



# Cambridge Pre-U

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/72**

Paper 5k Special Subject: The Civil Rights Movement in the USA, 1954–1968 **For examination from 2022**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 40

---

**Specimen**

---

This syllabus is regulated for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

This document has **8** pages. Blank pages are indicated.

**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>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 role of the federal authorities in helping to improve conditions for African Americans. You should analyse the content and provenance of both documents.</b></p> <p>Similarities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both Documents A and B are calling for some form of ‘affirmative action’, although neither uses that term.</li> <li>• Document A states that the federal government has already taken important steps [in employing without regard to race]. Document B agrees [‘federal action, however commendable’], but it ‘is too little and may well be too late’.</li> <li>• Both documents agree that discrimination exists, that it is wrong and that there should be equality.</li> <li>• Both documents agree that unless change is made, civil unrest is likely (Document A – ‘their only remedy is in the street’; Document B – ‘violence could erupt at any moment’) and, therefore, action by as many bodies as possible is essential.</li> </ul> <p>Differences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document A argues that action by the federal judiciary and Congress on a variety of fronts can resolve the problem. Document B argues that the input of the whole community (unions, public and private businesses, government agencies, etc.) is required.</li> <li>• Document B is very clear that the speaker is not asking for special treatment for the black community. Document A implies this in the first sentence but it is not explicit.</li> </ul> <p>Provenance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Affirmative action’ was a relatively new idea so it is not surprising that President Kennedy wanted to explore the practicalities of its implementation by the federal authorities. However, Young’s personal experiences of life in the cities where the problems facing African Americans were most acute help to explain his reservations about the effectiveness of federal authorities.</li> <li>• President Kennedy was speaking on national television, intent on convincing people that federal authorities could make a difference, hence his reference to the Supreme Court decision (of 1954) to end segregation in education. As such, the tone of his remarks is optimistic. However, Young was speaking after a summer of protest, including the March on Washington, and his comments reflect the frustrations of the African American population. This helps explain his more pessimistic view of the role of federal authorities.</li> <li>• Document B represents the views of the leader of the NUL so it is not surprising that his aims were more ambitious (calling for a ‘domestic Marshall Plan’) than those expressed in Document A, given the political constraints on President Kennedy.</li> <li>• Concerns about a white backlash against reform help explain the insistence of both authors that they do not want to treat African Americans more favourably.</li> </ul>	10

