



Cambridge IGCSE™ (9–1)

HISTORY

0977/22

Paper 2

May/June 2022

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 50

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.

This document consists of **10** printed pages.

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.

Question	Answer	Marks
19th Century topic		
1	<p data-bbox="304 315 1286 378">Study Sources A and B. How far do these two sources agree? Explain your answer using details of the sources.</p> <p data-bbox="304 416 1326 512">Level 5 Compares big messages – A is generally positive about the Ku Klux Klan (KKK) while B is negative about the KKK. Must be supported, if not treat it as a disagreement of detail. 7</p> <p data-bbox="304 551 1326 582">Level 4 Agreement and disagreement of detail or sub-messages 6</p> <p data-bbox="304 620 1326 651">Level 3 Agreement or disagreement of detail or sub-messages 3–5</p> <p data-bbox="304 689 600 721">Agreements include:</p> <p data-bbox="304 759 1222 918">The KKK was mysterious People at the time thought it protected people There was concern at the time about the lawlessness of former slaves There was disorder The KKK was powerful.</p> <p data-bbox="304 956 639 987">Disagreements include:</p> <p data-bbox="304 1025 963 1088">A says it was organised, B says it was not A says it was doing good, B says it was doing evil.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1126 1326 1223">Level 2 Identifies information that is in one source but not in the other or states that the sources are about the same subject OR Compares the provenance of the sources 2</p> <p data-bbox="304 1261 1326 1292">Level 1 Writes about the sources but makes no valid comparison 1</p> <p data-bbox="304 1330 1326 1393">Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question 0</p>	7

Question	Answer	Marks
2	Study Source C. How useful is this source to a historian studying this period? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge.	7
	Level 6 Useful as evidence that there were people critical of the KKK	7
	Level 5 Useful because it is accurate – supported by contextual knowledge or cross-reference	6
	Level 4 Informed interpretation of what is in the cartoon (sub-messages) but not getting to big message of L6 e.g. the KKK was operating at the time, black Americans were being lynched.	4–5
	Level 3 Informed rejection OR It is useful because it is biased	3
	Level 2 Valid interpretation of cartoon but does not address usefulness	2
	Level 1 Answers based on misinterpretations of cartoon OR Answers based on provenance	1
	Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question	0

Question	Answer	Marks
3	Study Source D. Are you surprised by Source D? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge.	8
	Level 7 Not surprised because it is early days of Reconstruction when action was taken against the KKK	8
	Level 6 Uses contextual knowledge or cross-reference to explain why surprised because it is issued by a Southern legislature	7
	Level 5 Uses other sources or contextual knowledge to explain why not surprised by content	5–6
	Level 4 Uses other sources or contextual knowledge to explain why surprised by content	4
	Level 3 Everyday day empathy answers OR Valid analysis of the source but fails to state if surprised or not surprised	3
	Level 2 Identifies what is/is not surprising but no valid explanation	2
	Level 1 Writes about the source but does not address the question	1
	Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question	0

Question	Answer	Marks
4	Study Sources E and F. How far does Source F make you doubt the account in Source E? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge.	8
	Level 6 Compares the sources and evaluates one of them	7–8
	Level 5 Evaluates E but no valid use of F	6
	Level 4 Answers based on disagreements	4–5
	Level 3 Answers based on agreements	3
	Level 2 Answers based on undeveloped provenance OR Different places OR Compares sources but does not address doubt OR Identifies what they doubt but no explanation	2
	Level 1 Writes about the sources but does not address the question	1
	Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question	0

Question	Answer	Marks
5	Study Source G. Why do you think Forrest denied saying what was reported in Source G? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge.	8
	Level 6 Uses context to explain difference over time – the tide has turned against the KKK	7–8
	Level 5 He has to be careful what he says because of possible consequences for KKK of the hearings	6
	Level 4 Because he does not want himself or the KKK to be seen as guilty of the unpleasant things described in G (everyday empathy)	4–5
	Level 3 Answers based on undeveloped provenance – less careful in interview than with hearings in Washington	3
	Level 2 Identifies parts of Source G which he might want to deny – no explanation	2
	Level 1 Unsupported assertions	1
	Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question	0

Question	Answer	Marks
6	<p>Study all the sources. How far do these sources provide convincing evidence that people supported the Ku Klux Klan? Use the sources to explain your answer.</p> <p>Award up to 2 bonus marks for evaluation of sources (no more than 1 per source).</p> <p>Source use must be reference to a source by letter, by provenance or by direct quote. There must be examples from source content. There must be an explanation of how this supports/does not support the statement.</p> <p>Use a ✓ in the margin for each source use in support of the statement and a x for each source use rejecting the statement.</p> <p>Agree (✓): A, B, C, D, E, F, G</p> <p>Disagree (x): B, C, D, F, G</p> <p>Level 3 Uses sources to support and reject the statement 7–10</p> <p>Level 2 Uses sources to support or reject the statement 4–6</p> <p>Level 1 No valid source use 1–3</p> <p>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question 0</p>	12

