



A-level HISTORY 7042/2J

Component 2J America: A Nation Divided, c1845–1877

Mark scheme

June 2024

Version: 1.0 Final



Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2024 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity, you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level, you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying Lincoln's leadership during the Civil War.

[30 marks]*Target: AO2*

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25–30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19–24**
- L3:** Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13–18**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7–12**
- L1:** The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1–6**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

Source A: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the author is Horace Greeley, a leading Radical Republican, abolitionist and editor of the 'New York Tribune', a very influential newspaper associated with the Republican Party. This is valuable for offering a Radical Republican's perspective on how Lincoln is addressing the war, in particular in his handling of the slavery question. However, as a radical viewpoint, it is limited in being more aggressive in his views towards Lincoln's policies on the war
- the date offers value as by this point, the original purpose of the war, the Crittenden Resolution, was being repealed, and there was increased pressure on Lincoln to make the purpose of the war to end slavery. Lincoln believed in gradual emancipation as a necessary war measure, whilst the Radicals demanded more
- the purpose is to apply pressure to Lincoln to enact something more concrete on how to treat slaves captured by the Union Army. Lincoln would issue the Emancipation Proclamation the following month highlighting that Union forces would offer protection to emancipated African-Americans
- Greeley's tone shows the Radical Republican faction's despair towards Lincoln's handling of the war. Radicals such as Greeley, Charles Sumner and Thaddeus Stevens believed Lincoln was being too lenient with the rebel states and that he would welcome them back with their slaves, causing frictions within the Republican Party during the Civil War.

Content and argument

- Greeley argues that many in the Republican Party believe Lincoln's ineffective leadership is delaying the end of the Civil War. There had been significant growth in opposition to Lincoln, including those in his own party like the Radicals. Lincoln had always maintained the purpose of the war was to restore the Union, however, many Republicans felt the purpose should be on abolishing slavery
- Greeley argues that Lincoln needs to do more to harm the Confederate cause by focusing his presidential powers on slavery in the rebel states. It can be noted by students that within weeks, as a response to this correspondence with Greeley and significant events in the war, especially the Battle of Antietam in September 1862, Lincoln responded with his Emancipation Proclamation. This changed the policy of the war and focused on attacking slavery in the rebel states, which pleased Radicals. This, however, caused serious criticism from Northern Democrats such as Vallandigham and Seymour of New York
- Greeley continues to stress that the 'rebellious traitors' need to be punished for causing the Civil War and firm measures need to be put into place. When Lincoln began drafting his Ten Percent Plan to readmit rebel states back to the Union, Radicals challenged him with the Wade-Davis Bill which was significantly harsher
- Greeley has serious concerns that Lincoln was being too lenient in his treatment of the rebel states and that his leadership was being questioned by his own party. Lincoln had previously stated he would welcome the rebel states back to the Union with their slaves, which was even demonstrated in the

1864 Republican campaign with abolitionists and radicals forming the Radical Democrat Party with Fremont, arguing Lincoln wasn't challenging slavery seriously enough. This argument, however, could be limited as it demonstrates a strong, radical opinion towards Lincoln's leadership, whilst many moderates praised him for his leadership.

Source B: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the author is Clement Vallandigham, a leading Peace Democrat from Ohio. As a Copperhead, he was very outspoken against Lincoln's handling of the war, and was arrested in May 1863 for his opposition, including encouraging Union soldiers to desert
- the purpose of the source is to criticise Lincoln's administration and to gain more support for the Democratic Party. The Democrats had won back two states in the 1862 mid-terms as there were no significant victories for the Union in the Civil War, causing growing opposition to Lincoln's leadership
- the date is January 1863, two weeks since the passing of Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. This offers value for showing Northern Democrat responses to Lincoln's war measures, with many arguing he was illegally changing the purpose of the war and going further than the powers given to him by the Constitution
- the tone is of typical outrage and partisan dislike for Lincoln's leadership. Vallandigham uses powerful language to emphasise his views on what has been allowed to happen under Lincoln's leadership, with 'multiple violations' suggesting Lincoln was betraying the Union. Lincoln did face criticism from the Democratic Party for some actions, such as suspending *habeas corpus* in Maryland in 1862.