Question	Answer	Marks								
2	<p><b>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that direct action was dependent on the leadership of Civil Rights organisations? In evaluating the documents, you should refer to all the documents in this set (C–F).</b></p> <p>Main issue:</p> <p>Was direct action dependent on those leading Civil Rights organisations? Certain leaders played a central role in planning direct action and mobilising support for it. This was the case with the leaders of the Congress of Racial Equality (the CORE), the Southern Christian Leadership Council (the SCLC), the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People (the NAACP) and other organisations. However, some examples of direct action were the initiative of individual activists and lacked planning.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 757 1326 2063"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 757 818 842">Analysis of interpretation in documents (AO3)</th> <th data-bbox="818 757 1326 842">Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 842 818 1167">Document C supports the view that direct action was dependent on the leadership of organisations. Rosa Parks may have initiated the bus protest, but Document C claims that the Montgomery Improvement Association (MIA) was necessary in order to sustain the action and provide a strategy.</td> <td data-bbox="818 842 1326 1167">Document C was the view of Martin Luther King, who headed the MIA, and it could be argued that he was bound to justify his intervention. Nonetheless, it is probable that the boycott would have been difficult to prolong over many months and with the solid support it enjoyed without the leadership of the MIA.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1167 818 1603">Document D suggests that direct action owed little to the leadership of Civil Rights organisations. Elizabeth Eckford walked to school on her own initiative without an escort. However, the President of the NAACP in Arkansas tried to work with the police and parents to ensure the safety of the nine children.</td> <td data-bbox="818 1167 1326 1603">Document D's testimony from Daisy Bates might be considered reliable given her admission of error or incompetence in not reaching Elizabeth Eckford before she set out to walk to school. Further, the NAACP had played a key role in the 1954 Supreme Court judgement on the desegregation of education and it is unsurprising that they tried to act at Little Rock to secure this judgement.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1603 818 2063">Document E emphasises the role of just four local students who took the initiative to act. At no point was the leadership of any Civil Rights organisation involved. Indeed, the students were unsure about how best to conduct themselves. The publicity given to the sit-in by the media is emphasised as an explanation for the spread of the movement.</td> <td data-bbox="818 1603 1326 2063">Document E was the testimony of one of the four students without any specific affiliation to a Civil Rights organisation. Thirty years after the event, the Civil Rights movement had secured many advances including desegregation of lunch counters, and not just as a result of the action in Greensboro, so the modesty of this testimony might be regarded as appropriate. The power of the press and TV was considerable.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Analysis of interpretation in documents (AO3)	Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)	Document C supports the view that direct action was dependent on the leadership of organisations. Rosa Parks may have initiated the bus protest, but Document C claims that the Montgomery Improvement Association (MIA) was necessary in order to sustain the action and provide a strategy.	Document C was the view of Martin Luther King, who headed the MIA, and it could be argued that he was bound to justify his intervention. Nonetheless, it is probable that the boycott would have been difficult to prolong over many months and with the solid support it enjoyed without the leadership of the MIA.	Document D suggests that direct action owed little to the leadership of Civil Rights organisations. Elizabeth Eckford walked to school on her own initiative without an escort. However, the President of the NAACP in Arkansas tried to work with the police and parents to ensure the safety of the nine children.	Document D's testimony from Daisy Bates might be considered reliable given her admission of error or incompetence in not reaching Elizabeth Eckford before she set out to walk to school. Further, the NAACP had played a key role in the 1954 Supreme Court judgement on the desegregation of education and it is unsurprising that they tried to act at Little Rock to secure this judgement.	Document E emphasises the role of just four local students who took the initiative to act. At no point was the leadership of any Civil Rights organisation involved. Indeed, the students were unsure about how best to conduct themselves. The publicity given to the sit-in by the media is emphasised as an explanation for the spread of the movement.	Document E was the testimony of one of the four students without any specific affiliation to a Civil Rights organisation. Thirty years after the event, the Civil Rights movement had secured many advances including desegregation of lunch counters, and not just as a result of the action in Greensboro, so the modesty of this testimony might be regarded as appropriate. The power of the press and TV was considerable.	30
Analysis of interpretation in documents (AO3)	Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)									
Document C supports the view that direct action was dependent on the leadership of organisations. Rosa Parks may have initiated the bus protest, but Document C claims that the Montgomery Improvement Association (MIA) was necessary in order to sustain the action and provide a strategy.	Document C was the view of Martin Luther King, who headed the MIA, and it could be argued that he was bound to justify his intervention. Nonetheless, it is probable that the boycott would have been difficult to prolong over many months and with the solid support it enjoyed without the leadership of the MIA.									
Document D suggests that direct action owed little to the leadership of Civil Rights organisations. Elizabeth Eckford walked to school on her own initiative without an escort. However, the President of the NAACP in Arkansas tried to work with the police and parents to ensure the safety of the nine children.	Document D's testimony from Daisy Bates might be considered reliable given her admission of error or incompetence in not reaching Elizabeth Eckford before she set out to walk to school. Further, the NAACP had played a key role in the 1954 Supreme Court judgement on the desegregation of education and it is unsurprising that they tried to act at Little Rock to secure this judgement.									
Document E emphasises the role of just four local students who took the initiative to act. At no point was the leadership of any Civil Rights organisation involved. Indeed, the students were unsure about how best to conduct themselves. The publicity given to the sit-in by the media is emphasised as an explanation for the spread of the movement.	Document E was the testimony of one of the four students without any specific affiliation to a Civil Rights organisation. Thirty years after the event, the Civil Rights movement had secured many advances including desegregation of lunch counters, and not just as a result of the action in Greensboro, so the modesty of this testimony might be regarded as appropriate. The power of the press and TV was considerable.									

Question	Answer		Marks
2	Analysis of interpretation in documents (AO3)	Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)	
	Document F describes the response of an African American to a Freedom Ride. William Mahoney confirms that the CORE organised the event and that the SCLC was involved in taking those attacked at Montgomery to safety. On both counts, it appears that direct action was dependent on the leadership of Civil Rights organisations.	Document F presents a matter-of-fact account of the experience of the Freedom Ride. The description of a bus in flames at Anniston, the attack on a student and the tension at Montgomery station is accurate. In fact, the testimony understates the violence. Document F implies the role of the SCLC was crucial in saving lives.	
	<p>Possible judgements (AO2):</p> <p>It could be argued that the evidence supports the view that direct action was dependent on the leadership of Civil Rights organisations. Without the MIA the bus boycott would have been difficult to sustain. Although the NAACP may be criticised for not acting quickly enough in Little Rock, its involvement in events there, and the desegregation of education more widely, were important. Without the CORE it is unlikely there would have been a Freedom Ride and the SCLC provided essential support to those involved.</p> <p>However, it could be argued that the evidence supports the view that direct action was not dependent on the leadership of Civil Rights organisations. The evidence provides many examples of individuals acting alone or with a few friends independent of the leadership of Civil Rights organisations. Indeed, without Rosa Parks there would not have been the MIA, and the four students in Greensboro sparked more widespread support among other students both in the South and the North.</p>		