



GCE MARK SCHEME

SUMMER 2019

HISTORY - UNIT 4
DEPTH STUDY 7

THE CRISIS OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC, c.1840–1877
Part 2: Civil War and Reconstruction, c.1861–1877

1100U70-1

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2019 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

It is hoped that this information will be of assistance to centres but it is recognised at the same time that, without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation.

WJEC regrets that it cannot enter into any discussion or correspondence about this marking scheme.

UNIT 4
DEPTH STUDY 7
THE CRISIS OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC c1840-1877
Part 2: CIVIL WAR AND RECONSTRUCTION c1861-1877
MARK SCHEME
QUESTION 1

Marking guidance for examiners

Summary of assessment objectives for Question 1

Question 1 assesses assessment objective 2. This assessment objective is focused on the ability to analyse and evaluate different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted. The total mark awarded to this question is 30.

The structure of the mark scheme

The mark scheme for Question 1 has two parts:

- Advice on each specific question outlining indicative content which can be used to assess the quality of the specific response. This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to. Assessors should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.
- An assessment grid advising which bands and marks should be given to responses which demonstrate the qualities needed in assessment objective 2.

Deciding on the mark awarded within a band

The first stage for an examiner is to decide the overall band. The second stage is to decide how firmly the qualities expected for that band are displayed. Thirdly a final mark for the question can then be awarded.

INDICATIVE CONTENT FOR QUESTION 1

NOTE: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to below. Assessors should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates. Each answer will be assessed on its merits according to the assessment grid as well as the indicative content.

With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the Confederacy between 1862 and 1864.

Candidates are expected to demonstrate their ability to analyse and evaluate a range of source material with a high degree of discrimination. Source evaluation skills should focus on discussing the strengths and the limitations of the nominated sources. To judge utility, there should be consideration of the content and the authorship of the nominated sources to discuss reliability, bias, purpose and validity, as appropriate. In analysing and evaluating the provided source material, candidates may deploy knowledge and understanding from their previous learning.

Credit may be given if previous learning is used to show understanding of the historical context if appropriate.

Candidates will consider the three sources in their historical context and might consider the value of the sources to an historian studying the Confederacy between 1862 and 1864. Understanding of the historical context should be utilised to analyse and evaluate the strengths and limitations of the sources. Appropriate observations in the analysis and evaluation of the sources may include:

Source A This is a diary entry for October 1862 and reflects the developing home-front problems for the Confederacy. Jones is a clerk in the War Department in Richmond so he is in a key position to comment on the war effort in the Confederate capital. The general context is the impact of war on the home front. The specific context is the problem of inflation and its developing impact. He mentions the important issue of depreciation of the currency which is regarded by many historians as a major reason for the Confederate government's inability to raise loans to sustain the war effort. The diary entry also shows clear evidence of famine. Jones provides clear evidence too of the impact of the northern blockade, 'starvation produced by the enemy'. The diary is of value in providing explanations for the dislocation of the Confederate home front as early as 1862: by 1864/1865 this had developed into a catastrophe. Expect some comments on the provenance of the source—it is a diary entry from a member of the Confederate government with first-hand experience of the problems and their importance.

Source B This is a private letter from a soldier in Lee's army written in July 1863. The general context referred to is the military history of the war. The specific context are alleged turning points in the war—he refers to Grant's significant victory at Vicksburg and Lee's defeat at Gettysburg, both in 1863. As a soldier he is very aware of the significance of the turn of events and how things can change dramatically in the space of a few weeks—as he says only a month before 'our prospects were as bright as could well be conceived'. The value of the source is the realisation of the scale of the defeats. If a soldier was thinking this, then what must more senior members of the army and government of the Confederacy be thinking? The outcome has caused

Simpson some angst; as he says 'The fall of Vicksburg has caused me to lose confidence in something or somebody.' Expect some comment on the provenance of the source. It is still a Confederate source—Vicksburg is 'gallant', the foe is 'merciless'. General Lee can hardly do any wrong and the explanation for his defeat is puzzling to Simpson as he still cannot comprehend it properly. Nonetheless it is a private letter to his parents so it has evidential value about the progress of the war and its impact on the Confederate armies.

