

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Pre-U Certificate

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2010 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

9769 HISTORY

9769/75 Paper 75 (Special Subject – The Civil Rights Movement in the USA, 1954–1980), maximum raw mark 60

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 must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- CIE will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2010 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	75

Special Subjects: Document Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

This question is designed largely to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.

Examiners should be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.

The Band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result not all answers fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.

In marking an answer examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Question (a)

Band 1: 8–10

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Band 2: 4–7

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the thrust of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the Band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the Band.

Band 3: 0–3

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	75

Question (b)

Band 1: 16–20

The answer will treat the documents as a set and will make very effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It will be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material will be handled confidently with strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge will be demonstrated. The material deployed will be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument will be well structured. Historical concepts and vocabulary will be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. English will be fluent, clear and virtually error-free.

Band 2: 11–15

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may well be absent at the lower end of the Band. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary and will be expressed in clear, accurate English.

Band 3: 6–10

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected, or especially at the lower end of the Band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may well be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places. Analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated. Although use of English should be generally clear there may well be some errors.

Band 4: 0–5

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely whilst understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may well be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished. English will lack real clarity and fluency and there will be errors.

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	75

Special Subject Essays

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and must be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners should give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may well yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 2 mark.
- (e) The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Band 1: 25–30

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this Band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this Band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	75

Band 2: 19–24

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this Band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Band 3: 13–18

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Use of relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

Band 4: 7–12

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may well be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear although lacking in real fluency.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	75

Band 5: 0–6

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	75

- 1 (a) How far, and why, do documents A and C differ in their analysis of the political situation for African Americans within the United States in the 1950s and 1960s? [10]**

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be focused upon the two aspects of the question. It may be that in explaining 'how far' the documents differ, some mention of similarities or areas of possible agreement will be helpful. The ability to place the documents in context will distinguish stronger answers, particularly when dealing with the second part of the question. In terms of differences, it is clear that both documents differ sharply in their attitudes to America. In Document A King stresses the 'glory of our democracy' because it enshrines the 'right to protest'. In Document C, however, Malcolm X depicts American society as an oppressive system which has made him a 'victim'. His use of the phrase 'American nightmare' might be usefully contrasted to Dr King's 'I have a dream' speech which occurred the year before Malcolm X spoke in Cleveland. There is also a significant difference in their attitude to non-violence. King's commitment to the 'teachings of Jesus' and his clear rejection of the methods of the KKK at the end of the Document illustrate his belief in peaceful methods; background knowledge can substantiate this point. Malcolm X's speech, by contrast, advocates meeting force with force, although it does envisage the possibility of a non-violent approach, a point which might be used to show that the degree of difference between the two men might not be as great as often assumed: it can even be argued that King exaggerated his respect for American democracy and compared it favourably to 'Communist' systems for tactical reasons. In exploring why the documents differ, background knowledge will be very helpful. It might be argued that by 1964, despite President Johnson's rhetoric, a degree of frustration was setting in and that this explains Malcolm X's more aggressive stance. It must also be made clear that the two men were greatly influenced by different religious outlooks. The two men had other significant reasons to see America differently: their respective class backgrounds might be explored and their roots in different parts of America. King was from the more rural south whilst Malcolm X had his support base in the industrial cities of the north. Also, both men had different aims: King was, in 1955, focused upon acquiring basic civil rights; Malcolm X had a broader set of aims such as awakening 'black pride' and confronting racist attitudes in American society.

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	75

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents that Martin Luther King was not the most important influence upon the movement for greater African American rights? [20]**