Content and argument

- Vallandigham argues that Lincoln had been abusing his powers as President during the Civil War on multiple occasions. Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation was met with intense criticism by Democrats, who claimed Lincoln had unconstitutionally changed the purpose of the war without working with Congress
- Vallandigham emphasises that Lincoln has repeatedly made decisions that were unpopular within the Union during the Civil War. Indeed, Northern Democrats such as Vallandigham and Horatio Seymour of New York referred to Lincoln as a 'tyrant' when addressing civil liberties within the Northern states, as shown with his 40 000 arbitrary arrests in Maryland to challenge Confederate sympathisers
- Vallandigham continues to argue that Lincoln's leadership has delayed the end of the war. This is valuable as the Peace Democrats were heavily critical of Lincoln's choice of military leaders who performed poorly in battles such as Pope and Burnside, and by this point, no decisive victories had been won by the Union
- Vallandigham summarises that the Union is no better under Lincoln's leadership and that the Confederacy was in a stronger position in the Civil War. This offers value as the Confederates had been successful in defending the Eastern theatre in Virginia.

Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the author is General Grant of the Union Army. Grant had a good relationship with Lincoln as Lincoln trusted him to deliver victory in the Western Theatre, despite Democrat calls for Grant to be removed from command. This would offer value from a military perspective of those who supported Lincoln. Lincoln would receive over 78% of the soldier vote in the 1864 election, highlighting his popularity
- the date is April 1864, which offers value for showing views towards Lincoln's leadership towards the end of the war. Grant, as well as others such as Sherman, had a lot of faith in Lincoln, who was particularly talented in cajoling his troops and not interfering too deeply in military matters
- the nature is a memoir of Grant's personal aid, Porter, who recalls Grant's first conversation with Lincoln. Students could argue that the first meeting and conversation between Lincoln and Grant would be of great importance, with Grant honestly sharing his dialogue with Lincoln, whilst also sharing his opinion towards Lincoln's leadership
- Grant's tone emphasises a lot of respect for Lincoln and his leadership qualities. Grant was clearly complimentary of how Lincoln had faith in him to lead the military in the war as newly appointed lieutenant general.

Content and argument

- Grant addresses Lincoln's honesty in his lack of military experience by his reluctance to get deeply involved in military strategy, and trusted his military leaders to do this for him. Lincoln had very little military experience in comparison to Jefferson Davis, however, he was an excellent man manager and would respectfully delegate responsibility to more experienced military leaders such as Scott, Grant and McClellan. The source is limited as it ignores his lack of success in the Eastern Theatre before 1863
- Grant argues that Lincoln knew when to interfere if the Union wasn't being successful and a change in military leadership was needed to end the war. Whilst valuable, as Lincoln did not hesitate to remove ineffective leaders such as Pope (Second Manassas), Burnside (Fredericksburg) and Hooker (Chancellorsville), he was criticised for keeping McClellan in charge of the Army of the Potomac for as long as he did against Lee
- Grant argues that Lincoln was aware of the frustrations felt by the people if change didn't happen during the Civil War. Lincoln was aware in 1864 of his unpopularity in the party, even stating 'I am going to be beaten, and if something doesn't happen soon, beaten badly'
- Grant argues that Lincoln had trust in him to deliver victory for the Union and that he didn't want to know his plans. Lincoln was deeply impressed by Grant (and Sherman) for delivering hard-war tactics in the West and forcing unconditional surrender of key Confederate defences such as Fort Donelson and Vicksburg, and Lincoln's leadership in promoting Grant to lieutenant general was key to winning the war. Lincoln claimed he'd rather not know Grant's plans, as he trusted him to use the superior forces of the Union against the depleted Confederate forces. Whilst limited as Grant was labelled the 'butcher' by Democrats, Lincoln defended him by stating 'He fights'.