Source C This provides further evidence of the dislocation and breakdown of consensus in the Confederacy by 1864. The general context is the condition of the home front in the South. The specific context is the belated attempt to introduce the draft and establish more military control of the war-making capacity in the South. This is late in the war—1864—and compares badly to the vigorous mobilisation of resources in the North. Moreover, as the source reveals, the strength of states' rights is very strong with one of the states resisting the authority of the government in Richmond. This illustrates not only distrust but also a sense of war weariness that is gripping the South and which has been used by historians to make comparisons between the effectiveness of the home fronts in North and South. The evidence of dissent from, even resistance to, the central government is compelling. Expect comment on the provenance of the source—these are publicly-debated resolutions from the North Carolina Assembly and as such the source is of considerable evidential value in showing attitudes on the Confederate home front at a crucial stage in the war.

Overall, candidates will provide a judgment regarding the value of the sources to an historian studying the Confederacy between 1862 and 1864 and are able to demonstrate that value through consideration of the tone and nature of the presented sources and understanding of the historical context.

UNIT 4

MARK SCHEME FOR QUESTION 1

In general terms the responses will display characteristics of one of the six bands shown below.

The table below gives advice on which band, sub-band and marks should be awarded to answers showing the appropriate characteristics.

Candidates should be rewarded for making connections and comparisons between elements of both parts of the depth study, where relevant.

Band 6 CHARACTERISTICS		<i>Sustained and accurate analysis and evaluation of the given sources; full understanding shown of the specific historical context associated with the set enquiry; reaches a full and substantiated judgement regarding the value of the sources to an historian studying the development of a particular issue over the period set.</i>
ASE OVER THE PERIOD SET		
B6H	30	The response shows accurate and sustained source evaluation using the content and attributions of each of the three sources, setting the response in the specific historical context and covering all of the period set in the enquiry. There will be a substantiated judgement regarding the value of the sources to an historian studying the development of a particular issue over the period set.
B6S	27	The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 6
Band 5 CHARACTERISTICS		<i>Meaningful analysis and evaluation of the given sources involving valid evaluation of the content and attribution of the sources; understanding shown of the specific historical context associated with the set enquiry; reaches a valid judgement regarding the value of the sources to an historian studying a particular issue.</i>
ASE		
B5H	25	The response shows accurate source evaluation using the content and attributions of the three sources, setting the response in the specific historical context and covering most of the period set in the enquiry. There will be a valid and supported judgement on the value of all three sources to an historian studying a particular issue.
B5S	23	The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 5
B5C	21	This mark can be used if there is understanding shown of the specific historical context of one source only.
Band 4 CHARACTERISTICS		<i>Clearly attempts an analysis and evaluation of the given sources in relation to the general historical context of the set enquiry with some evaluation of the content and attribution; a sound judgement is seen regarding the value of some or all three sources.</i>
GCX, V and/or U		
B4H	20	The response is able to discuss the strengths and limitations of the three sources by focusing on their attributions, content and especially the general historical context. This will be used to reach a reasoned judgement on value of all three sources. Occasional references to utility are acceptable.
B4S	18	The response is able to discuss the strengths and limitations of the three sources by focusing on their attributions, content and the general historical context. A judgement on value will be present on some or all of the three sources though some general comments on utility may be seen.
B4C	16	The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 4 in discussing the general historical context. Mainly focussed on UTILITY but with a limited reference to value.

Band 3 CHARACTERISTICS		<i>Mechanistic and formulaic use of the content and attributions of the given sources to evaluate their utility and / or value; a limited judgement on the utility and / or value of the sources will be seen. Limited understanding of the historical context.</i>
Mechanistic V, S&L and U		
B3H	15	
B3S	13	
B3C	11	The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 3. This can also be used if only one source is attempted.
Band 2 CHARACTERISTICS		<i>Mechanistic and formulaic use of the content and / or attributions of the given sources to show their strengths and / or limitations.</i>
TRAWL		
B2H	8	
B2S	6	The response is able to discuss the strengths and / or limitations of some of the three sources by focusing on their content mostly.
Band 1 CHARACTERISTICS		<i>Copies or paraphrases from content or attributions of the given sources.</i>
COPYING / COMPREHENSION		
B1H	5	
B1S	3	
	0	Use for incorrect answers

QUESTIONS 2 AND 3

Marking guidance for examiners

Summary of assessment objectives for Question 2 and 3

Both questions assess assessment objective 1. This assessment objective is a single element focussed on the ability to analyse and evaluate and reach substantiated judgements. The mark awarded to the question chosen is 30.

