to ‘reclaim the dignity of black identity’.</li> </ul>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The perspective of each author helps explain the difference between them. Document A was written immediately after Malcolm X's death when his loss would feel acute and without the scope to judge the long-term significance of Malcolm X. Written 30 years after Malcolm X's death, Document B is more reflective.</li><li>• Document A is more personal and intimate and written in a journalistic style whereas Document B is more academic, the contrast in line with the professions of the two authors.</li></ul>	



Question	Answer	Marks						
2	<p><b>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that non-violent protest was effective in promoting civil rights? In evaluating the documents, you should refer to all the documents in this set (C–F).</b></p> <p>Main Issue:</p> <p>Was non-violent protest effective in improving the rights for African Americans? Non-violent protest did promote the rights of African Americans in terms of arousing interest in and support for civil rights for African Americans and practical changes. However, many were apathetic to non-violent protest and others, especially whites, were resistant to it and it only served to reinforce existing hostility.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="316 719 1313 1720"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="316 719 815 819">Analysis of interpretation in documents (AO3)</th> <th data-bbox="815 719 1313 819">Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 819 815 1218"> <p>Document C supports the view that non-violence promoted the aims of the Civil Rights Movement. The sit-ins worked. They encouraged individuals, especially students, to engage and the desegregation of the lunch counters was achieved in more than 150 cities. This implies a change in the attitude of many whites who accepted the end of segregated lunch counters.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="815 819 1313 1218"> <p>Document C was the view of a pioneer of the sit-in movement so it could be argued that he was bound to claim the effectiveness of non-violent protest. However, the fact that desegregation of lunch counters was widespread confirms the claims made by the author and the student leader quoted in the document.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 1218 815 1720"> <p>Document D suggests non-violent protest was effective if only in some places. Despite setbacks in Albany in 1962, 'a tremendous change had taken place in the thinking of Albany's African Americans'. It is also claimed that 'cracks have appeared in the social structure' in towns like Atlanta. However, the document claims that other parts of the South are 'impermeable by the ordinary activities of non-violent direct action'.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="815 1218 1313 1720"> <p>Document D might be considered to be balanced as it recognises the limits to non-violent protest as a way to promote the aims of the Civil Right Movement, as the title of the essay makes clear. The author had lived in Georgia for eight years, so he witnessed events in Atlanta and Albany. As an academic, his approach is analytical. Also, attitudes in the Deep South were entrenched and non-violent protest had little effect; cross reference to Document E might be made.</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Analysis of interpretation in documents (AO3)	Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)	<p>Document C supports the view that non-violence promoted the aims of the Civil Rights Movement. The sit-ins worked. They encouraged individuals, especially students, to engage and the desegregation of the lunch counters was achieved in more than 150 cities. This implies a change in the attitude of many whites who accepted the end of segregated lunch counters.</p>	<p>Document C was the view of a pioneer of the sit-in movement so it could be argued that he was bound to claim the effectiveness of non-violent protest. However, the fact that desegregation of lunch counters was widespread confirms the claims made by the author and the student leader quoted in the document.</p>	<p>Document D suggests non-violent protest was effective if only in some places. Despite setbacks in Albany in 1962, 'a tremendous change had taken place in the thinking of Albany's African Americans'. It is also claimed that 'cracks have appeared in the social structure' in towns like Atlanta. However, the document claims that other parts of the South are 'impermeable by the ordinary activities of non-violent direct action'.</p>	<p>Document D might be considered to be balanced as it recognises the limits to non-violent protest as a way to promote the aims of the Civil Right Movement, as the title of the essay makes clear. The author had lived in Georgia for eight years, so he witnessed events in Atlanta and Albany. As an academic, his approach is analytical. Also, attitudes in the Deep South were entrenched and non-violent protest had little effect; cross reference to Document E might be made.</p>	30
Analysis of interpretation in documents (AO3)	Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)							
<p>Document C supports the view that non-violence promoted the aims of the Civil Rights Movement. The sit-ins worked. They encouraged individuals, especially students, to engage and the desegregation of the lunch counters was achieved in more than 150 cities. This implies a change in the attitude of many whites who accepted the end of segregated lunch counters.</p>	<p>Document C was the view of a pioneer of the sit-in movement so it could be argued that he was bound to claim the effectiveness of non-violent protest. However, the fact that desegregation of lunch counters was widespread confirms the claims made by the author and the student leader quoted in the document.</p>							
<p>Document D suggests non-violent protest was effective if only in some places. Despite setbacks in Albany in 1962, 'a tremendous change had taken place in the thinking of Albany's African Americans'. It is also claimed that 'cracks have appeared in the social structure' in towns like Atlanta. However, the document claims that other parts of the South are 'impermeable by the ordinary activities of non-violent direct action'.</p>	<p>Document D might be considered to be balanced as it recognises the limits to non-violent protest as a way to promote the aims of the Civil Right Movement, as the title of the essay makes clear. The author had lived in Georgia for eight years, so he witnessed events in Atlanta and Albany. As an academic, his approach is analytical. Also, attitudes in the Deep South were entrenched and non-violent protest had little effect; cross reference to Document E might be made.</p>							