Section B

- 0 2** 'In the years 1850 to 1854, the growth of abolitionist sentiment in the Northern States was the main cause of division between North and South.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that in the years 1850 to 1854, the growth of abolitionist sentiment in the Northern States was the main cause of division between North and South might include:

- William Seward's 'Higher Law' speech on 11 March 1850 was considered an example of abolitionist sentiment becoming more prominent in Congress. Seward's speech galvanised more Northerners to turn against the Democrats who appeared to be more pro-slavery expansion. Over 100 000 copies of his speech were printed and distributed, increasing abolitionist views and causing the South to fear growing abolitionist sentiment in the North, especially in the Senate
- the 1852 publication of 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' by Harriet Beecher Stowe influenced a growth in abolitionist views, especially in the North. An estimated one in five Northern readers read the book and were becoming more horrified at the treatment of slaves. The Southern response of 'Anti-Tom literature' such as 'The Planter's Northern Bride' by Caroline Lee Hentz, demonstrated the fierce defence of slavery in the South, which further increased divisions over slavery in the Union
- leading Northern abolitionists, such as Salmon Chase, continued to speak out against the 'Slave Power' following the war with Mexico, and during the presidency of Franklin Pierce which was heavily associated with pro-slavery measures, such as the attempted annexation of Cuba
- the ongoing Northern resistance to the stricter Fugitive Slave Act 1850 demonstrated increasing abolitionist views causing tension. Examples such as the Jerry Case (1851) and the Burns Affair (1854) where abolitionists freed captured fugitive slaves, caused outrage amongst the South as they felt Northerners, especially abolitionists, were ignoring their state rights and the 1850 Compromise.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1850 to 1854, the growth of abolitionist sentiment in the Northern States was the main cause of division between North and South might include:

- there was a commitment to national harmony following Congress's passing of the 1850 Compromise. Despite some resistance, many Northerners accepted the Fugitive Slave Act and returned fugitive slaves, which demonstrated some effort to appease the South and reduce tensions
- slavery expansion, not abolitionism, was considered the key cause of division in this time period. Following the 'one hell of a storm' caused by the Kansas-Nebraska Act 1854, many Northerners felt the 'Slave Power' was growing in control over the federal government.
- The repeal of the 1820 Missouri Compromise, as part of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, rapidly increased divisions and saw the emergence of the Republican Party, which was devoted to anti-slavery expansion into the territories
- The emergence of new politicians with secessionist beliefs in Congress increased divisions. Prominent figures such as Jefferson Davis of Mississippi took on the mantle left by John Calhoun, advocating for states' rights and slavery expansion into the territories.

Students may argue that in the years 1850 to 1854, abolitionism certainly entered national politics on a scale different to that earlier in the time period. Key individuals such as Seward, Brown and Chase would spearhead the abolitionist cause, with the support of literature breakthroughs and multiple scandals linked to the expansionist agendas of the Democratic Party. The concept of abolitionism was growing, however, more pressing matters such as the growing fear of slavery expansion into western territories could also be argued as more important for sectional divisions, especially when spearheaded by secessionists such as Jefferson Davis and David Atchison.

- 0 3** To what extent was Republican victory in the 1860 election the result of the weaknesses of the Democratic Party?

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that Republican victory in the 1860 election was the result of the weaknesses of the Democratic Party might include:

- the Democrat's reputation was weakened by their refusal to pass important economic measures to support a struggling Northern economy, effectively bringing splits over economic policy within the Democratic Party. Following the Panic of 1857, Northern businesses suffered. When the Republicans proposed higher protective tariffs, Buchanan and the Democrats rejected these, causing more Northern industries to turn to the Republicans in the 1860 election
- Buchanan's involvement in the Dred Scott decision, 1857, damaged his and the Democratic Party's popularity. Northern Democrats didn't side with Buchanan's stance on the Dred Scott decision, whilst despite being a Northerner himself, seemed to side with more Southern views. This suggested a deeper split on sectional levels, ruining their chances of securing victory in the 1860 election.
- the actions of Senator Douglas from Illinois had made the Democrats lose valuable Southern support entering the 1860 election. His stance against the pro-slavery Lecompton Constitution, and his defiance of the Dred Scott decision with his Freeport Doctrine in August 1858 caused Southerners to resent him, splitting the party and gifting the election to the Republicans instead of Douglas winning the Northern vote
- the splitting of the Democrat Party in 1860 made Republican victory more likely in the 1860 election. The Southern walk-out at the Charleston and Baltimore conventions led to the formation of the Southern Democrats under Breckinridge, however, this action made winning the electoral college vote impossible, resulting in a victory for the Republican Party who claimed 180 electoral college votes.