The structure of the mark scheme

The mark scheme for Questions 2 and 3 has two parts:

- Advice on each specific question outlining indicative content which can be used to assess the quality of the specific response. This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to. Assessors should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.
- An assessment grid advising which bands and marks should be given to responses which demonstrate the qualities needed in assessment objective 1.

Deciding on the mark awarded within a band

The first stage for an examiner is to decide the overall band. The second stage is to decide how firmly the qualities expected for that band are displayed. Thirdly a final mark for the question can then be awarded.

Organisation and communication

This issue should have a bearing if the standard of organisation and communication is inconsistent with the descriptor for the band in which the answer falls. In this situation, examiners may decide not to award the highest mark within the band.

INDICATIVE CONTENT FOR QUESTION 2

NOTE: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to below. Assessors should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates. Each answer will be assessed on its merits according to the assessment grid as well as the indicative content.

'Until 1864 a record of disappointment and failure.' How far do you agree with this assessment of Abraham Lincoln's presidency?

Candidates are expected to consider and debate the full range of issues that affected the key concept in the question—in this case whether Lincoln's presidency was a record of disappointment and failure until 1864. They will consider a range of key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance where appropriate and also the relationship between the key characteristics and features associated with the issue in the question. In addressing the context of the set question, candidates may deploy knowledge and understanding from their previous learning. Credit may be given if the knowledge and understanding deployed helps to address the specific question set.

Candidates will offer an analysis and evaluation of Lincoln's presidency. In order to reach a substantiated judgement about this issue, candidates may argue that Lincoln's presidency was definitely a disappointment and a failure until 1864. They may support the proposition by considering:

- the failure to prevent the outbreak of the civil war;
- the failure to achieve decisive military success until 1864 and its high cost;
- Lincoln's alleged abuse of executive power—habeas corpus and martial law;
- opposition of Republicans to plans to reconstruct the south—Lincoln's alleged leniency;
- political infighting and the gloomy forecast for the 1864 presidential election.

Candidates may consider challenging the proposition in the question by arguing that Lincoln's presidency was, in fact, mainly successful even up to 1864. They may note that Lincoln:

- maintaining political unity in the cabinet;
- saved the Union and won the war;
- had military insight and picked a winning team by 1864;
- had a Shrewd border state strategy
- had an emancipation strategy
- showed political leadership and inspiring leadership of the North
- skilfully avoided foreign intervention;
- co-ordinated the war effort and mobilisation of resources;
- made early moves at reconciliation; however, these were cut short by his assassination.

Overall, candidates will offer a debate and come to a substantiated judgement regarding the achievements of Lincoln's presidency and whether the record was one of disappointment and failure until 1864.

INDICATIVE CONTENT FOR QUESTION 3

NOTE: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to below. Assessors should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates. Each answer will be assessed on its merits according to the assessment grid as well as the indicative content.

To what extent was President Grant mainly responsible for the failure of reconstruction in the period from 1865 to 1877?

Candidates are expected to consider and debate the full range of issues that affected the key concept in the question—in this case whether President Grant was mainly responsible for the failure of reconstruction in the period from 1865 to 1877. They will consider a range of key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance where appropriate and also the relationship between the key characteristics and features associated with the issue in the question. In addressing the context of the set question, candidates may deploy knowledge and understanding from their previous learning. Credit may be given if the knowledge and understanding deployed helps to address the specific question set.

Candidates will offer an analysis and evaluation of the issue of the failure of reconstruction. In order to reach a substantiated judgement about this issue, candidates may argue that President Grant was mainly responsible for the failure of reconstruction in the period from 1865 to 1877. Candidates may consider supporting the proposition that President Grant was indeed responsible for the failure of reconstruction by noting:

- his presidency was dogged by scandals, distracting the focus on reconstruction;
- he failed to sustain reconstruction after 1872;
- his political failure to maintain republican unity on reconstruction;
- his failure to sustain Congressional reconstruction;
- his failure to intervene in Mississippi in 1875 undermined resistance to white violence and intimidation.