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each, although some will need more attention than others. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated and critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is also to be expected. Most of these documents can be used to argue that the view that Dr King was not the most important influence is quite convincing. Document B can be used to stress the importance of the Presidency and background knowledge might help strong candidates mention the crucial role of President Johnson as well. Document C also shows that other black leaders, such as Malcolm X, offered a very different sort of leadership which led eventually to the Black Power movement. Document D can also be used to show that Dr King was not dominant as it shows how grass roots activism was spontaneous and not directed by King. Even Document E seems to show that King was dependent upon the advice of others and part of a team rather than above the team. However, the documents can also be used, to some extent, to show King as a very powerful leader. The skill and strength of his oratory is evident in Document A. Document E is clearly extremely useful in substantiating the view that King certainly came to dominate the Montgomery Boycott. Also, it might be argued that Kennedy's intervention shown in Document B was prompted by King's strategies in Birmingham. Malcolm X in Document C may be rejecting King's approach but it is also clear that much of what he is saying is in direct response to King. Background knowledge might be used to argue that King was more influential than Malcolm X, although this is debateable. The grass roots activism of the sit-ins, shown in Document D, might also be said to have been inspired by King's non-violent methodology. All sorts of conclusions are possible but the stronger candidates will focus sharply on the precise words in the question in order to shape their final judgement.

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	75

2 How important was the Supreme Court in bringing about the success of the Civil Rights movement? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Good answers will show an awareness of key Supreme Court decisions, particularly *Brown v. The Board of Education, Topeka, Kansas* in 1954. The limitations of the Supreme Court will also have to be explored. The slow pace of school desegregation after 1954 would be a good example of the relative weakness of the Court but there will be other ways to make the point. Knowledge of cases other than *Brown* would distinguish a strong candidate. Strong answers will make reference to other factors, such as presidential interventions and the role of the various Civil Rights organisations and individuals. These factors should be measured against the significance of the Supreme Court as part of the final judgement.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered judgement. Attempts to deal with the historiography and with differing interpretations, although not required, may enhance responses. The legal doctrine of 'separate but equal' will need to be explained and also the idea of States' Rights, which was used to justify opposition to Court rulings and slow implementation of decisions. Knowledge of the American constitution and how power is divided between competing elements could also distinguish stronger answers.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects.]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show both a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problem in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 10	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	75

- 3 'The decisive breakthroughs in the struggle for Civil Rights occurred in the 1950s rather than the 1960s.' How far do you agree with this judgement? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. The case for the 1950s will require attention to events such as the Supreme Court ruling in *Brown v the Board of Education*, the Montgomery Bus Boycott, the Little Rock Nine and so forth. The case for the 1960s will entail analysis of the significance of sit-ins, the Freedom Riders, and the events in Birmingham and Selma. President Kennedy might be usefully contrasted with Eisenhower. It is important that some attention be given to the term 'decisive'. This should lead stronger candidates to compare the relative significance of the various important events. Credit should be given to candidates who argue that both decades saw important breakthroughs but there ought to be a clear, final judgement.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered judgement. Attempts to deal with the historiography and with differing interpretations, although not required, may enhance responses. What constitutes a breakthrough will have to be assessed. Strong candidates will see that there were various different types of critical moments, ranging from Supreme Court rulings and presidential interventions to spontaneous sit-ins and demonstrations. High level answers will be aware that there was usually pressure 'from below' before there were concessions 'from above'.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects.]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show both a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problem in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	75

4 How accurate is the view that President Kennedy was, at best, a reluctant reformer in the field of Civil Rights. [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. In order to argue that Kennedy was more than a reluctant reformer it will be necessary to demonstrate knowledge of his appointments, his creation of the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, and his response to the situation in Birmingham in 1963, which prompted him to begin the process of drafting Civil Rights legislation. The political risk involved in doing this – given the possibility that white voters in the South might turn against the Democratic Party – should also be taken into account. However, it is also true that in his earlier career he had not shown great enthusiasm for Civil Rights and even after his election he did not initiate major changes until, arguably, the crisis in Birmingham forced his hand. Even his support for Dr King, voiced during the 1960 election, can be seen as a tactical ploy in order to win the African American vote. Although cases can be made for both sides of the argument, stronger candidates will arrive at a clear and well argued judgement.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered judgement. Attempts to deal with the historiography and with differing interpretations, although not required, may enhance responses. Strong answers will demonstrate an awareness of the delicacy of Kennedy's position, given the narrowness of his win in 1960. The nature of Kennedy's Liberalism might be explored and this could allow reference to the 'myth' of Kennedy which might be said to obscure the reality of his presidency.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects.]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show both a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problem in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.