Arguments challenging the view that that Republican victory in the 1860 election was the result of the weaknesses of the Democratic Party include:

- Lincoln and the Republicans were a party that was against the perceived 'Slave Power' conspiracy. A vote for the Republicans suggested the North were against slavery expansion in the territories
- the proposals made by the Republicans in their platform in the 1860 election were popular with the Northern states which aided their victory. The proposals included the development of a transcontinental railroad and higher protective tariffs, which Northern industrialists and supporters of a free labour economy welcomed to aid Northern recovery from the Panic of 1857
- the reputation of Lincoln was particularly strong in the North. His ability to challenge Senator Douglas in the Lincoln-Douglas debates in 1858 elevated his reputation as a politician and as an orator. His 'Honest Abe' persona also made him a more acceptable choice for Northern voters, and his campaign team labelled him as the 'Rail Candidate' drawing on his working-class background to make him more appealing
- the continued belief that the Democrats represented immigrants helped ensure Republican victory. Irish and German immigrants continued to vote Democrat, so nativists in the North voted Republican.

Students could reach the conclusion that the damage was done by the many mistakes by Buchanan, Douglas and their apparent connections to the growing 'Slave Power' in the federal government and the Democrat Party. The Democratic Party was deeply split on sectional lines, making Republican victory inevitable. However, students may also evaluate that the strengths of the Republican Party would be enough to secure victory. Lincoln's own reputation and skill won over many critics and their well-pitched platform focusing on anti-slavery expansion promises was what the North wanted to vote for.

0 4 'There was no significant improvement to the lives of African-Americans in the years 1867 to 1877.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that there was no significant improvement to the lives of African-Americans in the years 1867 to 1877 might include:

- racism remained high in the ex-Confederate states during Reconstruction. The violent nature of the Colfax Massacre in 1872 suggested no social improvements for African-Americans
- the economic decline of the 1870s saw African-Americans forced to enter sharecropping. Due to their lack of work skills and education, many ex-slaves found themselves back on the plantations with former plantation owners, suggesting little economic improvements for African-Americans. This was also demonstrated in the Northern states, where African-Americans continued to be paid minimum wages and faced discrimination in the workforce
- white supremacist groups in the South emerged after the Civil War to challenge any progression for African-American rights. The Ku Klux Klan and other paramilitary groups terrorised African-American politicians, schools, churches and neighbourhoods with very little federal protection
- African-Americans still found it difficult to exercise their full legal rights. Many Southern states permitted 'black codes' which hindered the rights of African-Americans, eg to vote, suggesting no significant improvement.

Arguments challenging the view that there was no significant improvement to the lives of African-Americans in the years 1867 to 1877 might include:

- the constitutional amendments passed after the Civil War saw significant improvement to the lives of African-Americans. The ending of slavery allowed greater mobility for African-Americans to seek employment and migrate to new areas, and gaining citizenship status offered some protection under the law
- the right to vote following the Fifteenth Amendment 1870 was significant for improving African-American lives. By 1870, Hiram Revels, an African-American had been elected to the Senate representing Mississippi, showing significant strides for African-American political rights. Future African-American politicians such as Blanche K Bruce would also prove African-American lives saw some improvement
- social and economic mobility for African-Americans significantly improved, with 10 cities in the South seeing their black population doubling during the 1870s
- the Freedman's Bureau significantly helped African-Americans. They provided support for building schools, hospitals and churches for African-Americans, supporting them as they transitioned out of slavery which was extended by the Radical Republicans.

Students may argue either way. Legally, constitutional amendments brought significant improvements to the lives of African-Americans, as slavery had been abolished by the federal government at the end of the Civil War. They allowed for greater movement for ex-slave families to improve their lives and integrate into American society. However, the lack of enforcement in the South by an uninterested President Grant and a more conservative Republican government in the 1870s, saw African-Americans experience very few social and economic improvements, with sharecropping becoming the only economic option for African-Americans.