Candidates may consider challenging the proposition in the question by arguing that other reasons were more significant than Grant in explaining the failure of reconstruction. They may note:

- that Grant implemented the Force Acts against the KKK in 1870 to 1872;
- Johnson's wrecking vetoes of Congressional legislation in 1865 and 1866;
- Johnson's impeachment was a major distraction;
- further attempts by Johnson to undermine radical reconstruction in 1867;
- the corruption of republican governments in the South;
- the failure of republicans in the North to sustain reconstruction after 1872;
- taxation and state debts outweighed reforms in voting, infrastructure and education;
- the failure to guarantee effective civil rights for African-Americans;
- southern white resistance, especially the Mississippi plan (1874);
- Hayes' deal in 1876, which destroyed the last republican governments in the south

Overall candidates will offer a debate and come to a substantiated judgement regarding the role of President Grant in the failure of reconstruction in the period from 1865 to 1877.

UNIT 4

MARK SCHEME QUESTIONS 2 AND 3

In general terms the responses will display characteristics of one of the six bands shown below.

The table below gives advice on which band, sub-band and marks should be awarded to answers showing the appropriate characteristics.

Candidates should be rewarded for making connections and comparisons between elements of both parts of the depth study, where relevant.

Band 6 CHARACTERISTICS		<i>The response is fully focused on the exact key concept in the set question, covering the whole of set period, with a clear and convincing debate on the main developments and reaching a substantiated judgement in a lucid and fully coherent essay.</i>
B6H	30	The response engages with the exact key concept and the fuller range of issues arising from the question set throughout the essay and is able to provide an analytical, evaluative and lucid essay with a fully convincing and substantiated judgement covering the whole of the set period.
B6S	27	The response engages with the key concept and the fuller range of issues arising from the question set throughout the essay and is able to provide an analytical, evaluative and coherent essay with a convincing and substantiated judgement covering nearly all of the set period.
Band 5 CHARACTERISTICS		<i>The response is mainly focused on debating the key concept in the set question, covering most or all of the full period. The response considers most of the main developments; provides a convincing debate and is able to come to a supported, balanced and appropriate judgement.</i>
B5H	25	The response engages with the key concept and offers a convincing debate regarding the range of issues arising from the question set throughout most of the essay. The essay will be analytical, evaluative and well written with a balanced and appropriate judgement covering most or all of the set period.
B5S	23	The response has a focus on debating the key concept set throughout most of the essay and is able to provide an analytical, evaluative and well written essay with a balanced and appropriate judgement covering some or most of the set period.
B5C	21	The response begins to show some of the characteristics of Band 5. <i>[This can be used for good conceptual responses which do not cover the greater part of the period]</i>

Band 4 CHARACTERISTICS		<i>The response has some focus on the key concept in the set question covering some to all of the set period, with some debate on some of the developments and a supported, balanced judgement on the key concept in a structured essay. There may well be some drift but there should be the beginning of a meaningful debate in the response.</i>
B4H	20	The response will feature some meaningful discussion of how and why the main developments, events or factors had an impact on the key concept in the set question over some or most of the period set. There will be an attempt at a balanced and supported judgement though some slight drift may be apparent.
B4S	18	The response begins to discuss the key concept in the question set, often with a series of mini judgements. There may be an attempt to consider a series of developments, events or factors in relation to the key concept set over some or most of the period. There may well be some listing of developments and some drift.
B4C	16	The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 4. <i>[This can be used for good Band 3 responses that offer at least one valid reference or judgement on the key concept.]</i>
Band 3 CHARACTERISTICS		<i>The response has some focus on the key issues set and begins to discuss these to come to a judgement on the question set. The response is usually restricted to a “for and against” discussion with some evidence of listing and unloading of notes. There may well be some considerable drift; and there may well be a mechanistic tone to the response.</i>
B3H	15	The response is based on a series of assertions, developments or factors over the period rather than the key concept in the question set. The response does offer a limited but valid judgement.
B3S	13	The response tends to be in the form of a generalised, listing of developments and factors.
Band 2 CHARACTERISTICS		<i>The response is largely based on the TOPIC area and is descriptive.</i>
B2H	8	The response is a predominantly descriptive account of the topic. There will be a “tagged on” judgement.
B2S	6	The response is a descriptive account of the developments and factors related to the topic area with no judgement attempted.
Band 1 CHARACTERISTICS		<i>The response is very limited, undeveloped, very brief or largely irrelevant.</i>
B1H	5	The response is very limited and undeveloped though there is some weak link to the topic area.
B1S	3	The response is very brief and / or largely irrelevant to the concept set.
	0	Use for incorrect answers