Question	Answer	Marks
20th Century topic		
1	<p data-bbox="304 315 1286 378">Study Sources A and B. How far do these two sources agree? Explain your answer using details of the sources.</p> <p data-bbox="304 416 1326 512">Level 5 Compares big messages – A says Soviets did not want to intervene and Jaruzelski wanted them to, while B says Soviets planned to intervene and Jaruzelski did not want them to. Note: This must be shown as one statement.</p> <p data-bbox="1305 517 1326 546" style="text-align: right;">7</p> <p data-bbox="304 584 1326 613">Level 4 Agreement and disagreement of detail or sub-messages 5–6</p> <p data-bbox="304 651 1326 680">Level 3 Agreement or disagreement of detail or sub-messages 3–4</p> <p data-bbox="304 719 600 748">Agreements include:</p> <p data-bbox="304 786 1326 1016">Jaruzelski was expected to deal with protests more forcefully Kania was replaced OR J. replaced Kania Jaruzelski introduced martial law OR martial law introduced (on 13 December) Jaruzelski says martial law was introduced to prevent Soviet intervention There was a Warsaw Pact meeting (on 4 December) Jaruzelski claims he did not invite Soviets in OR he did not want Soviet intervention.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1055 639 1084">Disagreements include:</p> <p data-bbox="304 1122 1305 1458">A says no preparations for military intervention, B says there were some (but they were under cover/called off) A says Jaruzelski demanded military support from USSR to support martial law, B says he wanted only moral backing A says Jaruzelski wanted military intervention to support martial law, B says he introduced martial law to stop an intervention A says Jaruzelski abandoned by Warsaw Pact, B says he had its support In A Jaruzelski replaces Kania because he was overheard criticising Soviets, in B to deal with protests In A Jaruzelski wanted Soviet intervention, in B he did not.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1496 1326 1592">Level 2 Identifies information that is in one source but not in the other OR States that the sources are about the same subject OR Compares the provenance of the sources 2</p> <p data-bbox="304 1630 1326 1659">Level 1 Writes about the sources but makes no valid comparison 1</p> <p data-bbox="304 1697 1326 1760">Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question 0</p>	7

Question	Answer	Marks
2	Study Sources C and D. How far would these two cartoonists have agreed? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge.	8
	Level 6 Compares points of view of cartoonists	8
	Level 5 Compares big messages	6–7
	Level 4 Compares sub-messages OR Valid interpretation of big messages of one or both cartoons but no valid comparison OR Asserts both cartoons critical of Soviets or both support Solidarity	4–5
	Level 3 Valid interpretation of sub-messages of one or both cartoons but no valid comparison	3
	Level 2 Answers based on undeveloped use of provenance OR Answers based on comparison of surface detail/misinterpretations e.g. Soviets control Solidarity.	2
	Level 1 Writes about cartoons without addressing the question	1
	Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question	0

Question	Answer	Marks
3	Study Sources E and F. Does Source F prove that Andropov was lying in Source E? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge.	8
	Level 7 Compares the sources and evaluates at least one of them	8
	Level 6 Reconciles the two sources – must have comparison e.g. E is the politicians planning while F is the Soviet military.	7
	Level 5 Evaluates E but no valid/relevant use of F	6
	Level 4 Answers based on disagreements between the sources	4–5
	Level 3 Answers based on the fact that both sources suggest an invasion had been proposed	3
	Level 2 Answers based on undeveloped provenance OR Identifies what Andropov is lying about but no support OR explains disagreement but never addresses lying OR Reconciled answer without comparison	2
	Level 1 Writes about the sources but does not address the question	1
	Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question	0

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>Study Source G. What is the cartoonist's message? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge.</p> <p>Level 5 Explains cartoonist's point of view 7 The cartoonist is making fun of/critical of Brezhnev (Soviets) for being scared of the threat Solidarity poses to the Soviets' hold over Eastern Europe.</p> <p>Level 4 Explains big message 6 Brezhnev is worried that Solidarity could threaten Soviet control of Eastern Europe.</p> <p>Level 3 Explains valid sub-messages 3–5 e.g. Brezhnev is worried about Solidarity, Solidarity is a threat, the Soviets control Eastern European countries, the Eastern Bloc might be attracted by Solidarity's ideas.</p> <p>Level 2 Misinterprets the cartoon 2</p> <p>Level 1 Surface description of cartoon 1</p> <p>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question 0</p>	7

Question	Answer	Marks
5	<p>Study Source H. Are you surprised by this source? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge.</p> <p>Level 6 Explains why not surprised because of Jaruzelski's purpose in H 8</p> <p>Level 5 Both types of Level 4 – surprised and not surprised 6–7</p> <p>Level 4 Uses other sources/contextual knowledge to explain why surprised or not surprised by details in H 4–5</p> <p>Level 3 Valid analysis of the source but fails to state if surprised or not surprised OR Level 6 answers that are not supported OR Unhistorical reasoning that makes sense (everyday empathy) 3</p> <p>Level 2 Identifies what is/is not surprising but no valid explanation OR Undeveloped use of provenance 2</p> <p>Level 1 Writes about the source but does not address the question 1</p> <p>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question 0</p>	8

Question	Answer	Marks
6	<p>Study all the sources. How far do these sources provide convincing evidence that the Soviet Union was willing to send armed forces into Poland? Use the sources to explain your answer.</p> <p>Award up to 2 bonus marks for evaluation of sources (no more than 1 per source).</p> <p>Source use must be reference to a source by letter, by provenance or by direct quote. There must be examples from source content. There must be an explanation of how this supports/does not support the statement.</p> <p>Use a ✓ in the margin for each source use in support of the statement and a x for each source use rejecting the statement.</p> <p>Agree (✓): B, C, D, F, H</p> <p>Disagree (x): A, E, G</p> <p>Level 3 Uses sources to support and reject the statement 7–10</p> <p>Level 2 Uses sources to support or reject the statement 4–6</p> <p>Level 1 No valid source use 1–3</p> <p>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question 0</p>	12