Question	Answer		Marks
2	Analysis of interpretation in documents (AO3)	Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)	
	Document E suggests that non-violence was a ‘necessary tactic’ but was ineffective. She claims non-violence ‘does NOT represent the Movement’. In quoting Carmichael, it might be argued that non-violent protest ‘used to work’, a few years earlier, but by 1964 that the North is ‘tired of demonstrations’ and ‘a backlash has emerged’. However, she does not advocate violence.	It might be argued that Document E represents the views of only one activist. However sincere she may have been, her claims that her views ‘are common’ are not corroborated here. Nonetheless, her comments about self-defence ring true as her letter was written just one month after the killing of three civil rights activists, from the North, in Mississippi.	
	Document F supports the view that non-violent protest was effective in promoting the aims of the Civil Rights Movement. M.L. King argues that African Americans had little choice but to demonstrate (‘our most precious right’) as they didn’t have ‘much money or education’ and no political power. Further, he claims that by marching they have come a ‘long way’. However, Document F also indicates the reverse was also true as it refers to the exasperation of the Chicago Tribune, which represented much of the white population, with demonstrations.	(Document F) As M.L. King was the leader of the SLCC who had been advocating non-violence, and been imprisoned for doing so, for over a decade, it is not surprising that he would defend the strategy. Further, it might be argued that non-violence had promoted the aims of the Civil Rights Movement in terms of the success of the sit-ins (reference to Document A), the support of moderate, liberal, opinion and the legislation of 1964 and 1965. However, in Chicago in 1966, marches by the Chicago Freedom Movement generated white violence (cross reference to Document D might be made).	
Possible Judgements (AO2):			
It could be argued that the evidence supports the view that non-violent protest promoted the aims of the Civil Right Movement. This was effective in desegregating lunch counters, raising awareness of and encouraging support for the Civil Rights Movement amongst African Americans and whites. It might be argued that non-violence was more effective in the years to the early 1960s perhaps most strikingly demonstrated in the March on Washington in 1963. Further, the reforms of Johnson’s administration, referred to implicitly in Document F, suggest non-violence was effective in promoting the aims of the Civil Rights Movement.			

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>However, it could be argued that the evidence supports the view that non-violent protest was ineffective in promoting the aims of the Civil Rights Movement. It might be claimed that it made no impression in the Deep South, in states like Mississippi. Non-violence might also be said to have strengthened the opposition of whites in the North as well as the South. Indeed, it appears that demonstrations merely encouraged more violence from whites (Documents E and F). It might be argued that non-violence had frustrated many African Americans who were prepared to consider alternative strategies advocated by the radicals of the mid 1960s, which this set of documents does not really address.</p>	